

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: Roy Liuzza

Associate Editors: Daniel Donoghue
Thomas Hall

| | |
|--------|------|
| VOLUME | 35 |
| NUMBER | 2 |
| Winter | 2002 |

ISSN 0030-1973

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER

Volume XXXV Number 2

Winter 2002

Editor

Jonathan Wilcox
Department of English
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

Publisher

Paul E. Szarmach
Medieval Institute
Western Michigan University
1903 W. Michigan Ave.
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-3801

Associate Editors

Year's Work in Old English Studies

Daniel Donoghue
Department of English
Barker Center / 12 Quincy St.
Harvard University
Cambridge MA 02138

Bibliography

Thomas Hall
Department of English (M/C 162)
University of Illinois at Chicago
601 S. Morgan Street
Chicago, IL 60607-7120

Assistant to the Publisher: Hilary Fox

Assistant to the Editor: R.M. Liuzza

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

Correspondence: General correspondence regarding *OEN* should be addressed to the Editor; correspondence regarding the *Year's Work* and the annual *Bibliography* should be sent to the respective Associate Editors. Correspondence regarding business matters and subscriptions should be sent to the Publisher.

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

Old English Newsletter 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. *OEN* receives no financial support from the MLA; the support of the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists and the Department of English at The University of Tennessee are gratefully acknowledged.

Copyright © 2004

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

Editorial Offices

email: jonathan-wilcox@uiowa.edu
fax: 319-335-2535
phone: 319-335-1913

Business Offices

email: mdvl_oen@wmich.edu
fax: 269-387-8750
phone: 269-387-8832

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

THE YEAR'S WORK IN OLD ENGLISH STUDIES

2000

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| John David Cormican | <i>Utica College</i> |
| Craig R. Davis | <i>Smith College</i> |
| Nicole Guenther Discenza | <i>University of South Florida</i> |
| Mary Frances Giandrea | <i>George Mason University</i> |
| Kurt Gustav Goblirsch | <i>University of South Carolina</i> |
| David F. Johnson | <i>Florida State University</i> |
| Richard F. Johnson | <i>William Rainey Harper College</i> |
| Eileen A. Joy | <i>Southern Illinois Univ.-Edwardsville</i> |
| Joseph P. McGowan | <i>University of San Diego</i> |
| Haruko Momma | <i>New York University</i> |
| Bruce O'Brien | <i>Mary Washington College</i> |
| Lisi Oliver | <i>Louisiana State University</i> |
| David W. Porter | <i>Southern University</i> |
| Mary K. Ramsey | <i>Georgia State University</i> |
| Chris Snyder | <i>Marymount University</i> |
| M. Jane Toswell | <i>University of Western Ontario</i> |
| Benjamin C. Withers | <i>Indiana University, South Bend</i> |

Edited by

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Daniel Donoghue | <i>Harvard University</i> |
| R. D. Fulk | <i>Indiana University</i> |
| R. M. Liuzza | <i>University of Tennessee, Knoxville</i> |

Contents

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects | 6 |
| a. History of Anglo-Saxon Studies | 6 |
| b. Cultural History | 7 |
| c. Language and Linguistics. | 10 |
| d. Research and Teaching Resources. | 12 |
| e. Bayeux Tapestry | 12 |
| f. Representations of Anglo-Saxon History | 13 |
| g. Essay Collections | 14 |
| h. Varia | 16 |
| 2. Language | 18 |
| a. Lexicon, Glosses | 18 |
| b. Syntax, Phonology, Other Aspects | 32 |
| 3. Literature | 48 |
| a. General and Miscellaneous works. | 48 |
| b. Individual Poems | 64 |
| c. <i>Beowulf</i> | 84 |
| d. Prose | 94 |
| 4. Anglo-Latin, Ecclesiastical Works | 109 |
| a. General | 109 |
| b. Early Anglo-Latin, Exclusive of Bede | 110 |
| c. Bede | 113 |
| d. Carolingian, exclusive of Alcuin | 117 |
| e. Alcuin | 117 |
| f. Ninth Century | 117 |
| g. The Tenth Century Reform and Beyond | 118 |
| 5. Manuscripts, Illumination, Charters | 119 |
| 6. History and Culture | 134 |
| a. General | 134 |
| b. Sub-Roman Britain, Anglo-Saxon Settlement, Celtic History | 137 |
| c. Missions and Early Kingdoms to c. 800 | 139 |
| d. Ninth Century and Scandinavian Invasions and Settlements | 143 |
| e. Tenth Century to the Norman Conquest | 146 |
| f. Church, Local, and Regional History | 148 |
| g. Law | 154 |
| h. Norman Conquest and Settlement | 157 |
| 7. Names | 162 |
| 8. Archaeology, Numismatics, Sculpture | 166 |

Preface

THIS ISSUE of *The Year's Work in Old English Studies* is unusual—perhaps unique in the journal's history—in being the product of a collaboration between two editorial teams. When Peter Baker and Rob Fulk handed over the editing duties at the end of 2003, I quickly became aware of the debt we owed them for getting YWOES 2000 underway and more generally for imposing order on what has evolved into a complex editorial project. Their labors deserve the thanks of every reader of YWOES. I am very grateful to Roy Liuzza, the new editor of OEN, for various kinds of assistance, and I look forward to our collaboration for years to come. It is a privilege to be working not only with him but also with the outstanding group of reviewers who have approached their task for this issue (and who have countenanced their new editor) with professionalism and good humor. They are the latest of many dedicated teams who have made *The Year's Work in Old English Studies* such a valuable resource. Like other Anglo-Saxonists I take no small pleasure in witnessing the envy of our colleagues from other disciplines and periods when they see the treasure hoard in each issue of YWOES. Roy and I intend to do everything we can to keep our colleagues mired in their envy, even if it means risking the sin of pride for ourselves.

The Anglo-Saxon equivalent of a gold watch (the Alfred Jewel?) goes to J. R. Hall, who after reviewing for twenty-five years has decided to leave the team of contributors. I know that all the editors whom Jim has outlasted join me in extending our thanks for his years of years of dedication to this project and for the consistently high quality of his reviews. I won't embarrass Jim by recounting how the world has changed since the year of his first review, which would be the rhetorical equivalent of shooting ducks in a barrel, but it is worth pointing out that many Anglo-Saxonists (including the current editors) have profited from his reviews over the entire length of their careers. Thanks are also due to Chris Snyder, who has stepped down from the "History" team but not before submitting several reviews for this issue. The 1999 YWOES was also the last as a reviewer for Rob Fulk, who deserves compounded thanks because for two years his duties as contributor and editor overlapped.

With this issue we are happy to welcome Mary Ramsey of Georgia State University, who takes her place as part of the team reviewing "Individual Poems" (section 3.b). We also welcome Jane Toswell of the University of Western Ontario to review "Literature, General and Miscellaneous" (3.a), and Kurt Goblirsch of the University of South Carolina, who joins Hal Momma in the "Language" section for "Syntax, Phonology, Other Aspects" (2.b)—a vaguely but aptly named section whose reviewers must read and assess a vast and unpredictable range of items.

It is our great regret that this issue must go to press without the Archaeology section, but beginning next year another two reviewers will join Elizabeth Coatsworth (who unfortunately and through no fault of her own was the only member of the former team left to tackle the work for the year 2000). The reconstituted team is already hard at work to bring this section up to date for the next issue.

Roy and I have made it a priority to nudge forward the publication dates to cut down on the gap between the appearance of the YWOES and the year reviewed (now at about four years); we hope this change will increase the value of this journal as a research tool without compromising its quality. To this end we have added reviewers to several sections, and we trust readers will see encouraging results as early as the next issue.

The contributors to *The Year's Work in Old English Studies* are named on the title page, and the authorship of individual sections is indicated by initials within or at the end of each section. Reviewers work from the OEN bibliography of the previous spring, occasionally adding items from the previous year's list of "Works not seen." Dissertations, redactions, summaries, and popular works are occasionally omitted, and their absence in no way constitutes negative judgment.

Comments and suggestions, as well as review copies of articles and books, may be sent to Daniel Donoghue, Department of English, Barker Center, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138.

— D.D.

1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects

a. History of Anglo-Saxon Studies

The enduring value of this yearly publication is celebrated in *Thirty Years More of the 'Year's Work in Old English Studies'* (OEN Subsidia 27. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute and Rawlinson Center, WMU, 1999). A founding father of YWOES, Joseph B. Trahern, Jr. has collected the papers presented in a session commemorating the thirtieth anniversary of the *Year's Work* from the program of the Old English Division at the 1998 MLA annual convention in San Francisco.

In her paper, "Philology, Linguistics: Should You Leave?: 1988–1998" (*Thirty Years More*, ed. Trahern, 3–14), Mary Blockley dismisses the possibility of a reconciliation between Linguistics and Philology, concluding that they have at best achieved "only a rapprochement" but that they may yet thrive under an amicable separation (6). Blockley surveys the problematic venues for language study through an exploration of the taxonomic categories used by the YWOES editors. She goes on to consider the language projects which dominated our field in the 1980s and 90s (Bruce Mitchell's *Old English Syntax*, the *Old English Thesaurus*, and the DOE, to name but a few), noting that they "have prepared the way for negative evidence to become accessible and reveal its importance in the kinds of questions that get asked" (10). Blockley concludes her essay with a list of significant "texts" (print and electronic) for anyone interested in the study of Old English language.

Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe, in "Keeping the Conversation Going: Critical Strategies and Old English Texts" (*Thirty Years More*, ed. Trahern, 15–27), uses the metaphor of a "conversation" to explore the interactions of various theoretical approaches "that we can see at play in three overlapping critical engagements: with the readerly text, with questions of the subject, and with matters of gender" (17). After noting the groundbreaking work of Nicholas Howe, Allen Frantzen, Seth Lerer, Pat Hermann, and Gillian Overing, which "endeavored to bring the world of OE scholarship into explicit conversation with various stands of contemporary critical practice," O'Keeffe focuses on "some very recent work to examine how different theoretical procedures are being deployed and regarded" (17). In a succinct yet thorough review of books by Carol Pasternack, Pauline Head, James Earl, John Hill, and Allen Frantzen, and essays by Clare Lees and Gillian Overing, O'Keeffe concludes

that "These works share but a single characteristic among themselves, apart from their newness—all of them stake out critical territory in contradistinction to what has preceded them" (22). O'Keeffe concludes her wise and balanced essay by noting that the sort of "border disputes" we have in the field are perhaps inevitable, but need not result in confrontation and the "astringent pleasures of critique" (22).

Nicholas Howe's "What Was Culture Thirty Years Ago for Anglo-Saxonists? What Is It Now?" (*Thirty Years More*, ed. Trahern, 29–37) addresses the two questions posed in his title. Citing Dorothy Whitelock's note of caution that she could consider only a "fraction of the contributions which have advanced knowledge" in her 1958 inaugural Cambridge lecture entitled, "Changing Current in Anglo-Saxon Studies," Howe confesses that he too will be able to offer "no more than a sketch of beginnings and endings, of 1968 and 1998" (29). Using the work of Morton Bloomfield and Edward B. Irving, Jr., Howe demonstrates that "In 1968, culture was closer to the center of the discipline than to its margins" (30). In his salmon-leap from 1968 to 1998, Howe pauses briefly to reflect on the positive contributions of language and manuscript studies to an understanding of the cultures of Anglo-Saxon England. To answer the second question of his title, Howe quotes colleagues whose work he admires (John D. Niles, Clare Lees, Allen Frantzen, John Hill, Gillian Overing, Marijane Osborn, and Roberta Frank), glossing each with his own insightful reflections on the subject of what "culture" means to the Anglo-Saxonists of today. Howe concludes the broad sweep of this "sketch" with the wry comment that "we have learned much and thus can realize how little we know and how much more there is to learn" (36).

In two interesting notes, Carl T. Berkhout reconsiders earlier assumptions about two antiquarians. In "Adrian Stokes, 1519–1585" (*NeQ* 47: 27–28), Berkhout lays to rest the issue of Stokes's age, especially in relation to that of his first wife, Frances Gray, Duchess of Suffolk and mother of Jane Grey, whom he married shortly after the execution of her first husband. Berkhout has discovered that Stokes's friend and noted Anglo-Saxonist, Laurence Nowell, recorded Stokes's "exact date and hour of birth" (28) in a horoscope in his commonplace book. According to Nowell's horoscope, Stokes was "less than 20 months younger" than his wife and thus Berkhout concludes that "the

common perception of him as rakish, opportunistic, and not very educated should be reconsidered" (28).

Carl Berkhout also debunks the attribution to the English humanist Roger Ascham of a passage in Old English from the Anglo-Saxon laws known as the *Edward and Guthrum* inscribed, signed, and dated (1556) in a first edition of *The Abridgement of the Boke of Assises*, a summary of judicial year books during the reign of Edward III ("The Old English Inscription Attributed to Roger Ascham" *N&Q* 47: 420–3). As Berkhout demonstrates, Ascham is unlikely to have ever had access to the two MSS which contain the passage, and that the text inscribed in the *Assises* differs in significant ways from those of the two manuscripts. The inscribed passage copies two textual errors found in Lambarde's printed edition of the Anglo-Saxon laws, *Archaiologia*, but this text wasn't printed until 1568, two years after the putative dating of the Ascham inscription. From a close inspection of the inscription and a sample of Ascham's handwriting, Berkhout concludes that the inscription's signature is unlikely to be Ascham's. He proposes that the *Assises* inscription was possibly "written with relatively benign intent in late Elizabethan or early Stuart times by someone with legal and perhaps antiquarian interests, a knowledge of Latin, not much knowledge of Old English, and sufficient calligraphic skill to imitate and to juxtapose classic examples of ancient English handwriting and elegant new English handwriting, or at least the signature of a notable practitioner of that new handwriting" (423).

Karen Thomson has written the introduction and accompanying bibliographical index for a reprint of John Petheram's 1840 publication *An Historical sketch of the progress and state of Anglo-Saxon literature in England* (Edinburgh: Stag). This "slightly enlarged facsimile reprint of Petheram's own copy of the book, with his marginal notations," provides a fascinating glimpse of an indefatigable and omnivorous bibliographer at work. The text also includes information on the work of noteworthy antiquarians of the day, principally John Mitchell Kimble and Benjamin Thorpe.

Two excellent collections of essays on the foundation and development of our discipline were published in 2000. They are *Literary Appropriations of the Anglo-Saxons from the Thirteenth to the Twentieth Century*, edited by Donald Scragg and Carole Weinberg (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), and *The Recovery of Old English: Anglo-Saxon Studies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, edited by Timothy Graham (Kalamazoo: MIP). Full reviews of these

two collections will unfortunately have to wait until *YWOES* 2001.

b. Cultural History

In "Welsh and English: Mutual Origins in Post-Roman Britain?" (*Studia Celtica* 34: 81–104), John Hines provides a detailed analysis of the evidence for an integrated conception of the formation of the post-Roman cultural and national identities of the "Welsh" and "English." Distinctions between these two identities are found not only in their languages but also in their social, political, and economic structures; Hines discusses how these identities developed in relation to each other. Beginning with a review of the history of the migrations of continental groups to Britain between the fourth and seventh centuries AD, Hines argues that these ethnic and political entities brought with them a "new concept of ethnicity" (84). The Angles, Saxons, and Jutes each brought with them a distinct sense of their own identities, forged on the continent. Much of the evidence for the material symbolization of these group identities is to be found among grave goods on the continent and in Britain. Hines charts "the line of development from the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes of the fifth century to the Northumbrian Angles, English Saxons, and Kentishmen of the eighth," demonstrating that these "proto-Anglo-Saxon groups ... must have been mixed and hybrid" (87). Hines next moves to a discussion of the progress of the concept of "Englishness" in post-Roman Britain. After he uncovers the evidence for "an English entity" in material culture, Hines turns his attention to the evidence for the development of a similar cultural identity among the British populations. Ultimately he rejects the notion that "these two groups existed and developed by following separate, evolutionary paths, adjusting to one another, in effect only in terms of how they defined each other's space, through antagonism, warfare, and occasional convenient alliances" (103). Hines instead demonstrates the "trend towards establishing and expressing ethnic identities" was common to both the continental Germanic groups who migrated to Britain and the "native" British populations. Although it is clear that language played a key role in establishing a "Welsh" identity, the evidence is less clear in the development of a sense of "Englishness" among the Anglo-Saxons. Hines proposes a more complex and intertwined conception of the processes that formed these identities.

In *Motherhood and Mothering in Anglo-Saxon England* (New York: St. Martin's), Mary Dockray-Miller explores the variety of venues in which the "perfor-

mance" of motherhood took place in the Anglo-Saxon period. Invoking the postmodern work of Judith Butler, Sara Ruddick, and Luce Irigaray, Dockray-Miller creates an effective rubric in which the concepts of a) "gender performance," which distinguishes the maternal as a separate category of analysis from either the masculine or feminine, b) "maternal work," which defines the role of mothers as the "protection, nurturance, and training of children," and c) "maternal genealogy," which presents an alternative to the traditional paradigm of patrilineal succession and ownership, constitute her lens of cultural observation (2-7). Given the relative silence of authentic female voices in the extant evidence, Dockray-Miller concentrates primarily on chronicles, wills, letters, and charters for firsthand evidence of "maternal practice." In Chapter 2, "Matrilineal Genealogy and Mildrið's Maternal Legacy," Dockray-Miller focuses on the royal monasteries of Ely, Minster-in-Sheppey, and Whitby, showing that these monasteries functioned as parallel entities to the institutional church. Furthermore, Dockray-Miller argues that these monasteries established a pattern of maternal genealogy, a biological practice of "sororal succession," and served as locations in which the maternal work of protection, nurturance and teaching of daughters took place. Chapter 3, "The Maternal Genealogy of Æðelflæd, Lady of the Mercians," follows the lineage of Osburh, mother of King Alfred, through her granddaughter Æðelflæd and great-granddaughter Ælfwynn to establish a genealogy of maternal practice in ninth- and tenth-century Mercia and Wessex through successive generations. Through a review of Æðelflæd's roles as wife (and ultimately ruler upon her husband's death) of the ealdorman of Mercia, Æthelræd, and sister to King Edward of Wessex, Dockray-Miller portrays the Lady of the Mercians as a skilled administrator, diplomat, military commander, and ultimately mother. Dockray-Miller illuminates the intersection between her various roles and persuasively suggests that she was more "than an anomalous female isolated in the patriarchal community of her father, husband, and brother" (75). She also demonstrates that Æðelflæd was a successful "maternal performer" because she was able to pass on to her daughter the administrative and managerial skills she had learned from a long line of strong women. Of Ælfwynn's ultimate disposition, Dockray-Miller argues that it is likely she entered a monastery in Wessex after she was removed from Mercia after her mother's death, possibly Nunnaminster which had been established by her grandmother Ealhswið. Dockray-Miller next turns her attention to "The Mothers of *Beowulf*": Modþryðo, Grendel's dam, Hildeburh, Hygd, and Wealhþeow. Given the nature

of the poem, each of these women is forced to conduct their maternal work within the context of the male-dominated heroic code. Dockray-Miller argues that of these "maternal performers" only Wealhþeow succeeds. Of the mothers in the poem, Modþryðo acts out the ethos of male heroic violence, and Grendel's dam enacts the revenge principle of the patriarchal cycle of blood-feud. Hildeburh fails to protect her son from violence and Hygd acts to protect her son by offering Beowulf the Geatish throne. The case of Hygd is particularly compelling, as her bid to keep her son safe by countering the norm of patrilineal succession is an instinctively "maternal" one. She ultimately fails; Beowulf turns down her offer and her son is killed in the Swedish feud. Only Wealhþeow, then, among the mothers in the poem, is able to protect, nurture, and instruct her children in a world of violence and blood-feud. In an Afterword entitled "The Politics of Motherhood," Dockray-Miller reviews the outline of her argument and makes a compelling and passionate appeal for a society in which "the maternal, embraced and accepted along with other gender performances that reach beyond traditional paradigms of masculinity and femininity, can become an example of nonhierarchical, nurturing, and empowering performance for women and men" (119). Dockray-Miller's book should be mandatory reading for anyone interested in recovering such lost "performances," and specifically female performances, from the largely patriarchal texts of the Anglo-Saxon period.

Stephen Glosecki explores the significances of the elaborate zoomorphic designs in much early Germanic art in "Movable Beasts: The Manifold Implications of Early Germanic Animal Imagery" (*Animals in the Middle Ages: a Book of Essays*, ed. Nona C. Flores [New York and London, 1996], 3-23). Glosecki argues that these visual images have individual referents but also signify something beyond their specific referents. Focusing first on the many images of boars in early Germanic art and literature (particularly *Beowulf*, the Sutton Hoo purse-lid, the Benty Grange helmet, and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*), Glosecki examines the complex significances of the images: apotropaic power, social status, strength in battle. Having demonstrated the symbolic power of the images of several other animals, Glosecki moves to a discussion of the changes in the signification of these images when cross cultural or contextual shifts occur (i.e., when these images "move" from one setting to another). Ultimately, Glosecki argues that these "movable beasts" elide easily from one cultural context to the next, accruing a range of significations which "con-

tinue to enchant us with [their] multifarious ambiguities" (19).

Joanne Mary Parker's "The Apocryphal Alfred" (*The Medieval World and the Modern Mind*, ed. Michael Brown and Stephen H. Harrison [Dublin and Portland, OR], 142–70), considers the "cult" of the ninth-century king that developed in the nineteenth century. Parker argues that Alfred's later popularity "may be viewed as part of a more general growth of interest in history, which was related to fears about the future and was a side-effect of the rapid pace of nineteenth-century political and economic change" (143). Everyone from political radicals and Protestant theologians to military historians and British imperialists appropriated the King as the emblem of their agendas. Parker traces the historical evidence for the body of legends, focusing primarily on the burnt cakes episode and the stories of Alfred's period in hiding. Through the nineteenth century, Parker demonstrates the degree to which these apocryphal legends were recast in a new body of literature to reflect the political, social, economic, and religious preoccupations of the appropriating constituencies. Parker concludes by noting the neglect which Alfred has suffered in the past century, but suggests that "With an exhibition on Alfred as 'London's Forgotten King' having recently been shown at the Museum of London, with a dig underway in Winchester for Alfred's remains, and with England searching for a sense of national identity in the aftermath of devolution, perhaps we may soon see a resurgence of the nineteenth-century popularity of King Alfred the Great" (170).

Stephanie L. Barczewski's *Myth and National Identity in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford) considers the role of the legends of Arthur and Robin Hood in "both displaying and shaping British national identity in the nineteenth century" (1). The book, a substantial revision of the author's doctoral dissertation, considers two areas of contention in the evolution of British identity: the effect of the increasingly nationalistic identities of the constituent parts of the United Kingdom on the development of the British identity as a whole and the issues involved in the nineteenth-century debates over who should have full rights of inclusion in the British polity and how the legends of King Arthur and Robin Hood mirrored these debates. Chapter Four, "Robin Hood, King Arthur, and the Rise of Anglo-Saxon Racialism" (124–61), will be of particular interest to Anglo-Saxonists. This chapter explores the degree to which nineteenth-century notions of "race" and "ethnicity," influenced by the contemporary work of anthropologists and Darwin's

evolutionary theories, created "an elaborate racial hierarchy ... which placed the Anglo-Saxon peoples at the top, a crude biological determinism seemingly confirmed by Britain's pre-eminent political, economic, and military position" (124). This new racialist identity inspired efforts to identify the historical and "racial" identities of Arthur and Robin Hood. In the nineteenth century, representations of Robin Hood in contemporary literature portrayed him as "a heroic Saxon freedom fighter struggling against Norman oppression" (127). Barczewski argues that through this image of Robin Hood, "late-nineteenth-century authors reinforced contemporary arguments proclaiming that racial purity must be maintained if Britain's predominant position in the world were to continue" (144). Robin Hood's identity may have been relatively easy to maintain, but Arthur's proved more problematic. References to Arthur in medieval sources "meant that his historical identity ... could not be completely reinvented to conform to contemporary racialist ideals" (153). Barczewski's analysis of the literary treatments of the legends of these two heroes charts the course of the production of a nineteenth-century Anglo-Saxon racial mythology that is still, alas, accepted in some quarters.

An eclectic collection of essays edited by Tony Lis-sell, *Our Englishness* (Hockwold-cum-Wilton, Norfolk: Anglo-Saxon Books) expresses a range of political and religious perspectives on the subject of English identity. Although wildly divergent in their approaches and rhetoric, the eight essays of this volume are passionate in their conviction of the existence of an "English" nation and attempt to define it in terms of history, culture, and community. Several essays ground their argument in the origins and continuities of the English language, while some perceive a uniquely English identity in the early Christian Church; still others tackle the politics of nationhood and nationalism and lament contemporary ideological trends which tend to suppress the sense of an "English" identity.

In a fascinating glimpse of the life of a modern icon, "Understanding the Outsider: Grendel, Geisel, and the Grinch" (*Popular Culture Rev.* 11.1: 99–105), Robert L. Schichler explores the literary correspondences between the figures of Grendel, the Grinch, and Theodor Geisel ("Dr. Seuss"). Beyond the obvious parallels between Grendel and the Grinch (the similarities in the names, the shared aversion to merry-making, and the striking visual likenesses), Schichler demonstrates a deeper affinity between the author and his creation, and Grendel, namely, their status as

"outsiders." Growing up during World War I, Geisel, whose father was German, suffered physical attacks by schoolyard bullies because of his national heritage. As Schichler points out, "In circumstances similar to Grendel's, [Geisel] is denounced and driven away because of his kinship with the ENEMY, who in this case is the Kaiser rather than Cain" (103). In contrast to the *Beowulf*-poet, who represents Grendel as an enemy of mankind, however, Geisel ultimately "shows his audience that the Grinch has a heart after all, that he can change for the better, and that his acceptance into the community makes for a richer, more joyful, and secure, integrated whole" (104).

c. Language and Linguistics

Peter J. Lucas has edited a facsimile edition of Franciscus Junius's 1655 edition of the so-called "Cædmon poems," *Franciscus Junius: Cædmonis Monachi Paraphrasis Poetica Genesis ac præcipuarum Sacrae paginæ Historiarum, abhinc M.LXXX. Anglo-Saxonicae conscripta, & nunc primum edita* (Early Stud. in Germanic Philol. 3. Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi). Junius's was the first edition of an OE poetic text. As a scholar and editor, Junius chose to reproduce the poetry as it appeared in the manuscript, written out as prose, though he included metrical pointing to indicate the verse-divisions. Junius's *Cædmon* was also the first book to use the Anglo-Saxon types he had commissioned cut and which were ultimately bequeathed to and used in many Old English texts printed by Oxford University Press. Included in this edition is a facsimile of Junius's handwritten commentary on the texts in Oxford, Bodl. Lib. MS Junius 73*. Lucas provides a lucid introduction to Junius's life and work, and an insightful discussion of his editorial principles in the *Cædmon* and the significance of Junius's methodology to the field of Anglo-Saxon studies.

Kees Dekker also considers Junius's contributions to our field in "Francis Junius (1591–1677): copyist or editor" (ASE 29: 279–96). In his review of the scholarship on Junius's editorial principles, Dekker complains that "Although Junius was a seventeenth-century philologist whose activities were based on contemporaneous scholarly principles, his achievements have been measured by modern standards and his work has been compared to the state of the art of two or three centuries later" (282). In a sweeping consideration of Junius's ideas about language and a detailed analysis of his textual changes, Dekker explores the rationale of the philologist's method of transcribing and editing Old English texts. Dekker demonstrates

that Junius "carefully strove to approach the language of the Anglo-Saxons as he imagined it to have existed in its perfect state, with the aim of exposing the true form and true meaning of the words" (295). Dekker concludes that Junius was neither an editor nor copyist in our modern sense of these activities, but was rather "a seventeenth-century philologist of the best kind" (296).

In "Sixteenth-Century Spelling Reform and the Printers in Continental Perspective: Sir Thomas Smith and John Hart" (*The Library* 7th ser., 1: 3–21), Peter J. Lucas explores the "close relationship between spelling reform and the technological means of representing it" (4) through the work of two sixteenth-century orthoepists. Smith's and Hart's proposals for spelling reform demanded the creation of special types to represent the orthographic symbols which they wished to add to the roman alphabet in order to express the phonetic sounds of English. Lucas demonstrates that the use of printing technology to represent phonetic symbols additional to those of the roman alphabet took place earlier on the continent than in England. Although both men were clearly influenced by practice on the continent, Smith, more so than Hart, exploited the technology for ideological purposes. As an associate of Matthew Parker, Smith was interested in representing Anglo-Saxon letter-forms, an endeavor wholeheartedly endorsed by Parker. Hart had a more idealistic orthographic agenda: he advocated "a new system of spelling for English without regard for the desirability of using the same alphabet as other neighboring languages" (21). Of the two spelling-reformers, then, Hart was the more experimental yet ultimately more insular, while Smith, in his desire to use Greek and Anglo-Saxon letter-forms, was more supranational and aware of the constraints of the idiosyncratic creation of new letter-forms.

Robert K. Bloomer, in his essay, "Rudolf Hildebrand's Impression on Friedrich Kluge" (*Amer. Jnl of Germanic Ling. & Literatures* 12: 23–29), uncovers the extent to which Hildebrand's research influenced Kluge's seminal *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. In the ten editions of his dictionary, Bloomer notes, statements and acknowledgements made by Kluge reveal a pattern of debt and gratitude to the reigning figures of the day in the fields of comparative linguistics and classical philology. For the first four editions of his dictionary, Kluge applies and refines the methodologies of the Neogrammarians Georg Curtius, Friedrich Zarnke, Hermann Osthoff, and Wilhelm Braune, each of whom he acknowledges in various places, mostly forewords and dedications. Bloomer discov-

ers, however, that a fundamental shift in his views on the goals of etymology takes place after the fourth edition, a shift he attributes to the influence of the work of Rudolf Hildebrand. Bloomer finds acknowledgement of Hildebrand's influence in various publications, but not in his dictionary; Bloomer argues that Kluge's self-conscious development as a word researcher, becoming a leader in the field by his late thirties, may have precluded open acknowledgement of Hildebrand in his dictionary. Bloomer concludes that "Kluge may have omitted Hildebrand in the first through fourth editions because he was still pursuing etymological research, and in the fifth through the tenth in order to add relief to his own legacy in progress" (35).

In "Language for Everyone: Eighteenth-Century Female Grammarians, Elstob, Fisher, and Beyond" (*History of Linguistics* 1996. Ed. David Cram, Andrew Linn, and Elke Nowak. Stud. in the Hist. of Ling. Sciences 94-95 [Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 1999], 205-13), Robin D. Smith reconsiders the work of Elizabeth Elstob (*The rudiments of grammar for the English-Saxon tongue*, 1715) and Anne Fisher (*A New Grammar*, 1750) in light of their motivations, methodologies, and achievements. According to Smith, Elstob's "declared motivation was to make the language accessible to women" (207). Her methodology, therefore, reflected the awareness that she was writing for an audience who would not necessarily have had any knowledge of Latin, Greek, or contemporary language theory. In her *Grammar*, Elstob reorders the organizational structure of Edward Thwaite's summary of George Hickes's *Thesaurus* and adopts Ælfric's method of introducing terms in pairs. Smith argues that Elstob succeeds in making her material accessible by presenting it "in terms that a native English speaker would find no difficulty with" (210). In contrast to Elstob, Fisher presents her material "in linear fashion being built up on the basis of simple questions and answers" (210). Fisher made use of English terminology for her grammatical concepts and the success of her method is suggested by the fact that her *New Grammar* went on to several printings. By the end of the eighteenth century, Smith observes that the success of these female grammarians had led to a proliferation of these texts, which were "no longer for the teaching of grammar *per se*, but to provide a basis for the learning of French" (212).

Gary D. German argues that nineteenth-century scholars, influenced by an ideology of "Anglo-Saxonism," underestimated the linguistic interaction between Britons and invading English in "Britons, Anglo-Saxons and Scholars: Nineteenth-century Atti-

tudes towards the Survival of Britons in Anglo-Saxon England" (*The Celtic Englishes II*. Ed. Hildegard L.C. Tristram. Anglistische Forschungen 286 [Heidelberg], 347-74). Beginning with a discussion of the origins and pervasiveness of the ideology of Anglo-Saxonism, German goes on to focus on the work of nineteenth-century historians steeped in this ideology who argued that the Brittonic-speaking population was eliminated by the migrating Anglo-Saxons. German laments the fact that many linguists seem to have adopted without reflection the assumptions of these historians and have therefore neglected the possibility of some sort of linguistic fusion of the English and Briton populations, which would have resulted in some sort of Anglo-Brittonic creole. In the second half of his essay, German presents some counter-arguments to the traditional views of the development of the English language and proposes "a sociolinguistic model for how the shift from Brittonic to English may have occurred as well as the form a Brittonic substratum in English may have taken" (349). Calling for more research on the question, German suggests that the language shift from Brittonic to English must no longer be viewed as a "unitary transformation, but rather as a multidimensional process dependent on multiple factors such as the settlement types (warband, kinship group models, etc.), geographical considerations as well as the religious, economic, and sociolinguistic relations of the populations involved" (373).

S.A.J. Bradley examines Grundtvig's process and philosophy of translation in his essay, "Det er hvad jeg kalder at oversætte Digte: Grundtvig as Translator" (*Grundtvig Studier* 2000: 36-59). In a wide-ranging discussion of the many issues at stake in translation, Bradley refers to early disputes between Grundtvig, P.E. Muller, and G.J. Thorkelin as well as to statements made by a recent translator of *Beowulf*, Seamus Heaney, in an effort to document Grundtvig's idiosyncratic and polemical approach to translation. Bradley concludes that translation, for Grundtvig, was "the versatile medium for appropriating, reconstructing, adapting and rehabilitating an antiquity that could form part of a present national identity and a contemporary and future agenda for a Danish folk in the traumatic age of shifting power, unstable loyalties and dissolving frontiers that was the Napoleonic and post-Napoleonic era" (53).

Supplementing the research of Eric Stanley into the earliest modern use of the term "Old English" to refer to the language of the Anglo-Saxons, Oliver Harris has uncovered another instance of an early antiquar-

ian's use of the term ("Old English = 'Anglo-Saxon': An Instance from Sir Simonds D'Ewes," *N&Q* 47: 414). In a passage referring to February 1631/2 in his autobiography, Sir Simonds D'Ewes (1602–50) describes efforts to transcribe Anglo-Saxon charters. He states that his "servant" was able to transcribe those charters which were in Latin, but "when hee came to anie that weere penned in old English or Saxo tounge those I copied my selfe" (414).

Carl T. Berkhout also explores Lambarde's use of the term "Old English" in "William Lambarde and Old English" (*N&Q* 47: 415–20). Berkhout establishes that "Lambarde's use 'Old English' in the first edition of *A Perambulation of Kent* (1576) can actually be nudged to about six years earlier" (415) when he finished the manuscript text. For much of his note, Berkhout focuses on the "reading list for the history of the English language" (415) Lambarde copied into the manuscript of his friend Laurence Nowell's work-in-progress, *Vocabularium Saxonicum*. Lambarde lists six items whose close scrutiny would reveal "how, and by what steps, our language is fallen from the old Inglish, and drawen nearer to the frenche" (416). The list includes the Anglo-Saxon laws; the Peterborough version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*; an Oxfordshire text of Henry III's proclamation of 18 October 1528 in Middle English; the Creed and the Pater Noster, mistakenly attributed to Robert Grosseteste, and *St. Patrick's Purgatory*, all in Middle English verse from the Auchinleck manuscript; a problematic reference to a poem known as *Iacob and Iosep* in "the booke called flos florum"; and the more familiar texts of *Brut* (which Berkhout declares must be "the popular late-fourteenth- and fifteenth-century prose chronicle, not the early Middle English poem by Layamon" (417)), Gower, and Chaucer. Berkhout points out that "Lambarde's list, so far as its texts can be identified, is remarkably similar to what we find in today's textbooks or readers for the early history of the English language" (418). The balance of Berkhout's note is devoted to a discussion of the earliest modern use of the term "Anglo-Saxon" as opposed to the more commonly used term "Saxon" to refer to the language and its speakers. Although he did so in a Latin text, Sir Thomas Smith seems to have been the first to use the term. Berkhout concludes his note with the observation that "by about 1570–3, ... [Lambarde] was developing an increasingly clear, organized understanding of Old English and that he knew in detail what made the English of the Anglo-Saxons 'old' as opposed to the 'mixt' (Camden's terms for Middle English) language of England after the Norman Conquest" (420).

d. Research and Teaching Resources

In a concise essay, "How Well Read Were the Anglo-Saxons? The World Wide Web Version of the *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici* Register" (*OEN* 33.3: 12–14), Rohini Jayatilaka reviews the aims, history, and present status of the *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici* project. In 2000, one year into a three-year grant from the Arts and Humanities Research Board, the *Fontes* database covered over 1150 Anglo-Saxon texts. The project hopes to have produced a CD-ROM version of the database by 2002. At present, the register is freely available through the *Fontes* homepage, <http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/>. For the remainder of her essay, Jayatilaka presents a user-friendly guide to searching the database. The web site and Jayatilaka's essay are an invaluable resource for anyone interested in source study.

Alexander Bruce suggests a number of useful "Strategies for introducing Old and Middle English Language and Literature to Beginning Students," *Stud. in Med. and Ren. Teaching* 7.2 (1999): 33–41. Although his motivations are personal and professional (job security ranks high), Bruce's objectives are two-fold and undoubtedly shared by those of us who regularly teach freshman and sophomore survey courses in British literature: "first, to help students appreciate the language, that is, to expose them to Old and Middle English in 'the original' ... and second, to help students see the connection between us and the medievals, that is, to help them see that, as human beings, we share many of the same questions and concerns" (33). Using "Cædmon's Hymn," Chaucer's "General Prologue" and "The Miller's Tale" from *The Canterbury Tales* as examples, Bruce walks the reader through several lesson plans for these texts. As an appendix, Bruce provides his translation and several humorous student translations of "Cædmon's Hymn." Bruce's engaging article will likely prove useful for many new teachers, and might even re-ignite a spark in the imaginations of those instructors whose enthusiasm may have long ago dimmed.

e. Bayeux Tapestry

In a brief but highly interesting review of the history of scholarship on and reproduction of the Bayeux Tapestry ("Above the Word, Beyond the Page: The Past and Present Dilemma of Bayeux Tapestry Scholarship" *Envoi* 8: 87–103), Martin K. Foys points out the fundamental contradiction of most scholarly treatments of the Tapestry: "[T]hrough reproduction and interpretation the material textile has been gradually textualized, and in effect disconnected from

the physical and spatial contexts of its narrative operation" (89). Foys argues that these scholarly efforts, though useful, fail as they only explain the Tapestry by negation, in terms of what it is not (94). Instead, Foys proposes a "revitalization of Tapestry scholarship through its liberation from traditional textual preoccupations" (99) by means of hypertextual and hypermedial technologies. According to Foys, these technologies allow for an interpretive repositioning of the Tapestry which will obliterate the linear constraints of print and recapture the "original spatial environment of the monumental textile" (100). Foys ends with the hope that "through a synthesis of new theoretical modes and digital representations, ... future attempts to preserve and reproduce [the Bayeux Tapestry] through word and image may be more holistic in the context they provide for interpretation" (101). Modestly, Foys neglects to mention his own work on a "digital edition" of the Tapestry, a CD-ROM of which has now appeared on the market. If his work fulfills only a fraction of the expectations Foys has for the technology, it will be a truly useful product indeed.

In a beautifully illustrated companion volume to her earlier reproduction of the Tapestry, *The Bayeux Tapestry Finale*, Jan Messent, a Yorkshire-born embroiderer and art teacher, tells *The Bayeux Tapestry Embroiderers' Story* (Thirsk, N Yorks: Madeira Threads). Although bound by the linear constraints of print medium, Messent superimposes her handwritten textual narrative over sumptuous pencil drawings which tell the tale of the production of the Tapestry. A transcription of her text appears at the end of the volume. With its wealth of information concerning the techniques used in embroidering the Bayeux Tapestry, the production of large-scale projects such as the Tapestry, modern equivalent products for reproductions and their retail sources, this volume will prove delightful and indispensable for anyone interested in the construction of the Bayeux Tapestry.

f. Representations of Anglo-Saxon History

Christopher Lucken considers the intersection of two radically different conceptions of the "End of Time" in the medieval historiography of Geoffrey of Monmouth and William of Newburgh in his essay, "La fin des temps et la fiction des origines. L'historiographie des îles britanniques: du royaume des Angles à la terre des Bretons" (*Médiévales* 38: 35–70). The first conception Lucken considers is by far the more accepted, namely that adopted by Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History* and articulated at greater length in Au-

gustine's *City of God*. According to this fundamentally "ecclesiastical" view, Christian historiography stresses the central role of the church in the destiny of human souls as it is concerned primarily with the conduct of those who embrace the teachings of the Church and thus will find themselves in the City of God at the End of Time. The other conception is the "national" view which assigns a community an origin and a past, in essence a "history," which in turn provides the community with an identity and a rationale for its present existence. Based as it is on the fiction of the "nation" or "people," this history is constantly under threat of aggression, namely the aggression of revision. Lucken's essay concentrates on the conflicting historiographies of the British Isles, from Bede to Geoffrey of Monmouth and William of Newburgh. He explores in detail the ways in which Geoffrey's "fictional" historiography in the *History of the Kings of Britain* responds to the "ecclesiastical" history of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*; he further argues that William of Newburgh's *History of English Affairs* is a direct reproof of Geoffrey's "fictitious" history, in which he "historicizes" the reign of Arthur and the prophecies of Merlin. Ultimately, Lucken suggests, these radically different approaches to history reflect a fundamental opposition between "ecclesiastical" history whose aim is to escape history and reside in the eternity of Heaven and "national" history which is temporal and bound to run its course on Earth.

In "La Vie des deux Offa, l'Enfance de saint Edmond et la logique des 'antécédents'" (*Médiévales* 38: 17–34), Monika Otter examines the functional logic of two Latin texts, Matthew Paris's *Vitae duorum Offarum* and Gaufridus de Fontibus's *De Infantia sancti Eadmundi*, which serve as "prequels" to the existing monastic histories of their houses, St. Albans and Bury St. Edmunds, respectively. In "Enfances et hagiographie monastique," Otter first delineates the particular genre characteristics of the *enfance* narratives of vernacular *chansons de geste* and romances. The following section, "De saint Edmond aux deux Offa," examines the structure of the two narratives, noting that they make use of many of the formal properties and motifs of the *enfances*. In her final section, "Logique des antécédents," Otter argues that the particular logic of the "prequel," its assertion of chronological priority and its anticipation and preparation of the principal narrative, serves to eschew historicity and reduces the veracity of the chroniclers' claims to a strictly textual level. Such conflation suited the propagandistic aims of monastic chroniclers.

María José Gómez Calderón explores the attraction of the Anglo-Saxon past to the Romantics in her essay, "Harold of England: The Romantic Revision of the Last Anglo-Saxon King" (*SELIM* 9 [1999]: 35-43). Gómez Calderón focuses primarily on the transformation of the figure of Harold Godwinson in Bulwer Lytton's novel *Harold, the last of the Saxon Kings* (1848) and Tennyson's *Harold* (1876). Gómez Calderón demonstrates that "Lytton's Harold recovers Anglo-Saxon history and transforms it into a canonic Romantic novel with heroes, battles, passions, and the fight for the freedom of the people against the foreigner" (41). In Tennyson's work, on the other hand, Harold is depicted as the tragic Romantic hero, a man tormented by inner personal conflict: "He is a perjurer and knows he is doomed to die, he does not love the woman he married and loves Edith who was supposed to take the veil" (41). According to Gómez Calderón, this nineteenth-century vindication and transformation of Harold Godwinson reflects the fact that "the Anglo-Saxon past was still a mythic territory for the Romantics" (43).

The Bede's World museum is back in the news. In her article, "Mixing Business and Bede" (*Museums Jnl* July 2000: 48), Jane Morris profiles Miriam Harte, the new director of the museum. Harte comes to Bede's World from the business sector, having worked eleven years for Proctor and Gamble. Harte, who took over at Bede's World in 1997, tells the story of her "conversion" experience during her tenure at Proctor and Gamble, when she decided to quit her job and pursue a graduate degree in Cultural History at the University of Northumbria. When the position at Bede's World opened up, the Board felt that Harte's qualifications in both the academic and business worlds suited the needs of the rapidly expanding museum/attraction. Harte believes she can bring to her new position the best of corporate culture, which she describes as the culture of "continuous change." Although she acknowledges that the corporate "culture of change" at Proctor and Gamble would need to be modified for Bede's World, she feels that the museum could benefit from the sorts of practices such a "culture" embraces. She cites greater training and development of personnel, improvement of the farm facility, further expansion of the educational program, and development of a conference business on the site as potential projects of improvement and development.

John Millard's "Anglo-Saxons with Attitude" (*Museums Jnl* October 2000: 32-3) takes a more negative view of the recent "improvements" at Bede's World. Millard criticizes the "post-modern" approach to the

architecture of the new display building; Bede's World could more helpfully tell the story of Bede and early Anglo-Saxon England, he argues, by using a more direct treatment. Indeed, if his description is just, the "Mediterranean-style villa" with its "cool, airy corridors with white walls, terrazzo floors and glazed doors," culminating in a "double-height enclosed atrium, in the centre of which is a huge wire-mesh mask of the man himself—the Venerable Bede" does seem incongruous with the life and work of the famous monk (32). In addition to the architecture, Millard objects to the organization of the new display. Visitors begin in "small dark spaces with monster heads, clunking interactives and lots of painted graphics" (33). A series of three large spaces follow: the first is devoted to the establishment of the monastery and features a "central wooden cross and bench below a suspended structure of mysterious import"; the second space is "a large hall with low aisles on each side" and features a glimpse of monastic life which is represented "by a clean scaffolding on which beige monks heave lumps of stone"; and the third space is the atrium which features the mask of Bede, surrounded by "gnomic verses" from his writing painted on the walls (33). Millard's complaint with the display and its building is that they "both opt for clever and allusive interpretation" over a more straight-forward approach: "They thus run the risk of confusing the unwary or untutored visitor, and they ultimately fail to bring coherence to the large and complex site" (33).

g. Essay Collections

Robert Boenig and Kathleen Davis have produced a festschrift, *Manuscript, Narrative, Lexicon: Essays on Literary and Cultural Transmission in Honor of Whitney F. Bolton*, celebrating the career of this prolific medievalist and linguist (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell UP; London: Associated U Presses). The eleven essays in this collection are divided into three sections. The essays in Part I, "Transmissions Between Manuscripts and Across Genres," focus on manuscripts and texts from the later Middle Ages and early Modern Period. These essays concentrate on the inevitable transformation of texts at the hands of editors and on the reformulation of texts when they are appropriated across genres. The essays in Part II, "Translating and Mediating Church Doctrine," will be of interest to Anglo-Saxonists and are reviewed elsewhere in this issue. These are Paul Szarmach's "Alfred, Alcuin, and the Soul," Kathleen Davis's "The Performance of Translation Theory in King Alfred's National Literary Program," and Phyllis R. Brown's "Cycles and

Change in *Beowulf*." The essays in Part III, "The Shifting Ground of Transmission," focus on linguistic transmission and transformation in the development and formation of language. This eclectic collection of essays reflects the erudition and wide-ranging interests of the honoree and the abiding admiration of his students. The volume includes an appendix listing Professor Bolton's publications.

The prodigious career of another medievalist is celebrated this year with a festschrift entitled, *Essays on Old, Middle, Modern English and Old Icelandic In Honor of Raymond P. Tripp, Jr.*, edited by Loren C. Gruber, with Meredith Crellin Gruber and Gregory K. Jember (Lewiston, Queenston, and Lampeter: Edwin Mellen). Eleven of the twenty essays in this volume concern Old English; of these, ten are reviewed elsewhere in this review and one will be discussed here. The volume opens with a warm tribute to Tripp's life and career. Arranged chronologically, the essays are divided into four sections. The essays in section I, "Old English and Medieval Latin Studies," focus on various aspects of the authorship and diction of Old English literature, from *Beowulf* to "The Nine Herbs Charm." The second section, "Old Icelandic and Medieval German Studies," contains essays on the voyage motif in Icelandic sagas, and the roles of dragons, Valkyries, and women in northern Germanic literature. As one might imagine, the "Middle English Studies" section contains essays on Chaucer's poetry, from *Troilus and Criseyde* to *The Book of the Duchess*. The fourth and final section, "Early and Late Modern English Studies," contains two essays, one on the navigational imagery of *Paradise Lost* and the other on modern adaptations of *Beowulf* (reviewed below). This admirable volume closes with a list of the Professor Tripp's publications.

Marie Nelson's "Beowulf Lives—And So Do His Worthy Adversaries: Archetypes and Diction, Both Old and New" (*Essays on Old, Middle, Modern English*, ed. Gruber, 481–509) examines the diction and archetypes of four novels for evidence of direct, mythological, psychological, and/or linguistic influence. The four novels are John Gardner's *Grendel*, Michael Crichton's *Eaters of the Dead*, Parke Godwin's *The Tower of Beowulf*, and Larry Niven, Jerry Pournelle, and Steven Barnes's *Beowulf's Children*. In addition to providing valuable summaries of each of the novels, Nelson analyzes the diction of the novels and the ways in which that diction embodies archetypal heroic values and/or modern psychological states. In her comparative word study of the novels, she focuses on words "that not only capture ancient values

and modern psychological states, but are also close translations of, or inspired by, those in the original *Beowulf*" (482). Nelson's ultimate appraisal of these renditions of the *Beowulf* story is favorable, acknowledging that much of the dynamism of these fictional recreations results from their authors' "awareness of the strength and adaptability of the language they inherited" (506).

The career of James Campbell is celebrated with a collection of essays entitled *The Medieval State: Essays Presented to James Campbell* (Ed J.R. Maddicott and D.M. Palliser. London and Rio Grande, OH: Hambledon). The volume is comprised of seventeen essays, the three opening essays of which are personal appreciations of Professor Campbell's forty-plus years as historian, tutor, and colleague in Worcester College, Oxford. In "James Campbell as Historian" (xiii–xxii), Patrick Wormald reviews Professor Campbell's prolific career as "the most consistently creative influence on the writing of Anglo-Saxon history today" (xiii). Wormald's assessment considers the wide range of subjects on which Campbell has written and details the abiding contributions of his *oeuvre*. David Hargreaves, in "James Campbell as Tutor" (xxiii–xxix), recounts his early encounters as an unremarkable undergraduate with the "fastidious and brilliant medievalist" (xxvi). A touching and warm account, Hargreaves' essay leaves the impression of a kind, gentle, and generous man, from whom we might all learn charity and humility. This impression is confirmed in "'Off To Do Good': James Campbell as Colleague" (xxxi–xxxvii), H.G. Pitt's jovial portrait of his "tutorial partner" at Worcester for over three decades. Pitt reviews Campbell's career as tutor, librarian, Dean, and scholar. Several other essays in this volume are discussed elsewhere in this review.

Jane Roberts and Janet Nelson memorialize the life and career of another Anglo-Saxonist this year in a collection entitled *Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes in Memory of Lynne Grundy* (King's College London Med. Stud. 17. London: King's College, Centre for Late Antique & Med. Stud.). An overview of Professor Grundy's too-brief life and career opens this volume; it is followed by "An Appreciation" (consisting of remarks at her service of thanksgiving) by Harold Short, Director of the Centre for Computing in the Humanities at King's College. The twenty-four essays of this volume represent a wide-variety of topics, mostly Anglo-Saxon but including ME as well, a variety indicative of Professor Grundy's broad interests. Many of the essays covering Anglo-Saxon topics are reviewed elsewhere in this volume; one is consid-

ered here. In "The Anglo-Saxons and the Shape of the World" (455–81), Gopa Roy surveys the evidence available in Anglo-Saxon written sources, both Latin and vernacular, for the shape of the world. Roy considers the evidence chronologically, dividing the essay into five sections: "The Patristic and Secular Latin Traditions," "The Early Anglo-Saxon Period (Seventh and Eighth Centuries)," "The Ninth Century and Alfredian Translations," "The Tenth Century," and "The Poetry." Roy argues that in the early and the late periods (e.g., in the writings of Bede and Ælfric, respectively) there seems to have been widespread acceptance of the idea that the world was a sphere. In periods when the traditions of learning were disrupted, however, Roy discovers a "break in the continuity of the idea of a spherical earth" (461). The variety of images for the shape of the earth, from eggs to discs, found in many of the Alfredian texts suggest an uncertainty about the shape of the world also reflected, Roy argues, in much of the extant vernacular poetry.

h. Varia

Vicki Ellen Szabo's "The Use of Whales in Early Medieval Britain" (*Haskins Soc. Jnl* 9 [1997]: 137–57) reviews references to whales in textual sources and reconsiders recent archaeological evidence to argue for a more thorough investigation of the economic role whale usage played in early British societies. Szabo, however, sounds a note of caution to the interdisciplinary approach she advocates. She points out the difficulties and dangers in attempting to reconcile the archaeological evidence, which is largely from the late Iron Age through the early Middle Ages, with the textual evidence, which dates from the high and later Middle Ages: "While one naturally considers that later historical materials generally reflect upon earlier periods, ... it is none the less an onerous task to reconcile documentary evidence from later cultures with earlier material traditions" (140). Documentary evidence indicates that whales were frequently spotted, often stranded on beaches, and their carcasses much valued in Britain and Scandinavia. Szabo points out that ON texts demonstrate a greater diversity of uses of whales than the Anglo-Saxon and continental evidence. Archaeological evidence suggests that "whale use was largely a local phenomenon, with exploitation based at the level of multiple family groups or communities, rather than at the regional level" (157). Szabo's essay opens the way for an investigation of the "the mechanisms of acquisition of marine mammals, the possibility of active whale hunting as opposed to scavenging, and the larger contribution of whales to late prehistoric and early medieval European economies" (157).

In "King Olaf Tryggvason and Sir Edward Elgar" (*Elgar Soc. Jnl* 11.4: 202–18), Gillian Fellows-Jensen uncovers some of the literary influences on Elgar's choral-cantata *Scenes from the Saga of King Olaf*. After a brief but fascinating discussion of the etymology of Elgar's name (with all the caveats one would expect from a professional name-scholar), Fellows-Jensen reviews the works of other nineteenth-century artists who were inspired by the heroic literature of the Norsemen: Thomas Gray, Sir Walter Scott, William Morris, and even Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Indeed, Fellows-Jensen devotes a good deal of attention to Longfellow, particularly to his "The Saga of King Olaf." Based on Dr Samuel Laing's translation of the *Heimskringla* saga, which Elgar is likely to have known himself, Longfellow's poem provided Elgar with the bulk of the material he needed to compose the *King Olaf*. Elgar reduced the material he found there, omitting some scenes and revising others. Elgar's genius, she suggests, is to be seen in his ability to provide an "artistic unity on his rather heterogeneous material" (218). Although Elgar's *King Olaf* has been overshadowed by his later work, Fellows-Jensen's essay suggests that it merits greater attention than it has received.

In *St. Cuthbert's Way: A Pilgrim's Companion* (Glasgow: Wild Goose), Mary Low has produced a richly rewarding book on many different levels. Although the route between Lindisfarne and its daughter house at Melrose set out in this guide is not an ancient pilgrimage route, parts of it were certainly known to Cuthbert, who scoured this rugged landscape on his pastoral journeys. At once a practical guide to the exigencies faced by the modern pilgrim and a spiritual guide to the solace and inspiration available to pilgrims of all faiths, *St. Cuthbert's Way* is divided into five main sections: "Before You Go (Practicalities)," "Cuthbert and his Contemporaries," "Field Guide," "Going on a Pilgrimage," and "Resources." The first section offers practical information about how to plan a pilgrimage, where to stay and what to take. It also sets out an itinerary for the modern pilgrim and provides useful addresses, telephone numbers, and contacts for Tourist Bureaus and holiday companies that organize pilgrimage walks. The second section introduces the main personalities and events of Cuthbert's historical era; the "Field Guide" takes a step-by-step approach to the route, relating the history and legend of the various sites along the way. Section Three, "Going on a Pilgrimage," explores the history of medieval pilgrimages and the persistence of pilgrimage to this day. "Resources" contains a collection of readings, songs, prayers, and

poems for people to enjoy along the route. The readings come from primary sources about Cuthbert and his companions, the Bible, and early medieval Christian writers such as Bede; a small number of readings come from non-Christian traditions. This book is a delight to read and, like the activity it describes, provides innumerable occasions for reflection.

Ben Greenman's "*Beowulf*: New Prose Translations" (*New Yorker* 29 May: 67) mocks the flurry of recent translations of *Beowulf* with three of his own fictional parodies by Helen Fielding, Frank McCourt, and David Letterman. The parodies are mildly amusing, if you enjoy the neurotic humor of the *New Yorker*.

Parke Godwin's latest historical novel *Lord of Sunset* is set during the reign of Edward the Confessor. Godwin's earlier venture into medieval subjects, *The Tower of Beowulf* (New York, 1995; reviewed in YWOES 1995), provided Grendel with a genealogy and the poem with an erstwhile narrator, Father Eligius. This time the story focuses on the life and love of Harold, second son of Earl Godwine of Wessex. In an imaginative blend of history, legend, and romance, Godwin tells the story of Harold's exile in Normandy, his oath to William, his rise to the throne, and his devotion to "Edith of Shaftesbury," his common-law wife of some twenty years. Narrated from different points of view, Harold's story is given new life through the pen of this master of historical romance. Despite its flights of fancy, the novel is a reverent rendition of a foundational myth in the formation of English identity.

Roxi Ashe's novel *Spell Weaver* (New York: Dorchester, 1999) is a far more fanciful tale of magic, intrigue, and lust set in the reign of Æthelred. The spirit of the novel is captured in the iconography of its cover: the bare-chested image of a Fabio-lookalike Viking raider, kneeling and gripping his sword by hilt and blade, gazes intensely passed the reader as if pondering the answer to the question printed in boldface beside him, "How does one subdue a man who is not a toad?" Lady Taras, a young enchantress, proves invaluable to her cousin, King Æthelred, when she accidentally transforms a lovesick knight into a frog. The king devises a plan by which to defeat the Vikings who have been ravaging his kingdom: Taras will enter the castle of the Viking chief, Lord Cynewulf, gain his confidence and affections, give him her transmogrifying potion, and then kill him once he has become enfrogged. Needless to say, her prey proves no easy catch. The muscle-bound "Wolf of the North" is an enchanting opponent whom the squirming heroine can hardly resist. Lest the plot be ruined for anyone,

suffice it to say that Taras will need more than cunning sorcery to subdue this Wolf and save her cousin's kingdom.

Memorials for Phillip Pulsiano, Sonia Chadwick-Hawkes, John Field, Lynne Grundy, and C.R. Dodwell were published this year.

R.F.J.

Works not seen

- Bennet, Stewart and Karen Charlesworth. *Lincoln's First Millennium: Romans, Anglo-Saxons, and Vikings*. History and Archaeology for the School Curriculum. Lincoln: Friends of Lincoln Archaeological Research and Investigation.
- Cross, Gillian. *Down with the Dirty Danes!* London: Collins.
- Deary, Terry. *The Smashing Saxons*. Horrible Histories. London: Scholastic Children's Books.
- Fisiak, Jacek. "Studies on Old and Middle English Language in Poland (1900–2000)." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 35: 3–17.
- Frankis, John. "Lawman and the Scandinavian Connection." *Leeds Stud. in Eng.* 31: 81–113.
- Harte, Jeremy. "Legends of the Fall: Giants in the Anglo-Saxon Imagination." *3rd Stone: Archaeology, Folklore, and Myth* 39: 5–11.
- Purkis, Sallie. *Romans, Anglo-Saxons, and Vikings Teacher's Book*. Sense of History, Key Stage 2. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education (Longman).
- Sampson, Fay. *The Flight of the Sparrow*. London: Robert Hale, 1999.
- Stanley, Eric Gerald. *Imagining the Anglo-Saxon Past: the Search for Anglo-Saxon Paganism and Anglo-Saxon Trial by Jury*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.
- Wawn, Andrew. "The Vikings and Victorian Merseyside." *Wirral and Its Viking Heritage*. Ed. Paul Cavill, Stephen Harding, and Judith Jesch. Eng. Place-Name Soc. Popular Ser. 2 (Nottingham: EPNS), 100–07.

2. Language

1. Lexicon, Glosses

In "The Semantic Puzzle of 'Red Gold'" (ES 81: 1–13), Earl R. Anderson sets out six previous attempts at explanation in summary form of why "red" gold appears in early Germanic languages (Old English *rēad gold*) and attempts a seventh. Anderson describes and dismisses previous evolutionary, neo-evolutionary, and relativist theories of basic color terminology and settles instead on an appeal to material culture, namely ochre. The range of reference in support of a material explanation for "red gold" is quite wide: from the use of ochre in paleolithic burials to that of red/crimson cloth in the Catholic rite, from Olduvai Gorge to the *Benedictional of Æthelwold*. Linguistically, consideration focuses on the maintenance of the semantic range of PIE **rudhró-* in Germanic and on the chromatic value of OE *rēad*, ON *rauþ* and other reflexes (as opposed to the evolutionary view that the terms focused more on contrasts in brightness). While consideration is given to the semantic focus of *rēad* on blood, "blood red," greater emphasis is placed on its "earthen, mineral, or metallic" focus, on *rēad* as representing "the colors obtainable through the artistic preparation of ocher and hematite" (10). The study ends on an inconclusive note, the puzzle all the more significant as in OE the only color term applied to gold is "red." While ES has long published in the philological and linguistic vein, the reader is done a disservice by the poor handling of diacritics and special characters throughout: diacritics are missing from Old English *rēad*, Old Irish *ruad* and *lí*; Greek is printed accent-free and often incorrectly: read *χλωρός* for *χλωρος* (2), *κύανος* for *κυανος* (4), etc. The Vulgate form for Red Sea is given as *mare rubae* where one expects *mare rubrum* (as at Ex 15:4).

An investigation into feudal terminology pre-1000 by Maria Giovanna Arcamone, "Germanico **fehu-* 'patrimonio' e germanico **laihwna-* 'prestito': contributo allo studio della terminologia feudale," in *Il feudalesimo nell'alto medioevo* (Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 47, Spoleto), II: 915–47, leads to very brief discussion of the Old English terms *feoh* (924–5) and *læn* (938–9). The forms are cited in a general discussion of Gmc **fehu-* 'livestock, cattle', and **laihwna-* 'loan, concession'. Each form is given with its derivatives and compounds (*feoh-hus*, *lænland*, etc.) and lemmata glossed, when applicable (thus OE *feoh* rendered Lat. *praecarium*, *commodum*, *commendatum*, *foenus*, *beneficium*). Arcamone's two critical terms produced

our modern terms of reference: feudalism, from Lat. *feudum/feodum* (syncopated form *feum*), related to the Gmc **fehu-*, and Md German *Lehnswesen*, from Gmc **laihwna-*. In what is really a *Sache und Wort* approach, Arcamone emphasizes the material origin of the term *feudum* in *bestiame* 'livestock, heads of cattle, movables', therefore *ricchezza* 'wealth'. Her semantic analysis of Gmc **feoh-* mirrors the sense given for OE *feoh* in J.R. Clark Hall, *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (4th ed. Toronto, 1984): "cattle, herd; movable goods, property; money riches, treasure" (though the case of the Gothic Bible is given mention, wherein Goth. *faihu* generally only means "goods, riches," not "cattle"). A general chronology of evolution in terminology is developed through the study, with a general pattern observed for **fehu-* that shifts from "cattle, therefore wealth" to "property, movables good = wealth" from the sixth century to AD 1000 (the troubling Gothic evidence left unresolved). From the late ninth-century Lat. *feum* and derivatives of Gmc **laihwna-* (such as OE *læn*) become increasingly associated, even synonymous, with *beneficium*.

One gets a sense of his developing entry for OE *bēor* in the anticipated new *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* from Alfred Bammesberger's "Zur Etymologie von westgermanisch **beur-a-*," *Sprachwissenschaft* 25: 229–31. The article pursues the details of the WGmc, PGmc, and PIE protoforms underlying OE *beor* and OHG *bior*; Bammesberger refers the reader to Klaus Dietz's "Sind engl. *Beer* und dt. *Bier* Erb- oder Lehnwörter?" (below) for secondary bibliography and fills out the protohistory of the term. Both studies lend support to the notion of "beer" and ancestral forms as belonging to the native Gmc stock. Bammesberger fills out the etymological background details to *beor*, a form over which much ink has been spilled and for which Ferdinand Holthausen recorded a brief entry only listing cognates (*Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3rd ed. Heidelberg; Carl Winter, 1974, s.v.). Here Bammesberger traces OE *beor* and OHG *bior* back to a Gmc root, not to Lat. *bibere* (as often suggested) or other extra-Germanic explanations. The problem encountered traditionally is the lack of a plausible explanation for underlying WGmc **beur-a-* and PGmc **beur-a-* or **beuz-a-*. Bammesberger proposes a derivation, by a "Vrddhi-bildung" (alluding to Sanskrit *vrddhi*, thus a full grade formation), from the Gmc nominal stem **bus-*. With recourse to Otto Springer and Albert Lloyd's new *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen* (2 vols. to date; A.L. Lloyd, R. Lühr, O. Springer, Göttingen:

Vandehoeck and Ruprecht, 1988–1998), Bammesberger charts a complex course: the proposed form *beuz-a-, deriving from *bus- by *vrddhi*-like lengthening and stressing of the theme-vowel, has behind it a proposed PIE *b^hews-ó-. A link is considered between *bus- and *bus-t-, which gave rise to *beusta-, whence OHG *biost* and OE *bēost* ‘beestings, first milk’. Insofar as the article sought to close an etymological gap, it ends tentatively, but offers a starting point to the PGmc and PIE source of OE *beor*.

It is necessary to consider next “Sind engl. *Beer* und dt. *Bier* Erb- oder Lehnwörter?” *Sprachwissenschaft* 25: 103–11, a detail Bammesberger expands upon in the same issue of the journal. Dietz seeks to close off once and for all the notion that English *beer*, German *Bier*, and other Gmc cognates derive from Latin/late Latin *biber(e)*. Dietz proposes that the forms are, in the end, Germanic, though the details of the proto-forms uncertain. The question of whether *beer/Bier* is a loan word or native Gmc form is pursued along linguistic and historical/cultural lines; employing a *Wörter und Sachen* approach, Dietz considers the history of brewing. For etymological detail, this study too is indebted to the Lloyd-Lühr-Springer *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen* and considers the histories of—and long history of distinction between—*beer* (OE *beor*) and *ale* (*ealu*). A survey of previous proposals for the origin of *beer* is given, including Christine Fell’s suggestion that the form is a loan from earlier Dutch (*Leeds Stud. in English* 8 [1975]). Dietz follows Fell in the sense that attention is particularly focused on the historical development of brewing. The tendency has been to locate the form in what part of continental Europe developed the method of adding hops to produce beer. Nonetheless, a distinction between **alub-* (“ale”, which has a long and complex cultural history, as arguments over *ealuscerwen* in *Beowulf* attest) and proposed **beura-* (“beer”) seems to obtain at least from the sixth and seventh centuries (the technique known to monastic brewmeisters in northern France). The broader matter addressed is a semantic one: connecting *beor* to Lat. *bibere* presupposes, in the face of phonological difficulties (or error, p. 108), a pattern of cultural spread and a pattern of association (from ‘to drink’ to a type of beverage). As Lat. has *cervisia*, which produced cognates in the Romance languages, and *bibere* produced cognate forms ‘to drink’ in the Romance languages too (Fr. *boire*), that *bibere* should produce *beor* does not seem necessary. Dietz mentions previous attempts to link **beura-* to WGmc **breura* (PGmc **breuza-*) and PIE **b^h(e)reu-*, whence “brewing,” or OE *beow* ‘barley’ and underlying proto-forms. Though

the ultimate etymology is unclear, Dietz settles on a semantic connection not between the word for a thing and the action of employing or partaking of the thing—“to drink” > “a type of drink”—but between the word for a thing and thing itself.

Bryan Bennett’s popular piece “House and Home,” *Modern English Teacher* 8.4 (1999): 23–25, mentions OE *dwellan*, *hamstede*, and *hus* in a breezy survey of terms for where one lives. It ends with *hovel*, a ME form of unknown origin.

In a year that saw a veritable slew—a loan from Irish—of studies generated by the *TOE* (*Thesaurus of Old English*), Janet Bately’s “Here comes the judge: a Small Contribution to the Study of French Input into the Vocabulary of the Law in Middle English,” in *Placing Middle English in Context*, ed. Irma Taavitsainen, Terttu Nevalainen, Päivi Pahta, and Matti Rissanen (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter), 255–75, examines the semantic domain of “Law and Order.” The study upends some conventional if unexamined wisdom about French loans to English legal vocabulary and the persistence of OE legal terms. As it was not until the mid-thirteenth century that laws in England were made in Anglo-French, examination of OE and ME legal terminology is needed (a desideratum being “a comprehensive list of Middle English legal terms”). Bately examines in particular terms for “court” and “judge,” beginning with the OE evidence. OE *dom*, *gemot*, *þing*, and *witenagemot* are discussed, though the last term—nonwithstanding William the Conqueror’s desire to be recognized by the “assembly of the witan”—described a body whose functions were taken over by the *curia regis* (*court le rey*). OE *dom*, its compounds and derivatives seem to have persisted throughout the entire ME period. Prior to 1375 one finds calques of English and French elements (*heigh court*, *first justice in benk*).

The first progress report of a new lexical project comes from Carole P. Biggam: “Anglo-Saxon Plant Name Survey (ASPNS). First Annual Report,” *OEN* 33.3: 9–11. Biggam recounts the origins of the project, the consultation of plant name material from the *TOE*, and the acceptance of ASPNS as a project of the Institute for the Historical Study of Language (University of Glasgow). The project was conceived of as being “predominantly semantic,” though in its work it draws upon research from a variety of disciplines (botany and archaeobotany among them). Among the project’s authors is Pieter Bierbaumer, who published the seminal *Der botanische Wortschatz des Altenglischen* (Bern: Herbert Lang, 1975–). Biggam also contrib-

uted "Grund to hrof: Aspects of the Old English Semantics of Building and Architecture," to the collection *Lexicology, Semantics and Lexicography: Selected Papers from the Fourth G.L. Brook Symposium, Manchester, August 1998*, ed. Julie Coleman and Christian J. Kay (Amsterdam: John Benjamins), 103–25. As an experiment based on materials from the *Thesaurus of Old English* (TOE), and illustrating principles of its organization and utility, Biggam "builds" two structures from the ground up with forms from the TOE set of words denoting "building, building materials, types of building, parts of buildings, and rooms within buildings"—a set with more than 630 member forms. And so we proceed from foundation (*grund*) to walls (among ground-level features are basal stones, *fofstanas*, and quoin-stones, *hyrnstanas*), doorways and windows and apertures, towers and roofs (up to the *scindel* and *scingal*, the oak shingles of an Anglo-Saxon roof). Intriguingly, the OE vocabulary of Anglo-Saxon wood and stone constructions may include loans from Romano-British Latin.

In "Pregermanic Fishnames III. A New Etymology of 'herring,'" *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 53: 1–6, Dirk Boutkan takes on the problem of the fish-name *herring* (OE *hæring*), which has no IE cognates outside of Gmc; solution has usually been sought in a non-IE language or substrate. Names of fish often present etymological difficulties; thus the difficulty in explaining English *cod* and Dutch *kwal* 'jellyfish' have been taken to indicate influence from a Northern European substrate. Boutkan makes an appeal to OE *heardra/heardhara* (sometimes glossed uncertainly as 'mullet') and other WGmc relatives (Gm *Harder*, Middle Dutch *harder/herder*) as cognates of a WGmc **hæringa-/haringa-* deriving from a Northern European substrate root **kVr-*.

Leiv Egil Breivik and Toril Swan consider the semantic differentiation of English existential *there* and locative *there* in "The Desemanticisation of Existential *there* in a Synchronic-Diachronic Perspective," in *Words: Structure, Meaning, Function: A Festschrift for Dieter Kastovsky*, ed. Christiane Dalton-Puffer and Nikolaus Ritt (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter), 19–34. Debate has generally focused on when in the history of English existential *there* came to be used less as a full adverb and more as an "empty subject-marker." Scholars such as Bruce Mitchell (*Old English Syntax* [Oxford, 1985]) did not think OE *þær* functioned like MnE existential *there*, but did evidence "some sort of introductory function." Based on examples from selected OE prose texts (Alfred's *Orosius*, Ælfric's *Homilies*, and the *Blickling Homilies*), Breivik and Swan

believe that OE *þær* shows instances where it exhibits not so much "concrete locative meaning and demonstrative force" as "propositions concerning existence," a change they see occurring in germinal form in OE when English "changed typologically from verb-second (TVX) to verb-medial (SVX). An example given is *þæt þær nane oðre near næran* from the Bosworth MS of the OE *Orosius*. They argue that this use of the OE adverb *þær* was equivalent to MdE existential *there* by asserting that it was "interchangeable with the classic dummy form *it*" (23; OE *hit*). Thus because OE *þær* "could be used without being in paradigmatic contrast with the proximal adverb *here* or indeed without having any concrete referential meaning at all" (29), Breivik and Swan see the semantic and syntactic reanalysis of the adverb as "empty topic" as dating to the OE period; during the (presumably, by their examples) late OE and ME period the process of "grammaticalisation" went further, with the form reanalyzed as an "empty subject-position holder."

A curious lexical gap in OE is the subject of Richard Dance's "Is the Verb *die* Derived from Old Norse? A Review of the Evidence" (*ES* 81: 368–83). While OE had words for "death" (*dēaþ*) and "dead" (*dēad*) an ancestor proper of MnE *die* (which first appears in the records during the ME period) is lacking. Dance first surveys the vexing form *deog* from *Beowulf* 850a, explained usually as either deriving from *dēagan* 'to conceal [oneself]' or from an otherwise unknown class 7 strong verb **dīegan*. If *dēog* is taken to mean "died," in Dance's view it "could easily be regarded as an archaic or fossilized lexeme" and the study moves on to consider whether a native OE cognate of Gmc **dawjan-* (likely strong class 6) had been lost then replaced by a foreign borrowing, most likely from Norse. Dance considers the alternative histories to the OE reflex of *die*: it either itself died and resurfaced in ME as *deien* (with ON *deyja* as the etymon) or dropped out of literary OE, presumably into dialectal or non-standard use, coming to light again after the conquest and the demise of the conventions of literary West Saxon. Careful, detailed discussion of each follows. The *Eadwine Psalter* gloss *cito defecerunt*: *hredlice dydon* (Ps 105:13) seems rightly parsed as 3rd pret. pl. of *dōn* rather than an instance of a native OE form for *die*. Dance argues for an origin in ON, though admitting that we are hardly on firm grounds in terms of evidence or linguistic patterns. An appeal is made to the case of MdE *trust*, ME *trusten*, which lack an OE ancestor but show "a striking similarity" to ON *traust*, *treysta*. A Scandinavian source seems as plausible in the case of *die*. What then became of a native OE reflex of **dawjan-* is taken up; noted are the alter-

native means of expressing “to die”: the periphrastic *bēon*, *wesan*, *weorþan* + *dēad* or *dēad feallan* or the “rather euphemistic” *gewitan* and *forðfēran*. The study concludes on a note of importance in a year that saw a number of lexical/semantic studies attempt a synthesis of more traditional philology with contemporary pragmatics, metaphor theory, and so forth: “The perennial problem for the linguistic historian remains of course just that the words not recorded on the page were those in the mouths of speakers, and these have gone the way of all flesh” (383).

English *big* comes under examination in Garry W. Davis’s “Notes on the Etymologies of English *big* and Gothic *ga-*,” *Amer. Jnl of Germanic Ling. & Literatures* 12.1: 41–52. While dictionaries have noted a possible etymological connection between English *big* and ON *buggi* (‘capable man’), Davis attempts to fill in the gap of earlier Gmc evidence by drawing on the history of Gothic *gabigs/gabeigs* (‘rich’). The form *gabigs* in proto-NWGmc form **yaβiys* became “resegmented,” allowing for a simplex **βiy-*. Davis traces the sound changes PIE [bʰ] > PGmc [β] > [b] in initial position to derive “the reanalyzed simplex **bigs*”, the reanalysis made possible by the placing of stress on the prefix *ga-* in Gothic. Whence ME *bigge* ‘strong, sturdy’ and MnE *big*.

Ulrich Detges’s “Time and Truth: The Grammaticalization of Resultatives and Perfects within a Theory of Subjectification,” *Stud. in Language* 24: 345–77, draws upon evidence from OE, Latin, and Spanish for a study of subjectification, here delimited as “the shift from concrete lexical meaning to a type of increasingly abstract, pragmatic and interpersonal meaning, based on the speaker’s attitudes towards the proposition” (345). The OE construction *habban* + PP is drawn on here, as is Kathleen Carey’s study “The grammaticalization of the perfect in Old English: an account based on pragmatics and metaphor” (*Perspectives on grammaticalization*, ed. William Pagliuca [Amsterdam, 1994], 103–17). The study seeks to identify the mechanism of change by the “invisible hand phenomenon,” i.e., when “meaning change is brought about independent of the individual speaker’s intentions” (346). The comparison between OE and eMn and Mn Spanish make for odd reading at first; at one point we are told that the OE construction *habban* + PP “gave rise to the perfect in early Middle English” (348), while in n. 6 Bruce Mitchell’s *Old English Syntax* is cited, conceding that to some OE specialists the construction “already functioned as a full-fledged perfect.” For Detges the construction fits into the “resultative II” category, actions that focus on “pres-

ent result” rather than “past event.” Detges notes the high occurrence of verbs of undertaking or achieving in *habban* + PP constructions in *Beowulf* (10 out of 48 instances). But the bulk of the pragmatic and semantic discussion draws on evidence from Spanish. And necessarily so—pragmatic considerations of OE encounter fundamental difficulties, not least of which would be the determination of the “speaker’s attitudes” from a historical, literary corpus.

Another salvo in a long-running dispute is Bernhard Diensberg’s “The Etymology of Modern English *girl* Revisited,” *Folia Linguistica Historica* 21: 119–24. Diensberg writes in response again to the origin of MdE *girl* in OE *gyrela* proposed and revisited by Fred C. Robinson (between 1967 and 1993, in the collection *The Tomb of Beowulf and other Essays on Old English* [Oxford: Blackwell, 1993]). The dispute is older than this (going back at least to Karl Luick’s 1897/8 note in *Beiblatt zur Anglia*), and perhaps could not be otherwise with such etymological mystery surrounding so basic a term. Diensberg objects to Robinson’s proposed etymology on the grounds of the type of metonymic extension involved (from article of clothing to the wearer, *gyrela* > *girl*) and “phonological considerations.” The former objection is dealt with very briefly, citing Yoshio Terasawa’s “Some Etymological and Semasiological Notes on *Girl*” (*Anglo-Saxonica: Beiträge zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte der englischen Sprache. Festschrift für Hans Schabram*, ed. Klaus R. Grinda and Claus-Dieter Wetzel [Munich, 1993], 335–45), wherein Terasawa examined the 70 or so occurrences of OE *gyrele/gyrela* and found them only to refer to articles of clothing. Nonetheless, such metonymic transfer is not unusual; the confection *marzipan* comes to English via Italian *marzapane* (the alternative form *marchpane* detoured through French), meaning originally “sugar-candy box,” and deriving ultimately from Arabic *mautabān*, meaning “glazed vessel.” The phonological objection is given the fullest treatment, particularly the problem of stop [g] replacing initial [j] in *gyrela*; if a northern variant, a southern form is wanting (unlike the case for *get*, *give*, *gild*, *guest*). Diensberg enlists two other studies that have found fault with Robinson’s phonological argument, including an etymological study by Anatoly Liberman (see below for his study of *boy*). The article ends by citing Terasawa’s assertion in the *Kenkyusha Dictionary of English Etymology* (Tokyo, 1997) that for *girl* we have only “etymology obscure.” One senses there will be a few more rounds to this debate.

A trio of etymological studies appeared from Klaus Dietz in 2000. “Sind engl. *Beer* und dt. *Bier* Erb- oder

Lehnwörter?" has been discussed above with Alfred Bammesberger's companion piece. Dietz's "Altenglisch *digol*, *digle* 'verborgen, heimlich': Etymologie und Geschichte einer Wortfamilie," *Sprachwissenschaft* 25: 201–27, considers the origin of the OE adjective *digol*/*digle*/*deagol*/*deogol*, especially its dialectal variants and their fates. The word is of fairly high frequency in OE, the *Microfiche Concordance* of the DOE recording some 300 instances of the form. A number of dialectal forms appear, and Dietz traces Mercian *dēgol* to WGmc **dauyul-* and Northumbrian *dēgle* to WGmc **dauyil-*. The matter is more complex in West Saxon as one finds the competing forms *dī(e)gol*/*dī(e)gle* and *dēogol* (the former prevailed). In three sections Dietz considers the forms of the word recorded, particularly the variation in the main vowel, which ranges across <(ie) ~ I ~ y>, <e>, <io ~ eo>, <ea>, <ei>, and occasionally <æ>; the dialectal nature of these variations (the manuscripts of the OE version of Gregory's *Cura pastoralis* are given particular consideration); and the fate of the forms in ME: by late OE forms with *-ē-* had died out. The OE weak verbs *lignan* and *(ge)lignian* are differentiated semantically and etymologically in Dietz's "Altenglisch *lign(i)an*, mitttelenglisch *lighnen*: 'leugnen, Lügen strafen,'" *Sprachwissenschaft* 25: 193–200. The dictionaries have traditionally kept the sense separate for *lign(i)an* 'deny' and *(ge)lyg(e)nian*, 'accuse of lying, give the lie to'. Drawing once again on the *Microfiche Concordance* of the DOE, Dietz examines the occurrences of the two verbs and traces West Saxon *lignan* to Anglian **lēgnan*; he also sees *(ge)lignian* as a late formation and quite possibly an Ælfrician coinage based on *lygen* 'lie.'

Susana Fidalgo Monge considers the impact of "the perennial experiences of a people whose lives are dominated by the sea" in "The Sea in *Beowulf*, *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer*: on Semantic Fields and Mediterranean Limitations" (*SELIM* 9 [1999]: 155–62). The semantic field of "the sea" is briefly considered in selections from three OE poems in which it figures vitally. Collocations involving the sea in OE are listed (usually in the forms ADJ + N and N + N), one of which involves its being "ice-cold," which in turn leads to a divagation of sorts on the reception of such passages by a Spanish reader more at home with the "idyllic" descriptions of the sea in Spanish literature, or to translations of OE literature into Spanish (where *sealtypa gelac* becomes undulant—*el océano ondulante*—in one version). Seamus Heaney's unfairly treated version of *Beowulf* is here cited—and who has handled better the sea imagery of the poem?—and we learn that the popular Spanish title for *The Seafarer* is *El navegante*.

J.A. Field's 1998 Manchester dissertation "Old English *mod* in the Context of Religious Change: a Semantic Study Based on Selected Texts" (*Index to Theses* 49: 848) suggests that the primary meaning given *mod*, namely "mind," is one imposed in the Christian period and that the senses "courage," "anger," "pride" date to the pre-Christian era. Evidence considered for the pre-Christian sense includes poems such as *Beowulf* deemed "independent of Latin models and sources." Pre-Christian *mod* could be conceived of as having "quasi-physical existence," could be attributed too to animals, and involved "a complex of distinctive social attitudes specific to people of aristocratic class." Christian influence, particularly of the Augustinian strain, pushed *mod* to become a "purely abstract construct."

Manfred Görlach pays tribute to the semantic work of Dieter Kastovsky in his survey "Conceptual and semantic change in the history of English," in *Words: Structure, Meaning, Function*, ed. Dalton-Puffer & Ritt, 95–109. Görlach argues that a "functional structuralist" approach still yields the best results for semantic and lexical study of OE and surveys general approaches to the subject from Saussure forward. He cautions against "emergency equations made to cover up lexical gaps," such as the extension of OE *dēma* to translate *praeses* *Cyrinus* in Luke's account of the Christmas story (Lk 2: 1–21). He offers as another examples the semantic field of "seats," "throne" in particular: for this OE could use *cynesetl* or *cynestōl*, the latter of which could also mean "royal dwelling, capital city" (in pre-postmodern linguistics, this was simply called metonymic extension). Görlach proceeds to discuss the nature of semantic change in the history of OE, outlining twelve reasons for change (including language contact phenomena, as with *knight* becoming the equivalent of *chevalier*, semantic transfers, changes in material culture, clipping, and others).

The case of Gmc words for *finger*, lacking "counterparts in any other Indo-European languages," is the subject of Ari Hoptman's "Finger and Some Other *f-* and *fl-* Words," *North-Western European Lang. Evolution* 36: 77–91. Attempts have been made to link English *finger* (the form has remained consistent throughout the history of English) to IE **penkʷe* 'five', a natural enough association; the closest form outside Gmc to *finger* is Armenian *hingerord* ('fifth'; there is some debate about the morphemic division of this form). Hoptman opts to pursue the line that *finger* is rather to be connected with "the physical motions performed by the finger itself," the etymon more like-

ly to be found “in a group of words beginning with *f-* or *fl-* that denote back and forth motion” (79). The notion of word creation by a system of sound-symbolism, by association with “appearances or movements in the physical world” is brought up with reference to the work of Wilhelm Oehl, whose term for the phenomenon was *Bildmalerei*. The initial sound in such groups of formations may be a “determiner” (here citing Anatoly Liberman’s “Some Germanic Words Beginning with *fl*” (*Word Heath. Wortheide. Ordheidi: Essays on Germanic Literature and Usage* [Rome, 1994]), e.g. the group *claw, cling, cleave, clip*. Hoptman identifies the cluster of forms to which he connects *finger* as consisting of interdental fricative + optional liquid (l/r) + vowel + consonant (usually a stop). The group elicited by the schema is rather extensive, and is given the semantic cover term of “back-and-forth” words. The functions of the finger are turned to next, particularly its counting and pointing functions (thus connecting it to the group of back-and-forth *f-* and *fl-* words). Left unresolved at the end is a long-vexing matter, the function of *-r* in **fingr-*.

The ordering of elements in deriving the sense of two OE compound forms in *-heard* is the subject of Carole Hough’s “OE *feolheard* and OE *irenheard*: Two hapax legomena Reconsidered,” *Neophil* 84: 127–36. The two words are from the poetry; *feolheard* from *The Battle of Maldon* (108b) has been taken as “hardened by the file” or “as hard as a file,” while *irenheard* in *Beowulf* (1112a) has often been taken as “as hard as iron.” Hough argues that only the former translation of *feolheard* is correct, and so *irenheard* should be translated as “hardened by the sword.” To this end Hough first draws from the DOE’s *Microfiche Concordance* the corpus of *-heard* compounds; onomastic use of *-heard* (especially the names *Æpelheard* and *Wulfheard*) makes up a significant portion of occurrences: 21 of Hough’s 46 lexical items, in fact. The most common compounds are *prohtheard* (4x), *nipheard* (3x), and *wigheard* (3x). The TOE is turned to for *-heard* compounds in the category “Strength”; of these 6 have a noun as the first element and in each case the pattern “hardened by X” seems the best interpretation, “with the first element designating the agent of hardening” (132).

We are told in Leena Kahlas-Tarkka’s “A Note on Non-Standard Uses in Middle English: Weak Preterites of Strong Old English Verbs” (*NM* 101: 217–23) that of “the 367 strong verbs in Old English, only 78 retain partially or wholly the original strong paradigm.” The focus of this study, with the aid of the *Hel-sinki Corpus*, is on those strong verbs that, starting in

ME, developed weak preterites. Strong verbs that exhibited occasional weak forms (such as *slæpan*, 7) and verbs that could be strong or weak (*hweorfan*, 3, beside weak *hwearfian/hwierfan*) and verbal pairs such as *hōn* and *hangian* are considered in an effort to find reasons behind such a fundamental change in the verbal system of English. A number of factors may be at play: first and foremost analogical remodelling (perhaps the greatest source for loss of strong verbs), but also phonological causes such as “homonymic clash,” extra-linguistic influence, and “contamination” or “contextual analogy” (e.g., when a strong form is used in proximity to weak preterites); and regional or non-standard dialectal forms.

One of the editors of the TOE, Christian Kay, served as moderator/editor of a series of brief reports on projects in English lexicography for the “Brook Symposium on the Revised OED and English Historical Lexicography: A Report,” in *Lexicology, Semantics and Lexicography*, ed. Julie Coleman and Kay (Current Issues in Ling. Theory 194. Amsterdam and Philadelphia). 229–39. Kay groups together very brief progress reports on the OED, *Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles*, *The Middle English Compendium*, the TOE, the *Middle English Word Studies* of Louise Sylvester and Jane Roberts (see below), and the *Historical Thesaurus of English* (the one disappointment is not to see anything on the DOE). In the same volume is Kay’s “Historical Semantics and Historical Lexicography: Will the Twain Ever Meet?” (53–68), a semanticist’s call for greater cooperation between two disciplines that concern themselves with getting at meaning. Kay draws on his work with the TOE and THE for his examples (from the semantic domain ANGER), noting that the TOE represents “a synchronic snapshot of the extant Old English vocabulary, with no attempt at further division into periods” (55). The study ends with a plea for the usefulness of cognitive semantics (here in the form of prototype theory) to historical lexicography. The metaphor theory of George Lakoff (in particular Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* [Chicago, 1980]) is brought into play in Kay’s “Metaphors We Lived By: Pathways between Old and Modern English,” in *Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, 273–85. Drawing again on work for the TOE, Kay examines the role of metaphor “as a key factor in the development of polysemy in particular lexemes or groups of lexemes,” such as the transference of terms for parts of the body to terms for bodies of waters and their parts, e.g., *heafod* and *muð(a)* as “head” and “mouth (of a river)” (Clark Hall’s *Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* seems to indicate some semantic differen-

tiation developed: *mūð* is defined as “‘mouth,’ opening, door, gate,” and *mūða* as “mouth (of a river), estuary”). Or, the “mind and its activities conceptualized in terms of physical space,” whence MnE notions of “to turn the mind to” (OE *hweorfan*), etc. While OE is not known to be “rich in similes,” metaphors abound, especially in the form of kennings. Here Kay turns to Lakoff and Johnson’s *Metaphors We Live By* for a means to map types of metaphor. Once one gets past the state-the-obvious nature of the Lakoffian labelling system (“Stupidity is close texture,” “Time is money,” “Understanding is light,” “Love is fire”) one gets a glimpse of the complexity of the task faced by the TOE (for which, see below), and the riches it has to offer.

In “Old Norse *taka*, Gothic *tekan*, Greek *τεταγών*,” *North-Western European Lang. Evolution* 36: 59–65, Frederik Kortlandt pursues the etymon to Gmc words for “touch, take” (OE *ðaccian* ‘clap, pat, stroke, touch gently’); while cognate forms are known, the problem has been with the Gothic form *tekan*—the initial *t-* (beside *þ-* as in OE and OS) and the long vowel *-ē-* are not “compatible with regular sound laws.” The problem is with the infinitive; the Gothic reduplicated preterite *taitok* is paralleled by Latin *tetigi* and Greek *τεταγών*. Kortlandt makes a call for greater precision in positing long vowels for the proto-forms. There is a need for “a powerful theory which explains why clear instances of original lengthened grade are so very few and restrains our reconstructions accordingly”; Kortlandt finds such a theory in J. Wackernagel’s *Altindische Grammatik* (Göttingen, 1896), a complex argument drawing especially on evidence from Vedic, among the postulates of which is that in certain paradigms of the verb, such as the injunctive (in Vedic and Sanskrit), the 1st sg. form has the full grade (the *vyddhi* vowel), the 2nd and 3rd sg. the lengthened grade (*guna*). Kortlandt argues that Gothic *tekan* and Tocharian B *ceš-* represent “a reduplicated paradigm” similar to Greek *τεταγών*. The problem for Gmc is that the lengthened grade of the verb in Gothic *tekan* is “an isolated formation” as this grade did not spread elsewhere in Gmc. The OE form *þaccian*, and related OS form *thakolon*, derive from **þakkō-*, which in turn may in Kortlandt’s view derive from **tagna-*, thus having originally a nasal present parallel to Latin *tangō-*, *tetigi*.

Loredana Lazzari studies the medical vocabulary preserved in the corpus of OE glosses, and presents and discusses bundles of medical entries from London, BL Add. 32246 in “Il lessico medico anglosassone: descrizione e classificazione delle glosse sul f.

4 del ms London, B.L., Add. 32246,” *Quaderni della Sezione di glottologia e linguistica (Chieti)* 10–11 (1998–99): 159–93. Lazzari begins with an overview of the importance of the Anglo-Saxon medical texts to a history of the reception and preservation of Greco-Roman medicine (*Læceboe III* in particular). The texts published in Cockayne’s *Leechdoms, Wortcunning and Starcraft in Early England* (3 vols., 1864–66) show the medieval distillation of the inheritance: the importance of the *herbaria*, of quasi-magical tracts, of books on maladies considered *a capite ad calcem*. Lazzari turns also to those *fasciculi* of medical terms found in the alphabetical bilingual glossaries (Épinal-Erfurt, Corpus, Cleopatra, Harley); the main focus is upon a cluster of 65 medical terms from fol. 4 of BL Add. 32246. A good many of these correspond to Isidore’s *De medicina* (*Etymologiae* IV). Lazzari considers first the 30 or so entries containing OE *hapax legomena* (and so *yleus* [*ileus, dolor intestinalum*] is glossed by three *hapax legomena*: *hrifwerf*, *hrifteung*, *hrifadl*); a second section considers those entries (very nearly all of those remaining) that are glossed by OE words found only in the glossarial corpus (bilingual glossaries and glossed texts). Each entry is given brief commentary, including sources (usually Isidore) and relevant attestations or other glosses to the lemma at hand. A concluding section lists the calques and types of formations in the glosses; in a medical class-list, most of the OE glosses are compounds (and these are classed under the headings “nominal compounds and “syntactic groupings.” A chart lays out for comparison the OE interpretations of the Latin medical terms (nearly all having to do with maladies and conditions) under three headings: the Antwerp and London glossaries; other glossaries and glossed texts; the OE prose medical texts. The comparison yields the observation on the remarkable number of OE *hapax legomena* in the London class-list.

Following on the work of Helmut Gneuss, Mechtild Gretsch, and others on the Benedictine Reform era and its scholarly milieu is Ursula Lenker’s “The Monasteries of the Benedictine Reform and the ‘Winchester School’: Model Cases of Social Networks in Anglo-Saxon England,” *European Jnl of English Stud.* 4.3: 225–38. Lenker’s study applies the linguistic theory of “social networks” (rather than the term one might expect, “speech communities,” as we are dealing solely with written records for the period) to explain the nature of what is meant by the “Winchester School” and its role in the formation and promotion of a literary West Saxon standard. In this view the school at Winchester (i.e., not just those resident there, but those in its ambit of its influence) “emerg-

es as a tightknit, localized network cluster which functions as a mechanism of norm enforcement and maintenance" (226). While admitting that the data available for a sociolinguistic study of this segment of the OE period—she cites Connie Eble's study of inflectional endings in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* (*Noun Inflection in Royal 7. C. XII, Ælfric's First Series of Catholic Homilies*, diss. U of North Carolina, 1970), which found a degree of "artificiality" in the language—Lenker cautions against considering "this Old English 'standard' identical to its modern written equivalents"; what else it might be is and probably could not be stated as so much more work is needed in OE dialectology. Another problem for a sociolinguistic analysis is the preponderance of anonymous texts, and those of uncertain provenance. Nonetheless, on the basis of known works of such outstanding individuals as Æthelwold and Ælfric, it does "indeed seem to be possible to operationalise network variables in the study of Anglo-Saxon individuals whose networks are of a relatively closeknit type" (230). The nature of the "Winchester vocabulary"—a controversial notion—is dealt with very briefly, with four examples given: a tendency to use *ælfremed* over *fremde*, *gelapung* over *cirice* (in sense of "Christian community"), *modig* over *ofermod*, and *wuldorbeag* over *cynhelm*. The maintenance and spread of this vocabulary was in the hands of the "Winchester Circle," which "consists of several individuals interacting with each other and is a 'social network'" (233). Lenker scores the density of this network at "(presumably) 100%" in that all of the monks knew each other firsthand; a difficult matter not addressed is whether we know how many members were included in this "circle." The diffusion of the "Winchester vocabulary" was carried out by "bridges," that is, monks with "weak network ties" (presumably those hailing from other regions who trained at the center or those visiting from other centers). A role was no doubt paid too by "non-human 'innovators,'" i.e., books (a term only modern linguistics could have invented). The work of Leslie Milroy is tapped again for the term "cultural focusing," that is, "the formation of a recognizable set of norms," which in the case at hand Winchester words had a role in bringing about. Lenker concludes on the note that the "Winchester vocabulary" seems "a model case of cultural and linguistic focusing in a tightknit network" (238). With a theoretical model in place, it will be interesting to see how it holds up under testing with data.

With some 140 items in its bibliography, Anatoly Liberman's etymological investigation of three English words is both immensely detailed and, of course,

concerned with much more than just "The Etymology of English *boy*, *beacon*, and *buoy*," *Amer. Jnl of Germanic Ling. & Literatures* 12.2: 201–34. Drawing on and, eventually, departing from Eric J. Dobson's "The etymology and meaning of *boy*," *MÆ* 9 (1940): 121–54, Liberman first traces the many and various attempts to explain a common term with mysterious origins (such as deriving from an OE proper name *Boia*, or a "baby word," or a nickname). Appeals have been made to Dutch (*boef* and the interjection *boye!*), Low German (and the modern and informal *Bube*), Frisian, and French—often forms that mean something like "youngster" or "rogue," as "It seems that two different sets of words coexisted in (West) Germanic: one denoted little boys, and the other devils and rogues" (207). But a recurrent problem has been linking these proposed etyma phonologically with ME *boie* and variants and so Liberman turns to *beacon*, OE *bēacen* (which also occurs in a number of compound formations: *sigebeacen*, *beacensfyr*, etc.). Ten proposals for explaining Gmc. **baukn-* are examined in detail (excepting those positing a Hebrew or Welsh origin); amidst the detail is a (brief) excursus on the co-occurrence of OE *beacen* and *tacn* (as at *Beowulf* 140–41); OE *tacn* derives from PGmc. **taikn-* and may share in its "strong religious (magical) connotations" (221). Discussion of *buoy* leads back to *beacon* as one possible origin is in the transmission of PGmc. **baukn-* to French (where it became *boie*), and thence in the form *bo(e)ye* back to Dutch (to English and elsewhere from there). Liberman ends inconclusively with each of the three words investigated and inveighs: "Every time etymologists do not know the answer to their problems they say *definitely*" (225).

An enormously important if rather understudied subject is taken up by Anna Maria Luiselli Fadda in "The Vernacular and the Propagation of the Faith in Anglo-Saxon Missionary Activity," in *Missions and Missionaries*, ed. Pieter N. Holtrop and Hugh McLeod, *Studies in Church History*, Subsidia 13 (Woodbridge: Boydell), 1–15. Luiselli Fadda takes on the matter of the linguistic medium of conversion and other missionary activity with specific reference to the Germanic sphere of activity. This is territory where one naturally turns to the primary documents of Gregory the Great, Bede, Boniface, and others—curiously, the work of Wilhelm Levison is not made use of—to trace the linguistic course of the missions. Gregory dispatched Augustine to Anglo-Saxon England with Frankish *interpretes*; at the court of Æthelbert in Kent Bede tells us contact was made by these interpreters, though "no explicit statement can be produced to prove in what language" (one would

think either Frankish or Latin or both at first, as Queen Bertha was a Frankish Christian). During the Irish missions to the north of Britain, Bede tells us, the Irish missionary Aidan was not entirely at home "in the English tongue," a want remedied sufficiently soon enough. The vital corpus of glosses and annotations from the Canterbury school of Theodore and Hadrian (newly edited by Michael Lapidge and Bernhard Bischoff, *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian* [Cambridge, 1994]) is briefly cited, although the caveat that glosses "never explained doctrinal or theological concepts but involved, instead, the realities of daily life" (8) does not apply to the glossaries edited by Lapidge and Bischoff. The linguistic exchange of course went both ways, and the matter of early Lat. loans in OE is briefly treated with reference to Alfred Wollmann's very valuable study *Untersuchungen zu den frühen Lehnwörtern im altenglischen* (Munich, 1990). The semantic extension of native words to cover new Christian meanings is also noted—as, for instance, in the case of OE *þegn* broadening to cover Lat. *discipulus* and *apostolus*. Luiselli Fadda provides an overview of a rich subject deserving more investigation.

Possible Celtic origins for organizational and hierarchical concepts (such as the *comitatus*) and terms (Gm *Reich* and *Amt*) are the subjects of Bernard Mees' "Celtic Influence in the Vocabulary of Hierarchy during the Common Germanic Period," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* 115, Germanistische Abteilung (1998): 361–88. Mees' study is also a history of the entire matter of Celtic influence on Germanic, from the "Celtomania" of the late-nineteenth-century French Celticist Henry d'Arbois de Jubainville (who helped develop the proposal of an Italo-Celtic transitional branch for IE) to the current "Celtosceptics" (in German scholarship the term *Iro-phobie* has been used). The matter is of some significance since followers of de Jubainville included Hermann Hirt (famous for his work with IE grammar) and Sigmund Feist (author of the *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Gotischen Sprache*). Views have taken a necessary corrective skeptical turn since then, but this corrective revisionism too has been taken too far. A certain amount of Celtic influence on the development of Germanic institutions seems plausible, even on a fundamental element like the *comitatus* (similar to Ir. *fianna*); parallelism between Lugh (**Lugos*) and Óðinn (**Wōðanaz*) "probably stems from their function as patrons of similar warrior groups" (374). Yet Mees cautions against seeing PGmc **rēks* (Gothic *reiks*) and **amb(i)-aktos* (Gm *Amt*, Gothic *andbahts*, OE *ambiht*, etc.)—the former possibly and the latter

very likely a Celtic loan—as evidence of "anything other than expected sporadic linguistic interference" (388). In reaching this modest conclusion, Mees gives both a survey of the tides of scholarship and of the treatment of classical sources on the early Germans and Celts.

"The spatial and temporal meanings of *before* in Middle English" (*Placing ME in Context*, ed. Taavitsainen et al., 329–37) by Ruta Nagucka looks at the use of preposition *before* to express anteriority in its locative uses and both anteriority and posteriority in its temporal uses. OE expressions of "before" are looked at briefly before the main focus on ME; "the temporal notion of antecedence" could be expressed by OE *onforan*, *toforan*, *fore-* "prefixal compounds," while it was observed that *ær* occurred more frequently in prepositional phrases. As ME *er* "was becoming less and less phonetically transparent and pragmatically advisable" we witness the rise of *before*.

A survey of current and in-progress electronic lexical resources is given by Matti Rissanen in "The World of English Historical Corpora: From Cædmon to the Computer Age," *Jnl of Eng. Linguistics* 28.1: 7–20. Of interest to OE specialists in particular are the corpora and databases given 7–11: the *Helsinki Corpus* (the earliest text of which is *Cædmon's Hymn*), The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (and the projected OE companion, which goes by the tortuous appellation Brooklyn-Geneva-Amsterdam-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English), the Middle English Compendium, the Electronic *Beowulf*, and the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus in Electronic Form*, which we are told "is available on the Internet for a modest annual subscription fee per institution." This sends one to the *TOE* to see if notions of *MODEST* have changed over time. The survey includes a helpful appendix of URLs for the projects mentioned.

In addition to a second impression of the *Thesaurus of Old English* (which yields the inevitable and rather pedestrian acronym *TOE*), several studies appeared from Jane Roberts in 2000. "The Old English Vocabulary of Nobility," in *Nobles and Nobility in Medieval Europe*, ed. Anne J. Duggan (Woodbridge: Boydell), 69–84, introduces the reader briefly to the format of the *TOE*, of the 18 sections to which Roberts appeals to two (category 7 "Opinion" and category 12 "Social Interaction") in discussing Old English terms for nobles and nobility. Some difficulties are identified right at the start: Anglo-Saxon terms for rank and social prestige often did not survive into MnE; Anglo-Saxon society was not ordered like the Anglo-

Norman and English society that followed the conquest; and the internal evidence, which can offer “false friends,” both culturally and etymologically. *Beowulf* is used as an initial test example: the titular hero is himself a man of “unusual qualities,” he fills the role of future hero, and the role of a leader who grieves for a slain follower; Hrothgar can be cited especially with regard to the last mentioned characteristic, and the encomium to Æschere in the poem is appealed to as epitomizing “the heroic ideal of Anglo-Saxon times.” Caution is raised that some terms, such as *eorl* or *hæled*—given noble renderings by Victorian translators—may not be titular or rank-bearing but “bleached of all heroic connotations” and best rendered simply as “man.” An analysis of the categories from the *TOE* leads to a discussion of “nobility” in OE in the abstract, the terms for “nobleness, excellence,” and notions of rank. *Beowulf* is turned to again in the section “Problems of register,” and while the poem presents problems as terms of reference (such as *æþeling* and *cyning*) are applied variously to characters (as might be expected for reasons of formulas and *metri causa*) an appeal is made to Anglo-Saxon laws (Alfred) where one does find “careful distinctions made for fines according to the rank of the property holder” in the case of breaking and entering. The study turns then to terms for persons of rank and returns to literary evidence, noting that in Anglo-Saxon England only Æschere from *Beowulf* is labeled with the term *aldorþegn* and concluding that “We no longer recognize the width of reference such words once held.” In “OE to eME: Looking Forward from the *Thesaurus of Old English*” (*Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 435–54), Roberts writes about the early days of the project (below) with the late Lynne Grundy and Christian Kay and the matter of organizing the material of the lexical project into domains. One of these, “education” in the domain “Mind,” serves as the example for this article’s look at continuity between OE and early ME; of the 460 terms catalogued pre-1500, some 138 occurred only in OE, 37 others could be linked across OE to ME. The OE share of vocabulary of education at first seemed high, though there are quite a few *hapax legomena* in OE; interesting too was that term “education” itself did not have a precise equivalent: OE words cluster most of all in “Teaching and Learning.” And though the OED lists its first occurrences from the early Modern period, one finds in OE *scolmann*. The sample and discussion here are offered so that continuities and discontinuities between OE and ME might be “examined in a systematic way across the whole lexicon.” In “*Robbares and reuares þat rýche men despoilen*: Some competing forms” (*Plac-*

ing ME in Context, ed. Taavitsainen et al., 235–53), Roberts again draws on the resources of the *TOE* to consider the semantic field of “robbery” and “theft” (directing the reader also to Jürg Schwyter’s detailed lexical analysis of “theft” (*Old English Legal Language: The Lexical Field of Theft* (Odense, 1996))). The range of terms in OE and eME for robbery, robbers, stealing, sacking, etc. (laid out in seven tables through the study), shows an interesting dialectal divide in use and collocation between northern and southern England that merits further investigation. The reader is once more directed toward the riches of the *TOE* and its *gripend*, *hlopere*, *goldþeof*, *wealdgenga*, and others; the study leaving the impression that the many terms for thieves and robbers in OE, both common and legalistic, bespeak a particular preoccupation with property in Anglo-Saxon England. Roberts’s “Two Notes on Layamon’s *Brut*,” in *New Perspectives on Middle English Texts: a Festschrift for R.A. Waldron*, ed. Susan Powell and Jeremy J. Smith (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer), 75–85, argues for making recourse to OE to aid in enlightening remaining opaque points in translation of the *Brut*. Two cruces in particular are noted: *giueles* (an appeal is made to the form *gifl* and the feminine abstract noun *giofolnesse/ giofolness*—the forms given as they occur in Alfred’s version of Gregory’s *Pastoral Care*) and *alodede* (with an appeal to OE [*ge*]libigian): for the former we get a sense “generosity, largesse,” and the latter “to make glad.” Layamon wrote at a time of linguistic flux, and with these two forms Roberts says we might rely upon “the continuity of the language from Anglo-Saxon England through into Layamon’s time, finding in him inherited ways of thought ... to take account of words that were demonstrably dropping out of use during the twelfth century.” One more item from Roberts for this year is her work with Christian Kay and Lynne Grundy on the second edition of the *Thesaurus of Old English* (Amsterdam: Rodopi; Costerus 132), 2 vols. (xxxvi, 719 + ii, 721–1562). The new impression is substantially the same work (no chance then for a waggish reference to big *TOE* and little *TOE*), though a note in the first volume (p. xii) alerts the readers to some changes, mainly alterations of spellings of headwords. Some regularization of headwords was made late in the project, but some “inconsistencies have been retained, as providing more information than would regularized forms.” The *TOE* is described as a pilot study for the much larger *Historical Thesaurus of English* and divides the vocabulary of OE into 18 broad domains: The Physical World, Life and Death, Matter and Measurement, Material Needs, Existence, etc. The domains themselves correspond to three groupings broader still: “the external

world"; "the mind and to aspects of behaviour on an abstract level"; "to society and its adaptation of the physical world" (from Roberts, "OE Vocabulary of Nobility," 69). Though the *TOE* is a rather large work prefatory to an even greater thesaurus, the introduction does caution that "the extant corpus of Old English is small and probably skewed in its representation of Anglo-Saxon vocabulary" (I.xxi). Four "flags" (the sigla *o*, *q*, *p*, *g*) are used to mark forms (but not meanings) and they signify: word of low frequency or *hapax legomena*; dubious words; words that occur largely in poetry; words belonging to the glossarial corpus. Though the editors describe their work as "somewhat of a blunt instrument, sacrificing semantic or grammatical specificity to breadth of conceptual coverage," one nonetheless notices its details, the attempt to map out not only broad semantic categories but discrete phenomena down to the most basic level or upward to great abstraction. Thus, for instance, in the second domain, after describing types of "woods" ("woodland," "wild woodland," "wood on a hillside," "wood in a meadow"), one encounters a class-list of "particular trees/shrubs": alder, ash, aspen, beech, birch, box, chestnut, elder, elm, hazel, holly, etc. Like the Latin-OE glossaries, the class-lists and fasciculi of the *TOE* give a sense not only of semantic groupings, but of the range of knowledge and interests of Anglo-Saxons, of how they mapped out their world linguistically. The *TOE* in its MnE-OE presentation format thus also serves as a sort of reverse dictionary. It can also be read as a record of loan forms; domain 16, "Religion," naturally enough gives whole bundles of Latin, Greek, and Latinized Greek loans: *unction*: *crismsmyrels*, *preaching*: *predicung*; and one sees too how much of the linguistic apparatus of Christianity was nativized in OE. As the name itself suggests, the thesaurus is a treasure-house of lexical and semantic information that will take its place alongside the *Microfiche Concordance* to the *DOE*. As a lexical curio, the very last entry of the *TOE* is *A female fiddler: fipelestre*.

Anna Helene Feulner's *Die griechischen Lehnwörter im altenglischen* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie 21. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang) is a careful and detailed survey of Greek loans, direct and indirect, in early English to 1100. Based on her Munich dissertation (directed by Professor Helmut Gneuss), Feulner's study is, like many other Munich dissertations, careful in the assemblage of great amounts of documentary evidence and highly programmatic. Using in part Alois Pogatscher's *Zur Lautlehre der griechischen, lateinischen und romanischen Lehnwörter im Altenglischen* (Strassburg,

1888) as a point of departure—the date of publication of which showing how overdue a study such as Feulner's is (the place of publication, Strasbourg, recovered by France in 1919)—Feulner, after a methodological introduction, considers some 280 Greek forms found in OE. The vast majority come through the medium of Latin, of course; many are glossarial (there being quite a number of *hapax* among them), and quite a few of the remaining ecclesiastical. The forms are given in 'Katalog' format (55–392); attestations are listed, the requisite dictionaries consulted, and, frequently, the Latin forms intermediary to the Greek originals and the loans as they appear in OE traced. Five sources are given particular attention in her appendices: Ælfric's *Grammar*, *Glossary*, and *De temporibus anni*; Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion* (the title itself a Greek loan, for which there is the OE *handboc* and the perfectly fine Latinate rendering *manuale*); the OE *Herbarium*; OE versions of the *Epistola Alexandri* and *De mirabilibus Orientis*; and Aldhelm's *opera* (perhaps for this occasion, *erga*). The teratological catalogue of "Alexander's Letter" and the "Wonders of the East" provides eight Greek forms (discussed 478–9), all of which arrived in the OE versions via Latin; one in particular gives evidence of the muddle that could be made of Greek in Roman garb: *ictifafonas* for *ichthyophagi*. The nature of such a catalogue approach is that breadth cannot always be matched by depth; in the discussion of *crisma* and *crismal* (164–6), the latter form is defined as "chrism-cloth" when it refers also to the chrismal or chrismatory (vessels for housing the three kinds of holy oils). Not cited but useful in explaining the form's appearance in OE is Aldhelm's riddle *De chrismale* (LV); and the word may not be a *hapax* as the Runic OE form *ciismeel* from the Mortain coffer inscription is perhaps to be read *c<r>ismēl* (discussed in McGowan, *Old English Lexicographical Studies* [diss. U Penn 1991]). Feulner's study is a thesaurus of sorts, in its Greek sense, which could be mined for a number of future studies of the appearance of Greek loans in OE, how they got there and what the scribes could often get wrong, but on a number of other occasions right.

Manuela Romano examines "ANGER in Old English," *SELIM* 9 (1999): 45–56, as part of a larger study of basic emotion concept terms in the medieval Germanic languages. Two main goals of the study are outlined at the start: a) an attempt at a "reconstruction of the conceptual system of the time"; b) a determination of how much of this system is "physiological and, thus, universal and how much culture specific of this period of the language." The semantic work of George Lakoff on metaphors is employed

throughout the study, particularly in its organization of "anger" into a series of metaphorical schemes: "ANGER IS A HOT FLUID" that "wells," "seethes" (*gewealdan*, *bindan*). The study derived from the *Microfiche Concordance* a corpus of some 40 terms relating to "anger," "wrath," "rage," "fury," etc., in some 900 contexts. The study admits of some difficulties, especially the limitations that come "[w]ith no informants to describe what they feel when they are angry and with the restrictions imposed by written data" (46). There are also problems with the applicability of modern metaphoric theory to OE literary evidence. The work of Lakoff in particular hinges upon idiosyncratic and selective readings of contemporary American English; the body of work by Americans of this school is generally poor in non-English data. Nonetheless, the "ontology of ANGER in Old English is similar to Lakoff & Kövecses' (1987) findings in *Contemporary American English* in that we find a contradiction between the fact that from a socially accepted point of view ANGER should be controlled and, at the same time, revenged and rewarded. Nevertheless, the great majority of contexts which appear in the OE corpus show that the first attitude must have been socially more acceptable than the second" (53). The conclusions are no doubt not uninfluenced by the preponderance of contexts for the forms deriving from glossed psalters, the *Pastoral Care*, and Ælfric—not examples of everyday speech, nor necessarily of everyday Anglo-Saxon attitudes and emotions.

María Ángeles Ruíz Moneva uses two of Ælfric's *Lives of the Saints* (Oswald and Edmund) to study the nature and use of compound formations in OE in her "Compound Nouns in the Old English Period: Functional and Pragmatic Approaches in Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*," *SELIM* 8 (1998): 239–58. Ruíz's study employs a functional approach (described in a preliminary section, 239–245), then turns to the OE compounds themselves. A difficulty in any study such as this is the extent to which a modern linguistic theory, viewing language as primarily as "a fundamental tool of social interaction" expressive of "the particular cosmivision shared by its speakers," can work with a corpus of non-everyday written language (such as the OE literary corpus, outside of the epigraphic corpus our only source on how OE was used). The relative freedom with which OE could call upon compound formations, especially kennings, is noted as are the semantic economy of the formation ("a condensation of information") and their "primarily syntactic" nature. Sample compound formations are examined from the two Ælfrician *Lives* and grouped into types according to their constituent elements: the *vita* of St.

Oswald exhibits six types (N or ADJ + suffix, N + N, N + N in apposition, [DET] + ADJ + N, genitive + N, prefix + N) and that of St. Edmund five (the first five types listed for Oswald).

The fundamental matter of the form (interrogative pronoun, interjection) and meaning (namely, how to translate the term, the very first word, for instance, of *Beowulf*) is the subject of E.G. Stanley's "Hwæt," in *Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 525–56. Some oft-repeated notions concerning *hwæt* receive a debunking. In function it was primarily an interrogative pronoun, and the translation of its less frequent exclamatory use is a matter "of taste, not certainty" (though one hopes that the *whacko!* mentioned makes no appearance any time soon). The exclamatory form in OE (found also in OS, *huat*) is examined in its occurrences recorded by the *Microfiche Concordance* of the DOE, as is its appearance in such collocations as *la hwæt*, *eala hwæt*, *ono hwæt*. Stanley suggests that for OE there was perhaps not so "decided" a distinction between the interrogative and the interjection as in MnE; and while the poetry could use *hwæt* initially—and here Stanley questions the practice of taking poetic *hwæt* as separate from the clause that follows—Wulfstan tended not to, or intensified its exclamatory force with an interjection such as *eala*. Non-interrogative *hwæt* could be "affirmative, explanatory, causal" in function (and one wonders whether it could be described at times as functioning as an asseverative, or mildly asseverative particle—something along the lines of a common function of Latin *uero*). Introductory *hwæt* functions, in what could be called aspectual terms, in "inceptive" rather than "continuative" manner. The handling of the *hwæt* from the opening of *Beowulf* quite naturally concludes the study; Stanley focuses particularly on those editors and translators who take the form as separate from what follows, or who print it extrametricaly (such as in Bruce Mitchell and Fred C. Robinson, *Beowulf: An Edition with relevant Shorter Texts* [Oxford, 1998]), a practice "for which the manuscripts and the scansion of Old English verse provide no evidence."

Louise Sylvester's "Towards a Middle English Thesaurus: Some Exploratory Approaches," in *Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 557–69, discusses plan for the ME companion to the TOE and gives examples from ME for the domains "education" and "upbringing"; during discussion of the latter OE *fostorling* and *fostring* are briefly mentioned. Sylvester's "The Vocabulary of CONSENT in Middle English" (*Lexicology, Semantics and Lex-*

icography, ed. Coleman and Kay, 157–78), addresses the matter of consent “as a legal concept in the medieval period” and represents also a contribution to the future *Thesaurus of Middle English*. Preliminary to a discussion of the semantic domain in ME, Sylvester considers the work for the TOE on relevant OE terms such as *geunnan*, *(ge)þafian*, *(ge)tipian*, *willan*, *est*, *ðafsumnes*, and others. For the OE discussion a basic question is asked: “The concept of CONSENT encompasses in its meaning notions of concord and agreement, and includes agreement to something, with the implied sense of permission or agreeing to someone doing something. Was this idea lexicalized in Old English?” (165). The results were mixed: when viewed synchronically, CONSENT, although lexicalized in Old English, had not achieved the complex of meanings that the definitions grouped under the terms consent in the MED suggest in the Middle English period.” Of significance is the large number of OE terms relating to CONSENT that appear in the glossarial corpus. Ancillary to the appearance of a TME to complement the TOE is Louise Sylvester and Jane Roberts’ *Middle English Word Studies: A Word and Author Index* (Cambridge: Brewer). The index is arranged alphabetically by author name and includes brief summaries of the word studies as well as a word index keyed to scholars who have discussed the term. The index could be used well with Matsuji Tajima’s equally valuable guide for OE and ME word studies (*Old and Middle English Language Studies: A Classified Bibliography, 1923–1985* [Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1988]).

“Old English Semantics: Problems of Evidence” by T. Styles is a 1997 Nottingham thesis that works toward “a theory of Anglo-Saxon semantics” by examining genres of texts involving meaning and transfers of meaning (including loan translations), namely OE rendering of Latin texts and the Lat.-OE class glossaries. Styles offers a description of the operating principles behind such texts that concern language meaning, principles that evidence some complexity.

An examination of the social roles encompassed by the terms *dreng* and *þegn* is pursued in detail in the prose, poetry, and runic corpus of ON (with some OE evidence as correlation) in Martin Syrett’s “Drengs and Thegns Again,” *Saga-Book of the Viking Society* 25.3: 243–71. Concentrating on the latter part of the Viking period (c. 900–1050), Syrett pursues the possibility that the two terms bore an English influence in their meaning and application, while also pursuing their precise meaning. Examination of the pair of terms leads to consideration of a number of others, such as the extension of ON *broðir* to mean “comrade,

fellow.” The epigraphic evidence of rune-stones mentioning *dreng* and *þegn* comes primarily from northern Jutland and Skåne, in the later tenth through early eleventh centuries. Skaldic verse seems to point toward a broadening of *þegn* from “free land-holding man” to include a sense that those lands were held by authority of a king. The general sense seems to have developed that *dreng* and *þegn* referred rather more to social status (the *dreng* usually denoting a “fighting man, warrior”) than to ranks in the king’s household (though such men could also be labelled with these two terms).

The origin and meaning of OE *cuopel* is investigated in some detail in Katrin Thier’s “The Cobles: Celtic Boats in Anglo-Saxon Northumbria?” *The Mariner’s Mirror* 86.2: 131–39. There is generally no dispute that the OE term refers to some sort of small craft (Holthausen, *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*: “kleines Boot,” from Medieval Latin *caupulus*); but whether the term derives from Latin or Celtic, and to what class of small boat *cuopel* belongs, are uncertain. Mt 8:23 *in naviculam* in the Lindisfarne Gospels is glossed *in lytlum scipe vel in cuopel*; Christ boards a little boat, or “coble.” While late Latin *caupulus* does also appear in the form *cobellus* (thirteenth-century Northern England and Scotland), this may be a “r-loan” from English or Scots. The nearest relative to OE *cuopel* is likely Welsh *ceubal* (from the glosses there is also Old Breton *caubal*). Thier traces the parallel histories of thing and word; Lindisfarne, and the general mission area of Northumbria, bore heavy Celtic, particularly Irish, influence. The type of craft the term designates—clinker-built (though not resembling Germanic practice) with sharp bow and broad transom stern—perhaps most resemble Irish currachs, which earlier Scots cobles resemble fairly closely. An early attestation of the form *coble* is in the Scots life of St. Ninian and the term may have been borrowed from British. It is possible that the Lindisfarne glossator “thought of Christ as sailing a Celtic type of fishing boat.”

A refreshing and corrective reading of traditional accounts of the history of the English language is given in Loreto Todd’s “Where Have All the Celtic Words Gone?” *English Today* 16.3: 6–10. Todd takes up what has become essentially axiomatic in such histories: the notion that there are very few Celtic loans in early English, excepting in some accounts toponyms and hydronyms. The same handful of examples is often repeated: *bannoc*, *brocc*, *cumb*, *luh*, *torr*, etc. Todd takes the skeptical approach of a Creole studies expert in the face of such a dearth of influence in what

was a rich contact situation that has persisted to this day. Todd recounts her doctoral work on two language contact situations—West Africa and Northern Ireland: “I referred to ‘multiple etymologies’ with regard to West Africa and no-one minded, but when I mentioned in a footnote the possibility that English *she* might actually have been influenced by the third person Irish female pronoun *sí* (pronounced exactly like modern ‘she’), my examiners were less than sympathetic. All three of them told me that I must not promulgate such a ludicrous etymology” (8). Todd then proceeds to examine the case for possible Celtic influence on the OE 3rd person feminine pronoun, raising a phonological objection to the traditional solution of influence from the OE demonstrative *seo*. Further examples of Celtic loans to early English are given and Todd answers her titular question: “They are to be found in considerable numbers in English—assuming you are willing to look for them.” An important point brought up as well is the tendency to admit the possibility of Latin loanwords entering OE via Celtic, but not Celtic words themselves. Current Creole studies would find this very odd, but it may have something to do with Irish missionary activity in Britain; we know from Bede that Aidan learned English to further his mission, even if he needed an interpreter at first. But an even larger matter is at hand and is rather more polemical than linguistic, as has shown up recently in discussions of Seamus Heaney’s translation of *Beowulf*.

OE *þegn* and *þegan* are the subject of Stefan Zimmer’s “Urgermanisch *þey-na-z ‘Gefolgsman,’” *Amer. Jnl. of Germanic Ling. & Literatures* 12.2: 291–99, which argues that PGmc *þey-na-z (‘follower, retainer, liege-man’, and the like) is to be connected to PIE *tek- ‘to touch, stretch out one’s hand’, and not to PIE *tek- ‘to beget’. Previous literature had maintained a connection to Greek τέκνον ‘child’, thus producing a core sense of “child” (therefore one under a protector). Zimmer appeals to cultural evidence as well as phonological, such as to rituals of induction of warriors or king’s men; such ceremonies often involved a “touch” bestowed upon the designate, whether of an extended hand, a tap or touch of a sword, or—in the Christian era—a cross, or some other item felt to have magical or sacred powers. The evidence appealed to is wide-ranging, from *Saxo Grammaticus* to Sanskrit (including Indologist Julius Jolly’s *Recht und Sitte* [Strassburg, 1896]).

Marina Buzzoni’s “La complementazione tramite *Accusativus cum infinito* nell’inglese medievale: analisi del costrutto in dipendenza dai verbi *hatan/*

(be)beodan/biddan, lætan, (ge)seon,” *Linguistica e filologia* (Bergamo) 12: 47–89 considers the occurrence in OE of the construction accusative + infinitive, concluding, *pace* the transformational-generative approach, that the construction operates under semantic rather than syntactic constraints. The construction, given the shorthand notation Acl, is examined as consisting of matrix predicate-accusative noun phrase-infinitive; what this involves is Latin constructions such as *credo te bonum esse* (“I believe you to be good”), or English constructions such as “I saw him leave,” “I promise you to go there.” Extensive citation is made of M. Callaway’s *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon* (Washington, D.C., 1913), but curiously much less of Bruce Mitchell’s 1985 *Old English Syntax* (the particularly relevant section is II: 3724–76). The matter is made more complex by the evidence cited—the OE Bede, *Beowulf*, King Alfred’s versions of Boethius, Gregory’s *Pastoral Care*, and Orosius, and *The Battle of Maldon*—and the nature of that evidence (perhaps half of what citations there are from OE are from the poetry, which presents other problems of syntactic analysis). Thus, as an example of the Acl construction with a verb of perception, *Beowulf* 1485–87a: *ge-seon sunu Hrædles, þone he on þæt sinc starap, / þæt ic gumcystum godne funde / beaga bryttan*. The verb (ge)seon is classified as one of those of “physical perception” that involve a semantic constraint by which the construction to follow the “matrix” will be Acl rather than a subordinate complement clause introduced by *þæt*. (Ge)seon is used as a test case of sorts and a good many examples from OE Bede, Boethius, Gregory, and *Beowulf* through eME *Havelok* are cited. The evidence is curiously mixed; while in *Beowulf* there is a clear preponderance of the infinitive of this verb followed by Acl (19 of 22 occurrences; the remaining instances involve a subordinating *þæt* or *hu*), the prose citations are more evenly split (in Alfredian prose, or at least the OE Boethius and Gregory, the infinitive plus subordinate complement clause is more common). The discussion of the Acl construction in terms of semantic rather than syntactic constraints—and the use of such terms as factive, semifactive, assertive, nonassertive predicates—echoes in a number of respects that of Neogrammarian approaches to the construction in classical languages (see, for example, that in Allen and Greenough’s *New Latin Grammar* [Boston, 1916, frequently reprinted], 456ff.).

In “Sintasi formali e lingue medievali: l’articolo in inglese antico,” *Archivio glottologico italiano* 85: 38–84, Paola Crisma considers the matter of the definite and indefinite article in OE, setting forth first a few cautions about approaches to date—namely, that

they have at times not properly employed statistical or computational methods, especially with regard to constructions whose attestations number in the hundreds or very rarely, and the use of heterogeneous corpora, without due regard for dialectal, diachronic, and stratified variation (the study also exhibits a tendency in Italian linguistic circles away from transformational-generative approaches toward the functional, as of Givón). Nonetheless, the present study examines the article in OE in a relatively large but fairly discrete prose corpus: Alfred's version of Gregory's *Pastoral Care* and Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* and *Lives of the Saints*. The next score of pages considers the syntactic and functional meaning of the article, with a few examples from English and Latin, the great majority from Modern Italian. Two major test cases follow: the use of the article with proper nouns (such as in the construction ART/DET + ADJ + nomen proprium: *ðone arleasan Saulum* [Ælfric]) and, a more specific case, the use of the article with the name of the divinity, where Crisma finds an interesting variation in the use of *God ælmihtig* (postmodifier, zero article) versus *se ælmihtiga God*. A further test case is made of the use of *an* in the indefinite sense with a noun with of "determinative" sense (as in the Ælfrician *Drihten com to anre burhscire, ðe is geciged Cæsarea Philippi*).

Luca Panieri approaches an old question with some new evidence (that from Modern Danish) in "Rivisitando i verbi deboli germanici della III cl.," *Linguistica e filologia* (Bergamo) 12: 25–46. Old English weak verbs of class III, both the four main ones considered by A. Campbell, *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959)—*habban*, *seccan*, *libban*, *hycgan*—and those such as *setian*, *leornian*, *losian*, *þolian* believed to have once belonged to the class, may be denominative or from other verbs and have behind them the Pgm. suffix **-ja/*-je*, itself from PIE **-yo/*-ye*. Examination of these verbs, with evidence from Danish and Gothic (*fastan*, *witan*), leads Panieri to the hypothesis that there may have been Germanic verbs, denominative or deverbal in derivation, ending in the stem vowel **-a-*.

Also influenced by Givón's functionalist approach is Letizia Vezzosi's "Portata sintattica limitata della subordinazione in anglosassone," *Archivio glottologico italiano* 85: 85–105. In a sweeping survey of OE syntax, Vezzosi applies a functionalist analysis to a series of syntactic (or morphosyntactic) constructions, particularly focusing on *incoerenza* (rather "inconsistency" than "incoherence") and *ripresa* ("resumption"). The matter of resumptive subordinate constructions

serves as one of the tests, such as the matter of tense and mood shifts, or inconsistencies in, within such constructions (for example, from Alfred's Orosius: *þæt he wære on Truso on syfan dagum and nihtum, þæt þæt scip wæs ealne weg yrnende under segle*). A general notion developed throughout is that written OE, while distant from the spoken varieties, nonetheless enjoyed a *sffruttamento* (perhaps best understood here as "a recourse to") of the linguistic resources of the vernacular.

J.P.M.

b. Syntax, Phonology, Other Aspects

In "Der Vokalismus von altenglisch *fersc* und althochdeutsch *frisk*" (*Sprachwissenschaft* 25: 113–15), Alfred Bammesberger explains the difference in the two reflexes of WGmc. **friska-*. The different vowels apparently go back to the paradigm alternation **frisk-/fresk-* in PGmc, which is owing to lowering of vowels before *-a-* of the following syllable in an early phase of Gmc. Such a change is also attested in Gmc **nesta-* 'nest' < IE **ni-sd-o-* and Gmc. **we-ra-* 'man' < IE **wiro-*. In the OE form a typical metathesis of *r* is posited, which is also known in words like OE *hors* 'horse' (cf. OHG *hross*). A secondary regressive metathesis is responsible for the form of Mod. E. *fresh*, which following Dietz (1999) is taken as the direct descendent of OE *fersc*.

In "The Indefinite Pronoun *man*: 'Nominal' or 'Pronominal'?" (*Generative Theory and Corpus Studies: a Dialogue from 10 ICEHL*, ed. Ricardo Bermúdez-Otero et al., Topics in English Linguistics 31 [Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter], 103–22), Linda van Bergen questions the common classification of OE *man* 'one' under the category of "nominal" rather than "pronominal." She checks the behavior of *man* against the well-known syntactic phenomenon that a pronominal subject in OE stays before the finite verb even in a clause introduced by a topicalized constituent, whereas a nominal subject in such a clause is "inverted" to a position after the finite verb. Having analyzed data taken from the *Helsinki Corpus*, Bergen concludes that "as far as inversion is concerned, the behavior of *man* is similar to that of personal pronoun subjects." She adds, however, that "*man* behaves more like a noun than like a pronoun" in certain syntactic environments including a subordinate clause with a pronominal object.

"The Morphological Status of Old English *ge-*" (*Amer. Jnl. of Germanic Ling. & Literatures* 7 [1995]: 165–78)

by Tracy Crouch posits the development of the morpheme from adverbial in IE to eventual loss. In English, *ge-* never quite reached the stage of grammaticalization as a past participle marker the way it did in German. In Old English, she argues, it did not only have the sense of 'together' when attached to nouns and a perfective sense when attached to a verb. In addition to being derivative and grammatical, it could also have lexical meaning, roughly that of modern *to* and *out* (Lindemann 1970: 65). Crouch argues that the form was a proclitic rather than a prefix. Following the tests of Zwicky and Pullam (1983: 503–04), Crouch finds that *ge-* behaves more like a clitic than an affix. Among other criteria, it exhibits a low degree of selection with respect to its hosts; it does not fail to combine with any particular words; and it does not exhibit any morphological idiosyncrasies. Nor does *ge-* function as a word. Following the characterization of clitics vs. independent morphemes proposed by Zwicky (1985), Crouch notes that the morpheme is never accented and thus forms a phonological unit with its host. As a clitic, it behaves more like an affix than an independent word with regard to binding, closure, construction, ordering, distribution, and complexity.

Garry W. Davis studies "OE *-estre* and PGmc **-arjaz*: the Origin and Development of Two Agentive Suffixes in Germanic" (*Amer. Jnl of Germanic Ling. & Literatures* 4 [1992]: 103–16). Following Krahe-Meid 1967: 184–86, Davis posits that OE *-estre* goes back to the PGmc suffix **-stra-*, which by addition of the suffixes *-ja-* and *-jō-* formed masculine and feminine nouns. Cf. Gothic *blōstreis* 'sacrificer'. While **-stra-* + *-ja-* was replaced by **-ārijaz*, a rare morphological borrowing based on Latin *-ārius*, *-estre* became the most productive feminine agentive suffix in OE (von Lindheim 1958: 494), as in OE *bacere* 'baker' / *bæcestre* 'baker woman'. The new suffix, **-ārijaz*, as in Gothic *laisareis* 'teacher', became *-er*, the most productive masculine agentive suffix in English and German. According to Davis, the use of *-estre* in animal names like OE *loppestre* 'lobster' and *eowestre* 'ewe' speaks against the hypothesis that the suffix is borrowed from the VLat. suffix *-istria* (cf. Schröder 1922, etc.). Although in Middle Dutch, and to a lesser extent Modern Dutch, the older use of *-ster* as feminine agentive is preserved (cf. MDu. *lëraar* 'teacher' / *lerster* 'teacher woman', MnDu. *werkster* 'female worker'), MnE uses the suffix only in derogatory words like *speedster*, *trickster*.

Javier E. Díaz Vera, in "Prolegomena to the Development of an Inventory of *Synsem* Features for the Old English Verb," *Miscelánea* (Zaragoza) 21: 71–85, applies the syntactic-semantic ("*synsem*") model to OE

causative verbs to demonstrate how the semantics of a given verb "acts as a filter of its syntactic projections." To take *hreowan* ('to CAUSE someone to FEEL sorrow') as an example, this "lexical" causative (as opposed to a causative formed through affixing) can be described as "+CAUS" (hence transitive), "±HUM" subject (hence with either a human or non-human cause), and "manner: unvolitional" (hence having a focus on the cause). In contrast, its non-causative counterpart, *hreowan* ('to FEEL sorrow for someone'), can be described as "–CAUS" (hence intransitive), "+HUM" subject (hence always with a human experiencer), and "manner: volitional" (hence having a focus on the subject).

"Analogical Levelling of Vowel Length in West Germanic" (*Analogy, Levelling, Markedness: Principles of Change in Phonology and Morphology*, ed. Aditi Lahiri [Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter], 47–70) by B. Elan Dresher is based on joint work with Aditi Lahiri. It begins with a reprise of their view of Open Syllable Lengthening (OSL) as just what the name states, i.e., lengthening in open syllables (Lahiri and Dresher 1999), and compares it to the compensatory lengthening view, especially according to Minkova 1982. They argue that their solution, which takes trisyllabic shortening and analogy into account, better explains the case of disyllabic stems with original short vowels. Words like *cradle*, *water*, with long and short accented vowels, respectively, should both end up with short vowels according to the compensatory lengthening view, because no vowel is lost and because the inflected forms were not likely sources of analogical lengthening: they were subject to TSS or their accented syllable was closed by apocope of a medial vowel. Their data set includes OE mono- and disyllabic stems, which were potential bases of OSL. In the MnE forms of these words, slightly more than half end up with short vowels and slightly less than half with long vowels. This is explained by analogy in either direction, which, they argue, steps in to clean up the confusion after the loss of inflectional vowels. Singular/plural alternations, such as *god/gōds*, *bēver/bevers*, must have been leveled out by language learners in order to simplify the situation. Included is a brief comparison with Dutch nouns with 'exceptional plurals', which have no syncope of inflectional vowels and retained singular/plural alternation of short/long vowels: *dag/dāgen*, *glas/glāsen*. The German cognates of these nouns, on the other hand, show levelling from plural (inflected) forms with OSL toward monosyllabic singulars: *Tag*, *Glas*. The levelling of vowel length in English then does not follow the same rule as some other cases of analogy, which give weight to the nom. sg. form in assigning class membership. In this case,

language learners establish a lexical representation, in which different forms of the paradigm can serve as the basis for analogy.

Jonathan Evans, in "Scribal Error as Linguistic Evidence in the *Peterborough Chronicle*" (*North-Western European Lang. Evolution* 37: 53–122), uses the spelling *þeora* 'their' as the earliest evidence for the borrowing of *þ*-pronouns from Scandinavian. The spelling occurs twice in Oxford, Bodl. Lib. MS Laud Misc. 626, once in annal 449 and once in annal 1086, which was copied from the so-called *Northern Recension of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* sometime in the year 1126. The form is usually either silently emended to WS *heora* or left untouched. Evans regards Plummer's explanation of the word (Earle and Plummer 1892) as a contamination of *heora* with the definite article *þara* as dubious due to the commonness of the genitive pronoun; he posits instead that the scribe unintentionally substituted *þeora* for his exemplar's *heora* owing to interference from his personal dialect. The word would thus be a loan-substitution for something like Old Norse *þeirra* in the Scandinavian speech of the Danelaw, and a precursor to *þegre* of the *Ormulum* a century later, and *theire* attested in London two centuries later. The area of Northampton surrounding Peterborough is located in a part of the Danelaw which, according to Thomason and Kaufman's (1988) model of Norsification of English, would have received Norsified English from the part of the Danelaw where Norse was spoken longer (Lindsey and Fourboroughs) after Norse ceased to be used in Northampton. Other Scandinavianisms in the *Peterborough Chronicle* include numerous lexical borrowings. The word *þeora* should thus be viewed as an example of contact-induced grammatical borrowing.

Olga Fischer's "The Position of the Adjective in (Old) English from an Iconic Perspective" (*The Motivated Sign: Iconicity in Language and Literature*, II, ed. Fischer and Max Nänny [Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins], 249–76) sets out to uncover semantic differences in OE adjectives placed either before or after the nouns they modify, even though grammarians generally see postnominal adjectives merely as a sign of free word order in OE. Fischer first conducts a binary feature analysis to show that the OE Adjective is characterized by features labelled as [+N] ("nominal") and [+V] ("verbal"). She then argues that prenominal adjectives, when morphologically weak, are attributive and thematic in nature, since they are inseparable from their head nouns. Thus prenominal weak adjectives are "much closer to the noun category." In contrast, postnominal adjectives, typically strong

morphologically, are predicative and rhematic and therefore "belong to an adjective category that is very close to the verb category."

Olga Fischer, Ans van Kemenade, Willem Koopman, and Wim van der Wurff's *The Syntax of Early English* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), is a welcome textbook on the historical syntax of English compiled from the perspective of Principles and Parameters theory. Written mainly for advanced undergraduate students, this co-authored book is also useful for students of Old and Middle English who are interested in finding how the latest development in theoretical linguistics can be applied to historical studies of language. In the introductory chapter, the authors make clear that this book is concerned with "(abrupt) grammar change" and not with "language change," hence excluding from its consideration graduality, lexicality, and other "fuzzy" issues. Chapter Two begins with an outline of OE syntax, generously illustrated with examples. Then follows an explanation as to why OE is a language with Subject-Object-Verb word order despite a "good deal of variation" on the surface level. Several topics are discussed to support this view. The third chapter gives an outline of ME syntax divided into sections corresponding to those in the previous chapter. The next five chapters focus on topics that are of great interest to generative grammarians. The fourth chapter deals with the "Verb-Second" constraint, which concerns the movement of the verb from its original position to the one immediately after the initial constituent such as the adverb *þa*, the negative particle, an interrogative, or a topic. OE shows many characteristics of an "asymmetric Verb-Second language" though with a few exceptions. The basic Verb-Second patterns found in OE are preserved in eME. Chapter Five explains that, despite the constant increase of Verb-Object word order on the surface, Object-Verb remained the underlying word order for ME "until about 1400." The sixth chapter analyzes particle + verb combinations. The syntactic behavior of OE particles is analogous to that of separable prefixes in Dutch and German, whereas particles in ME can be analyzed "in much the same way as present-day English." The seventh chapter examines the distribution and properties of infinitives and concludes that "some pervasive changes have taken place" between OE and present-day English. The authors argue that these changes are a "by-product, so to speak, of the fixation of Verb-Object word order." Likewise, the 'easy-to-please' construction, as shown in the eighth chapter, experienced two major changes both around 1400. The last chapter considers grammaticalization, a process of the development of grammatical words from lexical words. This section is of particular

interest, because grammaticalization, due to its primary concern with discourse, semantics, and the mechanism of cognition, presents a view that is “foreign to the general approach adopted in this book.” The authors therefore outline two cases of grammaticalization and reanalyze them as grammar change within the Principles and Parameters framework.

Its title notwithstanding, Elly van Gelderen's *A History of English Reflexive Pronouns: Person, 'Self', and Interpretability* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins) is not so much a thesis on a detailed history of English reflexives as a theorization of the development of English from an analytical language to a synthetic language seen through the lens of reflexives. The first two chapters provide an overview of the development of reflexives from OE to early MnE. Here the author rehearses the history of *self*: in early OE, this word occasionally modified reflexive pronouns as an emphatic adjective; when this usage became more frequent in late OE, *self* gradually increased its nominal character; finally, the word lost many of its inflectional endings and became reanalyzed “as a head noun.” This well-known, syntax-based account of *self* is supposed to have a morphological counterpart: originally, simple pronouns were used as reflexives, because their rich morphology had enabled them to form a “Chain” (i.e. co-indexed relationship) with their antecedents; when they lost some of their special morphological marking in late OE, they were more frequently combined with *self*, until they began to lose their pronominal status and became the non-head components of reflexive *self* compounds. Such a neat correspondence between syntax and morphology, however, turns out to be less clear-cut when greater attention is paid to the corpus. Much of the problem seems to concern what Gelderen calls “person split”: first and second person pronouns were apparently first to lose “inherent Case” (i.e. morphological marking), and yet they continued to be used as reflexives. In other words, we need to explain why third person pronouns were last to lose inherent Case, and nonetheless first to develop special reflexives with *self*. In order to explain this apparent contradiction, Gelderen presents a model: “In older English, first and second person pronouns have fewer fully marked θ -features (e.g. for number and gender) and can therefore continue to function anaphorically even though they lose inherent Case; third person pronouns, on the other hand, have fully marked θ -features and when inherent Case disappears, they cease to function anaphorically.” The subsequent four chapters provide further evidence for “person split” through the examination of syntactic topics such as “pro-drop”

(non-expression of pronominal subject), loss of verbal agreement, loss of inherent Case, and the impersonal (or “ergative”) construction. In the final chapter, Gelderen concludes that “morphological change has syntactic consequences but not necessarily at the same time.”

Michael Getty in “Differences in the Metrical Behavior of Old English Finite Verbs: Evidence for Grammaticalization” (*English Lang. & Linguistics* 4: 37–67), examines *beon*, *willan*, *cuman*, and several other OE verbs that may occur with infinitives or participles, in order to consider whether they have already begun to shift from an open-class, major category (i.e. the lexical verb) to a closed-class, functional category (i.e. the auxiliary verb), even though this process, known as grammaticalization, is generally believed to have taken place in the ME and early MnE periods. Getty analyzes two poetic texts, *Beowulf* and *The Battle of Maldon* (as specimens of early and late OE, respectively), because the meter of OE verse has syntactic ramifications: lexical words must be stressed, whereas grammatical may be unstressed. Having observed that the verbs in question carry metrical stress much less often than unambiguously lexical verbs, Getty argues that these verbs already show some degree of “decategorization” towards the auxiliary category. He further provides evidence that this decategorization was probably an ongoing process in OE: compared to *Beowulf*, for example, *Maldon* tends to use these “pre-auxiliary” verbs without metrical stress; while *Beowulf* seems to place a phonological restriction on the placement of *all* verbs, *Maldon* seems to have eased this restriction on the placement of pre-auxiliary verbs.

In “Alternative Case Markings in Old English Texts” (*ES* 81: 185–98), Gwang-Yoon Goh undertakes to reveal “what OE morphological cases really encode and how such alternative case markings should be interpreted in OE texts.” Is it possible, for instance, to explain why *wipsacan* (‘to renounce’) takes dative, accusative, and genitive in the sentence *se fæder wipsoc his bearne, and þæt bearn wipsoc þone fæder, and æt nextan ælc freond wiðsoc oðres*? Goh postulates different degrees of “semantic opposedness” for different cases, according to their “relative obliqueness” measured by their potential for passivization: accusative carries the highest degree of opposedness, dative carries a lower degree of opposedness, and genitive probably carries the lowest degree of opposedness. Hence *wipsacan* uses dative for “the child” but accusative for “the father,” because, Goh explains, “the challenge by a child to his father ... would bring

about even more opposedness between the two individuals involved than father's rejection of his child." Likewise, *wipsacan* uses genitive for "a friend," because "[d]isputes among friends ... would be less noticeable in opposedness than the other two cases."

In another insightful work, "Relative Obliqueness and the Contribution of Nonheads in the Subcategorization of Old English Compound Verbs" *English Lang. & Linguistics* 4: 13–36, Goh undertakes to explain the mechanism of a "seemingly peculiar case-government pattern" for a given OE compound consisting of a prepositional prefix and a head verb (a "P-V compound"): *wipcweþan* ('to contradict'), for example, has inherited one argument from its head verb (i.e. dative of person) and the other argument (i.e. genitive of thing) from its non-head preposition (and not from its head verb, which takes accusative of thing). In order to explain why the P-V verb allows its non-head preposition a limited contribution to its argument structure, Goh introduces an "obliqueness hypothesis" for OE noun phrases ("NPs"): "first, accusative NPs are less oblique than dative NPs, which are less oblique than genitive NPs, and second, regardless of cases, verbal arguments are less oblique than prepositional arguments." With this hierarchy in mind, we may understand that a P-V compound is able to inherit only a more oblique argument from its preposition.

In "Asking Why Exactly *them*, *these*, and *those*," (*North-Western European Lang. Evolution* 36: 113–20), Joachim Grzega ponders on the fates of plural forms of the OE demonstrative pronouns and third-person personal pronouns. As for the eventual shift from the dative plural *him* to *them*, Grzega supports the view that the replacement of the initial *h* by *þ* in the ME period was caused by the OE demonstrative *þa*, even though "Old Norse influence certainly played an important part in accelerating this change." As for *þas* ('these') and *þa* ('those'), their phonological descendants were both replaced by non-historical forms by the early MnE period. While the morphological development of these plural demonstratives is complex, the changes involved often seem to have been motivated for cognitive disambiguation.

In "On the (Non-)existence of High Vowel Deletion" (*Analogy, Levelling, Markedness*, 353–76), Richard M. Hogg discusses a set of problematic issues associated with all of the various phonological accounts of this OE rule and suggests what kinds of criteria a new theory of HVD must satisfy. HVD is presumed to be responsible for the deletion of *i*, *u* follow-

ing heavy syllables (or two light ones) in forms like neut. nom./acc. pl. *word* (vs. *scipu*), various forms of *i*-stem *flæsc* without final *-i*, nom. sg. *lār* without final *-u*, or pl. *werod* 'troops'. One issue is that the rule is opaque in its interaction with itself. In other words, it is not clear how to explain WS *hēafdu* 'heads', with *-u* in a HVD environment, although the form apparently exhibits HVD of medial *-u*. Hogg suggests that an optimality theoretic approach would predict the occurrence of both *hēafdu* and *hēafud* forms in free variation as in the *Vespasian Psalter*. The constraints involved are the following: 1. All syllables must be parsed by feet. 2. Input/output correspondence of high vowels. 3. Input/output correspondence of non-high vowels. 4. Forbidding of super heavy rhymes (*VVCC). While most accounts have ignored HVD with respect to strong verbs, which occurs mainly only in Anglian dialects, Dresher (1978: 198) finds that 1st sg. *-u* as in *bīdu* 'I wait', is exempt. Hogg concurs, but claims that this means that HVD is a morphologically based rule from the start, rather than being a purely phonological rule. Old Saxon has the same exemption to HVD. As nom./acc. pl. forms with *-a* instead of *-u* become more common in LWS, it is hard to argue for high vowel deletion for nom./acc. pl. *werod*. Hogg disagrees with Idsardi's (1994: 529) attempt to explain Dresher's (1978: 152–53) observation that HVD applies irregularly in the *Vespasian Psalter* in phonological terms, when the alternation in the nom./acc. pl. is probably morphological in nature. He concludes that the opacity of HVD and its original morphological restriction make it a highly marked phonological rule.

"Inflectional Classes, Morphological Restructuring, and the Dissolution of Grammatical Gender" (*Gender in Grammar and Cognition*, ed. Barbara Unterbeck et al. [Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter], 709–27) by Dieter Kastovsky examines the roots of the transition from grammatical to natural gender in late OE and early ME. The process is usually attributed to the decay of nominal inflectional endings in concert with the rise of an uninflected definite article *þe/the* and the reassignment of the weak and strong demonstratives *se, sēo, þæt, þis, þēos* as deictics. Kastovsky seeks to explain in more detail how the decay of endings triggered the transition. It is not merely to be understood as phonetic attrition of final syllables, but rather as part of a general morphological restructuring which triggered several processes: the dissolution of inflectional classes, the dissociation of gender and number, and the gradual generalization of word-based morphology. The author notes that in OE the IE structure of nouns (root + stem formative

+ inflection) was reduced, because the stem formatives or themes had lost their identity and function and fused phonologically with the inflections. Class assignment was thus no longer indicated by an overt marker, but had become a covert lexical property. Additionally, there were very few gender-specific combinations of determiner/adjective/noun-inflections in OE. Case and number came to be divorced from one another: number became dominant and case became recessive. The nom./acc. pl. ending *-as* (> *-es*) of the *a*-stems (and, by analogy, *-(e)n* of the weak nouns) was reinterpreted as an indicator of plurality alone. The final blow is the refunctionalization of the determiners, which by now had become the most salient indicators of gender, at least in the singular, temporarily as case indicators and as deictics.

Judith Mara Kish studies vocalic reflexes before *w* in northern West Midlands in “*Ē and ēo Development in the Cotton Nero A. x: a New Dialect Feature*” (*Folia Linguistica Historica* 21: 99–117). In contrast to most ME dialects, the four texts of this manuscript (*Pearl, Cleanness, Patience, Gawain and the Green Knight*), dated to about 1400, show different orthographic representations of the two vowels. In combination with *w*, OE *ǣ* (*ēa*) is written <ew> as in *fewe* < OE *fēawe* and OE *ēo* is written <w> as in *nwe* < OE *nēowe*. Both vowels apparently evolved to *eu* before *w* and were reduced to *e* as in the rest of England. In the latter the rounded back element fused with the following semivowel. An interesting parallel is Chaucer’s avoidance of rhyming pairs like ME *fewe* and *nwe*. The author rejects the possible explanations of <w> for OE *ēo* as scribal shorthand or as syncope of *e*, analogous to apocope of *e*, due to the constraints of meter. Calling on the evidence of *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Middle English* (1985: 499, 509), Kish suggests that the spellings of the manuscript reflect a northern pronunciation which was later lost. In *eu* as the reflex of *ǣ* she posits accent on the first element of the diphthong, resulting in the expected spelling <ew>, while in *eu* as the reflex of *ēo*, she posits accent on the second element, resulting in the spelling <w>, which reflects only the prominent second element. The exceptional spellings *grew* (< OE *grēowian*) and *knew* (< OE *cnēowian*) are derived from confusion in the syllable division, whereby *w* is sometimes homosyllabic with the preceding vowel.

In “The Origins of the Northern Subject Rule: a Case of Early Contact?” (in *The Celtic Englishes II*, ed. Hildegard L.C. Tristram, *Anglistische Forschungen* 286 [Heidelberg], 329–46), Juhani Klemola argues that Celtic-English linguistic contact in the early OE

period might have been responsible for a construction widely observed in northern dialects of present-day English and illustrated by the sentence “*they peel them and boils them*.” This construction can be explained by the “northern subject rule,” according to which all verbs in the present tense must have the *-s* ending (hence “*boils*”) except for those adjacent to a personal pronoun subject (hence “*peel*”). According to Klemola, this morphological system is “extremely rare” typologically, and yet it is found in Welsh and several other languages, all of which go back to “parent British.” Klemola therefore concludes that the northern subject rule may be a manifestation of “a substratum influence from the Brytonic language of the Britons living in the North of England” during the early migration period.

Ekkehard König and Peter Siemund in “The Development of Complex Reflexives and Intensifiers in English” (*Diachronica* 17.1: 39–84) discuss the history of English reflexives from the perspective of cross-linguistic typology. Of the many questions asked in this paper, the one that seems most relevant for OE studies concerns contexts in which the development of “complex *self*-forms” (e.g. *himself*) first began, since, as it is well known, OE personal pronouns originally held the double duty of being either disjoint (e.g. ‘him’) or co-referent (e.g. ‘himself’), while OE *self* originally functioned not as a reflexive but as an intensifier. The paper points to a situation where *self* is likely to occur with reflexive pronouns: namely, constructions with verbs denoting “preferentially other-directed activities”—like killing and destroying—whose objects are usually not expected to be reflexive. Regarding the question “which meaning of the intensifier *self* was involved in this development?” König and Siemund use examples from different languages to argue that “either the adnominal intensifier or the adverbial exclusive intensifier, and maybe even both, can plausibly be assumed to have been involved in the development of complex *self*-forms in English.”

Thomas Kohnen’s “Explicit Performatives in Old English: a Corpus-Based Study of Directives” (*Jnl of Hist. Pragmatics* 1: 301–21) examines the OE section of the *Helsinki Corpus* to investigate the use of “directive speech-act verbs,” that is, “verbs describing a speech act by which an addresser ... attempts to get an addressee ... to perform an action.” Kohnen points out that OE directive performatives are frequently found in prefaces and legal texts, and that they often use verbs like *beodan* (‘command’) and *biddan* (‘beseech’), namely, verbs that seem to “imply an unambiguous and asymmetric relationship be-

tween addresser and addressee." From the viewpoint of pragmatics, OE might be called a "period of performatives," because "Old English texts contain more performative directives than their Latin sources." Kohnen postulates that "Old English, as a primarily oral culture, was still characterized by more oral performative formulas than the well-established, literate Latin world."

Willem Koopman and Wim van der Wurff challenge the theory of grammar competition and its generative assumptions in "Two Word Order Patterns in the History of English: Stability, Variation and Change" (*Stability, Variation and Change of Word-Order Patterns over Time*, ed. Rosanna Sornicola, Erich Poppe, and Ariel Shisha-Halevy, *Current Issues in Ling. Theory* 213 [Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins], 259–83). Rather than relying on the notion of competition and diglossia and assuming independence of individual grammars, the authors prefer to consider grammar changes in terms of optionality and variability. They argue that the theory-based idea of an "abrupt change" from object-verb ("OV") to verb-object ("VO") in about 1200, for instance, is "a distortion of the facts," since VO order already existed in OE, while OV order is found even after the ME period. In fact, changes over the ordering of object and verb are "long and extremely gradual": in early OE, "OV order is the norm, with VO being a special order," but in later OE, "VO order becomes more widely available."

"Preaspiration or Preglottalization?" (*Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 53: 7–10) by Frederik Kortlandt is a defense of his theory that preglottalized stops were present in PGmc, regardless of whether or not they were present in IE. He adduces eight reflexes of preglottalized stops in Gmc: 1. Preaspiration in Icelandic, 2. Preglottalization in western Danish (vestjysk stød), 3. Gemination following short vowels in Swedish, 4. Assimilation of *mp*, *nt*, *nk* to *pp*, *tt*, *kk* in the larger part of Scandinavia, 5. NGmc Gemination of *k* before *j*, *w*, 6. Gemination of *p*, *t*, *k* before *r*, *l* in WGmc, 7. Standard English glottal stops before tautosyllabic plosives, 8. Affricates and geminated fricatives originating in the High German sound shift. He replies in particular to Goblirsch (1999), who points out that these phenomena do not represent direct evidence of preglottalization and posits the traditional feature of voice for Common Gmc. In Kortlandt's reconstruction of Germanic, the peripheral dialects of Icelandic and Upper German, as well as the more central Danish, all of which have incomplete voicing of stops, are the most archaic. In the author's view they

point toward a reconstruction of the PGmc obstruent system with voiceless fricatives, unaspirated voiceless stops, and voiceless obstruents with a complex articulation, which is reflected as (pre)aspiration in the north and (af)frication in the south. These features and the others listed above are purported reflections of preglottalization. Kortlandt also disagrees with Page (1997), who posits preaspiration in the Common Scandinavian period and derives vestjysk stød from it, an idea first proposed by Pedersen (1912). The author instead proposes that West Scandinavian preaspiration developed from preglottalization by lenition.

Anthony Kroch, Ann Taylor, and Donald Ringe in "The Middle English Verb-Second Constraint: a Case Study in Language Contact and Language Change" (*Textual Parameters in Older Languages*, ed. Susan C. Herring et al, *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* 195 [Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins], 353–91), demonstrate a north-south split in the syntax of ME and attribute this dialect variation to "the Viking invasions of northern and eastern England in the eighth and ninth centuries." In this brilliant essay demonstrating a marriage of generative grammar and sociolinguistics in the domain of historical linguistics, the authors argue that southern ME is a "variant of IP-V₂," as it has inherited from OE the mechanism of constructing a verb-second clause ("V₂") through the movement of the verb to the Inflection Phrase ("IP"), whereas northern ME belongs to the "CP-V₂" type, which generates a V₂ clause by moving the verb to the Complementizer position in the Complementizer Phrase ("CP"). Kroch, Taylor, and Ringe postulate that this construction developed in the North, because the movement of Verb to Inflection became impossible after the loss of agreement inflection in the region. Such an impoverishment of morphology must have resulted from English-Scandinavian linguistic contacts, where adult immigrants learned English imperfectly and eventually changed the syntax of that language.

A number of items in this section are found in *Placing Middle English in Context*, ed. Irma Taavitsainen, Terttu Nevalainen, Päivi Pahta, and Matti Rissanen (Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter), a collection which originated in the Second International Conference on Middle English held in 1997. The introductions to the various sections of the collection offer insight into how Old English can be used to enhance Middle English studies. In the general introduction, the editors write that the last two or three decades have seen "a kind of revolution in Middle English studies" triggered by a surge of interest in

manuscript materials and “the advent of computerized corpora.” In the introduction to a section entitled “Dialect, normalization and corpus-linguistic methodology,” N.F. Blake speculates that in the eME period, “what people understood or remembered about classical Old English must have been quite varied and ... few scribes or authors necessarily had a concept in their minds as to what written form of English should be used.” In the introduction to the section “Lexical semantics,” H.-J. Diller endorses a quantitative study based on a systematic scrutiny of data and underlines the importance of such collaborative and multi-institutional projects as the *Helsinki Corpus* and the *Historical Thesaurus of English*. L. Brinton points out, in the introduction to “Utterance and discourse meaning,” that pragmatics can successfully be applied to grammaticalization, which considers how OE lexical words were transformed into grammar words in later periods.

In “Old English (Non)-Palatalised */k/: Competing Forces of Change at Work in the “seek”-Verbs” (*Placing ME in Context*, ed. Taavitsainen et al., 461–73), Marcin Krygier proposes Scandinavian influence to explain the dialectal variation and the modern forms of a morphologically related group of verbs. The ‘seek’ type includes class I weak verbs with an original stem-final velar stop. In the present tense there is alternation between palatal and velar stop (*sēcan* ~ *sēcþ*), after syncope had reintroduced velars in the 2nd and 3rd sg. The preterite had fricatives in these verbs (*sēcan* ~ *sōhte* ~ *gesōht*). This group also includes verbs like *streccan*, *tācan*, *þeccan*, *þencan*, *wyrcean*, etc. The spread of the velar through the present paradigms of these verbs by analogy (according to the traditional account of Luick 1914–40: §689 and Hogg 1992: §7.42) is unlikely, since one would not expect analogy to proceed from more marked forms like the 2nd and 3rd person singular. Krygier’s examination of a sizeable corpus collected from 30 major ME texts dating from the twelfth through fourteenth centuries shows three dialectal groups with respect to the treatment of the consonants in these verbs. In the Southern dialects palatal forms dominate with velar forms in the minority. The West Midlands is considered a relic area with almost exclusively palatal forms. The North and Northeast Midlands show a predilection for the velar type, especially the North. The author attributes the distribution of the velar forms to Scandinavian influence. Present-day forms tend to have velars if there was a corresponding verb in ON (OE *sēcan*, ON *sækja*, MnE *seek*), while those without a corresponding verb in ON tend to have palatals (OE *tācan*, MnE *teach*).

Margaret Laing’s “Never the twain shall meet: Early Middle English—the East-West Divide.” (*Placing ME in Context*, ed. Taavitsainen et al., 97–124) is a progress report on the preparation of the *Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English (LAEME)* at the University of Edinburgh. Four principles applied to the work on *Linguistic Atlas of Late Middle English (LALME)* had to be modified in order to work with the peculiarities of the textual transmission of the years 1150–1300, especially the 120 years before 1300, from which period most of the texts are transmitted. The principles in abbreviated form are as follows: 1. Written language should be examined in its own right. 2. Regional dialects have overlapping distributions. 3. The fit-technique can help localize hitherto unlocalized texts. 4. Some scribes translate original texts into their own dialect to varying degrees, some rather completely. The transmission of the period is rather scanty and generally lacking in orthographic convention, coming on the heels of the century-long linguistic disruption following the Norman Conquest. Thus all of the available literary, documentary (wills, charters, writs, including boundary clauses), and glossary texts need to be taken into account, despite the difficulties that may be associated with them. The establishment of a documentary matrix for use in the fit-technique is hampered by a lack of local documents that may be used as anchor texts: only versions of originally OE documents copied into local registers and cartularies come into question, but these have often not been translated into ME. Alongside the usable local documents are a limited number of literary manuscripts with local associations and other literary texts, whose language has already been fitted into the continuum. The localized texts tend to cluster in the SW Midlands and SE Midlands, with a north-south gap throughout the middle of the country. Three factors may contribute to this apparent situation: 1. Writing and preservation of texts was mostly the business of the religious centers such as Worcester, Peterborough, Bury and Canterbury in this period. 2. At this point, little dialectal differentiation can be established for the North and the far South. 3. The localization of texts is affected by the poles of attraction that have already been established in the east and west. Work on texts surviving in more than one localizable version, such as the *Poema Morale* and *Ancrene Riwle* may help alleviate this situation.

In “Language Periodization and the Concept ‘middle’” (*Placing ME in Context*, ed. Taavitsainen et al., 7–41), Roger Lass attempts to establish how meaningful ‘middle’ is as a linguistic term. He argues that although the term has its roots in mystical (triadomantic) practice and has much to do with our modern

perspective, it is nevertheless appropriate to a certain extent for describing a particular period in the histories of English and related languages. In Germanic linguistics, tripartite periodization goes back to Jacob Grimm's (1848) use of the terms *Althochdeutsch*, *Mittelhochdeutsch*, *Neuhochdeutsch*. In English, however, the early nineteenth-century terms were 'Anglo-Saxon' for the oldest period and 'Semi-Saxon' for the following period, which was considered not yet completely 'English'. Division of the history of English into more than three epochs was undertaken by Richard Morris (1882) and Henry Sweet (1891); Sweet adduced specific texts as exemplary of early, late and transitional periods. Along with nonlinguistic criteria such as the influence of French after the Norman Conquest and Caxton's first printed books, the most common linguistic criteria for defining the ME period are the merger and confusion of inflectional vowels, leading to the loss of case distinctions and grammatical gender, which had been substantially retained throughout the OE period. Yet a statistical analysis of the *Cura pastoralis* shows that levelling and confusion of endings are already well underway in the tenth century. Lass also notes gender confusion for a number of nouns in OE. In an effort to quantify the relative archaism of the Old, Middle and New Germanic languages, he assigns each a score according to ten characteristics of PGmc: 1. root-initial accent, 2. distinction of at least three vowels in inflectional syllables, 3. the dual, 4. grammatical gender, 5. four ablaut grades in at least some strong verbs, 6. distinct dative case marking, 7. inflected definite article, 8. adjective inflection, 9. infinitive suffix, and 10. person/number marking in the verb. For 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 9 the languages are assigned points on an all-or-nothing basis, while for 4, 7, 8, and 10 gradual scaling is used. The results are predictable by the predicate of a given language, except that Modern Icelandic qualifies as 'old' and Modern German as 'middle', while ME, Modern Swedish and Middle Dutch qualify as 'early modern'. In this study, ME's ranking is based on Chaucer, but examination of several texts reveals a broader range for ME: *Ormulum* and *Owl and Nightingale* fall between the 'old' and 'middle' Gmc languages, while the *Kentish Sermons* are grouped with the 'middle' Gmc languages.

Robert McColl Millar's *System Collapse System Rebirth: the Demonstrative Pronouns of English 900–1350 and the Birth of the Definite Article* (Oxford, Bern, and Berlin: Lang), is a rigorous re-examination of the development of *the*, *this*, and *that* from the OE demonstratives *se* and *þes*. The book consists of seven chapters grouped into three large sections. Among

many innovations found in this book is Millar's approach to the corpus: while limiting his investigation to nine texts or text groups, ranging from glosses to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* to *Sir Orfeo*, he pays attention to the whole of each item, including all relevant manuscript readings. In the first section, Millar focuses on the transition period from OE to ME, when the complex system of OE began to crumble in the North, no doubt because of the Scandinavian influence. In naming "the initial product of the friction between Old English and Old Norse," Millar chooses the term *koinē*, which he defines as "a language or dialect where a harmonisation (or levelling) of grammar and phonology for the sake of mutual comprehension has taken place between speakers of different varieties of essentially the same dialect continuum." Since this *koinē* had "very LOW prestige" in post-Conquest England, it was never stabilized as one system but developed into many more *koinēs* (or *koinēoids*). As the Northern force spread to the South, giving rise to many such *koinēoids* through "creative friction," ME experienced "the crystallisation of what can only be termed 'conservative radicalism', a stage where an attempt was made to retain the fundamental distinctions deemed necessary for the languages." In the second section, Millar considers the effect of conservative radicalism on the demonstratives in ME, namely, how their "formal and functional integrity" was compromised by phonetic attrition, and how new words emerged from a morphological chaos caused by the use of both historical and non-historical forms even within a single community. Millar explains this complex phenomenon by introducing three types of ambiguity. One is called *ambiguity in ending* "by which many vowel endings fall together at -ə and are eventually discarded": e.g., *þone* and *þæm* became lumped together into a single form ending with -n (hence losing the distinction between accusative and dative) and then dropped the consonantal ending altogether (hence losing the distinction between nominative and objective). Another process is *ambiguity in form*, "by which originally distinct root vowels fall together." This triggered another process called *formal dislocation*, through which such distinct endings as -re and -ra came to be discarded precisely because of their distinctness. These two processes reduced the paradigm for OE *se* ultimately to one form, *the*. The same procedure happened to the OE compound demonstrative *þes*, since its morphological forms including *þisne*, *þissum*, *þisre*, and *þissa* were also reduced to the single form *this*. The third process, *ambiguity in function*, explains how OE *þæt* gradually lost its grammatical coding as neut. sg. and "shifted in meaning towards 'pure demonstrative' us-

age." The book ends with a section summarizing the formation of a "discrete definite article" through a series of phonological changes, hence showing how OE *se* underwent a "paradigm fissure" and gave birth to the distal demonstrative *that* as well as the "separate bona fide article" *the*.

In "Das Präteritum der 4. und 5. starken Verb-klassen im Germanischen" (*North-Western European Lang. Evolution* 36: 45–58), Karl-Heinz Mottausch attempts to explain the long vowel in the non-singular forms of class 4 and 5 strong verbs, where one would expect the zero-grade or *e* as the 'morphological zero-grade', for example, in class 4, 1st pl. *nāmum*, sg. *nam* from **neman-* and class 5, 1st pl. *γāβum*, sg. *γaβ* from **yeβan-*, assuming that class 4 pl. has replaced **numum* following the class 5 form. Of the explanations for the origin of the long vowel so far proposed—compensatory lengthening, a lengthened-grade perfect, a lengthened-grade *s*-aorist, the lengthened-grade (*ō*-) preterites of class 6, contraction in vowel-initial verbs (after loss of laryngeal)—Mottausch argues for the last, despite the fact that only one verb, **etan-*, comes into consideration in Germanic as the source of analogy for the entire class: if the source is a common verb and innovation is necessary (cf. Kurylowicz 1968) such a scenario is not without precedent. The non-singular stem **æt-* may derive from secondary innovation of a reduplicated perfect formation **e-ed-*, with lack of gradation in the singular forms. Following Cowgill (1960, cf. Mottausch 1994), the author posits sg. **e-at* with subsequent leveling to non-sg. **āt-* on the model of class 6. The non-singular form is in turn the result of the contraction in **e-et* > *ēt* > *āt*. This reconstruction assumes formerly general perfect reduplication in Gmc. Analogy spread first to other verbs with *e* + *t*, such as **metan-*, **setjan* and then to the remainder of the verbs in class 5.

Robert W. Murray proposes a non-quantity-based explanation for open syllable lengthening, homorganic lengthening, trisyllabic shortening, closed syllable shortening and degemination in "Syllable Cut Prosody in Early Middle English" (*Language* 76: 617–54). Motivations for OSL calling on compensatory lengthening (Sarrazin 1898 to Minkova 1982, 1985), foot maximization (Lahiri and Dresher 1999, reviewed last year in *YWOES*), and timing templates (Luick 1898 to Ritt 1994) are found to be inadequate. Instead, Murray invokes the notion of *Silbenschnitt*, first described by Sievers and later employed by Jespersen as close/loose contact and Trubetzkoy as the correlation of syllable cut. Most recently, Vennemann 2000 discusses syllable cut as the successor of segmen-

tal quantity in Germanic. According to Murray, syllable cut prosody adequately motivates all of the processes mentioned above. In fact, he sees the graphic doubling of consonants in the *Ormulum* as marking preceding short vowels in closed syllables, i.e., strong cut; cf. *bedd*, *mille*, *atter*, *chilldre*, *keppte*. This method can be employed by Orm since degemination has already taken place in his NE Midlands dialect, as has been argued by Kurath 1956, Phillips 1992, Minkova and Stockwell 1994, although, in Murray's view, OSL has not yet occurred in *Ormulum* forms like *sune*, *efen*, *berenn*, *cumenn*, *dide*, *hefig*, *hope*. These examples would indicate that it is not merely a short vowel that is reflected by consonant doubling. Murray is even against incipient OSL as argued by Phillips 1992, Anderson and Britton 1997, and Fulk 1996: 485. Moreover, he sees the establishment of the correlation of syllable cut preceding the *Ormulum* as the driving force in all of the quantity changes that have taken place by Middle English times. After the establishment of syllable cut, quantity became redundant. The other changes are merely the realignment of length contrasts in accordance with the prosody of syllable cut. This view is in contrast to the traditional view that the correlation of syllable cut is first established by OSL, which resulted in the syllable structures long vowel + short consonant and short vowel + long consonant or cluster in ME and most of the contemporary dialects throughout the Germanic-speaking world.

Ruta Nagucka's "Conceptual Semantics and Grammatical Relations in Old English" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 35: 19–32) recommends that scholars supplement syntactic and lexical analyses of OE with "pragmatic, psychological and other criteria" in order to attain a better understanding of "the conceptual world of the speaker." For example, a clause like *"storm oft holm gebringep"*—where *storm* and *holm* may constitute either a subject-object or object-subject relationship—may be disambiguated by examining other references to storm and ocean/flood in Anglo-Saxon literature. Nagucka favors the former reading, because "the sententious saying that the sea often brings forth a storm is in my opinion just one of such nature maxims" that reflect the Anglo-Saxon view of the world. Nagucka also proposes to determine the precise meaning of adjective-noun compounds by considering the "qualia structures" of their nominal elements, that is, "characteristics internal ... to the pragmatic knowledge connected with the nouns."

In another article, "Is Old English a Configurational Language?" (*Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny* 47: 3–13), Nagucka considers whether OE is a configura-

tional language having a “deep” phrase structure or a non-configurational language having a “flat” phrase structure. After examining “the principal grammatical relations in the assignment of the typological characteristics concerning configurationality,” including word order, government, and case, Nagucka argues that OE seems to show a mixture of configurational and non-configurational characteristics in all areas with the exception of passivization (strongly configurational) and omission of pronominal subjects known as pro-drop (strongly non-configurational). Nagucka concludes that OE, though not purely configurational, demonstrates “tendencies towards configurationality,” which seem to “lead up to configuration as the basic encoding of grammatical relations in later periods of the development of English.” But the failure to assign OE to either type leads her to question the adequacy of the categories of configurationality itself.

Saara Nevalinna’s “A Note on the Use of Nonfinite Forms of Intransitive Mutative Verbs with the Verb *to come* in Old and Middle English” (NM 101: 313–21) offers an insightful analysis of the OE and ME equivalents of the MnE construction consisting of *come* and the present participle of an intransitive mutative verb expressing manner. In English before 1500, such a verb took one of the three non-finite forms: past participle, infinitive, and present participle. Of these constructions, *come* + past participle is already rarely attested in OE. In the construction *se ... cwom feorran gefered* ‘he ... came journeying from afar’, *come* functions as a “perfective verb” in conjunction with a participle denoting “the state of the subject at the moment the action comes to an end.” This construction was probably superseded by *come* + infinitive very early, since the latter construction is common in OE. *Come* + infinitive was also used in ME (especially in the Southwest), but it gradually declined. *Come* + present participle is attested in OE and has remained common ever since. In the last two constructions, *come* seems to take on “durative force” together with the non-finite verbs denoting “the state of the subject during the process.”

In “The Progressive from Old English to Early Modern English,” (SELIM 9 [1999]: 21–34), Paloma Núñez Pertejo provides a detailed summary of theories on the origins and development of the “expanded form” in English, that is, the combination of a copula and a present participle. Núñez endorses G. Nickel’s “blending theory,” according to which the expanded form in OE is “a syntactic mixture of several different constructions,” where present participles may be, among others, “predicative adjectives,” “appositive partici-

ples,” or “agent nouns in -end.” It seems that the expanded form belongs to the realm of style rather than grammar in OE, because it is more common in prose than in verse, and also because it is often used interchangeably with the non-expanded form. In fact, “*be* + present participle” did not become “part of the aspectual system” until the early MnE period.

Michiko Ogura’s “‘Gewat + Infinitive’ and ‘uton + Infinitive’” (NM 101: 69–78) examines the OE verb pair *gewitan* and *witan*, both of which may occur with infinitives and therefore function as auxiliaries. According to Ogura, the auxiliary use of *gewitan* is limited mostly to poetry, where the lexical sense of the verb (‘to go, depart’) seems to be “weakened and absorbed” by the infinitive, which often denotes the sense of motion (e.g. *sec(e)an*, ‘to seek’). In prose, *gewitan* usually occurs as a main verb, and it may mean ‘to die’ either with or without a *fram-* or *of-*phrase. The non-prefixed counterpart, *witan* may be called a “hortatory auxiliary,” since it occurs exclusively in the 1st person pl. *uton* (‘let us’). *Uton* + infinitive is common in prose. The auxiliary use of neither *gewitan* nor *witan* survived in English, presumably because of the loss of the Anglo-Saxon poetic style for the former, and the introduction of the synonymous phrase *let us* for the latter.

In a fascinating essay entitled “Coordinate Deletion, Directionality and Underlying Structure in Old English” (*Generative Theory and Corpus Studies*, ed. Bermúdez-Otero et al., 125–51), Rodrigo Pérez Llorido uses the “Directionality Constraint” to argue that OE, though generally believed to be a language with SOV word order, has already begun to move in the direction of SVO word order in the typological spectrum. His claim is based on two observations he makes on coordinate constructions found in both early and late OE texts: first, none of the coordinate constructions uses “backward deletion,” a syntactic operation that is allowed only to languages with SOV word order; second, the early texts employ SOV word order in their coordinate constructions more often than do the late texts. In addition, the early texts contain a large number of coordinate constructions without verb deletion. Such an “unusual” structure, Pérez Llorido argues, is “an indicator of verb-finality” and therefore confirms the classification of early OE as a SVO language. If his inference is correct, late OE must have shifted towards SVO word order, because the undeleted structure in question is much less frequent in the late texts.

In “Constraints on Syllable Structure in Early Germanic” (*Jnl of Indo-European Stud.* 28: 17–29), Marc Pierce explains Sievers Law in Gothic, degemina-

tion in Old Saxon, and open syllable lengthening in Middle Dutch by optimality theoretic principles. The constraints employed in his analysis are 1. The Onset Principle: syllables must have onsets (ONS). 2. Prokosch's Law: stressed syllables must be bimoric (PL). 3. The Coda law: syllable codas are not allowed (NO CODA). The attested forms under question are predicted as the optimal outcome of these three competing constraints. All of the constraints cannot always be satisfied, but the winner satisfies most or at least the most important of them. Unaccented vowel-consonant alternations (*i ~ j*) as in *sôkeip* vs. *waljip* in Gothic are found to derive from the constraint hierarchy: ONS >> PL >> NO CODA. The same applies to Old Saxon degemination word-finally, medially before a consonant, medially following a consonant, following long vowels, and in unstressed syllables. Cf. *skattes/skat*, *kussian/kusta*, *swerdrago* < **swerd-drago*, *lêda* < **lêdda*, *blindumu* (Go. *blindamma*). Open syllable lengthening in MDu allowed the language to satisfy both PL and ONS: forms like *nê-man* with OSL have a bimoric accented syllable and begin the unaccented syllable with a consonant. Pierce argues that this analysis can account for forms like *mel* 'flower', *gel* 'yellow' with both apocopated unaccented vowel and short accented vowel, while the compensatory lengthening hypothesis cannot.

In "Theory, Empiry, and Textual Witnesses: Acutes in the Lindisfarne Gospel and Early English Vowel Quantity" (*Sprachwissenschaft* 25: 497–512), Nikolaus Ritt reanalyzes the evidence of this text in support of the unified theory of English vowel lengthening presented in his dissertation (Ritt 1994). In the text in question, acutes occur in words with vowels generally taken as WGmc old long vowels, e.g., *tīd*, *rīc*, and in words where homorganic lengthening has apparently occurred, e.g., *gōld*, *blīnd*, *ðōrn*. Since acutes generally do not occur in words where open syllable lengthening has taken place in English, the traditional interpretation holds that the evidence speaks for HL before the date of the text (mid-tenth century), and open syllable lengthening at a later date. An analysis of the data in the glosses to the *Lindisfarne Gospel* reveals the following: of the 426 accents in the text, 318 occur over vowels which can be construed as old long or long due to homorganic lengthening (i.e. in closed syllables), while only 108 occur over vowels in open syllables, including finally. Of the latter category, 35 occur in inflected forms or spelling variants of words that occur more often in closed syllables. This apparent reluctance to place acutes over vowels in open syllables is interpreted by Ritt as evidence that the scribe thought OSL was indicated by the environment and

therefore found no necessity to mark it. This conclusion would support Ritt's and Bermúdez-Otero's view that OSL and HL were one and the same process, namely 'quantity adjustment' or vowel lengthening in light syllables, with the homorganic clusters being the equivalent of single consonants. Ritt also questions the traditional syllabification of words where so-called OSL took place. His view of the acutes in the text can also explain forms like *récende*, *smécende*, which otherwise were subject to trisyllabic shortening. Ritt's analysis thus accounts for 87% of the acute accents in the glosses.

Sándor Rot's "Old English–Old Scandinavian Plurilingualism on the Territory of 'Danelaw' and the Results of Its Linguistic Interference on the Morphological Level of English (*Eastern European Contributions to Scandinavian Linguistics*, ed. Håkon Jahr [Oslo: Novus, 1997], 47–61) suggests that language contact as well as phonetic/phonological factors played a role in the loss of inflection and analytical development in ME. The end of West Saxon hegemony owing to the Norman invasion as well as the ultimate demise of Anglo-Norman apparently allowed the increased influence of Northern and Midland varieties of English spoken in the territory of the former Danelaw. As in similar cases, the non-code switching type of contact between OE and Old Scandinavian, two genealogically related and structurally typologically identical dialects, seems to have promoted a dynamic type of linguistic interference. Numerous common lexical items fostered mutual understanding, which resulted in the formation of various types of bilingualism (cf. Townend below). While identical roots or stems must have facilitated communication between speakers of the two languages, the difference in the endings of the Old Scandinavian vernacular of the Danelaw and the Northumbrian and Mercian varieties of OE did not. This state of affairs, argues Rot, promoted the weakening and loss of the endings. Morphological innovations, developing in the contact situation in the north, eventually spread to the more conservative southern dialects. These include: neutralization and leveling of case endings, resulting in the spread of the *s*-plural and the *s*-genitive, and the dropping of final *-n* in the infinitive. The Scandinavian-English contact may also have contributed to the loss of grammatical gender and its replacement by biological gender (cf. Kastovsky above).

Frederick W. Schwink examines "The Velar Nasal in the Adaptation of the Runic Alphabet" (*Amer. Jnl of Germanic Ling. & Literatures* 12: 235–49). Because the runes are adapted from a Mediterranean writing

system (Morris 1988, Odenstedt 1990, Williams 1997), Schwink proposes that the innovator of the runes learned some system of alphabetic writing in the south and sometime later, upon return to Denmark, tried to reconstruct what he had previously learned and apply it to his own language. Based on the attestations of the *ing*-rune (listed in full by Westergaard 1981: 143–50), it does not seem possible to tell whether it represented a phoneme or sequence of phonemes. It is possible that the OE *ŋ*-rune represents a combination of two *k*- or *g*-runes (Seebold 1991: 444), which would point to a sequence, at least in the phonetic sense. Gothic, where *briggan* 'bring' is spelled with <gg>, is of limited help on this point; here too, scholarly opinion is divided as to whether <gg> represents [ŋ] or [ng]. Yet the spelling at least makes it clear that the coronal nasal was assimilated to the velar stop. Schwink concludes that trying to analyze the work of the runic adaptor according to the concepts of phonemes and allophones does him injustice; in the use of the rune in question, he was representing a 'significant sound', regardless of whether or not that sound fits into our modern linguistic categories.

Kenneth Shields, Jr. sets out to explore the question "Old English 'Einheitsplural': an Archaism?" (*Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 53: 11–19). In so doing, he suggests replacing the traditional view that the unified plural in North Sea Gmc (OE, OFris, ON) is an innovation of this group. OE *-ap*, OS *-ath* is taken, for example by Voyles (1993: 256), as a development of the second and third plural endings of the weak verbs, IE **+éte* and **+ónti* > Gmc **+eθ* and **+anθ* > /+aθ/, which then replaced the 1st plural **+umz*. Working with the ideas of the proponents of "the new image" of IE morphology, Shields proposes that the unified plural goes back to IE itself. By the new reconstruction (Adrados 1992: 1), the most ancient stage of Indo-European development, IE I, was not yet inflected. Inflection developed in IE II to include the use of endings and other resources, but not the opposition of stems. Only in IE III, which is practically the stage of traditional reconstruction, were stems opposed to mark tenses and moods in the verb, masc. and fem. genders and comparison in the adjective. Shields' ideas support those of Lehmann (1974: 201), who maintains that only the 3rd plural, along with the singular endings, can be reconstructed; the 1st and 2nd plural seem to have been developed independently by the dialects. In agreement with Schmalstieg (1974: 190), Shields (1992: 67–69, 1997: 109–13) proposes that the original IE 3rd person ending, at the same time a suffix with general non-singular function, was **(e/o)n*; very late **(e/o)nti* resulted

from the contamination of the original ending with the 3rd person primary suffix **-ti*. Most of the IE dialects would then have formed the 1st and 2nd person plural verb endings through the affixation of singular personal markers (1st sg. **-m*, 2nd sg. **-t[h]*) by various non-singular morphemes. Following Polomé (1982: 53), the author argues for Gmc as an archaic branch of IE, noting Fourquet's observation that Gmc conjugation resembles that of Anatolian, which has the contrast between present and past and two basic moods: indicative and imperative. Even if WGmc is seen as the least archaic among Gmc dialects, specific archaisms cannot be ruled out in this branch. The difficulties in explaining the divergent plural verbal endings in Gmc, such as OHG 1st pl. *-mes* vs. Go., ON *-m*, could be done away with by assuming later independent developments.

In "Standard Language in Early Middle English" (*Placing ME in Context*, ed. Taavitsainen et al., 125–39), Jeremy Smith examines to what extent the AB language of *Ancrene Wisse* (Cambridge, CCC 402) and the texts in Oxford, Bodl. Lib. MS Bodley 34 (*Hali Meidhad*, *Sawles Warde*, and the lives of SS Juliana, Katherine and Margaret) can be considered a regional standard of ME. Dobson (1976) has localized the first text to Wigmore Abbey in North Herefordshire and Laing (1993: 24) has dated it to about 1230. Contrary to LWS and Central Midlands Standard, AB does not fulfill any of Haugen's criteria (selection, codification, elaboration to all functions, acceptance) for standard languages even to a limited extent (cf. Shepherd 1972: xv). Despite the fact that we are dealing with the older type of written standard with a 'focus' rather than a 'fixation' on unity (as with modern standards), the variation in the two principal MSS has been understated. At best, it can be considered one of several local attempts to reorganize the traditional spelling of the area. To establish the diatopic and diachronic type of the AB language, Smith compares it with other SW Midlands texts of roughly the same date (the Nero MS of *Ancrene Riwe*, *The Soul's Address to the Body*, the Lambeth Homilies, the Cleopatra MS of *Ancrene Riwe*) and to later texts from North Herefordshire (The Harley Lyrics, a text of John Lydgate's *Troy Book*). Since the article is a report of work in progress, the results are preliminary.

"On the Phonetic and Phonological Interpretation of the Reflexes of the Old English Diphthongs in the *Ayenbite of Inwit*" (*Placing ME in Context*, ed. Taavitsainen et al., 489–504) by Albertas Steponavičius reviews previous explanations of the development of OE *ea*, *eo*, *io* and *ēa*, *ēo*, *īo* in Old and Middle Kentish

and attempts to explain the changes in terms of the sound system of this dialect. Following Wright and Wright 1934: §63, §67, the author posits that Kt alone among the English dialects transformed the OE falling diphthongs into rising diphthongs by stress shift and retained them as such into the fourteenth century. Jordan (1925: §61.b, §82, §85) and Luick (1964: §359) also assume rising diphthongs in MKt, the latter, however, proceeding from level ('schwebende') diphthongs which could also result in falling diphthongs. Steponavičius (cf. 1965 and 1987: §§145–52) connects the raising of the first element in Old Kentish *ea*(:), which he presumes to be [æ], to the raising of /æ(:)/ to /e(:)/ in Kentish. He further proposes, in the terms of Martinet, that the narrowing of the first element in the low diphthong forced the same change in the mid diphthongs *eo*(:) to maintain their zone of security, although this forced a merger in the high diphthongs *io*(:). In MKt, the fronting of the second element in the remaining diphthongs, [ea], [iA] > [eæ], [ie], is attributed to the lack of opposition between /æ/ and /a/ in OKt. It is posited that the high diphthong changed by analogy to the low diphthong. Following on the heels of the Kt stress shift, the short diphthongs were monophthongized to /æ/, /e/, which are reflected in the language of *Ayenbite*, dating from 1340, as /a/, /e/. The reflexes of the long diphthongs are /æ:/ and /jæ:/, /je:/, the former depending on word position. The latter are considered biphonemic by the author. The reflexes in *Ayenbite* are /je:/ initially or after dentals and /e:/ medially and following velars < OE *ēa*; /je:/ initially and after dentals, /i:/ finally and before /w/, and /au/ before /w/ with stress shift < OE *ēo*, *io*. The orthographic variants are enumerated for each reflex.

In "What Happened to Old English Clitic Pronouns and Why?" (*Words: Structure, Meaning, Function*, ed. Dalton-Puffer and Ritt, 289–305), Robert Stockwell and Donka Minkova examine the decline in the use of preverbal object pronouns in ME. Constructions of the type *he him hæfde geseald gislas ond aðas* (*Chron* 893) 'he to-him had given hostages and oaths' are quite common in OE. Yet between 1150 and 1400 the object pronouns increasingly move to the right of the governing verb in prose texts. Thus more modern constructions of the type *7 brohte him þider mid micel ferd* (*ChronE* 1140.14) 'and brought him thither with a large army' become the norm in ME. Verse texts reveal a mixture of archaic and modern pronoun placement. Since the word order in these texts is influenced by meter, the study concentrates on prose texts: *Peterborough Chronicle* (1122–1154), *Ormulum* (c. 1200), Richard Rolle, *Ayenbite of Inwit*, (both early s. xiv), and Chaucer (late s. xiv). The archaic *Ayenbite of Inwit* is

an exception to the trend. The authors consider various explanations for the development. The Scandinavian scenario, which proposes that the borrowing of *they* triggered a change in the syntactic character of the pronouns (Kroch-Taylor 1997), is rejected; the current data found no strong correlation between the use of the new pronoun and the new word order. Instead they propose a variety of factors including the increased use of the ACI construction in ME, the syncretism of pronominal forms and accompanying use of prepositions, and, more tentatively, the continued use of "quirky" subjects after the establishment of the SV order. The principal cause may, however, be the generalization of SVO order, which may have been enough by itself to force the postverbal placement of pronouns.

Tomoyuki Tanaka's "On the Development of Transitive Expletive Constructions in the History of English" (*Lingua* 110: 473–95) uses the framework of the Minimalist Program to explain why only English between the fourteenth and the sixteenth centuries could permit the "TEC," a construction containing the expletive *there* and a transitive verb (e.g. *ther may no kyng lede gret lordship*). It is relatively easy to account for the disappearance of TECs in the early MnE period: the loss of "rich" verbal morphology finally led to a simplification of English clause structure, hence rendering ungrammatical a number of constructions including the TEC. More challenging, however, is the question as to why OE and eME did not permit TECs, even though it had even richer verbal morphology to sustain the complex clause structure. Tanaka attributes this change to "the decline of subject clitics in the fourteenth century," which triggered the change of certain feature specifications and enabled two VP-external subject positions to be "utilized simultaneously."

Matthew Townend's "Viking Age England as a Bilingual Society" (*Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlements in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, ed. Dawn M. Hadley and Julian D. Richards. [Turnhout: Brepols], 89–105) is a reconsideration of the sociolinguistic situation of this period. Townend accepts that English and Norse were mutually intelligible to the extent that speakers of one language could be adequately understood by speakers of the other. In these Anglo-Scandinavian communities, two different languages were spoken; they were not necessarily made up of bilingual speakers. Townend argues against the view that pidginization took place through Anglo-Norse contact and that ME represents a creole arising from this situation (cf. Domingue 1977, Fisiak 1977, Poussa 1982), agreeing with Görlach (1986) that it is

all too easy to judge languages as creoles because they have some loanwords and some degree of inflectional loss. In assessing the situation one must also go further than speaking of 'blending', 'mixing', 'mingling', or 'fusion' of two languages, as many standard histories of English do, or the mere listing of loan words. Instead one should attempt to answer questions about the status and usage of loans. A model study is Dance's (1999 and forthcoming) work on Norse-derived loans in SW Midlands texts of the eME period. Dealing with a limited corpus, he is able to examine questions of the usage and the register of the borrowings, as well as their distribution and frequency. Based on comparison of place names and deity names used by the Danes and the English in Æthelweard and Ælfric, Townend concludes that to the Anglo-Saxons, *Denisc* (Old Norse) was a distinct language spoken by the Danes, and that the linguistic difference was most obvious in the onomastic sphere. The evidence of the Danish King Cnut's court also points to the vitality of spoken Norse language and poetic tradition in England, although texts were composed in English there, written Norse apparently being reserved for runic texts. The relationship of the two languages is described as adstratal, i.e., of equal prestige: there are neither very few nor very many Norse loans in English, which would indicate either an inferior or a superior status, and the Norse language survived for some time in England, although there is no evidence revealing exactly how long. The wide distribution of Scandinavian place-names is indicative of a significant Scandinavian-speaking population over a long period of time in areas where the names occur. It is unlikely that the Scandinavian influence spread far beyond areas where speakers lived, or that only an elite minority of Scandinavian speakers was present in England. Scandinavianized English place names, he argues, point to the co-existence of speakers of the two different languages.

"Triple-Cluster Reduction in Germanic: Etymology without Sound Laws?" (*Historische Sprachforschung* 113: 239–58) by Theo Vennemann posits a scalar constraint for word-initial syllable heads to explain difficult etymologies. In Gmc, triple-consonant clusters with *s* are not common and tend to be unstable. The author establishes that they are more preferred according to the following increasing scale: *skn-*, *skl-*, *skr-*. While IE allowed the latter two, it seems PGmc, judging by the attestation of the Old Germanic languages, generally allowed only the last. The cluster *skl-*, with IE moveable *s*, was simplified by deletion of either of the latter two sounds. For example: MLat. *sclavus* 'slave' lost *k* in all of the older languages: English *slave*, earlier *sclaue*, WFrisk. *slaef*, NFrisk. *slaaw*, MDu.

slave, *slaef*, Du. *slaaf*. MLG and LG *slave*, older Germ. *slaf(e)*, Swed. *slaf*. German twice reborrowed the word, once as *schlav(e)*, and finally as *Sklave*, when it appears the constraint had been lifted. Varying effects of the constraint can explain the connection of the following words: Lat. *claudere* 'to shut', Germ. *schließen*, with moveable *s* and palatalization of the *sk* sequence, and English *shut*, with *l*-deletion and palatalization; Germ. *gleiten*, without moveable *s*, and English *slide* with moveable *s* and *k*-deletion. An example with *spr-* is Germ. *sprechen*, with the cluster retained, and English *speak* with *r*-deletion. The establishment of such etymologies was not open to the Neogrammarians, because implementations of such developing phonotactic constraints do not usually assume the character of sound laws without exception.

In "(Im)personal Verbs of Emotion in Germanic" (*IF* 105: 284–303), Heidi Waltz proposes an alternative to Denison's (1993: 92) view concerning verbs like OE *lician*, namely that personal forms of otherwise impersonal verbs occur only as calques of Latin. Particularly for impersonal verbs of emotion and physical sensation, the personal construction constitutes a viable alternative native syntactic construction, even if only rarely used. A survey of Latin, Vedic Sanskrit and Homeric Greek shows that this category of verbs was used in both personal (with nominative experiencer) and impersonal (with non-nominative experiencer) constructions in other branches of IE. After an analysis of constructions containing psych-verbs in OE and OHG, Waltz agrees with Delbrück that the Gmc non-nominatives were modeled after the native personal construction. As Delbrück observed, the Gmc personal verbs of emotion mostly governed the genitive case. Such verbs in OE include *blissian* 'to rejoice', *sceamian* 'to be ashamed', *geornian* 'desire', etc. In the opinion of the author, oblique case marking of the cause with a nominative experiencer was a marker of intransitivity, along with the intrinsic semantics of particular verbs. Waltz agrees with Ogura (1996: 143) that the variation between personal and impersonal for these verbs in OE was stylistically motivated, but does not agree that the impersonal is indirect because of the use of an oblique experiencer. She thinks the two constructions shared the same meaning.

In "Grammaticalization in Early English" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 35: 43–51), Jerzy Welna demonstrates how the OE adjective *full* underwent "grammaticalization," a transition from a lexical word to a grammatical word. Welna argues that *full* was grammaticalized by "two sequences of changes": a path from adjective to adverb, giving rise to the OE inten-

sifier *full*, as in *full rice* ('very powerful'), and "cliticization," through which the independent word *full* became a suffix and began to form new adjectives (mostly) with nouns, like OE *handful* 'handful'. While the suffix *-ful* became increasingly productive after the OE period and is still used today, the intensifier *full* declined after the late ME period and fell into disuse in the nineteenth century. The loss may be attributed to the introduction of the intensifier *very*, which itself was grammaticalized from the OF adjective *verai* ('true').

Jerzy Welna examines evidence for vowel lengthening before <rd, rl, rn> in ME and early MnE texts in "Some Remarks on the Nonprimary Contexts for Homorganic Lengthening" (*Placing ME in Context*, ed. Taavitsainen et al., 475–87). Lengthening is not as well attested before clusters with [r] as before the 'primary' homorganic clusters <mb, ld, nd>; <ng> did not produce lengthening as consistently and its effects are completely lost in present-day English. A survey of Holthausen's 1934 etymological dictionary yields a list of potential candidates for homorganic lengthening before nonprimary clusters: 61 *rd*-items, 69 *rn*-items, 18 *rl*-items. The N Midlands *Ormulum* (c. 1200), where consonant doubling presumably indicates a preceding short vowel 'covertly', yields examples such as *hord* 'hoard', *swerd* 'sword', *ærn* 'eagle', *bærnenn* 'burn', *cherl* 'young man' vs. *harrd* 'hard', *þornness* 'thorns'. ME devices used inconsistently in other texts for 'overt' marking of vowel length include doubling of vowels, insertion of following <i> (Northern) and employment of the French sequence <ou> to represent *ū*. The relatively uniform orthographic system in about 170 Wycliffite MSS with Central Midl spellings makes use of such devices; examples in the *OED* include *beerd* 'beard', *queern(e)* 'quern', *spourn* 'spurn', *eorl* 'earl'. A further survey of early printed texts from 1500 on, which employ spellings such as <ea> for long open *e*, <ee, ie> for long closed *e*, etc., yields further evidence for the status of vowels before the clusters in question. The author concludes that the position of the standard ME handbooks is correct, namely that length varied in the nonprimary contexts; nor is it necessary to postulate that all items with these contexts were once affected by lengthening and that the process was later selectively reversed.

David Lloyd White's "Irish Influence and the Interpretation of Old English Spelling" (Diss. U of Texas; *DAI* 61A: 3150) argues once again in favor of monophthongs for the OE short digraphs <ea>, <eo>, <io>, arguing that they represent short front vowels at the three different heights: /æ/, /e/, /i/, respectively. This ques-

tion has seen intense debate; White follows Marjorie Daunt in suggesting an Irish origin for these spellings. He reasons that since the Irish had phonemic velarization, they naturally misperceived English as having it too; both the short and long digraphs were evidently intended to indicate velarization of the following consonants. In the long digraphs, the valid phonemic distinction of diphthongization was misperceived; but in the short digraphs, no such contrast ever existed. For White, Irish influence on OE orthography is to be expected from the prominent role of Irish (rather than Roman) missionaries in the conversion of England. White rejects diphthongal explanations for the short digraphs (such as those of Stockwell and Hockett) as unnecessarily awkward; the general dismissal of Irish influence, White argues, is based on a misunderstanding of the phonetics of secondary articulations (particularly intrusion) and a literal interpretation of the digraph spellings, which he considers phonetically implausible. Yet short diphthongs are not unknown in Germanic, occurring, e.g., in the Westphalian dialect of German.

Debra Ziegeler's "The Role of Quantity Implications in the Grammaticalisation of *would*," (*Language Sciences* 22: 27–61) offers a single method of analysis based on Grice's Maxim of Quantity to explain how OE *wolde* was grammaticalized in subsequent centuries, shifting its status from a lexical verb denoting volition in the past ("wished") to an auxiliary verb. The auxiliary *WOULD* denotes a relative future tense that allows interpretation ranging from "factual" (predicting the realization of the proposition on the basis of the minimal amount of information), to "counterfactual" (predicting the non-realization of the proposition on the basis of additional information) to "hypothetical" (suspending the prediction of the outcome of the proposition because of its conditional nature). In OE, *wolde* generally occurs "in main clauses with a nominal or verbal complement," even though there are already "indications of hypothetical meanings emerging in non-factive environments." But many of the grammatical environments for OE *wolde* are still factive, "illustrating a relative future meaning in *WOULD* in which the past temporality is provided by the time reference of the main clause."

K.G., H.M.

Works not seen

Gelderen, Elly van. "Binding Theory and Minimalist Features." *Proc. of the West Coast Conference on Formal Ling.* 18 (1999): 558–69.

3. Literature

a. General and Miscellaneous Works

Editions, Anthologies, Bibliographies. Translations

The year 2000 saw the second edition of Bernard Muir's two-volume *Exeter Anthology of Old English Poetry*; the foreword advertises some new readings derived from the digital images of the new electronic facsimile, updates to the commentary and bibliography, and correction of typographical errors. The changes are no doubt worthy, though the publication of a second edition only six years after the first presumably owes itself to the more exciting availability of the digital facsimile on CD-ROM.

Elaine Treharne's *Old and Middle English: An Anthology* (Oxford: Blackwell) devotes 253 of its 592 pages to Old English texts with facing translations. Treharne points out in the introduction (which surveys 700 years of English history, literature and language in thirteen pages) that her "principle is always to provide the manuscript reading rather than to emend; emendation only occurs when the scribe's form makes no sense or is illegible" (xxvi). Where she does emend, the fact is signalled only in the endnotes to the entire anthology. This fidelity to the manuscript text, combined with the complexity of Old English sentence structure, makes for occasional awkward syntax in the translation, which Treharne keeps line-for-line with the text wherever possible. The selections from the Exeter and Vercelli manuscripts are particularly fine, and show the wisdom of Treharne's decision to group the texts by manuscript. A large extract of *Beowulf* is given (lines 320-1250), and *Judith* appears in its entirety. The Junius MS appears by way of two extracts from *Exodus*. Ælfric is well represented, Bede receives only cursory treatment—the classic story of Edwin's conversion to Christianity is absent—but otherwise the selection of texts is orthodox. The anthology may not have great classroom appeal in North America, where attempts to teach Old and Middle English in the same course rarely succeed, but it may be useful in other ways.

The Classics of Western Spirituality has chosen for what appears to be their 100th book a selection of Anglo-Saxon texts selected and translated by Robert Boenig, *Anglo-Saxon Spirituality: Selected Writings* (New York and Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press). Richard Emmerson's rather traditional preface notes the binary oppositions of Anglo-Saxon England, the dualistic understanding of a world of paganism and Christian-

ity in which the latter is "muscular, not mystical" (xv). Boenig writes an extended introduction, beginning with a survey of the Christian history of Anglo-Saxon England, followed by a consideration of the surviving poetry which emphasizes its origins in song and oral performance. After briefly considering the prose style of the period, Boenig turns to what he terms the obstacle-ridden attempt to define Anglo-Saxon spirituality. He points to its conventional, conservative tendencies, the scarcity of mysticism, and the vividness and ubiquity of eschatological material. With particular reference to the *Phoenix* and Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi* he elucidates the contradictions in Anglo-Saxon attitudes towards the apocalypse. The texts themselves he introduces by way of the manuscripts in which they appear. The prose texts in the volume include four Blickling homilies (X, XIV, XVII, XIX), three Vercelli homilies (II, VI, XI), three saints' lives by Ælfric and his "On the Sacrifice of Easter," three Wulfstan sermons, and finally three homilies from Oxford, Bodl. Lib. MS Bodley 343. The selection of poetry is more idiosyncratic: short selections from *Genesis A* and *B*, all of *Judith*, *Guthlac A*, and the *Advent Lyrics* (*Christ I*), *The Phoenix*, and several shorter texts including *Lord's Prayer I*, Psalm 121 from the Paris Psalter, *The Dream of the Rood*, *Maxims II*, *Cædmon's Hymn*, *Soul and Body II*, and *Judgment Day I*. The translations are straightforward and clear, and Boenig sensibly does not indicate any emendations or scholarly uncertainties in the text, which is clearly intended for a general audience. On the other hand, neither does he whitewash the text; the serial rape and slavery episodes of Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi* appear without footnote. The notes themselves are principally concerned with biblical sources. The collection of shorter lyrics appears to prefer narrative or hortatory material, although such meditative Christian texts as *Resignation* might have been worth including. Despite its specific intent to reach a general audience, however, Boenig's collection might well find a second niche market among Anglo-Saxonists looking for classroom texts or hoping to refresh their own knowledge of the spiritual life in Anglo-Saxon England.

Graham Holderness surveys the field of *Anglo-Saxon Verse* for nonspecialists in the *Writers and their Work* series produced by Northcote House and the British Council. After an introductory chapter, he divides his subject into four fields: heroic, elegiac, Christian, and love poetry. The introduction concerns the reasons to study Anglo-Saxon verse. The opening chapter on the background and prosody invokes a

rather folksy and even fusty approach that uses, for example, F.P. Magoun to demonstrate the oral-formulaic character of Anglo-Saxon verse. Holderness does usefully distinguish between assimilationist and imitative translation. The rest of the text consists of long selections of Holderness' translation (as an example, the opening of *Beowulf*: "Hey! We've heard of the glory / Of the good old days") and discussion of selected poems. He takes a fairly straightforward approach to the *Battle of Maldon*, arguing that "the only shame is in shrinking from combat; the only dishonour the cowardice of taking flight," and congratulating Byrhtnoth for his heroic idealism. *The Dream of the Rood* acquires an epigraph dedicating it "For the Church of St Michael and All Angels, Bedford Park"; Holderness suggests that "ultimately the poem is a meditation on, and an example of, the spiritual value of devotional art." Claims such as this, true enough in their way but severely limited and limiting, make one feel that the naive student should be kept away from this book.

By contrast, such a student might profitably be directed to Gwendolyn A. Morgan's *Anglo-Saxon Poetry in Imitative Translation: The Harp and the Cross*, even though it lacks scholarly apparatus and has only brief introductions. Morgan provides OE texts and facing-page translations for a selection of poems, but in a daring move for an introductory text proposes some new interpretations and presentations of the poems. Thus, for example, Riddles 30a and 30b are retitled "The Harp" and "The Cross" and form the book's centerpiece. Morgan uses an unusual taxonomy and includes many texts not usually seen. The first section, entitled "From Historical to Heroic," includes *The Coronation of Edgar*, *The Death of Edward*, *The Battle of Maldon*, and *Waldere*. The second section includes riddles, two bestiary texts, and two metrical charms under the heading "The Riddle of Life," while the third section intriguingly headed "The Archetype and the Personal" has subheadings for "Women's Voices," "Men's Voices," and "The Social and Spiritual." Last, perhaps fittingly, is a section called "Devotional" with four explicitly Christian texts. Each group of poems has a headnote explaining Morgan's interpretation of the texts. The translations are idiosyncratic but useful for students and general readers. The last text in the book, *Bede's Death Song* reads in Morgan's translation: "Before his parting no one ponders / thoughts much wiser than he thinks he must / nor ever wonders ere his wasting / what his ghost, of good or of evil, / after his death-day will be deemed to be worth." Reaching for alliteration always causes difficulties, but the syntax here avoids overpunctuation while maintaining the complexity of the original thought. Tom Shippey provides a pref-

ace in which he muses about the way in which Anglo-Saxon materials have not become part of the national myth; he proposes that Old English poetry requires careful attention and study to unlock its riches, and that Morgan provides a good point of entry into that project.

Kathleen Herbert offers a reset and reprinted version of her 1993 book *Spellcraft as English Heroic Legends* (Hockwold-cum-Wilton: Anglo-Saxon Books). In her foreword Herbert states that "In spite of their power and strangeness, very little creative work has been done recently with these stories," though she concedes their influence on the *Lord of the Rings*. The last sixty pages of the book include a brief introduction to OE for a general audience, and analysis of the six sets of story material which are given life in the first 220 pages. The stories themselves occasionally plod, and they are as replete with names and places as their sources, but they offer intriguing interpretations of conundra such as the relationships of Waldere, Hagen, and Hildegyð, or between Geat and Mæðhild, or the back-story of *The Husband's Message*.

Finally, decorous acknowledgment from one review publication to another is due to "Old English Literature" in *The Year's Work in English Studies* 81: 132-70. Produced by Jill Frederick and Mary Swan, the section reviews articles and books on poetry (organized by manuscript), prose, and general background material (under ten headings). Based on a somewhat eclectic but useful choice of texts, especially under "Social, Cultural and Intellectual Background," the entries largely summarize the main argument of the works reviewed, a reasonable decision given their space constraints.

General Studies

Janet Bately appropriately considers Old English renderings of Latin *philosophus* for the Lynne Grundy *Festschrift* in "Upwita/Philosophus Revisited: A Reflection on OE Usage" (*Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 15-36). A loanword from *philosophus* occurs on six occasions, five in the Orosius translation and one in an early eleventh-century gloss to Boethius' *De Consolatione*. Alfred uses *upwita*, which first occurs in the late eighth-century Corpus Glossary, in his translation of Boethius in contexts which render the Latin *philosophus*, where it has no parallel in the Latin text, and referring to named classical philosophers. Two forms based on *upwita*, *upwitegung* and *upwitigan* also occur, both in Ælfric. Other usages reflect Isidore's divisions, the more gen-

eral sense of teachers and practitioners of the liberal arts in general, and on two occasions in biblical glosses, the translation of *scriba* "[Jewish] scribe" (perhaps the result of carelessness). Some kind of special status is evidently indicated when *upwitan* is a gloss on *seniores* in the Vespasian Psalter and other texts, and the term is also used for senior advisors or administrators (who evidently incurred more respect in Anglo-Saxon times than they do today). This appears to be the usage in both *Elene* and *Andreas*. Finally, the term "occurs in a more general and sometimes purely English context" including *The Battle of Brunanburh*, where it clearly means "authorities" or "wise men." Ælfric supports this usage, especially by collocating *upwita* with *weoruldlic* on four occasions. Considering other collocations as well, Bately concludes that *upwita* has the core meaning "wise or learned man" but appears in a "fairly restricted group of contexts, indicating people's professional status rather than their intellectual attainments." It is found almost exclusively in translation, and Alfred chose this imprecise term, with its vernacular elements, to avoid Latin technical terms. The translator of Orosius, on the other hand, avoided *upwita* in favor of more precise terminology, in this case the Latin *philosophus*. *The Dictionary of Old English* will not have to do much, if any, work when it arrives at this word.

In the same volume, Hugh Magennis surveys "Conversion in Old English Saints' Lives" (287–310), noting that in Anglo-Saxon texts the saint is static, bringing others to the "turning" which is conversion. Visual images depict saints in stasis, as dignified, impassive, and motionless icons. Hagiography might be a narrative genre but powerful iconographic principles are inherent to it, so its approach is often ritualistic and celebratory. The texts demonstrate the unchanging character of the saint, and this pattern holds so true in Anglo-Saxon England that even saints whose lives clearly changed were assimilated to the pattern. Magennis reviews the surviving lives of notable converts, particularly the apostles. In verse, St. Andrew in *Andreas* is essentially the idealized hero, even when his constancy is inconsistent with the facts of the story, and St. Helen in Cynewulf's *Elene* is a static and very firm figure; she even engages in coercion and violence to force Judas into conversion. Interestingly, once Judas gives up his intransigent defiance of truth, he becomes a significantly less active character. St. Eustace always had saintly qualities, even before his conversion, and his worthiness calls Christ to appear to him. "Conversion" in his case simply means that he remained virtuous. Ælfric omits any reference to St. Sebastian's life before conversion, recounting only

his saintly deeds. More problematic are the tales of repentant sinners who become saints, but such tales are particularly scarce in Old English—in fact there is only one, the anonymous *Life of Mary of Egypt*. Mary's conversion turns from sin to spirituality, and thence to secret sanctity. She does not display saintly composure, being embarrassed by her nakedness and displaying a first-person confessional approach to her Christianity. Even after her conversion she experiences misery and uncertainty, craving the food and wine she once enjoyed, and insisting on her imperfections. Only when she receives the eucharist for the first time can her life achieve completion, but even her last words continue to lack composure. She was, as Magennis points out, "an unusual saint, whose story and presentation conflict with the norms of iconographic hagiography." Understandably, then, there is evidence of unease with the story of Mary of Egypt; Goscelin's heavily edited version (1082–3) assimilates her to the iconographic model of sanctity, making her into a heroic hermit. Anglo-Saxon hagiographers, Magennis suggests, would have approved.

A third paper from the Grundy *Festschrift* is Katharine Scarfe Beckett's useful and comprehensive "Old English References to the Saracens" (483–509). Scarfe Beckett starts with etymology, concluding that the term *Saraceni* came to describe a combination of nomadism and Arab ethnicity. Early material about them may have arrived in Anglo-Saxon England with commentaries on the Old Testament by Jerome (later followed by Bede and Alcuin), with Orosius, and certainly with Theodore and Hadrian after 669. The biblical etymology construed the Saracens as the children of Sarah, the "duplicious successors to tribes who were already presented unfavourably in the Old Testament." During the seventh and eighth centuries, the Arab tribes known as *Saraceni* largely converted to Islam; Scarfe Beckett details the evidence for English knowledge of Saracens, including pilgrim accounts, references in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and other points of contact with the East. After the mid-eighth century the prose references, with one doubtful occurrence in the verse *Solomon and Saturn*, provide historical or geographical information and, usually, imply opprobrium. Passing references occur in such texts as the OE translations of Orosius and Bede, a gloss in the *Durham Ritual*, and a section of miscellaneous educational material added to the Lindisfarne Gospels (which unusually connects the Saracens to India). By the tenth century, the Saracens are simply violent and hostile to Christians, and appear in the OE *Malchus* at some length attacking and capturing the monk. Malchus and a female compan-

ion escape their slavery and return, leaving behind the dangerous desert-dwellers. In two homilies and in his translation of Judges, Ælfric similarly characterizes the Saracens as conquerors and destroyers of Jerusalem. The *OE Martyrology* also has Liutprand purchasing the relics of Augustine of Hippo, thereby rescuing the saint from a Saracen threat. The C-text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, probably copying from a continental source, records the emperor Otto II engaging with a Saracen army in 982 and defeating them with difficulty. In total, nine Anglo-Saxon texts mention the Saracens, most of them pejoratively, and probably all of them connected, however nebulously, to a religious context that was not neutral.

Nicola Petilli's "Le Opere in Volgare del Venerabile Beda" (*Città di vita* 51 [1996]: 151–6) introduces Bede by describing the *Historia ecclesiastica* as a national history establishing the ecclesiastical, ethnic and cultural identity of the English. Petilli links Bede to the vernacular through the ninth-century translation of *HE*, through the texts he is reported to have translated (the Gospel of John, Isidore's *De natura rerum*, the Pater Noster), and through the pedagogical and religious use of the texts he rendered into the vernacular. Nonetheless, Bede marked the vernacular as inferior, at best a pathway to the perfection of the divine word in Latin.

Louis J. Rodrigues's latest endeavor from Llanerch Press is *The Dream of the Rood and Cyn(e)wulf' and Other Critical Essays* (Felinfach, 1998). The volume ranges from articles on Pepys and Evelyn to analysis of Indian, Catalán, and Galician writers. Relevant for our purposes are the title essay and four others, all of them the product of SELIM conferences and previously published in those proceedings; and one paper taken from the author's doctoral thesis presented at Barcelona in 1990. In the 1991 essay which provides the volume's title, Rodrigues suggests that Cynewulf might have constructed both *Fates* and *Elene* according to the mathematical arrangements proposed by D. R. Howlett for interpretation of *Dream of the Rood*. *Fates* in particular corresponds to the Golden Section; in *Elene*, following Anderson, the symmetrical design is less obvious but can be traced through the symmetrical distribution of direct discourse. The time is ripe, Rodrigues suggests, for a reconsideration, possibly an expansion, of the Cynewulfian canon. "Cyn(e)wulf': more in our thoughts than in our prayers!," from the 1994 SELIM conference, focuses on the poet's runic signatures. The paper reviews scholarship on the author, relative date and order, themes, Latin sources, manuscript position, and orthography of the poems

and their signatures. "Margaret of Antioch—Pseudo-Saint and Martyr" establishes the historiography and hagiography of Margaret, recapitulates the legend, and notes that the tale served the purpose of entertainment and edification. Two papers address modern English translations of OE verse: "Some Modern English verse renderings of *The Ruin*" evaluates interpretation to date of the poem, its stylistic effects, and three translations (Mackie, Hamer, Crossley-Holland), concluding that none of them properly appreciates the poem; "Further observations concerning the translation of Anglo-Saxon Verse" considers prose renditions of *Dream of the Rood*. Finally, "From Manuscript to Manuscript: two Anglo-Saxon Runic Riddles 19 and 42, reconstructing and translating both texts from MS transcriptions.

Sachi Shimomura writes about layered narratives, their judging audiences, and the narrative and epistemological implications of those judgments in a 1999 thesis at Cornell, "From Doomsday to Romance: Visual Judgment in Old and Middle English Narrative (Geoffrey Chaucer)" (*DAI* 60A [1999]: 2483). Shimomura argues for a mode of publicly-displayed judgment according to which seeing affirms or creates truths. Thus, in OE sermons and in *Christ III*, the visual preoccupations or metaphors of revelation of Doomsday find a parallel in secular discourses. Rather than patristic and biblical presentations of revelation, *Christ III* provides a concrete and literal visualization of Judgment which echoes heroic shame/praise discourse. Doomsday also preoccupies Richard M. Trask in "Looking Forward to Doomsday: An Old English Pastime" (*In Geardagum* 21: 1–21). Trask approaches what in the aftermath of the millennium is very familiar ground, the consideration in OE texts of the present as prefiguring the eternal. Using the Augustinian sense of time as a starting point, Trask reviews the relevant texts, arguing that "time exists in a vanishing state" and that OE texts demonstrate an "existential optimism" which makes their presentation of the Last Judgment both matter-of-fact and prodigious.

Janet Duthie Collins, in "The Reality of the Classification 'Poetry' for Old English" (*LACUS Forum* 24 [1998]: 389–97), proposes that the features that distinguish poetry from prose in OE are a matter of quantity, not quality. After comparing a set of OE prose and poetic texts, she concludes that both cover the same topics and that the basic syntactic structure used is the long, non-periodic sentence, a product of the "adding style." The commonness of dislocation, disjunction, word play, synonymy, adjectival substantives and usage of meta-

phor demonstrates itself in examples from regular prose, alliterative prose, and alliterative poetry, which Collins analyzes in some detail. Collins concludes that alliterative prose is decorated prose, with erratic alliteration and no consistent pattern development. Poetic syntax is not characterized by dislocation and disjunction, since these are almost as common in prose, nor by other stylistic and rhetorical features. In fact, Collins proposes, OE poetry "could more accurately be called a variation of Old English narrative prose or even free verse"—a conclusion which seems extreme. The paper may not advance our understanding of the boundaries between OE verse and prose, but it does clarify the similarities and demonstrate the differences with precision and concision.

A signally important paper is Angelika Lutz, "Æthelweard's *Chronicon* and Old English Poetry" (*ASE* 29: 177–214). Lutz starts with the vexed question of Æthelweard's Latinity, noting that it exhibits "strikingly individual features" but that it has only ever been considered within the context of Anglo-Latin. Given that Æthelweard was a member of the late Anglo-Saxon nobility and a layman who actively promoted the vernacular, he might have written in Latin only because his addressee, Matilda, could only read the material in that language. Some details of the ealdorman's version of the Cynewulf and Cyneheard episode smack of heroic poetry, introducing boasts, expressions of loyalty to one's lord, details of actual fighting uncharacteristic of the *Chronicle* but reminiscent of the *Battle of Maldon*, and a statement that the fight was fierce. The models for Æthelweard's heightened style might include OE texts, especially heroic poetry. Lutz therefore examines the *Chronicon*'s lexicon, beginning with the list of rare Greek words identified by Campbell, but deciding to focus particularly on words for "ship," a large subcategory of Campbell's thirteen words. Fully six of the words are chosen for their semantic suitability, their utility to emphasize the actual use of ships, or because they refer to nautical matters. Similarly, Æthelweard uses many Latin words for "ship" or for parts of ships. Lutz organizes the poetic words for "ship," a very large group, into three categories: general terms, specialized compounds, and other specialized terms. Æthelweard tends to render the general terms, which are most common in the *Chronicle*, with "more specific or more unusual Latin or Greek expressions." The set of other specialized terms includes several Scandinavian loans. Æthelweard's usage reflects OE poetic choices only to a limited degree, and he employs metonymic expressions, some poetic expressions, and some specialized technical terms. The one real parallel is his "clear intention to avoid

the lexical monotony of his main source," though his search for variation in the field does not necessarily derive from vernacular poetry. Lutz therefore turns briefly to other thematic areas, using Winterbottom to note the frequency of variation in descriptions of military actions, geographical location of historical action, dates, the concepts of "winning victory" and "going to war," and the concept of the "passage of time." Much variation occurs, but when the semantic field is typical of vernacular poetry, Æthelweard uses different means of attaining variation, and when it is not typical of poetry, no conclusion can be drawn. Only rarely does he vary the terms for "man, warrior," and perhaps only once for a specific effect does he vary "king." Lutz finds more positive results with syntactic and stylistic resemblances, where the evidence does not point in several directions at once. Again she follows Campbell and starts with passages of asyndeton involving ships, though unlike Campbell Lutz considers the thematic point relevant. Æthelweard conveys the dramatic power of the 877 destruction of 120 ships, arranging descriptive details as an asyndetic sequence, and using the metonymic term *carina* "keel/ship." Similar expansions occur in 418 as the Romans depart for Gaul, and in 885 for a naval battle between the English and Viking forces. Other military actions also receive the asyndetic style (755, 892, 875, and in an early passage about the Saxons attacking the Scots at the request of the Celts), not for extra facts, but for the creation of scenes of dramatic action. Lutz compares the details of those scenes to those in *Maldon*, *Brunanburh*, *Genesis A*, *Beowulf*, and *Exodus*. The asyndetic strings of variants on the themes of battle and seafaring in the poetry are precisely what Æthelweard had in mind in composing the *Chronicon*. More specifically, Winterbottom's description of the Vergilian elements in Æthelweard's verse structure, while valid, does not account for the high incidence of alliteration. Comparing Michael Lapidge's and Andy Orchard's analyses of Aldhelm's alliteration and formulaic usages, Lutz concludes that OE as well as Latin standards of alliterative usage are in place. Æthelweard used both the poetic conventions of vernacular poetry and those of Anglo-Latin hexameters as developed by Aldhelm (himself strongly influenced by vernacular poetry). The idiosyncrasies of Æthelweard's style in the *Chronicon* suggest that he strove for poetic coloring in his lexical variation, unusual syntactic effects, and use of alliteration; Lutz posits that his uneven use of these effects may reflect the experimentation going on around him with vernacular text-types and styles.

Finally, John M. Hill's *The Anglo-Saxon Warrior Ethic: Reconstructing Lordship in Early English Litera-*

ture (Gainesville: U Press of Florida) is a re-engagement with the heroic code. Hill starts by recounting scholarly misconceptions, from Earle's idealistic presentation of heroic stories through Bertha Phillpotts' holy revenge which "flattens too many otherwise significant social and situational nuances" (6), and thence to R.W. Chambers and his spiritual successors. Feud is always inexorable, even when it is heavily criticized in texts such as *Beowulf*. Hill's focus, however, is on the dramatic heroic action itself, and on narratives of revenge feud or warfare "with scope enough for us to parse the issues shaping action and defining values" (15). Not surprisingly, then, the first two chapters concern *Beowulf*. Using anthropological approaches to rites of passage and discussion of kinship and legacy with respect to Wiglaf, Hill considers the shaping role that violence assumes at the level of the individual retainer. He proposes that a "predatory righteousness" develops in the young man, an aggressive superego in Freudian terms. The dragon represents "the total collapse of psychic life into pure, unopposed possessiveness" (40), and Wiglaf in his freely given return is the only retainer to triumph over the self-centered and the threateningly possessive; he mediates between the larger-than-life hero and the ordinary followers, birthed into heroic status through the "violent midwifery of battle" (45). The second chapter includes case studies of Hengest, Ingeld, and Eadgils as parts of groups that reform themselves using an ethnopsychology of loyalty, honor, and retainer identity after lethal violence has ended a prior accommodation. Hill works through the family relationships, chronologies and motivations of each figure in detail, with a focus on action and demonstrations of decisions, only very rarely on the language or expression of the poem—which does occasionally make it seem as though he reads *Beowulf* as a social document only. Hill makes many good points, however, such as remarking upon Hildeburh's intense purposefulness in the Finn Episode, a purposefulness which we should not ignore in our tendency to feel compassion for her and interpret her (and, by extension, other women in the poem) as pure victim. Interestingly but perhaps less convincingly, he proposes that the portentous allusions to future treachery in the relationship between Hrothgar and Hrothulf are not borne out by the text.

Hill then turns to other texts, beginning with the feud annals of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. He focuses on the Sigebriht opening of the Cynewulf and Cyneheard story, the deposition of a sitting king and his chartered killing, specific and located after the monstrous slaying of a steadfast lord. The remainder of

the text, he suggests, demonstrates that "the consequences of killing a rightly ruling king are rightly bad" (88). Re-formation of groups cannot occur around this kind of killing, and the Alfredian dynasty of the West Saxons demonstrated this very clearly in the *Chronicle*. To support this point Hill turns to the account of Æthelwold's rebellion when Edward succeeds his father Alfred. However, Æthelwold prudently fails to uphold his boasts, loses his captive woman (a consecrated nun recaptured by Edward), and seeks the Danes in Northumbria. Eventually, as he continues his peace-breaking and disobedience, he is killed in battle. This admonitory story foregrounds Cyneheard's actions, and reinforces the ethically superior kingship of the West-Saxon dynasty. Chapter Four addresses the next relevant moment in that dynasty, the occasion which gave rise to *The Battle of Brunanburh*. Hill argues that the poem's sophisticated artistry celebrates noble lordship as simultaneously martial and legislative. He suggests that the heroic past is not a nostalgic memory but an integral part of the present, so that the two *Chronicle* poems of royal victory (*Brunanburh* and *The Five Boroughs*) are very appropriately close to each other. The justice of the victory at Brunanburh is reflected in the poem's language, which Hill analyzes in some detail; conquering lands and establishing boundaries by the sword are the proper legislative work of a warrior-king. Finally, Hill considers contrasting definitions of loyalty in *The Battle of Maldon*. The radically loyal retainers engage in a "transvaluation underwritten by all the social ties that bind freemen together honorably" (125). He concludes that the poet constructs a momentous ideal—not a new conclusion, though the path by which it is reached is innovative. In the conclusion Hill himself weighs up and reconsiders his argument, returning to *Beowulf* for detailed comments. His key point is that the ideological work of these texts is the "completion of a stunning, new ideology of retainership and loyalty in the face of overwhelmingly triumphant lordship" (130). A matching ideology of retainership is proposed in these texts. However, whereas *Beowulf* meditatively considers the contingencies of these ideas, more polemical texts like *Maldon* and *Brunanburh* heighten the political capital of proper behavior by both lord and retainer. Hill concludes, therefore, that heroic story was not a simple reflection of human activity, but an ideal employed for political purposes in late Anglo-Saxon England.

General Studies of Old English Poetry

Bettina Heinrich's *Frühmittelalterliche Bibeldichtung und die Bibel* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang) considers the

biblical poetry in the vernacular of the early Middle Ages in England and Germany. She paraphrases and analyzes the three OE poems (*Genesis A* and *B*, *Exodus* and *Daniel*); the three Old German texts "Psalm 138," Otfrid von Weissenburg's *Evangelienbuch*, and the short "Christus und die Samariterin"; and two Old Saxon poems, the *Genesis* and *Heliand*. To support her approach she refers in passing to *Andreas*, *Azarias*, *Beowulf*, *Judith*, and *Cædmon's Hymn*. The first half of the book is devoted to consideration of the OE texts (working from the base texts in the ASPR rather than Grein-Wülker, as might have been expected). Heinrich works steadily through each one, pulling up the biblical source and comparing it in detail against the paraphrase. She considers the paraphrases both as translation and as poetry, and by placing her consideration of the *Genesis* texts side by side she is able to rethink the approaches to poetry of the three creators. The results, systematic and careful, show that the poets knew the Bible well, and knew what features they wished to emphasize in their renditions. With *Exodus* the scope widens slightly, since Tolkien and Lucas in their editions have also studied the poem line-for-line with the Vulgate (as Doane did for *Genesis A*), and Heinrich is able to contrast and weigh their conclusions, while incorporating them into her own project. For *Daniel* she compares the Vulgate to the text in Farrell's edition, and concludes that the poem is a looser rendition. Most of the second half of the book analyzes Otfrid's *Evangelienbuch*, though the *Heliand* gets the last fifty pages. When considering the meanings of individual words Heinrich throughout uses Bosworth/Toller; the DOE does not even appear in the bibliography. The book, while clearly displaying the style and limitations of a thesis, is a useful and comprehensive treatment of the Vulgate Bible as it served as source for some Germanic and Old English poems.

Karl Reichl effectively carries the torch of oral-formulaic analysis with *Singing the Past: Turkic and Medieval Heroic Poetry* (Ithaca: Cornell UP). The book focuses on Turkic bards and epics from Central Asia, using such texts as *Edige* and *Ormanbet-biy* as comparanda by which to illuminate *The Battle of Brunanburh*, *Finnsburh Fragment*, *Beowulf*, and other texts. In the introduction Reichl states that although he is primarily studying various aspects of a living tradition of oral epic poetry, these aspects can also contribute to understanding that part of medieval epic poetry which many scholars have associated with an oral milieu. The opening chapter reviews Turkic-speaking bards of central Asia and Siberia, and the structures and performance circumstances of their

verse, considering especially the type-scenes, thematic patterns, and singers of epic texts. The second chapter begins with an analysis of *The Battle of Brunanburh* by noting that its emphasis is on praise rather than narration and linking the text with other medieval references to the battle. William of Malmesbury quotes a Latin poem of thirty-three hexameters on the battle, and the detailed description of *Vínheiðr* in the thirteenth-century *Egils saga Skallagrímssonar* concerns the same event. Reichl compares the style of the two vernacular versions and notes that both are evocative rather than descriptive. *Brunanburh*, however, is integrated into a historical record and clearly intended to be historiographic in nature, while the Old Norse version is part of a biographical narrative. To consider the historiographic parallels, Reichl invokes the OHG *Ludwigslied* and suggests that with *Brunanburh* it continues a native tradition but has come under the influence of Latin writing. Both blur the boundary between praise and narrative. In order, however, to consider the distinction, or lack thereof, between heroic poetry and historical song, Reichl turns to modern traditions of oral epic poetry, especially the poem *Namaz*, the story of a rebellion in what is today Uzbekistan. After his analysis Reichl concludes that although *Brunanburh* is a historical song, *The Battle of Maldon* is not. The next chapter goes in search of the heroic lay as first posited by Andreas Heusler, beginning with Old Irish heroic tales, a Kazakh poem, and concluding with both versions of the *Finnsburh* story and the *Hildebrandslied*. Reichl concludes that the surviving fragment of *Finnsburh* is unlikely to have been "part of a longer narrative poem on the scale of *Beowulf* or beyond." While some elements in the poem are common to other heroic poetry, it also demonstrates a conciseness and concentration on one event, a dramatic unity that suggests it belongs to the genre of the heroic lay, not the epic.

Chapter four addresses the question of heroic epic and tribal roots, starting with minstrel performances and the sequencing they employ. One or more shorter songs preface the epic, and Reichl provides one example of an underlying theme as contributing to the national identity of the Karakalpaks. The epic itself, he contends, is textually embodied by the genealogical element of heroic poetry, lists as well as a general concern with descent and succession. This insistence on tribal history and continuity forms the base of the epic, though it can be overgrown by fabulous elements and shaped into mythic patterns. Chapter five addresses this shaping, starting with the air of reality and historical truth that Klæber found so re-

markable in *Beowulf*. Reichl argues that the historical dimension of the poem can be discussed meaningfully, despite the overgrowth of legendary motifs. In particular, the "authority of the singer guarantees that the happenings of the epic do relate to the tribe's past, that they are indeed true." Despite the difficulties of perceiving *Beowulf* as "our hero," the truth is authenticated by the truth-asserting function of the poet. Reichl applies the same analysis to the *Chanson de Roland*, and in the conclusion compares Provençal lyric to *Widsið* for its performance aspects. Evidence indicates that music was functional in oral performance, and he concluded by discussing the aesthetic and affective dimensions of that music. It is not often that new ground is staked out in the field of oral narrative, but Reichl does so here. He also shows exemplary patience with his material, placing it in the appropriate critical, historiographical, and performative contexts from which to draw judicious conclusions. This book adds to the debate.

Two theses also continue the study of the interlinking of literacy and orality with poetry in Anglo-Saxon England. Elizabeth Jane Rowse (Diss. U of Kansas) presented "*On frymðe wæs word: the Importance of Literacy, Orality, and the Role of the Poet to the Heroic and Christian Interpretations of Anglo-Saxon Poetry*" (DAI 61A: 2705). Rowse proposes a reconsidered understanding of the poet in terms of his position in a society that is influenced by both orality and literacy, and eases the traditional critical dichotomy between the heroic and the Christian. The inseparable coexistence of these two elements results from the coming together of two systems of communication (orality and literacy), two ethical systems (Germanic and Latin-Christian), and two languages and literatures (English and Latin). Lori Ann Garner argues in "Oral Tradition and Genre in Old and Middle English poetry" (Diss. U of Missouri-Columbia; DAI 61A: 1833) that issues of genre in Old and Middle English poetry are closely tied to concepts of performance, orality, and tradition. She uses genre theories from folklore scholarship to compare genres in living oral traditions to those in medieval literature. More specifically, she studies OE charms for their performance context as healing rituals, and she takes up the laments and proverbs embedded in *Beowulf*.

In a doctoral thesis at King's College London in 1998, D.W. Charnick considers "The Role of Evil in Old English Narrative Verse" (*Index to Theses* 49: 428). Charnick demonstrates that evil is destructive and ugly, reflective of unsound reasoning, established within the context of defeat set by Satan's rebellion.

In *Beowulf*, the stylized Grendel episode is contextualized by the symbolic conflict of good and evil, with emphasis on evil's destructive, degrading and defeat aspects. This symbolism also informs the more social evil of revenge perpetrated by Grendel's mother. The positive present is set in dichotomy with the negative past and future, and with the dragon combat, a new symbolism inheres another good/evil dichotomy in the social fabric.

Matthew Townend coins a neat alliterative title in "Pre-Cnut Praise-Poetry in Viking Age England" (RES 51: 349-70), and notes that the only cluster of this material in OE is the poems in the tenth-century *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. However, some Old Norse skaldic verse, which reached its height in the reign of Cnut, exists from the tenth century—poems or fragments in praise of Æthelred, Sveinn Haraldsson, and Eiríkr blóðox. Townend first posits that the *Chronicle* poems enjoyed an anterior and perhaps a subsequent circulation apart from the *Chronicle*, partly on metrical grounds and partly from consideration of the texts and their context in the annals. These poems also avoid gnomic generalization and narrative, and they demonstrate a preoccupation with names, particularly with praise or blame of those names. These features are very similar to the skaldic praise-poems, as is the accumulations of nouns and noun-phrases for descriptive purposes. Townend then turns to the question of influence, examining whether the OE poems followed skaldic tradition. He criticizes Roberta Frank's finding of syntactic links to *Beowulf* where no ON lexical influence can be demonstrated, and objects to John Niles' failure to distinguish between mere linguistic influence from speakers of ON and literary influence from skaldic poetry. He notes a second approach, that of Jeff Opland, who traces a generic template of praise-poems, a useful approach since it does not require the intelligibility of skaldic poems by an English audience, only a more general sense of influence. Townend himself expands the frame to consider "the conditions under which praise-poetry flourishes" in cultural terms. To do so, he follows Chadwick's old model of a Heroic Age, one in which praise-poetry would be likely to praise warlords, and considers whether the Viking Age would demonstrate those conditions. He concludes that the unstable world of competing warbands, raiding, and plundering did indeed exist in England in the tenth century, largely brought there by the Vikings as they destabilized and destroyed current political structures. Praise-poems such as *The Battle of Brunanburh* and *The Capture of the Five Boroughs* would belong in this kind of confrontational world, and "supply an alterna-

tive perspective on late Anglo-Saxon kingship"; the king himself might have encouraged literary monuments to his conquests. The culmination of this new praise-poetry might be *The Battle of Maldon*, since it weaves praise-poetry with narrative, eulogy with direct speech. Townend makes a complex argument, and its implications cannot all be developed here, but his proposals open a new way of considering the cultural world of the tenth century (though at the risk of overemphasizing anarchy and chaos) and its literary products both in Old Norse and in Old English.

At the opposite extreme from the secular world of praise-poetry and martial kingship is a detailed consideration of the Exeter Book elegies, written in a monastic scriptorium yet tied to a heroic tradition. Where Townend embraces the heroic tradition, Helena Znojemska rejects it as an improper background in "Where Ingeld and Christ Meet: the Exeter Book Elegies" (*Litteraria Pragensia* 18 [1999]: 27–61). Her question, not an original one, is: what are stubbornly un-Christian poems like *Widsið*, *The Wife's Lament*, and *Wulf and Eadwacer* doing in the Exeter Book? Some texts are "neutralized" by being placed in a Christian frame, however weak, but the elegies remain intransigent. She concludes, however, that these texts must have had a culturally appropriate interpretation that would neutralize them. Adapting Fred Robinson's theory of the appositive style, Znojemska contends that the secular pieces "played the role of a 'controlled contrast' to the Christian poems." She analyzes *The Seafarer* in some detail to demonstrate the two apposed views, and the outcome in favor of Christianity. For the more extreme end of the spectrum, she considers the purely heroic aspects of the two *Frauenlieder*, critiquing several attempts to Christianize the poems and arguing for her theory of a "controlled contrast" (though the theory is never explained in detail). In an appendix the author provides texts and translations into English of *The Seafarer*, *The Wife's Lament*, and *Wulf and Eadwacer*.

Also concerned with elegies, specifically with a reconsideration of their generic category, is Klaus von See's "Das Phantom einer altgermanischen Elegien-dichtung: Kritische Bemerkungen zu Daniel Sävborg, 'Sorg och elegi I Eddans hjälte-diktning'" (*Skandinavistik* 28 [1998]: 87–100; the Sävborg article is in *Stockholm Stud. in the History of Literature* 36 [1997]). Using his own background in Norse and Old High German, von See reconsiders the themes, lexicon and structures of the Old English elegies. He concludes that more work is necessary to extend Sävborg's arguments.

Finally, Peter Orton examines the scribe's role in the production of poetic texts, with a study of the handful of poems which survive in more than one copy. His *Transmission of Old English Poetry* (Westfield Publications in Medieval and Renaissance Studies 12; Turnhout: Brepols) engages in a very detailed and comprehensive study which can only be sketched here. About 679 lines from twenty poems exist in multiple copies; they have been studied in detail only by Kenneth Sisam and Katherine O'Brien O'Keefe. Orton examines "the kinds of influence to which Old English verse was subject during its transmission" and contends that scribes made mistakes, sometimes did not understand the texts they were copying, and that good readings generally are earlier than bad ones. The first section of the book, in six chapters, examines changes resulting from transmission, focusing on the language of the scribe as opposed to that of the text, the pathology of copying, the role of the scribe as editor, the confused scribe, the ambitious scribe, and the scribe as poetaster. The second section considers what faithful transmission reveals, including chapters on the fixity of linguistic forms and on the meticulous copyist. In chapter one Orton considers, very briefly, the disjunction that can occur between the language of the scribe and that of the text, though surprisingly without reference to David Megginson's Toronto thesis on the topic. Mechanical errors in copying are the focus of the next chapter, and Orton establishes a useful taxonomy for considering these copying features, especially the more difficult cases. The ways in which the scribe edited and repaired their text during the copying are Orton's concern in the third chapter; the fourth addresses the same issue from the point of view of scribal confusion, which results in unnecessary repairs, misunderstandings of syntax or meaning, or the rejection of unfamiliar words. The fifth chapter, on the ambitious scribe, looks at modifications made when Orton feels that the scribe did not find the text opaque but knew or could guess the meaning of a word that was nonetheless replaced, transposed, or in some way substituted. Interpolations of words or phrases are analyzed in chapter six, though its title "The Scribe as Poetaster" seems misleading. Chapter seven looks at cases in which scribes engaged in the faithful transmission of linguistic forms, and chapter eight considers cases in which scribes reproduced not just words but letter forms, accent marks, abbreviations, capitalization and punctuation, and other format elements from the exemplar. The detailed analyses in these chapters will help those who edit or study the individual poems under consideration, since Orton is careful and judicious in his consideration. However,

a fundamental problem is that while many individually-considered specific analyses are provided here, the headings imply a kind of certainty and a faith in the efficacy of this approach, and the approach is very old-fashioned indeed. In the concluding chapter Orton rules out oral transmission as the explanation for variants between the two versions of *Soul and Body* and for *Solomon and Saturn*. Cases of very close copying, particularly the B and C copies of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, are also identified, and poetic vocabulary clearly caused confusion on a number of occasions. Rarely did scribes who attempted repairs make sense, perhaps only in *Brunanburh* lines 40–44, and language or poetic syntax could cause major misunderstandings. When scribes added words or lines to texts, they could be surprisingly adventurous and confident in their additions. Finally, Orton concludes that the possibility of oral transmission may be “a distraction in the study of OE poetry.” In the last few pages of the book he addresses O’Brien O’Keeffe’s argument, describing her points as “elusive” and suggesting that her thesis may not be based on “what can reasonably be surmised about the transmission of OE poetry.” Whatever the merits of O’Brien O’Keeffe’s thesis, it should have been addressed at the beginning, not the end, of a book on this subject (incidentally, the bibliography does not include Douglas Moffat’s swingeing response in *Speculum* to O’Brien O’Keeffe’s arguments). Orton’s nonetheless intriguing conclusion is that in the Anglo-Saxon period the copyist and the poet occupied quite distinct worlds, and that the embarrassingly bad efforts produced by scribes when they composed poetry suggests that by the end of the Anglo-Saxon period written poetry had become steadily weaker and prosier as it lost touch with the vigor that once sustained it, the oral tradition.

Meter and Prosody

The most important publication in this category is Kari Ellen Gade and R.D. Fulk, *A Bibliography of Germanic Alliterative Meters* (OEN Subsidia 28). The bibliography has six principal sections: Comparative Germanic Metrics, Old Norse, Old English (the longest segment), Middle English, Old Saxon and Old High German. Gade and Fulk have here compiled an extremely useful tool, and one whose utility is in no way affected by the quibbles which follow. It began as a bibliography for a graduate class in comparative Germanic meters and retains some traces of that origin, including translations of non-English titles, occasional annotations, and a division into detailed subsections which might be of more use to the stu-

dent than to the specialist. The subsections also give rise to an occasionally dizzying series of cross-references, and at times one wonders if the subsection is of any forensic use. Thus, Bliss, having appeared under “Descriptive Theories of Normal Verses, Analytic Systems, and Critiques of Them (Including Studies of *Beowulf*)” does not appear under “Hypermetrics” despite the relevant appendix and analysis in his 1962 book. Similarly, the chronological division under each heading can be vertiginous; the search for S.O. Andrew includes two cross-references and one book from 1940 under “Studies of Stress, of Verse Syntax, and of the Metrical Treatment of Particular Words and Word Classes” and two books from 1931 and 1948 under a different heading. No doubt the divisions are absolutely correct in the terms of this bibliographical arrangement, but it can be difficult to trace out one scholar’s contribution to the field as a whole. There are some inconsistencies in the indexing and while the compilers appear to have found the relevant dissertations from North America, few European theses appear (especially relevant to Old English metrics in recent years are those of Mark S. Griffith and Rachel Mines). These are, however, minor quibbles based on the Old English section. Among other services for the field, the compilers have established a detailed starting-point for research in Old Saxon and Old High German, both of which merit further attention.

Otherwise 2000 was a slow year for meter, given the amount of recent activity in the field, especially in comparative Germanic metrics. In a very brief article, Robert P. Stockwell elegantly elucidates “Incompatibilities among Theories of Anglo-Saxon Metrics” (*The Life of Language: Papers in Linguistics in Honor of William Bright*, ed. Jane H. Hill et al., Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 108 [Berlin and New York, 1998], 473–80). He provides the opening ten lines of *Beowulf* with scansion from Pope and Sievers, representatives of theories which keep time and which don’t, and his own “maximally trochaic” interpretation. He works through the standard difficulties and concludes that dactyls are to be counted as trochees, since the two weak stresses gather into a “metrically superordinate unit”; that unary heavy feet are also trochees in performance, however awkward the terminology; and that silent ictus at the onset explains light feet. He indicates the ways in which his “maximally trochaic” schema distorts maximally the trochee which underlies it. Most difficult is the inevitable violation of the four-position principle, differently solved by different metrists. Stockwell’s conclusion is that the decision between keeping time with Pope and keeping precise descriptions and hopeless rhythms with Siev-

ers is, ultimately, an aesthetic one. Perhaps it is, but only clear statements of the advantages and disadvantages of practical scansion—such as Stockwell himself provides—according to the two approaches will allow a more reasoned consideration of that decision.

Yasuyo Moriya is also interested in the OE poetic line, though not at all in its divisions into feet, in “The Line Boundary of Middle English Alliterative Meter Compared to that of Old English Alliterative Meter” (*NM* 101: 387–401). Moriya’s concern is the line end; the ME alliterative meter is slower towards the end of the line, and although it contains more syllables it features a more regular alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables. To examine this hypothesis, Moriya examines 1034 lines of Old English from six poems and 2020 lines of Middle English from nine poems, working up a system of scansion that compares the two and treats final *-e* coherently. OE meter has more varieties in line conclusions whereas ME meter “strongly prefers ending the line with a single offbeat.” The alliterative revival might better be called a renewal or a reflowering, since, beginning with the line boundary, a complete remodeling of the meter has taken place.

Elsewhere Moriya considers another aspect of alliterative meter, the stress patterns of compounds (“Compounds in Old English Alliterative Meter,” *International Christian University Language Research Bulletin* 13 [1998]: 59–69). Moriya examines five OE poems, about 700 lines in total, to consider whether the position of a compound in the half-line and the presence or absence of another stressed element in the half-line determines the stress or lack thereof on the second element of the compound. Not surprisingly, Moriya concludes that these features are relevant (though Type C verses appear to be scanned as Type A in one set of examples). A similar hierarchy of stress occurs in noun-genitive noun sequences. Reviewing the compound stress rule as elucidated by Russom and Hutcheson, Moriya demonstrates its workings in a dozen or so lines from *Beowulf*.

Yookang Kim uses modern phonological theory to analyze prosodic units as points of reference in sound change in order to reconsider some longstanding problems in historical linguistics. “Prosody and prosodically motivated processes from Germanic to Middle English” (Diss. U of Wisconsin-Madison; *DAI* 61A: 3146) argues that phonological phenomena can be accounted for through the interaction of prosodic domains with morphological operations in the lexicon. Kim proposes that a bimoraic trochee plays a role at

all stages of linguistic development in West Germanic, Gothic, Old English and Middle English. Also interested in the mora is Seiichi Suzuki, whose “Resolution and mora counting in Old English” appeared in *Amer. Jnl of Germanic Ling. & Literatures* 7 (1995): 1–28. Suzuki notes that Kaluza’s Law restricts the operation of resolution by determining that the second syllable must be either a short vocalic ending originated from a pre-OE short vowel or a long vocalic ending originated from a pre-OE long vowel. Suzuki is concerned with the mora count of this unstressed syllable which stands after the short stressed counterpart. Using Cable’s set of rules for resolution, Sievers type A2a (/ \ / x), and examples from *Beowulf*, Suzuki concludes that “being bimoric has been identified as a minimal phonological weight of a lexical word form.” Using geminates, Suzuki further concludes that “two morae constitute the maximum value of a syllable in Old English.” The implications are both metrical (the markedly low frequency of resolution in the second life of the b-verse and the overall higher frequency of resolution in the first lift bear out Suzuki’s argument), and phonological, since the restriction on moric value results from vowel shortening, high vowel deletion, and denuclearization—all sound changes that affect unstressed syllabic segments in pre-OE. Suzuki classifies all these sound changes as the reduction of an unstressed mora, which seems a rather neat solution.

Intertextuality

Jonathan Wilcox brings us a new and perhaps unexpected (for those who did not attend the Kalamazoo sessions in 1997) approach to Old English texts with the collection of essays *Humour in Anglo-Saxon Literature* (Cambridge: Brewer). Most of the essays will be analyzed in later sections, but a few range across more than one text. Wilcox points out in his introduction that while laughter has been accorded some attention by Old English scholars, humor, its obvious corollary, has been overlooked. He touches briefly on Freud, Bakhtin, sociological and anthropological approaches to considering humor, and argues that Anglo-Saxon humor was not as grim and sardonic as it is usually painted, but had real moments of genuinely relaxed laughter. On the other hand, since these moments occur largely in the riddles of the Exeter Book or the passions of saints, both freighted by their monastic surroundings, Wilcox admits that there is a paradoxical uncertainty in studying Anglo-Saxon humor. On yet another hand, the paradigm according to which the Anglo-Saxons governed their social lives needs clearer understanding, and the study of humor—the breaking of that paradigm as the incon-

gruity that points up the congruity—provides one way of revisiting our preconceptions.

In "'Grim Wordplay': Folly and Wisdom in Anglo-Saxon Humor" (33–48), T.A. Shippey reviews mistaken modern notions about various Anglo-Saxon moments as "charged with irony," follows and refines Hugh Magennis' taxonomy of laughter in OE poetry, and reviews the corpus with the preliminary theory that the laugh in OE is usually on those who laugh. Humor has therefore a sardonic quality, exemplified in the miserable efforts of the Assyrian officers to awaken Holofernes in *Judith* or in the false expectations of the watchman in the *Finnsburg Fragment*, incrementally corrected by Hnæf, who well perceives moonlight on weapons. This nexus of folly corrected by wisdom is found particularly in the proverbial literature, and Shippey considers disjunctures between appearance and reality in several of the *Durham Proverbs*. More intriguing, perhaps, are cases in which the proverb seems plain, even foolish, on the surface but subtle underneath. The famous enigma at the end of *Wulf and Eadwacer* may be a cynical proverb of this kind, a bitter reflection on how the never-joined relationship was so wholly sundered. Shippey also finds a "two-level response" in the opening stanza of *Deor*, suggesting that the "supple sinew-bonds" restraining Weland were so supple that they did not exist. Similarly, he proposes, Byrhtnoth's response to the Viking spokesman is his attempt to joke grimly back about the insolence of his proposal. Finally, Bede obliquely, sardonically, uses the subjunctive in his *Death-Song* to suggest that no one can be fully wise and to allow for a mordant smile at death. Whereas Ragnar Loðbrok in his death-scene can engage in triumphant laughter as he collapses, Bede can point out his own ignorance as to what is coming next, contemplate his lack of wisdom, and die with a slight, albeit Christian, smirk on his face. The contextual argument here is less persuasive than others in the article; the best section remains the discussion of five "Wellerisms" (from Dickens) in the *Durham Proverbs*, including *Wide ne biþ wel, cwæþ se þe gehyrde on helle hrīman* "Things are bad all over, said the man who heard screaming in hell."

Holding pride of place as the last piece in Wilcox's book is, fittingly, Hugh Magennis's "A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to Heaven: Humorous Incongruity in Old English Saints' Lives" (137–57). This is an intelligent and important paper. Passing briefly over incongruity theories and the ingenious use of incongruity in various poetic texts, Magennis briefly focuses on the amusing incident in which the princess advises her father, in a letter, that she wishes to

marry the shipwrecked man, Apollonius. The effect of comedy depends on the interleaving levels of ignorance and enlightenment of the characters. The incongruity involved in saints' lives, however, involves a more complex analysis of joyful or wondrous incongruity such as the meek inheriting the earth, or the wondrous incongruity—which to the modern reader might appear humorous—of St Edmund's head calling out its location to the local people. The translator of the *Legend of St Mary of Egypt* in no way emphasizes the humorous potential of the chase across the desert or the hours during which the two exhausted old people ask each other for blessing. Similarly, the Andrew of the poem *Andreas* is a dignified and ideal hero, not at all reluctant or uncertain. The poem in no way exploits the dramatic irony of having Christ as captain of the ship, and it omits any mention of the miserable nausea of the cohort. Despite the general tendency in OE adaptations to remove individualizing details and unsettling episodes in which the saint is less than heroic, some texts do have fallible, more human, protagonists. Even *Andreas* is not completely sanitized and flattened, in that the poem does highlight the ridiculous scene of eucharistic parody, and Andrew does suffer a spiritual crisis in his cell, which leads to the loss of his dignity. Guthlac in *Guthlac A* experiences despair, and Margaret (save in one version) briefly fears the dragon. Cynewulf, however, follows standard Old English practice in that Juliana never suffers any confusion when the devil tempts her. Magennis's main focus, however, is on the anonymous OE version of the *Legend of the Seven Sleepers*, which neither recasts nor flattens its source, unlike the version by Ælfric of the same material. The anonymous version focuses on the plot, and delights in its human issues, in the comic effects of the youths' belief that they have slept for one night only. The focus of the humor is the perplexed youth Malchus, and Magennis details his bemusement at the changes in Antioch and the comic, even near-tragic, results of his attempts to buy bread in the marketplace with ancient coins. Magennis concludes that at least this Old English adaptor chose not to idealize the saints and flatten out the details in the story, and instead revealed in the incongruity and delight in the working of grace. Here, at least, is one situation which Wilcox's theory applies—not all extant Anglo-Saxon humor is sardonic. Just most of it.

O.G. Chupryna's "*Temporum opinio* v drevnmen iazyke i soznanii" or "*Temporum opinio* in Ancient Language and Consciousness" (summarized for me by Vladimir Tumanov, to whom I am grateful) (*Voprosy Iazykoznanii* 5 [1999]: 87–100) adopts the Sa-

pir-Whorf hypothesis that the cultural and environmental experience of a given group colors the connotations of certain words, and attempts to use the language of that group—in this case the Anglo-Saxons—as a gauge for establishing psychology. Chupryna reviews ancient or mythological thinking about the perception of time, moving onwards to suggest that in most Germanic languages most temporal words have to do with separation, joining/rotation/revolution, change, growth and width. As OE, for example, moves into the written realm these original nominal characteristics disappear, and categorical words generate images linked to the concept behind the word. Anglo-Saxon England had three paradigms: the heroic, the popular-Christian and the Latin-Christian. In the heroic paradigm the word *niht* connects to evil and danger having to do with hostile military forces, but in Bede's usage, the popular-Christian paradigm, night is a time of righteous prayer, visits from saints, and instructions from God. Chupryna briefly discusses two specific words with reference to *Beowulf*: the difficult OE word *sæl* 'time', whose link to Indo-European is hard to establish but which occurs in a stable context of battle/revenge and feast. *On geardagum* must have meant more in *Beowulf* than merely "the past," having presumably to do with the germ of the heroes' fates. In *Elene*, by contrast, (*on*) *geardagum* refers to the past as the time when Christ lived, shifting from the heroic paradigm to the popular-Christian paradigm. A similar shift occurs with *fruma*. It may be that Chupryna perceives a chronological sequence where one does not exist, but otherwise she makes an interesting, if not entirely original, point about the Anglo-Saxon lexicon.

A second and very welcome collection of essays in this category is the Variorum Collected Studies of Milton McC. Gatch, *Eschatology and Christian Nurture: Themes in Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Religious Life* (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum). The thirteen papers in this collection are all major pieces which have been previously reviewed; it is a joy to have them collected in one place so that we can learn from Gatch's ruminations on Christian education, Anglo-Saxon spirituality, the Harrowing of Hell in devotional literature, the role of the Office in late Anglo-Saxon monasticism, the seldom-studied *Vision of Leofric*, and various themes and contemporary responses to Anglo-Saxon homilies in particular and in general. Gatch's brief introduction succeeds in making two additional and supernal points: the need further to reevaluate the importance of Gregory the Great, and the insufficiently-analyzed focus of the early Church on Resurrection rather than immortality, so that ref-

erences to the soul are largely moral and hortatory (or parenetic) even into later medieval eschatology.

A third, explicitly intertextual, collection in 2000 is the special issue of *Philological Quarterly* edited by John M. Hill on "Anthropological Approaches to Old English Literature" (PQ 78, Winter 1999). The collection includes eight papers and an introductory essay; reviewed here are the introduction by Hill (1-14) and Peter R. Richardson's "Making Thanes: Literature, Rhetoric and State Formation in Anglo-Saxon England" (215-232). Hill's introduction is a fine preliminary distinction between the work of the social historian and the work of the anthropologist, delineating the profound differences between the two approaches. Anthropological studies treat people as living non-linear lives, involved in personal relationships and kinship connections. In small-group identity politics, individuals establish their own sense of personal honor and pursue options which will secure their social, political and cultural circumstances. Rather than focusing on the developing state, the ethnographic historian examines the ways in which the past is embedded in the present, time is structural rather than linear, change is not necessarily desired, and the "how" of a situation is more important than the "why." For the anthropologically-sensitive reader, the historical, literary, or cultural moment is always set in its specific context. The idea is not original, and in this construction the anthropological approach seems likely to find every individual incident and detail worthy of reporting, so that any opportunity for synthesis or for a broader vision is lost. Nonetheless, as Hill's introductions to the individual papers demonstrate, much is to be gained in the explication of detail; for example, he extends Stephen Glasse's argument to suggest matrilineal kinship possibilities that might explain *Beowulf*'s care in providing Wiglaf with the Wægmunding properties. Richardson's essay, Hill proposes, looks forward to the ways in which a nation-state develops, and argues that Anglo-Saxon poems 'script' that development, proposing that audiences are led to identify with the changing structures of centralized lordship, kingship, and state formation. In his paper, Richardson suggests that the connection between state formation and Anglo-Saxon imaginative literature merits investigation for the ways it scripted a transition for the audience, at a level "beneath the horizon of consciousness," from tribe to state. He begins by observing that Anglo-Saxon literature is notably prescriptive or hortatory. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* itself has been argued to be propaganda, and the surviving royal genealogies legitimize rule. More specifically, in the *Cynewulf* and *Cyneheard*

episode, the notion that lordship supplants kinship is an unsubtle conclusion; rather, the complexity of the syntax in the relevant passages "shows a saga-like attention to equipoise and fine calibration." Alfred's law-code similarly finds it necessary to limit feud and strengthen lordship, but also to recognize the kinship rights to self-help. Later kings, Richardson argues, attempted to circumscribe and control kinship rights by establishing other feud structures. Kinship structures are also invoked by Wulfstan to model his audience's political and religious obligations. In the *Battle of Maldon*, the kin group aligns with a nascent patriotism. Most importantly, the tension between kinship and kingship in *Beowulf* is complex, so that Wiglaf's throne-worthiness is complicated by his sword's history, and *Beowulf* comments upon the inherent possibility of fratricide when he notes that he has never killed a kinsman. Hrethel, unable to use the conventions of blood-feud, turns the aggression inward and dies. Bringing kinship under control had its corollary in the growth and status of thaneship. The audience of *The Dream of the Rood* is scripted into thaneship by the cross, the protagonist of the poem; the manipulation of narrative perspective in such poems as *Beowulf* allows the thanes to view the action and to function as a dramatic audience within the poem. Wiglaf is a pivotal figure in Richardson's reading of the poem, the character who most invites identification from the audience, and sharply distinguishes himself from his peers and kin. While the idea that this 'scripting of thaneship' took root in the audience beneath the horizon of consciousness seems difficult to prove, it does seem plausible that thaneship was necessarily promoted as an alternative to kinship in the early nation-state, and that the transition between the two would be reflected, if perhaps not initiated, in the surviving literature.

The nexus between literacy, nationhood and the nature of duty is the concern of Donna Schlosser in "Cynewulf the Poet, Alfred the King, and the Nature of Anglo-Saxon Duty" (*Comitatus* 31: 15-37). Schlosser uses Benedict Anderson's notion of community and nation to propose that when Alfred uses the vernacular in the prefatory letter to the *Cura Pastoralis*, he is creating the bond of a shared consciousness. In addition, he does so with a secular sense of time, in the "meanwhile" that is more than the perception of time as a prefiguring of sacred moments, and becomes the earthly opportunity of time in which to construct a community. Going farther than most commentators on this passage, Schlosser suggests that the king is indirectly chastising his educators with insufficient learning on their part, and ordering them now to

learn and to teach what they learned insufficiently in their youth. He even employs the intellectuals of the church to establish a new and secular educated citizenry, to build his vision of the present. Cynewulf's codas also demonstrate a sense of the shared experience of the journey towards heaven, with Cynewulf himself as "a lonely penitent who has waited too long before trying to find his way home to heaven," and concerned that his audience not make the same mistake. His codas move from meditation to revelation or divine insight so that he crafts his own wisdom. In apocalyptic terms, though Schlosser does not use them, life is the preparation of the soul at all times for its return journey to heaven, and moments of revelation come at any time. For King Alfred, she proposes, the project is more complex, since as king his concern is principally with life on earth. He challenges his audience, the bishops, to teach and to train, and he shows his own example in his translations. While both Cynewulf and Alfred note the transitoriness of life on earth, Alfred's project is to establish and develop an earthly community. He depicts an English heritage worth recovering, and proposes a project of renewal, education as an active and national endeavor. Cynewulf privileges the spoken word as the way to revelation, but Alfred builds on learning, the written word. Moving far from her text, Schlosser proposes that Alfred even envisages property ownership, and for the citizens of his proposed nation-state to become citizens of the world linked by education but also by a shared notion of the transience of earthly life.

D. Dias notes that pilgrims appear so frequently in medieval literary texts that their presence and significance can be overlooked. Pilgrimage, she suggests in "Pilgrims were they all? Aspects of pilgrimage and their influence on Old and Middle English literature" (Diss. Nottingham 1998; *Index to Theses* 49: 1206), is not just a given fact of medieval life, a pious exercise. The product of both syncretism and heated debate, pilgrimage was not a monolithic concept but a mosaic of ideas. The thesis charts the development of Christian pilgrimage through the Bible, the writings of the Fathers, the influences of classical pagan religious practice, the impulses of popular devotion, and the resulting incorporation of the multiple meanings of pilgrimage into the spirituality and literature of the Anglo-Saxons.

Sex and Gender

Mark Atherton provides a compendious title for a wide-ranging article in "A Place for Mercy: Some Al-

legorical Readings of 'The Woman Taken in Adultery' from the Early Middle Ages (with Particular Reference to Bede, the *Heliand* and the Exeter Book)" in *Ciphers in the Sand: Interpretations of the Woman Taken in Adultery* (John 7:53-8:11), ed. Larry J. Kreitzer and Deborah W. Rooke, Biblical Seminar 74 (Sheffield), 105-38. In the opening pages Atherton reviews Bede, the vernacular versions in Anglo-Saxon England, the equal treatment of women in property ownership after marriage, Germanic laws and punishments for adulterous women, and the ambiguous law in Æthelberht's code (c. 31) which seems to require the lover both to pay wergild and to obtain another wife for the wronged husband. The law might be financially ruinous, but it does not compare to the execution or torture of the woman, as found in Continental versions of the same material. Atherton settles down to focus first on Bede's Lenten homily on John 8:1-12, and notes that Bede is particularly interested in Christ's standing upright and stooping down, his writing with his finger in the sand, and his simple act of speaking "Let one who is without sin among you be the first to throw a stone at her." Bede analyzes Christ's concern with mercy and humility, exemplified in his gestures and their motivational significance. Atherton points out the parallel in Book 2 of the *HE*, the story of Augustine's oak and its sequel, in which it becomes clear that Augustine may have the light of God, but little humility. For the Lenten homily Bede creates two framing structures, the sacred place which is the Mount of Olives, and the time of daybreak at which the light of the world is made manifest. The mercy and consolation shown by Christ are doubly emphasized by Bede. Atherton turns abruptly to the Old Saxon *Heliand*, written after the forced Christianization of Saxony, at a time when Alcuin and possibly Hrabanus Maurus were espousing a policy of greater accommodation, even including the use of the vernacular, rather than the more oppressive Carolingian policies. The *Heliand*, a life of Christ written in verse, transforms the setting to Old Saxony and emphasizes both kingship and the *comitatus* relationship between lord and retainer. For the handling of John 8:1-12, the *Heliand* author used Bede's homily as a source, and possibly also the revision of Bede's homily by Alcuin. Alcuin's version, however, focuses on Christ's power and nobility; he does not stoop, never humbles himself, and encourages the audience of the Sermon to hang this light high in the halls. The ruling on the case takes place in one such hall, in the Temple itself, and it even appears to criticize Old Saxon law for its harshness on this question. Mercy is emphasized, and the Latin *condemnare* changes to Old Saxon *derian* 'to harm', so that it is

said that no one, including Christ, "harms" the woman rather than "condemns" her. Christ stands alone, powerful, firm, brightly-lit and speaking of illumination and wisdom. The first-person protagonist of *The Wife's Lament* may not be adulterous but she is certainly accursed. Atherton contrasts her situation—with its darkness and misery, its pre-Christian religious site, its focus on feelings and emotion—to that in Bede. If this lament is answered by the optimism and reconciliation of *The Husband's Message*, then Atherton proposes that an allegorical interpretation of the story is possible. "The wife of the biblical story and of the two poems represents, typologically, benighted humanity" (131) and she awaits the remission, the written mercy and invitation of the Lord. The riddling text of *The Husband's Message* may invoke the Gospel; rather than a letter from a husband, it could be the divine "good news." The conclusion may cast light on ciphers in the sand, but these are shifting sands indeed. Given Atherton's earlier argument about the power and independence of Anglo-Saxon women, why should one now be cowering in a cave waiting for a letter from her God/husband to pull her out? But Atherton is to be commended for taking one brief Latin exposition from a sermon, one discussion in an Old Saxon poem, and one set of circumstances from a notoriously difficult Old English poem, and fashioning a coherent and merciful approach to adulterous women in Anglo-Saxon England.

Another original article on Anglo-Saxon women is Paul Beekman Taylor's "Figures of Female Cover on Medieval Germanic Landscapes" (in *Essays on Old, Middle, Modern English*, ed. Gruber, 337-59). Starting with the twin premises that God separated earth (masculine) and water (feminine) and that the Anglo-Saxons loved puns, Taylor notes the homonymy of *maria*, genitive plural of sea and the Virgin Mother. He ranges through scholastic interpretations of the Creation, grammatical and natural gender, onomastic etymologies, and Germanic sensitivities to women as life-giving sexual forces. Taylor applies these notions, convincingly, to Gunnar's fall when his horse stumbles, and he lands on the hill with its soft grass (reminding him of Hallgerðr's hair), such that he experiences a sexual reawakening which causes him to return home to his wife. In *Beowulf* and *Njal's Saga*, Taylor points out that women mediate change, and are both life-giving and life-destroying. Medieval English and Norse texts exploit name-elements to reflect both the protective and magical sides of women. Thus *burh* and its cognates *Bjarga* and *beorgan* designates a female covering force both in the *Bjarg-rúnar* 'help-runes' and in *Beowulf*'s donning a byrnie *ban-*

cofan beorgan 'to protect his body' (1445). Women, in Taylor's construction, "bring a text of power with their names and person" and use that power to bear children, provide life-force for artifacts, and protect men's political and social power (354). Some elements of Taylor's argument are not only unconvincing but anachronistic (Tacitus appears on several occasions as an authority on Germanic attitudes to women); other parts of it, as this brief summary may demonstrate, present women as filled with force solely for the benefit of their menfolk, an assumption which may be offensive to contemporary sensibilities and does violence to grammatical gender and to the Anglo-Saxon depiction of women in surviving texts.

Post-Conquest (and later) Old English

The essays in Mary Swan and Elaine M. Treharne's *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP) reflect the continuing growth of studies in English after the Conquest. The ten papers in the volume will be considered under appropriate headings later in this volume; in the introduction (1–10), Treharne and Swan review the surviving manuscripts of OE texts demonstrably written in the twelfth century (noting the importance of Neil Ker in this regard), and survey scholarship on these codices. They point out that scholars should focus on the monastic institutions rather than secular establishments, and that although scholarship on individual scriptoria has proven itself fruitful, not enough work has been done to establish useful generalizations about the copying of manuscripts in England from 1066–1200. These papers, they suggest, start to establish the groundwork for those generalizations.

Comparing the politics of orality in Old English and Black English in "Ah ain't heard whut de tex' wuz': The (Il)legitimate Textuality of Old English and Black English" (*Oral Tradition* 14/2 [1999]: 304–20), Michael Saenger compares and contrasts Bede's *Cædmon* with Zora Neale Hurston's John Pearson in her first novel *Jonah's Gourd Vine*, published in 1934. Saenger hopes to demonstrate the different purposes for which the two authors have placed poets in their narratives, who not only create texts of their own but also present them in a kind of performance. Both authors have preachers at the center of their texts, and Saenger notes other similarities: in their pre-enlightened states both *Cædmon* and John work with beasts, both have moments of silence before their divine gifts descend, both are described as producing many fine and unrecorded poems but in each case only one work survives, and both texts have a complex oral and written relation-

ship with the Bible. The detailed analysis of *Cædmon's Hymn* and of the sermon for Zion Hope Church is more enlightening. *Cædmon* creates a text which fits both itself and its author into a seamless social continuity without political overtones, whereas in order for John to deliver his sermon he must reject the legitimate future offered by his white father in favor of a future of African-American oratory with a profoundly political message. Both texts are about origins, but Hurston's dramatic narrative creates a humanity to reflect a black God the father, whereas *Cædmon* gives an orthodox and apolitical version. Hurston explicitly chooses to use Black English, and tries, however inadequate the effort must be, to create a sense of the true oral event. Bede uses Latin and literary language, erasing oral, pagan, and Germanic elements. On the other hand, there are stylistic similarities between the two texts, and both use oral epithets. Saenger perhaps over-emphasizes the parallel between John's bestial and lustful nature and *Cædmon's* bovine associations; he also elides John's sermons into the same order of poetic text as *Cædmon's* poems, a move that requires more argument even if his quotations from the sermon (which aligns to the left in the text and largely lacks punctuation) do have poetic flair. Saenger concludes that both authors establish legitimacy for their texts in similar ways, though Hurston's overtly political approach interests him more than does Bede's orthodoxy.

Finally, Margaret Gillian McGeachy defended a U of Toronto Ph.D. thesis entitled "Lonesome words: The vocal poetics of the Old English lament and the African-American blues song" (*DAI* 61A [1999]: 169). She argues that the voices of these two poetic traditions are remarkably similar in their emotive expression of personal and social struggle, and juxtaposes the texts of Old English laments against those of blues songs from the 1920s and 30s. The thesis examines the narrative stance of the first-person speaker, the use of formulas, themes of exile and imprisonment leading to personal psychological struggle, and the reception of texts by their audiences.

M.J.T.

Works Not Seen

Berthoin-Mathieu, Anne. "Le vol, la loi et la magie dans l'Angleterre anglo-saxonne." *Idéologies dans le Monde Anglo-Saxon* 9 (1997): 27–37.

Blockley, Mary E. "Axiomatic Implications of a Non-Occurring Heavy Verse in Old English." *Parergon* 18.1: 1–10.

Eshleman, Lori. "Weavers of Peace, Weavers of War." *Peace and Negotiation: Strategies for Coexistence in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. Ed. Diane Wolfthal. Arizona Stud. in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance 4. Turnhout. 15–37.

Felling, Shiraz. "The Oral Poet as 'News Reporter': Taking Another Look at the Anglo-Saxon Scop." *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Symposium about Language and Society–Austin (SALSA VII)*. Ed. Nisha Merchant Goss et al. Texas Ling. Forum 43. Austin, TX. 41–55.

Meaney, Audrey L. "The Hunted and the Hunters: British Mammals in Old English Poetry." *ASSAH* 11: 95–105.

b. Individual Poems

Andreas

In "Old English *unnan* in *Andreas*, Line 298b" (*N&Q* 47: 409–11), Alfred Bammesberger dusts off a previously proposed interpretation of the above-mentioned verb in *Andreas* 297–98. Several editors and translators after Klaeber proposed strained and unattested meanings for the verb *unnan*. When Andrew approaches the ship that will take him to Mermedonia, he is told that he may board "when ye have made your payment, the appointed sum, as the ship-warders, the men on the boat, make agreement with you" (R.K. Gordon's translation). Bammesberger looks closely at the grammar of the passage and makes a convincing case for translating the passage as "'they will grant you [to go] over the wave-planks,' and this means 'they will show you on board.' There is no need to assign a special meaning to *unnan* in this *Andreas* passage" (411).

Ivan Herbison seeks to redress what he identifies as the traditional view of *Andreas* as a "naïve and incompetent exercise in *Germanisierung*" (211) in "Generic Adaptation in *Andreas*" (*Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 181–211). At the heart of this view "has been the perception of incongruity between the style and subject matter of the poem" and a desire to read it as Christian epic (181). Following a brief overview of critical assessment of the poem's genre, he notes that the only challenge to such a reading has come from those who apply allegorical and typological modes of interpretation to the work (183). Its opening lines have often been read as a clumsy attempt to represent the apostles as heroic warriors. But if it is freed, he argues, from the "legacy of the idea of Christian epic, the opening lines can be seen as an attempt to represent the protagonist as a

miles Christi" (186). The rest of Herbison's article addresses "the nature of representation in *Andreas* and the related issues of generic adaptation," i.e. the way in which the poet responded to his narrative source. Herbison examines the putative source's structure, themes, and genre in some detail, and concludes that whereas the *Praxeis* represented Andrew as a developing figure, *Andreas* gives us a much more static character in its attempt to rewrite the source "to accommodate a specifically hagiographical perspective" (191). The poet, then, never intended to create a Christian epic, but a work of hagiography. "Even if the poem that results is not entirely successful, it nevertheless demonstrates a consistent exploitation of the full resources of the inherited poetic tradition in the representation of Andrew as a *miles Christi*, and a consciousness of the difficulties posed by the inherited narrative" (211).

Battle of Maldon

In "Sorrowful Tribute in *Armes Prydein* and *The Battle of Maldon*" (*N&Q* 47: 11–14), Andrew Breeze looks at a medieval Welsh poem that shares the motif of "sorrowful tribute" with *The Battle of Maldon*. Breeze argues that the analogous poem, the *Armes Prydein*, can be precisely dated to the last few months of 940 (12). More importantly for students of *The Battle of Maldon*, he shows how "a comparative reading of *Maldon* and *Armes Prydein* sharpens our focus on the poetry of war in tenth-century Britain" (14). The topic of "spears for tribute" appears in both poems, and Breeze demonstrates the different ways it is worked out in both poems: "*Maldon* was written to boost English morale or to commemorate the Essex fallen or both. *Armes Prydein* looks to the future, not the past. It is political propaganda couched as prophecy" (13).

Carole Hough re-examines the evidence for a long-accepted emendation in line 191 ("*The Battle of Maldon* Line 191b," *ANQ* 13.3: 3–8), concludes that it is based on a certain degree of special pleading, and offers an alternative reading which also helps resolve a disputed passage earlier in the poem. Hough explains that frequent letter omission was a characteristic flaw in the work of John Elphinston, the deputy keeper of the Cottonian library thought to have been the copyist who transcribed the poem from its now-lost manuscript. In 1985 the actual copyist was identified as David Casley (Elphinston's successor). Such errors are not found in Casley's other transcriptions, which left scholars to explain how he could have made so many in this one; "the supposed association with Elphin-

ston may have led editors of the poem too readily to invoke this solution in the case of problematic readings. It is therefore worth considering whether any of the apparent errors may more plausibly be accounted for in other ways" (4). None of the other instances in which a letter has apparently been left out are at all similar in kind to the line in question (*and his broðru mid him begen ær[n]don*). Moreover, Hough demonstrates that the meaning produced by the emendation does not make good sense: *ærnan* usually means "to gallop" but such a meaning seems unlikely here given the fact, previously pointed out by Scragg, that Godric has already taken the only available horse. But while Casley was not given to omitting letters in his transcriptions, his work does show frequent misreadings of Anglo-Saxon characters (5–6). Hough argues convincingly that Casley may well have written <ð> for <ð> in this line, writing *ærdon* for *ærðon* 'before, previously'. This new reading also sheds some light on an earlier crux, for it clarifies that *Oddan bearn* in l. 185 must be taken as a plural subject and a reference to Godric's brothers Godwine and Godwig, exclusive of Godric.

John D. Niles gives a wonderfully contextualized reading of Byrhtnoth's exultant laughter in "Byrhtnoth's Laughter and the Poetics of Gesture" (*Humour in Anglo-Saxon Literature*, ed. Wilcox, 11–32). He prefaces his discussion of this one moment in the poem with a brief foray into cognitive anthropology, touching on the question of the existence of a universal human nature and considering how feasible it is for us today to tell how "the Anglo-Saxons experienced laughter, grief, impatience, anger, jealousy, lust, regret, and any of a number of other emotions as we do, or as we imagine that people of several generations ago did" (13). Niles does not assume that a universal human nature exists, but he does believe that the Anglo-Saxons laughed as much as anyone else: "their palette of emotional responses to the stimuli of life was probably analogous to ours without being identical to it. To the extent that laughter is a social construction and a construable gesture rather than an upwelling of biology, their laughter, considered as a sign, is bound to have had different meanings from ours, for their society itself was different in countless ways" (16). Niles offers a close reading of the moment in the poem where Byrhtnoth, wounded but victorious in his initial encounters with the Vikings, laughs out loud (146b–148). What does this laughter mean, and how are we to respond to it? It is not, of course, an expression of humor: Byrhtnoth's men have not been cracking jokes, and he himself has just been wounded, so he has no apparent reason to be jolly. Rather,

Niles shows, Byrhtnoth's laughter "serves as one of many instances in Old English poetry of the language of things and gestures" (21). By this Niles means "the tendency for abstract ideas to be expressed in terms of concrete images, material objects, and bodily displays, in a system of signs that is supple enough to encompass a wide range of human experience" (21). In the course of his discussion, Niles reads this passage "in the context of archaic narratives of a comparable type" (17), drawing in examples from other Old English prose and poetry, as well as Old Norse/Icelandic saga. Along the way, he questions whether it is possible "to read the language of things and gestures in early English poetry with the confidence of native speakers" (26), but concludes that even if we fall short of the mark, the attempt can be instructive and should be made. Most images of laughter in Old English literature, says Niles, are of the sardonic type (28); but there is more to Byrhtnoth's laughter "than defiance, scorn, and the hero's self-marking as a hero" (28). Byrhtnoth's quick laughter is a sign of his short-sighted exultation at having bested a Viking opponent; it is a sudden outburst of *ofermod*, and as such "sums up the spirit of *Maldon* in a single image" (32). Most significantly, Niles concludes, "His laughter is a gesture that expresses what the nature of heroism is, in the eyes of ordinary humanity: *it is what both attracts and repels us when a person is resolute in pursuit of a cause that is noble, even if hopeless or misguided*" (32; Niles' italics).

As part of the special edition of *PQ* dedicated to anthropological approaches to OE literature, Craig Davis examines "Cultural Historicity in *The Battle of Maldon*" (*PQ* 78 [1999]: 151–69). Each human culture, as anthropologists remind us, constructs its history to conform to predetermined plot structures that enable meaning to be extracted from the sometimes-chaotic events of the past. "Different cultures, different historicities," as Marshall Sahlins formulates it (151). The *Maldon* poet, however, employed not one but two narrative models of history in commemorating the battle in which Byrhtnoth lost his life. The first is the model of Christian salvation history from creation to the triumph of the kingdom of heaven, a history that is mapped onto a narrative of individual salvation. The second is the Germanic myth of human heroes and gods fighting against monstrous cosmic forces only to succumb in the end. The *Maldon* poet superimposes the two radically different metanarratives, but in doing so removes any explicit mention of pagan heroes so that only the Germanic plot pattern of conflict and defeat remains. The Christian narrative of history is thrown into relief at Byrhtnoth's prayer

before he dies. In discussing Byrhtnoth's *ofermod*, Davis recuperates some positive shades of meaning by arguing that "[t]he poet roughly conflates noble courage and violent pride" (161) to give the word cultural ambivalence in the context of the poem. The article closes by noting the mutability of historical plot structures, a process that can be witnessed in the Maldon-poet's skillful manipulation of the inherited tradition. [reviewed by Dan Donoghue]

Death of Edward

E. G. Stanley discusses Old English kennings for the sea in two late poems, *The Seasons for Fasting* and *The Death of Edward* ("Old English Poetic Vocabulary: 'The formal word precise but not pedantic,'" *Essays on Old, Middle, Modern English*, ed. Gruber, 177-200). His purpose is not to show how inadequate the skills of the late Old English poets were, but rather to point up the analytical insufficiencies of some of their later critics (178). In the process, he encounters "the underlying problem of how, in a literature as distant as that of the Anglo-Saxons, we are to evaluate excellence or inferiority ... I am old-fashioned enough to believe that that exercise in value-judgement is neither too bourgeois nor too unacademical for serious, literary scholarship of the late twentieth century, but is an ineluctable concomitant of all reading of literature, yet the basis of such judgment may be hard to establish" (178). Stanley's starting point is the view expressed by Sisam in an assessment of *The Seasons for Fasting* that "[a]lliterative verse is not a good medium for precise expression" (175). He registers discomfort with some modern critics' tendency to detect strong personal feelings (or the lack thereof) in Old English prose or verse, and cautions against "experiential" readings of Old English poetry (189). "We have no way of judging the validity of our assertion when we assert that an Anglo-Saxon poet felt sympathy with something experienced or that he had some natural personal feeling. All we can tell is whether it seems to us modern readers that an Old English poet has used words in context precisely and effectively; and by 'effectively' we mean that the effect on us is that Old English verse still exerts an effect on our literary sensibility across the gulf of time that separates us from the poet and his depicted reality" (191).

Dream of the Rood

Robert Crawford's translation of *The Dream of the Rood* ("The Vision of the Cross," *Stand* n.s. 2.2: 143-46) is printed with no introduction or indication of his source edition, but judging from his rendition of

line 9b (see Wheelock, below), odds are it was Pope or Dickens-Ross, both of which emend *engel dryhtnes* to make it a plural subject: "and crowds of angels / All through the universe viewed it with awe" (143). This line and many others show how free and interpretive the translation is. For example, Crawford compresses and alters 20b-21a (*Eall ic wæs mid sorgum gedrefed. / Forht ic wæs for þære sægran gesyhðe*) into "Writhing, / I dreaded my dream." An interesting and, one assumes, intentionally provocative rendering of *Frean mancynnes* (33b) is Crawford's "Man of mankind." Translations invite, nay, demand nit-picking criticism on the part of those who are familiar with the original and have a forum in which to do so. Out of sympathy and respect for Crawford's undertaking, I shall pick no more nits here. This is a sensitive, interpretive translation whose author is clearly moved by the original poet's art and message.

Éamonn Ó Carragáin's "The Annunciation of the Lord and His Passion: a Liturgical Topos from St Peter's on the Vatican in *The Dream of the Rood*, Thomas Cranmer and John Donne" (*Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 339-81) is a characteristically learned *tour de force* of the liturgical kind. In an exhaustively wide-ranging examination of liturgical sources underlying *The Dream of the Rood*, Ó Carragáin traces the development of a liturgical topos linking the celebration of Christ's incarnation and his Passion. Ó Carragáin begins with the passage in the poem which calls attention to the honoring of Mary (ll. 90-94). From here he establishes the importance of Marian associations in the poem, and the way the poet resolves them: "To have Mary stand by Christ's Cross would conflict with the central concept of *The Dream of the Rood*: to retell the Crucifixion from the Cross's point of view, and, from the moment Christ appears in the poem (33b), to have the Cross play a role reminiscent of that of Mary at the Annunciation. The poet does not describe Mary standing by the Cross, because he identifies Mary with the Cross in a far more intimate manner" (344). Moreover, "This poet, uniquely, grasped that the incarnation and Passion, both, required the cooperation of creatures: and thus that there was a similarity between the dilemma of Mary at the incarnation and that of the Cross at the Passion" (344). In what follows, Ó Carragáin explores the implications of the new feast of the Annunciation of the Lord (*Adnuntiatio Domini*) instituted in Rome in the late seventh century. As he notes, the date of this new feast was 25 March. "This date almost always fell during Lent, and often in Holy Week, and this posed a liturgical problem: how could the joy of Christ's incarna-

tion be celebrated during the penitential season that prepared for his Passion?" (347). The answer was a liturgical innovation composed by the monks of St Martin's, the Vatican Mass for 25 March. Building on an ancient antiphon, "the Vatican prayer explored the idea that Christ's birth, death and resurrection provided a pattern in which mankind could share" (350). This Mass may or may not have been written by John the Archcantor, whom Bede tells us was in charge of the liturgy of St Peter's in the late seventh century. Abbot John, of course, accompanied Benedict Biscop and Ceolfrid on their journey to Northumbria. "It cannot be coincidence that there, perhaps two generations after John's visit to Northumbria, we find a vernacular poem which dramatizes Christ's Passion in terms designed to recall his Annunciation" (352). Ó Carragáin goes on to consider further implications of poem and the design of the Ruthwell Cross, and ultimately draws Thomas Cranmer and John Donne into the discussion. This is a wonderful combination of liturgical detective work and critical appreciation, and a study that will reward frequent re-reading. The connection Ó Carragáin makes here is no less than brilliant: "The poet's understanding of the Annunciation story as an heroic encounter enabled him to discover a vital point of contact between an ancient patristic tradition and the heroic values of his own society" (345).

Jane Roberts offers a fine, close reading of the thematic similarities between the Ruthwell Cross and *The Dream of the Rood* in "Some Relationships between *The Dream of the Rood* and the Cross at Ruthwell" (*Stud. in Med. Eng. Lang. and Lit.* [Tokyo] 15: 1-25). In addition to providing an overview of the backgrounds, historical and critical, of these two important Anglo-Saxon monuments (1-4), she adduces a close analogue to the poem in one of the riddles of Tatwine, a closer analogue, she argues, than the Exeter riddle usually mentioned in such discussions. Roberts notes how motifs that may have been derived from a riddle like Tatwine's "run through the framing outer parts of the poem, both the narrator's thoughts (1-27, 122-156) and the included (78-121) address of the cross to the narrator" (7); these also happen to be in that part of the poem most often "wished away by its earliest readers and by many anthologists" (7). Next Roberts turns to the inscribed Ruthwell Cross, guiding the reader in an interpretation of the whole by following its inscriptions from the north side and proceeding left to right (8-15). Her aim here is to "demonstrate the integrity of the Ruthwell Cross, indicating how English verses of the narrow panels are to be understood as part of the whole cross" (17-

18). Her concluding section compares further the two monuments' putative functions in their cultural contexts, the poem having been intended essentially for private devotion (21), whereas the Cross "was a part of religious life in eighth-century Northumbria, a liturgical object, from a context in which life [was] structured by daily services" (20). Roberts points out that "The Ruthwell Cross and *The Dream of the Rood* share a common inheritance in biblical story, theology, liturgy and much more besides, but they shape this inheritance to very different ends" (21).

Jeremy I. Wheelock argues, quite rightly in this reviewer's opinion, that the MS reading in line 9b of *The Dream of the Rood*, *engel dryhtnes*, needs no emendation ("The Word Made Flesh: 'engel dryhtnes' in *The Dream of the Rood*," *ELN* 373: 1-11). Wheelock is responding in particular to claims that a reading of the phrase in question which equates the "messenger of the lord" with Christ "makes little sense theologically, poetically or structurally" (1). Most of this article is devoted to showing how such an association was developed early on in the Christian church, and that there were ample avenues for transmission of this idea to Anglo-Saxon England: "[N]ot only was the concept of the pre-existence and identification of Christ with Old Testament theophanies historically an accepted doctrine of the church—hardly a product of twentieth-century fundamentalism, as some colleagues have suggested—but also the idea was part of the common knowledge of the laity in Anglo-Saxon England" (5). I had never considered the figural association of the cross with Christ to be much of a stretch poetically or theologically, but Wheelock's argument here offers some empirical evidence (Éamonn Ó Carragáin drew our attention in 1987 to the cross as a symbol of Christ's glorified body, a reference which Wheelock does not overlook). It is not strictly necessary, however, to view the messenger implied by *engel* here so narrowly as to exclude anything other than Christ. The cross, whether or not it is to be seen as symbolic for Christ, is a well-established eschatological 'messenger' in the tradition that informs this poem (see my "Old English Religious Poetry: *Christ and Satan* and *The Dream of the Rood*," *A Companion to Old English Poetry*, ed. Henk Aertsen and Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr. [Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1994], 159-87, for an allusion to a relevant eschatological motif in the poem). Structural problems do remain, however, and there will no doubt be critics who find, for example, the word order in line 9b (*Beheoldon þær engel dryhtnes ealle*) somewhat awkward. Others have dealt with this issue elsewhere (e.g. William Helder, whom Wheelock cites) and so Whee-

lock's final conclusion rings true: "Since a consistent reading of the text is possible as it stands in the manuscript, emendation of line 9b, far from being necessary to 'fix' the 'nonsense of the MS,' would seem to be a serious mistake" (8).

Guthlac A and B

The goal of Ágnes Réffy Horváth's "Saint Guthlac, the Warrior of God in the *Guthlac* Poems of the Exeter Book" (*AnaChronist* 2000: 1–28) is to show that the two Old English *Guthlac* poems both exhibit a significant degree of originality, derived mainly from native OE poetic technique, and that, in addition to their Latin sources, they borrowed much from "the treasury of Old English poetry" (1). She examines both poems in some detail, and seeks further to "demonstrate the characteristic features of hagiographic literature in them" (2). In the course of her explication Horváth reveals the commonalities between *Guthlac A* and OE elegiac verse (3), *Beowulf* (6–9), and battle poetry (8). Her extended reading of the poem culminates in her conclusion that the *Guthlac A* poet "is not primarily concerned with the life of St Guthlac, but uses the example of his passion to illustrate one way in which a man who has faith may gain everlasting joy" (13). The second part of her article similarly draws out connections between *Guthlac B* and other OE poems, among them *The Dream of the Rood* and *Wanderer*. "In *Guthlac A* the fight with the demons moves toward allegory. There is a cosmic perspective in which the reader can see the saint's internal battle. The fights happen in space, and with circular structure the poem begins and ends in heaven. *Guthlac B* on the other hand, tells us about the fulfillment of Guthlac's soul. The progress moves through time from Adam to Guthlac" (22).

Phoenix

Alfred Bammesberger's "The Old English *Phoenix*, l. 407b: *topas idge*," *NM* 101: 45–49, examines a difficult phrase embedded in a passage fraught with other interpretive difficulties:

Wurdon teonlice topas idge
ageald æfter gylte. Hæfdon Godes yrre,
bittre bealosorge.

As Bammesberger notes, the MS reads *wurdon*, commonly emended to *wurdon* as indicated by the superscript *v* over the first *o*. But *idge* is an otherwise unknown word, and *topas*, if accepted, a most unusual and unattested plural form of *top*, which should of

course be *teþ*. Bammesberger suggests that erroneous word division obscured the original *topa sigbe* (cf. MnE *scythe*). Bammesberger's proposed solution to this crux is elegant and has the advantage of minimal emendation: "If *topas idge* (407b) is read as *topa sidge* and emended to *topa sigde* = *sigþe*, the meaning of the half-line can be rendered as 'the sharpness of their teeth.' No further changes in the manuscript readings are required. Lines 407–9a can be translated as follows: 'they (= Adam and Eve) became harmful. They got the sharpness of their teeth after the sinful action. They had God's wrath, bitter anguish'" (47).

Dora Faraci considers the migration of symbols from one text to another in "Sources and Cultural Background: the Example of the Old English *Phoenix*" (*Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale* 42: 225–39). Like Petersen (see below), she sees a unity of design and a skillful technique in the poet's adaptation of his Latin source. Her chief focus, however, is the identification and analysis of a source text not previously associated with the poem. She illuminates the passage describing the re-birth of the Phoenix at lines 230–40 (228), paying close attention to the development of the bird from apple to egg to worm and then to eagle. It is especially this last motif that connects the poem to the new source. Discussions of its sources have included mention of the *Physiologus* tradition, but references have always, it seems, been to the Greek *Physiologus* or the Latin B version. Faraci notes the similarities between the *Phoenix* and the Latin Y version of the *Physiologus* where, she points out, we find the same sequence in the bird's stages of transformation. Following an explication of these similarities, Faraci further explains how this association can help us understand the poem, how "the author stresses the double nature of the symbolical structure he means to build: both birds are emblems of renewal, but while the eagle, mainly in the *Physiologus* and by the Fathers of the Church, represents the spiritual renewal of man (particularly through baptism and by getting rid of sins), the phoenix represents Christ's resurrection.... There is therefore in the text no aporia, the apparent incongruity can find a solution in the double value of the resurrection of Christ and of man the two birds represent" (237).

In "*The Phoenix: The Art of Literary Recycling*" (*NM* 101: 375–86), Helle Falcher Petersen argues for a greater appreciation for the literary merits of the poem. Following a useful overview of *Phoenix* criticism, Petersen concludes that there is growing awareness in recent criticism that the poem "is considerably more than a translation and appended conventional

Christian allegorization of a Latin text; it is increasingly seen as a fine poem in its own right, possessing a rich complexity and a sense of direction not found in its principal source" (377). Petersen then offers a close analysis of two rhetorical devices in the poem—variation and the *nis (ne) ... ac* construction—to show how the poet interweaves "the multiple meanings of his poem to create, in the basis of his Latin source, something altogether different" (381). The poet's skill with these two devices shows him to be "a gifted poet, who used the material of the *Carmen* to create a distinctly different poem" (385).

D.F.J.

Cædmon's Hymn

Earl R. Anderson's "Old English Poetic Texts and Their Latin Sources: Iconicity in *Cædmon's Hymn* and *The Phoenix*" (*The Motivated Sign: Iconicity in Language and Literature* 2, ed. Olga Fischer and Max Nänny [Amsterdam: John Benjamins], 109–132) provides a detailed look at how two Old English poets may have responded to and utilized iconicity in their poems derived from Latin sources. Throughout the essay Anderson adds to the non-specialist reader's sense of what iconicity actually is: "Words are iconic (or not) relative to each other in context, and relative to the phonotactic and morphological rules of the language, yet iconicity is located on the 'periphery' of language, in the (metaphorical) frontier where language meets its real-world referents" (120). His first concern is scribal substitution of iconic words, saying that "when an expressive or iconic word is substituted by some other word in a variant manuscript, the changeling-word is almost always also expressive or iconic" (110). The examples he brings to illustrate this point come, however, not from *Cædmon's Hymn* or *The Phoenix*, but from the Middle English *Owl and the Nightingale*. Anderson returns quickly to the Old English, however, and explains how *Cædmon's Hymn* exhibits syntactic iconicity, while its relationship to the Latin version in Bede's *HE* is problematic: Anderson agrees with Kevin Kiernan ("Reading *Cædmon's 'Hymn'* with Someone Else's Glosses," *Representations* 32 [1990]: 157–170), that the text as we have it in Old English is a poetic translation of Bede's Latin prose and not, as Peter Clemoes has argued (*Interactions of Thought and Language in Old English Poetry* [Cambridge: 1995]), the transcription of an Old English *Hymn* circulating in oral tradition. Of the two sentences comprising the OE version, the second provides "an obvious example of chronological syntactic iconicity, inspired by the poet's Latin source," whereas the first "avoids chronological iconicity but pro-

vides a subtle example of hierarchical iconicity" (113), which Anderson also calls "preferential iconicity" (115). One of the most elegant parts of the argument involves what Anderson describes as God's building project in creation, which naturally follows the rules for Old English alliterative verse, but which also includes "a pattern of transverse alliteration that is independent of the poem's regular versification pattern" (116). He then turns rather abruptly to *The Phoenix*. Here, the relationship of the poem to its Latin source is clear, but the iconicity of the poem is more complex, based as it is on morphological and phonemic elements of the language. The argument hinges on the use of synaesthesia, onomatopoeia, homoeoteleuton and other devices to create iconic associations more subtle than scholars have heretofore realized. Most compelling are Anderson's discussions of the use of vowels and consonant clusters to achieve "translinguistic iconic associations" (124), based on the research of psycholinguists throughout the last century. Anderson ends by suggesting that, while the poet suppresses the similes and classical allusions of the Latin original, he nevertheless "substitutes a different but equivalent artistry" (127).

Charms

In "Sidelights on post-conquest Canterbury: towards a context for an Old Norse runic charm (DR 419)" (*Nottingham Medieval Studies* 44: 1–27), John Frankis speculates about the cultural context surrounding the inclusion of a runic Norse charm in London, British Library MS Cotton Caligula A. xv. Frankis describes the physical position and appearance of the charm itself in the manuscript, demonstrating that the text is intelligible, unlike other charms that consist only of nonsense words or syllables, and that, although one cannot conclusively compare hands in Roman and runic characters, the writing materials used to draw the runes seem to be in keeping with the pen and ink used to write the rest of the text: there is no compelling reason to deny that the scribe of that section of the manuscript also wrote the runes. He then demonstrates the probability of Scandinavian linguistic presence, however limited, in post-conquest Canterbury, possibly among the monks of Christ Church Priory. Frankis follows this with a discussion of other trilingual texts such as *Eadwine Psalter* (Latin with English and French glosses), claiming that the portion of the Caligula MS produced at Christ Church (fols. 120–53) may indicate a conscious effort to demonstrate the continuing worth of Old English texts. The argument about the charm centers not around what it means—Frankis ably but quickly deals with

possible translations/interpretations early in the essay—but rather what it meant for whoever copied it into the manuscript. Given that the runes are not gibberish of the sort often found in charms, that they appear to have been written into the text by the original scribe, and that they appear to be part of the textual unit surrounding the computational tables for determining the date of Easter, with an illustration of St. Pachomius receiving the tables from an angel to begin the section and the runic charm to end it, the charm cannot be dismissed as graffiti. Frankis points out that the name “Gyrl” from the charm might actually be “Cyril,” who is linked in Bede’s *De temporum ratione* (ch. 43) with Pachomius, making the charm (whatever it may mean) the end of the computational section. He admits that the Canterbury Runic Charm poses a number of problems, some of which he has not solved in his essay, but the evidence he musters in order to explain isolated pieces of the puzzle are interesting and worthy of the further study Frankis advocates.

Stephen O. Glosecki also addresses context and meaning in “Blow these vipers from me: Mythic magic in *The Nine Herbs Charm*” (*Essays on Old, Middle, Modern English*, ed. Gruber, 91–123); like Frankis, Glosecki is more concerned with the context surrounding the charm and what it may have meant to an Anglo-Saxon audience than with what it means to a modern audience biased by the purported objectivity of science and predictability of medicine—though modern physicians admit the fallibility of their methods and the unpredictability of disease. Glosecki begins by admitting that little about the charm is clear, save the scholarly disagreements it has begotten. Throughout the essay, Glosecki refers to previous readings of the charm and painstakingly explains why he accepts some and rejects others. To get the reader past what he believes to be the initial objection to the poem, that it is bad science, Glosecki demonstrates that for the society in which the charm was current the notion of magic was as common as twentieth-century reliance on antibiotics; in the spirit of using any and every means possible to heal the patient, the leech would have blended the use of herbal remedies with incantations, the physical with the spiritual. Nor is this approach at odds with Christianity: the practitioner had the example of the consecration during the Eucharist to reinforce the notion that set phrases used in conjunction with physical bread and wine could effect spiritual healing; could not similar incantations be used in conjunction with herbs to effect physical healing? For those scholars who prefer to read the charms as holdovers from a pagan past,

Glosecki also discusses the myths of the Germanic peoples in order to demonstrate how the charm is not the result of “deliberate pruning,” but rather it “underwent erosion and accretion, a gradual process of polycultural development. Its growth reflects that of Anglo-Saxon society itself” (94). The disjointed qualities of the charm, whether its imagery, its pantheon (Christ and Woden both appear), its practical versus magical elements, are all part of Glosecki’s kaleidoscopic view of the charm. He examines the use of poetic devices such as punning, kennings and other compounds, repetition, and irony; grammatical constructs of gender; imagery drawn from nature, religion, and folklore; numerology; and a host of others. Apart from a missed reference to Moses lifting up the serpent in the wilderness (110), Glosecki seems to have covered all the bases in his wide-ranging, one might say free-wheeling, discussion of *The Nine Herbs Charm*. He also attaches to the end of the essay his own translation of the charm, which differs somewhat from those of previous scholars, but he scrupulously explains those deviations in the text of the essay; the reader may not always agree with his conclusions but cannot quibble with his willingness to explain how he arrived at them.

In “The Inscription of Charms in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts” (*Oral Tradition* 14 [1999]: 401–419), Lea Olsan reminds readers that, although charms have been preserved in writing, they are first and foremost oral texts, yet unlike other oral genres in their specificity of use and stated practical purpose: “[t]he assumption underlying charms is that the incantations (whether words or symbols or phonetic patterns) of a charm can effect a change in the state of a person or persons or inanimate object” (401). Further, as Glosecki also insists, these ritual utterances are best seen not as either pagan or Christian, but as an amalgam of the two, magic and religion “coalesced into one rite” (403). Olsan outlines a typical structure for the charms: 1) a heading naming the purpose of the charm; 2) directions for performance; 3) the words of the incantation or chant; and 4) a concluding formula (403). Examining these elements, Olsan focuses her discussion on the charms found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 41 (containing the Old English version of Bede’s *HE*), with translations of and notes on analogous charms found in other manuscripts, specifically London, BL Harley 585 and CCCC 190. She asks of these texts the following questions: “(1) How do charms for the same purpose differ, specifically in structure and motif? (2) How do formulas circulating in Latin differ in manuscript contextualization from those circulating in Old English,

and (3) How do charms differ in the kind of authorization they acquire from being written in the gaps or margins of manuscripts as opposed to those written seamlessly as part of a text?" (404). Olsan assumes that the charms were inscribed in Corpus 41 to make them accessible for actual, performative use, not simply as a record of quaint curiosities from the past. One of the Corpus charms is found also in BL Harley 585 and Olsan compares the two versions with an eye to showing that the Corpus version "is a less scripted and less textualized version of the charm" because it offers itself as a mnemonic aid for a competent practitioner more than as a full script to be read by one unfamiliar with the use of charms (408). Such an incomplete form would allow for more flexibility in performance and assumes that such flexibility would be valued. Olsan ends by stressing that her conclusions, specifically that the charms are recorded in order to be used, apply only to Corpus 41, because much of her argument is based on the manuscript context; the other manuscripts she examines contextualize the charms differently (411).

In "Some Anglo-Saxon Charms" (*Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 411–33), Edward Pettit "presents new and revised editions of some early English charms from two manuscripts, together with consideration of their analogues" (411). The first manuscript, Oxford, Bodl. Lib. MS Auct. F. 3. 6, contains an Anglo-Saxon charm dated to the first half of the eleventh century and included in three previous editions (Arthur Napier, "Altenglische Miscellen," *Archiv* 84 [1890]: 323–27; Alexander Tille, "Thebal Amulets," *Scots Lore* 1 [1895]: 61–78; G. Storms, *Anglo-Saxon Magic* [1948], 305–06). Pettit disagrees that this charm is "against a dwarf," suggesting instead that it is meant to be used against fever, as the word *dweorh* is construed in both the Old English translation of the *Medicina de Quadrupedibus* and the *Peri Didaxeon* (418). At the beginning of the commentary, he augments Tille's list of fifteen charms that use variations of the phrase "thebal guttatim" with seven others, then explains the possible meanings of this murky phrase; his own interpretation is that *Thebal* is the name of an angel and that *guttatim* may refer to a feverish sweat. The second manuscript, London, BL Royal 12.E.XX, contains three charms on fol. 126v that interest Pettit: one for toothache, one for an eye affliction, and one for fever. The first has been edited previously only in Tony Hunt's *Popular Medicine in Thirteenth-Century England: Introduction and Texts* (Cambridge, 1990), p. 349 n. 170; the other two not at all. Pettit notes for the first time in print that a version of the charm *Ad den-*

tium dolorem also appears in the *Lacnunga* and that version has been edited numerous times (420, n. 40). This charm is the subject of the balance of the article, with *Contra bonum malannum* getting a page of commentary and *Contra febrem* only three sentences. The discussion of *Ad dentium dolorem* does seem to require extensive commentary because of the difficulty of the text. Pettit produces coherent readings of the words that have been taken as nonsense or obscure magical terms and produces what evidence he is able in light of the difficulty of the text, but he agrees that until satisfactory explanations of some of these obscurities are provided, much of the meaning of the text must remain in doubt.

Fates of the Apostles

The authorship and significance of the text are the foci of James E. Anderson and Leslie D. Schilling's essay, "The *Begang* of Cynewulf's 'Fates of the Apostles'" (*Essays on Old, Middle, Modern English*, ed. Gruber, 23–47). The authors argue that the poem has suffered in critical esteem ever since it ceased to be read as an extended Cynewulfian ending to *Andreas* and began to be considered as an independent poem, "an underachievement of an otherwise skillful poet, a slight work deserving of study mainly because it happens to bear Cynewulf's signature" (23, citing Krapp's introduction in *ASPR II*: xxxviii, and Claes Schaar, *Critical Studies in the Cynewulf Group* [New York, 1967]). This essay suggests that the importance of *Fates* has more to do with its structure and relationship to other Cynewulfian and Vercelli works, both verse and prose, and with the subtle word-play that allows the authors to disagree with Patrick W. Conner's tenth-century date for poet and poem ("On Dating Cynewulf," *Cynewulf: Basic Readings*, ed. Robert E. Bjork [1996], 23–55), and to conclude that Cynewulf the poet is identical with Cynewulf, Bishop of Lindisfarne from c. 740 to 780 (32). In brief, the argument runs that the structure and import of the poem has to do with a subtle play between *begang* as "way, course, progression," and *begang* as "worship" or "worship service" (30). The authors see the penitential account of the author and the long intercessory ending as utilizing the inherent redundancy of the litany (31); that *Fates* appears in the Vercelli Book with a series of texts concerned with journeys and processions is carefully demonstrated earlier in the essay (26–30). Such a format would be natural to an eighth-century bishop, and the fact that the form is partly obscured by the abbreviated martyrologies, the omission of the responses of the faithful, and the inclusion of non-lit-anic elements is in keeping with Cynewulf's desire to

give the text a private rather than communal voice: "only the closing instruction of his audience beginning at line 115 ... formally acknowledges a community of supplicants" (34). The poem may be rescued from obscurity, according to the authors, by seeing it as subtle wordplay in which Cynewulf grapples with his own *begang*: "Bishop and celebrant of solemn liturgical processions, teacher (as he says at the end of *Christ II*) remembered by name in litanic prayer, poet and devotee of the Cross in his weary old age (as he tells at the end of *Elene*), Cynewulf was seeking intercession in *Fates* apparently for his unheroic procession through life, a journey which in his view did not merit its own story" (37). The authors are currently working on a larger project, "Processional Themes of the *Vercelli Book*," which will presumably address more fully the idea that the *Vercelli Book* may have been compiled on a processional theme as well as expand their treatment of the Cynewulfian material (38, n. 1; 39, n. 8).

John M. McCulloh takes a different approach to the text, asking, "Did Cynewulf use a martyrology? Reconsidering the sources of *The Fates of the Apostles*" (ASE 29: 67–83). For the last hundred years or more, "scholars have sought to identify the source or sources for the hagiographical information the author incorporated into his text" (67). Early theories suggested that the most important source was Bede's martyrology, but Henri Quentin's examination of the martyrology tradition demonstrated that of the two martyrologies thought to be Bedan, only one was genuine and was a relatively short text that did not include the details found in *The Fates of the Apostles* (*Les Martyrologues historiques du moyen âge: étude sur la formation du Martyrologe romain* [Paris: 1908]). Quentin called the other, longer text the "Pseudo-Bede of Cologne" and dismissed it from his considerations. In addition to the Bede and Pseudo-Bede texts, McCulloh also considers J.E. Cross's contention that the information found in *The Fates of the Apostles* came from a collection of full-length apocryphal accounts of the lives of the apostles instead of from a martyrology, as well as Patrick W. Connor's suggestion (in "On Dating Cynewulf," 35–45) that Cynewulf's source was an expanded version of the martyrology of Usuard of Saint-Germain-des-Prés and that such a source would not have been introduced into England before the tenth century (71). The hunt, therefore, for a martyrology that could have been Cynewulf's source has been renewed, but McCulloh is at pains to demonstrate why none of the candidates deemed likely can be the sole source text. In a painstaking comparison of the information included in the *Breviari-*

um apostolorum, the martyrology of Florus of Lyon, and that of Ado of Vienne (who moved the eulogies of the apostles into a special *Libellus de festivitibus sanctorum apostolorum* at the beginning of his martyrology), McCulloh concludes that none of these texts agrees with *The Fates of the Apostles* in every particular. He also looks briefly at the order in which the apostles appear in Cynewulf's text; it matches none of the three texts studied, nor the *Notitia de locis sanctorum apostolorum* or *Festa (omnium) apostolorum* (both edited by Quentin and Delehaye in the *Acta Sanctorum*, Nov. II.ii.2–3). He offers instead the suggestion that Cynewulf's source was more likely a passionary, which could have inspired him to treat the apostles separately from other saints, could have provided his order of presentation, and could have furnished most if not all of the details he relates (83). McCulloh admits that until such a text is located, his solution must remain hypothetical, so it joins a host of other possible identifications of Cynewulf's source for *The Fates of the Apostles*.

Genesis A and B

Using *Genesis A* and texts by Ælfric as his primary material, Daniel Anlezark discusses the role of the matriarch in "An Ideal Marriage: Abraham and Sarah in Old English Literature" (*MÆ* 69: 187–210). Anlezark begins with patristic traditions surrounding the couple, pointing out the idealized early accounts of their relationship, clearly at odds with the biblical account, then explains Augustine's characterization of Abraham and Sarah, which was largely motivated by his desire to answer the Manichaean attacks on the morals of Old Testament figures (190). Because he does not wish Abraham to appear as a liar in the episodes with Pharoah and Abimelech, or as either an adulterer or a bigamist in his relationship with Hagar, Augustine explains (away?) each incident on both the literal and the allegorical levels. Continuing this tradition, both the *Genesis A* poet and Ælfric "show a concern to present Abraham and Sarah as virtuously living Old Testament saints, and share an anxiety to emphasize Abraham's holiness in particular" (191). The poet, for example, focuses on Pharoah's lust, which becomes the significant moral problem of the episode, not Abraham's deception. Both the poet and Ælfric are selective in the details they relate from the biblical account and occasionally reinterpret or add material. The result is that Abraham is not perceived as cowardly for telling Pharoah that Sarah is his sister, not his wife; rather he is cast as wise for perceiving the potential danger to himself as the husband of a beautiful wife in the court of a lustful man (193). Anlezark shows how both au-

thors follow Augustine in portraying Abraham and Sarah as the ideal couple, with Abraham the wise, patient husband and Sarah the silent, submissive wife (195). The only place this pattern is violated is when Sarah suggests that Abraham take Hagar to his bed in order to have a son, and later when Sarah insists that Hagar and Ishmael be exiled. In both cases, the crux of the discussion is on the relative social positions of Sarah and Hagar: Sarah is not really stepping out of character as Abraham's submissive wife; she is asserting her rights as his wife over those of his concubine. Further, because Abraham acts on Sarah's counsel in both instances, he is absolved of primary responsibility for them. "Sarah emerges temporarily from her stock characterization as the obedient wife to develop a more rounded personality, but does so only when the poet is concerned for the way in which his audience will perceive the conduct of Abraham" (204); the same is equally true of Ælfric's Sarah: for both authors, she is consigned to Abraham's shadow.

Paul Battles begins his "Genesis A and the Anglo-Saxon 'migration myth'" (ASE 29: 43–66) with the obligatory nod to Nicholas Howe's 1989 *Migration and Mythmaking in Anglo-Saxon England* (rpt. Notre Dame, IN, 2001). He agrees that migration is a central myth to the Anglo-Saxons' understanding of themselves as a people and suggests that an examination of *Genesis A*, a poem not considered in Howe's book, may lead to a slightly different understanding of the Anglo-Saxon concept of migration that not only parallels the biblical account of the Exodus but also expresses a cultural phenomenon not explicitly linked to the Exodus. For this reason, Battles distinguishes his use of the term "migration myth" from Howe's, including in it "the body of stories dealing with the Germanic tribes' migration to England" (44). Battles gives a digest of the work of other scholars who have concluded that the text of the poem paraphrases the Latin so closely that "amplifications or alterations that follow a clear pattern can alert the reader to the presence of traditional stylistic devices" (45). By systematically studying these alterations, Battles detects an underlying traditional theme of migration that shapes the Old English poem. The key migration passage, against which Battles discusses all the others, is the account of the tower of Babel, which is the first migration mentioned in the poem and which does not harmonize with the biblical source (46). Battles' own summary expresses this best:

Important changes include the scale of the tribal movement (great throngs settling Shinar "far and wide"); a motive that does not fit the

circumstances described by the source (search for more spacious territory); a surprisingly sympathetic tone in characterizing the tower-builders before the beginning of their projects (they are "famed warriors" and "sons of nobles"); and the less ignominious dispersal after Babel (the tower-builders once again become settlers in search of more territory, rather than wretched refugees from God's wrath). (51)

Such alterations in the text stem not from haphazard use of oral formulae, but rather the deep embedding of the traditional migration. Battles invokes John Miles Foley's compromise between Albert B. Lord's oral formulaic theory and the zero repetition suggested by David K. Crowne and Donald K. Fry, that there are clusters of repeated ideas that are expressed in highly variable half-lines that may have only root morphemes in common. Battles provides two tables to illustrate the clusters, figure 1 showing the verbal repetition in the migration theme passages of *Genesis A* (56), and figure 2 (57) showing their sources. Battles concludes "that the verbal repetition in the migration passages of *Genesis A* by far exceeds those of the source; and secondly, that the repetitions in the Old English poem do not simply derive from paraphrasing of similar details in an identical fashion (most of the repeated items in *Genesis A* have no counterpart in *Genesis* at all)" (55). Battles also rejects A.N. Doane's suggestion that the migration theme in *Genesis A* derives from the source, in part because the migration connected to the Babel episode cannot have been derived from the source, and also because Doane's theory "fails to account for distinctive elements in *Genesis A* which never feature in the biblical narrative," such as the "search for a more spacious land" motif (60–1). Battles ends by examining genealogies, showing that they, too, fuse native and biblical origin myths, as when the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* for year 855 (A, D)/856 (B, C) includes in a genealogy for Ælfred's father Æthelwulf not only the usual Germanic "ancestors" such as Woden but also a sequence of biblical figures from Noah back to Adam. Æthelwulf's genealogy thereby blends native and biblical myths of origin similar to the overlapping of migration stories in *Genesis A*.

In "The Old English *Genesis B* poet: Bilingual or Interlingual?" (*Amer. Jnl of Germanic Linguistics & Literatures* 5 [1993]: 163–84), Irmengard Rauch utilizes methodologies from research regarding modern language users to demonstrate that the first language of the *Genesis B* poet was most likely Old English rather than Old Saxon, as was argued by Bernhard ten Brink

(*Geschichte der englischen Literatur*, vol. 1. [1877]) and later by B. J. Timmer (*The Later Genesis* [1948]). As *Genesis B* is "a premier case of language interference" (164), the question remains as to the nature of the interference. For the purposes of her argument in this brief article, Rauch examines lines 790-820, the Adam and Eve story, which is the only section for which an Old Saxon fragment is extant (*Vatican Fragment I*, ll. 1-26). The article presents both versions side by side and, while the print is small, it is useful to have both passages available in full to the reader. The author demonstrates that modern linguistic research methods allow a researcher to determine the first language of a translator by virtue of the grammar, syntax and lexicon used in a translation. In brief, bilingual language users, while producing sentences that are generally consonant with the standard form of the language, also show instances of interference from the other language. In her example speakers of both German and English may produce German sentences that generally conform to Standard High German, but they may also show varying degrees of interference from English grammar, syntax, or lexicon. Rauch then examines Timmer's argument in order to demonstrate that it inadequately accounts for the language use apparent in the poem. Based on her method and the data produced, Rauch believes that "[u]ltimately the OE data, contrasted with the nature of Old Saxon and configured with extrapolations from differing cognitive strategies of language translating and language understanding, argue for an Anglo-Saxon provenance of the *Genesis B* poet" (182).

Also concerned with issues of language, Tom Shippey explores not triumph but "Hell, Heaven, and the Failures of *Genesis B*" (*Essays on Old, Middle, Modern English*, ed. Gruber, 151-76). Shippey begins by reviewing the tendency of past scholarship to look for "masterpieces" and to engage in special pleading for texts that contain various flaws (151). He notes briefly the inconsistencies of *Genesis B* with the biblical accounts of the Fall of the Angels and the Fall of Man (151-54), then summarizes the explanations that have been given for these problems. The bulk of Shippey's argument, however, has to do not so much with thematic inconsistencies as with inconsistencies in the poet's use of language. Shippey points to passages in the poem where the verse has been deservedly praised as subtle, powerful, evocative, and a host of similar adjectives, then questions how the poet can slip in an instant from powerful, carefully crafted verse into pointless (one might say banal) repetition that goes far beyond apposition (157-58). For example, Satan's speech beginning at line 347 begins well, then breaks

off at line 349b into repetition of information (and half-lines) that has been given at least twice earlier in the poem. The poet then seems to regain his balance and continues with the sophisticated speech of lines 353b-56. Shippey argues that certain alliterative pairs are connected so intimately to certain ideas that they almost irresistibly call those ideas into the text, which causes needless repetition or digression. Alliteration can become a snare for the unwary poet (168). "Its traditional techniques in some respects made the whole work of composition easier, and also helped (as grammatical structures do in plain prose) to generate thoughts and meanings which would not have arisen without them, which were originally present not in the poet's creative mind, but in the associations and contrasts latent in poetic language" (170). The unevenness of the poetry of *Genesis B*, then, has less to do with an unskilled interpolator, as Müllenhoff and others argued regarding such passages in *Beowulf* (*Beovulf: Untersuchungen über das angelsächsische Epos und die älteste Geschichte der germanischen Seevölker* [1889]), and more to do with the linguistic associations that led the poet into familiar, if lackluster, poetic territory.

Judgement Day II

The second in the series of Anglo-Saxon Texts published by D.S. Brewer, Graham D. Caie's edition of *The Old English Poem Judgement Day II* includes a critical edition, translation, and commentary on the poem from Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 201, as well as editions of Bede's *De die iudicii* from London, BL Cotton Domitian A. i, and of the Old English homily *Be domes dæge* from Oxford, Bodl. Lib. Hatton 113. Caie's edition pulls together all the material relevant to understanding the poem, from its putative source in Bede to its prose analogue in the Hatton homily. It also includes discussion of the manuscript context, where *Judgement Day II* appears with the thematically related *Lord's Prayer II*, *Gloria I*, *Exhortation to Christian Living* and *A Summons to Prayer* (although Caie follows Fred C. Robinson in seeing the latter two as a unified whole; see "'The Rewards of Piety': Two Old English Poems in their Manuscript Context" [1989]; rpt. with an edition of the poem in *The Editing of Old English* [Oxford, 1994], 180-95). Caie also investigates a possible link between these poems and the Old English version of the *Benedictine Office*. The edition includes sections discussing the title; the manuscript and manuscript context; the relationship of the poems, the *Office*, and *Wulfstan*; descriptions of the related MSS; a detailed comparison between the poetic and prose versions

(this, with the subsequent text, translation, and commentary is more than worth the price of admission); and the usual glossary, bibliography and index. With so much apparatus, it might be easy to overlook the literary analysis that Caie provides, but it is among the most valuable sections as he ranges through existing scholarship to provide a nuanced reading of the poem as an expansion (especially the first nine lines) of Bede's original, intended for a lay audience and appealing to them through rich metaphors and compelling prosody. Caie speculates that *Judgement Day II* may be less about Doomsday than about "a spiritual pilgrimage that begins with contrition and confession, through the other states of penance, encouraged by the awesome fear of Doom and hell, to the final stage of beatification. Doomsday was not the theme, only a means to an end. It is the subtle work of a poet-priest, attracting us by a lyrical introduction, terrifying us with the fear of hell and then leading us to a penitential frame of mind" (81).

Maxims I and II

Elizabeth Jackson's article "From the Seat of the *þyle*? A Reading of *Maxims I*, Lines 138-40" (*JEGP* 99: 170-92) suggests that one possible way of reading the lines announced in her title, which many have seen as inferior, is to consider them as describing "the actions which a particular individual must undertake in order to fulfil his role in society" (192). According to Jackson, it is possible that these lines are addressed to the *þyle* and may be read as providing advice appropriate for someone in that position. She begins her discussion by calling into question earlier translations of these lines on both structural and aesthetic grounds, for the most part rejecting textual emendations and looser translations that do not preserve original grammatical and syntactic relationships between the elements. Her compositional analysis is both thorough and compelling, particularly as she demonstrates the similarity of the list's organizing principles to an earlier list (ll. 129-31) (173). This discussion is too intricate to rehearse here but presents a compelling case against arguments dismissing this section of *Maxims I* as having neither sophistication nor complexity. Jackson continues by showing parallels from the "prescribed-actions list" of *Maxims I* with a similar section in the Old Icelandic *Hávamál*. She cautions against reading the texts identically based on their seemingly superficial similarities, then shows that the similarities may be anything but superficial. Jackson discusses the possibility that the two texts were extant at roughly the same time, but does not insist that direct borrowing account for the

parallels she has drawn; instead, she refers to a suggestion she made in another essay ("Some Contexts and Characteristics of Old Norse Ordering Lists," *Saga-Book of the Viking Society* 23 [1991]: 111-140 at 128), that the most likely explanation is that the "correspondence might result from a common origin in Germanic oral traditional lists" (190). This shared tradition would explain why *Hávamál* is so much more overtly pagan: the pagan tradition was still very much alive for the Icelandic author, while it was fragmented for the Anglo-Saxon poet.

Paris Psalter

In her dissertation "Selected Old English Psalms: A Translation and Commentary" (SUNY at Stony Brook; *DAI* 60A [1999]: 2914), Sally LaForte provides translation of and commentary on ten vernacular psalms in the Paris Psalter: 51 (fragmentary), 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 96 (fragmentary), 103, 150 (fragmentary). After a brief introduction, the dissertation takes up "Literal and Free Verse Translations of Selected Old English Psalms." The first section of this chapter provides the OE version from the Paris Psalter with an interlinear literal translation in Modern English. The second section includes the Douay-Rheims version; the third is the *Liber Psalmorum iuxta Hebraicum* (the discussion of the second and third sections are reversed in the introductory material); the fourth is a free-verse translation original to the author. This last translation was produced with reference to Mitchell Dahood's translation of the Psalms from Ugaritic and John Kohlenberger's translation from Hebrew. The commentary section discusses issues of translation, including sections on classification (very brief), criticism, specific translation problems, literary and poetic analysis of the texts, and the psalms as cultural artifacts. LaForte classifies Psalms 51-57 as "laments of the individual," 96 as an "enthronement psalm," and 103 and 150 as "imperative psalms of praise." Though the dissertation treats only a fraction of the available Old English psalms, the author does not fully explain her criteria of selection; there are, after all, others that could be included in the classifications she uses. One section especially interesting to this reader compares and contrasts Hebrew and Old English cultural and liturgical uses for the texts, citing grammar, syntax, and idiom to explain the similarities and differences uncovered. The second major division of the commentary discusses the relationship between the text and the design of the Paris Psalter, including the base text, manuscript analogues and influences, issues of paleography, and other textual concerns. The work is interesting and wide-ranging;

its weakness from a researcher's point of view is that it seems neither exhaustive nor systematic in its treatment of the psalms included in the manuscript.

M.K.R.

Riddles

In his 1993 essay "Locating *Beowulf* in Literary History" (*Exemplaria* 5 [1993]: 79–109), John Niles argued that the time had come to stop looking at *Beowulf* as representative of monolithic cultural values and social institutions, and instead to focus on reading the poem "as a site of ideological conflict, a complex work of art that responded to lively tensions, agreements, and disagreements in the society from which it came" (80). In recent years there has been a marked and intellectually fruitful shift in the shape of much OE literary criticism that speaks to Niles's directive. Robert DiNapoli's scholarship in recent years is one such example. In 1998, DiNapoli published two articles, "The Heart of the Visionary Experience: *The Order of the World* and its Place in the Old English Canon" (*ES* 79: 97–108) and "Poesis and Authority: Traces of an Anglo-Saxon *Agon* in Cynewulf's *Elene*" (*Neophil* 82: 619–30; both reviewed in *OEN* 33.2), in which he argued that both poems contain traces of the suppressed memory of a tension between native pre-Christian and imported Christian ideas about the nature and purpose of poetry. In his 2000 article "In the Kingdom of the Blind, the One-Eyed Man Is a Seller of Garlic: Depth-Perception and the Poet's Perspective in the Exeter Book Riddles" (*ES* 81: 422–55), DiNapoli builds upon his earlier argument, proposing that in certain Exeter Book riddles that suppressed cultural memory "takes a shape more deliberate, conscious, and contentious than it is allowed to have in any other Old English poetry" (423). DiNapoli first looks at the riddles that portray "the act and technology of writing" and writing's "mental culture" in tones fraught with ambiguity, skepticism, and even violence (K-D 17, 26, 47, 51, 88, and 93, with Riddle 59 analyzed as a representation of a reconciliation between the two cultures). Riddle 60 is interpreted as signifying "alternative claims for the power and authority of the oral and poetic" (429). Next, DiNapoli turns to what he views as the "remarkably few" riddles—all about birds with musical qualities (K-D 7, 8, and 24)—that address acts of speech and song in exuberant tones and also associate voice with "an expansive sense of physical freedom" (436). He then moves to Riddle 39, a riddle Williamson has characterized as one of the most difficult to solve. Williamson's own solution, which DiNapoli follows, is "[the

spoken] word" or *to gesecganne* 'to speak'. This riddle is especially important to DiNapoli's overall argument as it "represents [spoken] language as a creature both omnipresent and ineffably fugitive" (436) and also "utterly destabilises the whole notion of textual authority" (438–39). DiNapoli also looks at the riddles that exemplify what he sees as a primary conceptual concern in OE riddles—the theme of making. He argues that Riddles 14 and 20 demonstrate the powerful "locative function" of the physical artifacts they describe and the ways in which the riddles "explore and celebrate the theme of artifice" (446); Riddles 42 and 43 make connections between making and the poet-as-artificer. DiNapoli then compares Aldhelm's Riddle 100 (*De creatura*) with the three riddles that open the Exeter Book collection (the "Storm" riddles, or, in Williamson's analysis, one riddle solved as "the wind as a scourge") to demonstrate that, whereas Aldhelm's riddle is an "orderly catalogue of natural creatures and phenomena," Exeter Riddles 1–3 are concerned mainly with "unmaking." Finally, DiNapoli turns to Riddle 86, commonly if curiously solved as "a one-eyed seller of garlic," a figure DiNapoli suggests "could hardly fail to evoke the figure of Óðinn, the Germanic god who in Scandinavian myth sacrifices an eye in exchange for wisdom, and who is also the patron of poetry and of visionary experience" (453). He provocatively wonders if this figure barging in on an assembly of wise men with his *twelf hund heafda* (signifying, in DiNapoli's view, the Anglo-Saxon poet's visionary abilities) might not represent, "in an almost Chaucerian moment of self-parody, the poet's sense of his own marginality within the Christian milieu that has overtaken his native tradition?" (454). We can't know, as DiNapoli admits, but his essay is important for helping us to think more deeply about the ways in which OE poetry registers the shifts and tensions in Anglo-Saxon culture as it converted to Christianity, and also encloses (while covertly celebrating) the suppressed memories of an earlier aesthetic culture.

In "A Contextual Study of the *Exeter Book Riddles*" (Diss. SUNY at Stony Brook, *DAI* 60A [1999]: 2914), Michelle Michie Yoshimori Igarashi's primary objective is to explore the Riddles in relation to different cultural constructs "within which one might consider the images representing the Anglo-Saxon literary aesthetic and textual representation of the world around them" (14–15). For Igarashi, the Riddles cannot be seen as a direct representation of the people who created them, but rather, are products of imaginative self-fashioning. The first chapter is concerned with Latin and Anglo-Latin riddlers of the fifth through eighth

centuries (Symphosius, Aldhelm, Tatwine, and Eusebius), and with discerning the Old English riddles' uniqueness through comparison with their Latin and Anglo-Latin counterparts. The second chapter undertakes a cultural analysis of the folk and literary aspects of the riddles, which are approached as *Kunsträtsel* ("literary enigmas") and *Volksrätsel* ("popular/folk enigmas") that reveal aspects of the literary imagination and everyday experience of the Anglo-Saxons. The third chapter focuses upon heroic elements in the riddles, especially within the context of the tribal hall, and includes comparisons of these elements with similar motifs in *Beowulf*, *The Wanderer*, *The Battle of Maldon*, *The Battle of Brunanburh*, *Maxims I & II*, and the *Finnsburh Fragment*, in order to highlight the ways in which certain riddles underscore and clarify Anglo-Saxon martial culture. The fourth and concluding chapter is devoted to a discussion of how *Wulf and Eadwacer* and *The Wife's Lament* "conflate the elegaic and *frauenlieder* genres to create a hybrid representation of Anglo-Saxon literary womanhood that is then reinforced by similar images within the riddles" (16).

Thanks to Nina Rulon-Miller, scholars of Old English will never again have to ask the question, "What's so funny about female masturbation?" ("Sexual Humor and Fettered Desire in Exeter Book Riddle 12," *Humour in Anglo-Saxon Literature*, ed. Wilcox, 99–126). It may not be funny at all in K-D Riddle 12, where it may serve instead as a vehicle for an aggressive form of homosocial humor and shame-ridden voyeurism that is very much "fettered" to the dark psychology of master-slave relationships. Rulon-Miller offers a provocative analysis of the psychosexual dimensions of a riddle (commonly solved as "ox" or "ox-leather") that has not generally been categorized as one of the "double-entendre" Exeter Book riddles, although most commentators admit that its closing lines, in which a "dark" or "black" (*sweartne*) woman is both fashioning and/or working a piece of leather while also, perhaps, masturbating with that same object, contain a rather pejorative and even misogynistic sexual innuendo. It is Rulon-Miller's assertion that Riddle 12 is shot through with sexual innuendo from start to finish, but in order to see this one has to read the riddle armed with the assumptions of Freud's work on humor-as-sexual-aggression (*Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious*) as well as with later theories of the psychology of humor, and with the understanding that the riddle's tenth-century reading community was made up of men "who lived in the homoerotically charged atmosphere of a medieval monastery, and who traded erotic badinage as a

way to covertly express homosocial desire" (101). In order to investigate more fully the riddler's "mistreatment" of the *wonfeax wale*, Rulon-Miller first reviews and expands upon John W. Tanke's essay, "*Wonfeax wale*: Ideology and Figuration in the Sexual Riddles of the Exeter Book" (in Britton J. Harwood and Gillian R. Overing, eds., *Class and Gender in Early English Literature: Intersections* [Bloomington, 1994]; reviewed in OEN 29.2), where Tanke compares Riddle 12 with other sexual Exeter Book riddles and argues that the pejorative attitude of the riddler toward the *wonfeax wale* is the result of the intersection of four factors: her "gender, her status as a servant, her ethnicity (if she is understood to be Welsh), and her sexual activity" (Rulon-Miller 109). In a comparative reading of Riddle 12 alongside K-D 20, 25, 37, 45, 54, 61, and 62, Rulon-Miller mainly affirms the particular points of Tanke's argument, but departs somewhat from his conclusion that the riddler holds the *wale* in contempt not only for her gender, class, and ethnicity, but also because in her act of auto-eroticism she serves herself more than her lord. For if we consider Freud's idea that one of the main characteristics of a dirty joke shared by men is "the use of a woman as an 'object of exchange' and a 'conduit' for 'cementing the bonds of men with men,'" the *wale* is ultimately condemned because the riddler "has allowed himself to indulge in and share an act of voyeurism of which he is ashamed" (123). Rulon-Miller also offers a new solution for the ambiguous leather article described in lines 7b–13a, variously solved by other commentators as "glove," "jerkin," "hat," "boots," "bed covering," and "coin purse" (102 n. 11), and also thought to serve as a leather dildo. Among Anglo-Saxon leather-working technologies was the process known as "*cuir boulli*," a "leather-hardening technique which the *wonfeax wale* seems to be following almost to the letter" (119), and she suggests that the *wale* is making a leather bottle. Rulon-Miller concludes with two translations of the riddle, an "innocent" and an "obscene" version, with the obscene version highlighting what she sees as a leather-bondage fetish. Regardless of how one might feel about Anglo-Saxon monks with leather fetishes, Rulon-Miller's larger argument represents a much-needed psychoanalytical reading of Riddle 12, especially in light of recent work on medieval sexuality, such as Allen Frantzen's *Before the Closet: Same-Sex Love from Beowulf to Angels in America* (1998) and Karma Lochrie et al.'s *Constructing Medieval Sexuality* (1997).

Rulon-Miller's essay has a companionable bedfellow in D.K. Smith's "Humor in Hiding: Laughter Between the Sheets in the Exeter Book Riddles" (*Hu-*

mour in Anglo-Saxon Literature, 79–98). Pondering what sort of “cultural work” the double-entendre sexual riddles might have performed in monastic culture, Smith begins with Freud’s idea that where a joke is not an aim in itself (i.e., “innocent”), it can only serve either a hostile or obscene purpose, and because obscene jokes involve a transformation of taboo images and words into a culturally acceptable form, “in the transmutation from unacceptable smut to obscene joke, the elements of sexuality are re-ordered and camouflaged” (82–83). Enjoyment of these jokes isn’t possible without a repressive social framework; the sexually repressive society Freud posits in his work on humor and the unconscious is a society not dissimilar from Anglo-Saxon England. Smith smartly points out, however, that there are critical differences between secular and monastic settings in Anglo-Saxon culture and he refers his readers to Tanke’s discussion (cited above) of how the sexual riddles might have had an edifying and disciplinarian function, in which “the riddler entices the solver into flouting cultural rules against sexual representation, but only in order to condemn and suppress this representation by offering the ‘correct’ and non-sexual solution” (86). Smith ultimately wants to make the more provocative argument that the riddles do not necessarily possess Tanke’s “artificial semantic hierarchy,” but rather the Derridean simultaneity of *sign* and *supplement*. In other words, the “polysemous imagery” of the obscene riddles might promote both answers and “the most important thing these riddles give to a representation of sexuality is a sense of their own self-effacing duplicity” (87). Through a close analysis of Riddles K-D 44, 45, and 54 (“innocently” solved by most commentators as “key,” “dough,” and “butter churn,” respectively), Smith shows that the sexual riddles “can be seen as an enactment of the Derridean concept of *différance*, in which meaning is always a function of difference and deferral circulating in a freeplay of associations” (88). Finally, Smith demonstrates the ways in which the riddles pull their audience “into Bakhtin’s world of the carnivalesque, in which the lower and upper body strata are subject to sudden reversals, and the closed, controlled body becomes uncontainable” (89). In other words, the sexual riddles blur the lines between “high” and “low,” and for all their implicit denials, provide the proof of a very vital and fluid sexual imagination rooted in “two conflicting visions which can only be held together by laughter” (98). This kind of laughter is still with us.

In her short critical essay “The Evening Singer of Riddle 8 (K-D)” (*SELIM* 9 [1999]: 57–68), Mer-

cedes Salvador Bello defends the solution “nightingale” against critics who have worked to unsettle this commonly-accepted answer first proposed by Dietrich in 1859, and later supported by Trautmann and Williamson (Krapp and Dobbie suggested “jay”; more recently, David Hill argued for “starling” in his short note, “Riddle 8: A Problem of identification or a problem of Translation,” *Med. Life* 11 [1999]: 22–23, reviewed in *OEN* 34.2). In a reading that is attentive to matters of lexicography and etymology as well as to the resonances between treatments of nightingales in classical and medieval literature, Salvador Bello runs through the various challenges other scholars have raised against the solution “nightingale,” and explains how the “textual peculiarities” in the riddle highlighted by other scholars “in fact constitute no obstacle to the maintenance of ‘nightingale’ as the most probable answer” (57). The bulk of the argument is taken up with two controversial matters, the first concerning the possible meaning to be derived from the runic character that appears in the MS between Riddles 7 and 8 above the word *reordum*, and which most scholars have read as the rune *Cen* (Williamson suggests *Ur*). Salvador Bello wants to follow Förster’s opinion (put forward in the 1933 facsimile edition of the Exeter Book) that the mark is not a rune at all, but rather a letter *n*, which “could be considered as a marginal *n*, written by a later scribe” (62). More interesting is Salvador Bello’s overview of the controversy surrounding the interpretation of the two obscure terms in line 9, *scirenige* and *sceawend-wisan*, where she convincingly argues for *scirenige* as a unique compound comprising *scire* and *linigan* that “could be pointing to the bird’s modulating voice, literally meaning ‘voice bending’” (65). As to *sceawend-wisan*, Bello argues for accepting Bosworth-Toller’s ‘a jesting song, song of a jester’ over the usual identification of the term with *sceawendspræc* (glossed as Lat. *scurilitas*), which has led some editors to assume a chattering jay over a nightingale. Given that one of the riddle’s key clues is *eald æfenscop*, and that being a “night-singer” is one of the chief characteristics of the nightingale—hence the bird’s name—it is somewhat surprising to see how productive of critical controversy Riddle 8 has been. The original riddler would be pleased.

Paul Sorrell’s “Word Alchemy: A Window on Anglo-Saxon Culture” (*Parabola* 25.2: 62–68) is a very short and informal essay directed at providing some insight into the Anglo-Saxon riddling tradition for the non-specialist reader of *Parabola*’s special issue devoted to “Riddle and Mystery,” which contains brief articles treating various aspects of riddling tra-

ditions in Eastern and Western cultures. Sorrell provides a whirlwind tour of the Anglo-Saxon culture of linguistic gamesmanship that runs the gamut from poetic kennings to the Exeter Book Riddles to runic inscriptions on crosses and caskets, and he also offers some comparisons between OE and Latin riddles, concluding that, whereas the OE riddles "offer a test of mental agility in a spirit of play," the Latin riddles, "with their often bookish subjects, learned allusions and punning language, play an educational role, revealing the mysteries of a world created by a Christian God" (68).

Edith Whitehurst Williams undertakes an archaeology of OE literary genres in K-D Riddles 10, 88, 90, and 93 in "An Insight of Form: New Genres in Four Exeter Book Riddles" (*Essays on Old, Middle, Modern English*, ed. Gruber, 231–61). Williams takes her title and critical impetus from John F. Adams's 1965 article "The Anglo-Saxon Riddle as Lyric Mode," where he argued that, although the Anglo-Saxon poet lacked a living lyric tradition, the riddles provide an "insight of form" for lyric expression. It is Williams's assertion that, in addition to displaying the emergence of the lyric form, some riddles bear the mark of other emerging genres which were asserting themselves—allegory in K-D 10 ("The Barnacle Goose"), fable in K-D 90 ("The Latin Riddle"), and elegy in the two "Ink-horn" riddles (K-D 88 and 93). In Williams's view, the miraculous birth of the goose from a barnacle in Riddle 10 has too often been interpreted as representing a 'folk' belief, but when one considers the writings of Isidore (*Etymologiae* IX) and Aldhelm (*De creatura*), "a belief in miraculous origins cannot be dismissed as popular superstition, but must be acknowledged as an explanation credited by the best educated minds of the day," and therefore Riddle 10 can be read as offering "a compact dramatization of salvation through baptism" (234). Riddle 90, the only Latin verse in the Exeter Book and an enigma for many interpreters, is seen by Williams as displaying, in addition to generic Biblical metaphors, "three streams of intellectual activity ... brought together within its brief span": the fable tradition, "the trend established by Alcuin in the Palace School of Charlemagne ... which combines reverence with pleasure in the realm of learning," and the pictorial imagination (236). Following Dietrich's insight that the riddle is constructed on a play on the word *lupus* (while disagreeing somewhat with all the variations on that word Dietrich posited), and drawing upon an eleventh-century Limoges manuscript that includes illustrated Latin fables and a collection of arithmetical games and riddles, Williams suggests that lines 3–5 of Riddle 90 "cast in the

fable mode, represent nothing more nor less than a factual scene, transformed into a riddle by the paradoxical problem of the numbers" (239). Williams proposes a solution in which we imagine a wolf standing beside a stream gazing down at a pike (for the Latin *lupus* can mean both 'pike' and 'wolf', and the presence of a fish would necessitate the water not directly denoted in the language of the poem), with the wolf's forepaws reflected in the water, giving us the four feet of the two wolves (*quattuor pedes*, l. 5) and seven eyes looking (*septem oculis videbant*, l. 5), if we include the pike's two eyes and consider the seventh eye to be the sun. Williams readily admits that her highly pictorial and fable-like reading does not easily cohere with the clearly religious opening lines, and the riddle is ultimately unsatisfactory, underdeveloped, and perhaps even incomplete or incorrect. More important to Williams is understanding the ways in which OE riddles bear the marks of Continental influences and were "flexible enough to accommodate innovation" (242). Williams lastly turns her attention to the two badly damaged and partially incomplete "ink-horn" or "staghorn" riddles (K-D 88 and 93), which she sees as "elegies in miniature" (242), primarily because they emphasize the themes of solitude, deracination, absence, bereavement, and stoic endurance in the diction of an aristocratic-heroic culture. Appended to Williams's essay are her translations of the four riddles.

In a short note, "Hypermetrical Verse Patterns in the Riddles of the Exeter Book" (*N&Q* 47: 405–09), Ursula Zehnder shares an interesting finding from her unpublished M.A. thesis, *The Riddles of the Exeter Book and Beowulf: A Comparison of the Metrical Composition* (Universität Zürich, 1996)—namely, that the cluster of six hypermetrical verses that many have noted occur in K-D Riddle 16 "show an unusual distribution of patterns" (405). Comparing her own scansion of K-D Riddles 1–40 with Geoffrey Russom's electronic scansion of *Beowulf* (available at <http://www.stg.brown.edu/webs/russom/formats>), Zehnder finds that, whereas in the clusters of hypermetrical verses in *Beowulf* "the distribution follows the general patterning of hypermetrical verses very strictly: heavier patterns in the a-verses and light patterns in the b-verses," only light patterns are found in the Riddles (406). Second, in Riddle 16 there is "not one a-verse beginning with an S position, in stark contrast to *Beowulf*, where all hypermetrical a-verses begin with an S position" (407–08). Third, the light hypermetrical verses of Riddle 16 "correspond to the statistically most frequent light types x//Sx/Sx [a1 (2A1a)] and x//Sxx/Sx [a1 (1A*1a)]," and finally, "the relative

frequencies of the Sievers types are comparable in both poems, with A the most frequent and E the least frequent" (408). Zehnder provides detailed tables to illustrate each of her points. The question naturally arising from this analysis, according to Zehnder, is "what the preference for lighter verses in the *Riddles* implies with regard to their metrical composition," especially in light of the fact that "the text seems carefully crafted within the rules of the metre in *Beowulf*" (408). Ultimately, Zehnder believes it would be "very desirable to refine the analysis of the *Riddles*, including other features of metrical composition, such as detailed rules of alliteration, of syntax, anacrusis, resolution, etc.," in order to have a better explanation for Riddle 16's unusual distribution of hypermetrical verses (408-09), which would, in turn, give us deeper insight into the aesthetics of their composition.

Ruin

The possible influences of the Anglo-Latin tradition in the *Ruin*-poet's representation of the past and his sense of aesthetics are Christopher Abram's quarry in his essay "In Search of Lost Time: Aldhelm and *The Ruin*" (*Quaestio* 1: 23-44). It is Abram's belief that *The Ruin*'s "peculiarities of theme and style have not successfully been explained by purely vernacular referents" (24)—in particular, the poem for Abram is less a "personal elegy" than a statement of *sic transit gloria mundi*, the model for which can be found in variants upon the *encomium urbis* theme in late Latin writing that were later incorporated into vernacular works such as *Durham*, and into Anglo-Latin writings such as Alcuin's *Versus de patribus, regibus et sanctis Euboricensis ecclesiae*. Abram also detects in *The Ruin* traces of the *de excidio* theme, well-known in Anglo-Saxon England from Gildas's polemical *De excidio Britanniae*. Abram sees an even closer parallel to *The Ruin*, however, in Venantius Fortunatus's sixth-century *De excidio Thuringiae*, which emphasizes fate as an agent of destruction and also dwells on the architectural features of the fallen kingdom. As Aldhelm is believed to have known the works of Venantius Fortunatus more than any other English writer of the period, Abram looks for resonances between Aldhelm's references to urban decay and *The Ruin*, in order to suggest that *The Ruin* is permeated by the same Christianizing moral irony that permeates Aldhelm's attitude toward the pagan past in his writings. Abram is quick to point out that it is well-known that Aldhelm relished the writing of pagan authors, and likewise in *The Ruin*, "the remains are magnificent, even if the pagans themselves have

withered away" (3). Abram further looks at specific episodes in Aldhelm's writings that share thematic concerns, imagery, and distinctive linguistic features with *The Ruin*, such as Aldhelm's account of the life of St Sylvester in his *Carmen de uirginitate* and his prose rendering of an episode from Sulpicius Severus's *Vita S. Martini*, in which Aldhelm goes into much greater detail than did Sulpicius in describing the architectural features of the pagan temples destroyed by Martin. Abram further details the "highly idiosyncratic" vocabulary of *The Ruin*—it shares more verbal parallels with *Maxims II* than it does with any of the other poem in the Exeter Book—and suggests that, whereas most Old English poetry relies on the repetition of standard formulas, the language of *The Ruin* "might be said to mirror the lexical choices made by Aldhelm and other authors of 'hermeneutic' Latin, where archaisms, Graecisms and glossary words all contributed to the complex, prolix and somewhat tortuous nature of their prose" (37). Finally, Abram points out the ways in which *The Ruin* is stylistically distinct from most vernacular poetry, while closer to the Anglo-Latin tradition, primarily in its heavy use of double alliteration, occasionally Latinate rhyme scheme, and low incidence of enjambment. Old English and Anglo-Latin poetry are increasingly thought to have been mutually influential, especially within a West Saxon literary milieu; Abram believes strongly that *The Ruin* should be viewed as part of the bilingual tradition of West Saxon poetics which breaks down the barriers between Latin and the vernacular.

Rune Poem

R.I. Page's *The Icelandic Rune-Poem* (London: Viking Society for Northern Research, 1999) has been issued as a separate monograph; originally published in 1998 in periodical form ("The Icelandic Rune-Poem," *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 42: 1-37), it was reviewed in *OEN* 33.2.

Seafarer

In "The Seafarer and the Birds: A Possible Irish Parallel" (*Celtica* 23 [1999]: 125-31), Nicolas Jacobs is interested in what he sees as an almost unparalleled instance of the expression of pleasure in the natural world in *Seafarer*, lines 19-22, where the speaker of the poem indicates that in place of the sounds of the mead-hall and the laughter of men, he now has the singing of birds to keep him company. Jacobs points out that while correlations between desolate landscapes and forlorn states of mind is a commonplace in Anglo-Saxon literature, this does not necessarily

mean that this correlation is a universal feature of the literature, and there are instances in the corpus (e.g., *Guthlac A* 742–45) where descriptions of the natural world “have all the agreeable connotations of an idealised medieval landscape” (126). Jacobs’s decision to read lines 19–22 of *Seafarer*, however, as an example of “the pleasures of nature afford[ing] a fair exchange for those of civilisation” (127) is a bit tricky, as most translations of the poem incorporate language that emphasizes the sea-birds’s cacophonous wails and screams, and the speaker’s catalogue of different birds (which extends to line 26) is immediately followed by his iteration of his solitary misery (*ne ænig hleomæga feascaftig ferð frefran meahte*, lines 25b–26 in Krapp and Dobbie’s text, which Jacobs also follows). In order to make the case that the speaker of *Seafarer* is actually taking consolation (or pleasure) in the cries of the sea-birds, Jacobs argues that whereas *fore* in line 21b is usually translated as “for” or “in place of,” rendering the sentiment that the company of birds simply replaces the mead-hall and the laughter of men, we should also consider “in preference to” as a possible translation. Jacobs admits that usage “unequivocally favours ‘instead of’” (128), and evidence for “in preference to” is sketchy at best. He also notes that the further elaboration upon the birds in lines 23–26 and the treatment of springtime in lines 48–55 possess enough adverse connotations that finally it must be accepted that the tone and attitude of lines 19–22 are too complex for easy interpretation and “one may impute to the speaker, as well as a new-found exultation in the delights of the wilderness, a stoical or an embittered resignation to his deprived state” (128). For a possible parallel from a later period to these tonally complex lines, Jacobs suggests two verse passages from the twelfth-century Irish *Buile Shuibhne* (lines 368–71 and 1160–71; no translations provided), in which “the loss of comforts of human society are weighed against the simpler pleasures of the natural world” (129). The existence of “an extensive tradition of unironic celebration of the natural world” in later Irish literature and its “complete absence” in the English tradition leads Jacob to believe that “an Irish rather than an English origin for the motif is likely” (129), but he admits that the process “whereby this apparently Irish motif came to be incorporated in the *Seafarer* remains obscure” (130). In fact there is hardly a paragraph where Jacobs does not point out the inherent instabilities in each of his interpretive suggestions, and he concludes his essay with the remark that the “trails of motifs in Old English poetry apparently derived from the Celtic languages” often “go cold,” and such, he admits, has happened in his case (131). *Caveat lector*.

Seasons for Fasting

For a discussion of *Seasons for Fasting* by E.G. Stanley, see his article in this section under *Death of Edward*, “Old English Poetic Vocabulary: ‘The formal word precise but not pedantic’.”

Wanderer

Building upon studies of orality and literacy by Ong, Stock, and Opland (with nods to Katherine O’Brien O’Keefe and John Miles Foley), Sealy Gilles argues that *Wanderer* is a hybrid poem comprising two competing genres—lament and gnome—that have pretextual histories and incompatible rhetorical strategies (descriptive complaint and prescriptive wisdom); nevertheless, it is only through the process of their textualization that these two disparate forms are able to enter into a dialectic (a “dual voicing”) whereby each genre is tested and modified by the other (“Text as Arena: Lament and Gnome in *The Wanderer*,” *The Rhetorical Poetics of the Middle Ages: Reconstructive Polyphony. Essays in Honor of Robert O. Payne*, ed. John M. Hill and Deborah M. Sinnreich-Levi [Madison, WI and Teaneck, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP], 206–20). First, we must understand that *Wanderer* is the production of a literate poet situated in a semi-literate culture who is writing “out of a wealth of inherited forms and venerable rhetorical ploys” (207). And because manuscript texts do not operate under the constraints of an oral performance that demands adherence to traditional conventions, a poem like *Wanderer* becomes a polyphonic, diachronic discourse that “generates both self-commentary and meta-commentary ... and serves as a mirror for the culture that produced it, a culture in the throes of its own struggle with tradition and invasion” (208). Gilles further argues that the multivocality of the OE elegies “may give us a compressed version of the dialogism and heteroglossia that Bakhtin finds only in the plenitude of the novel” (209). More specifically, Gilles sees *Wanderer*’s hybridization of gnome and lament as yielding “a kind of *amplificatio*” on the *an-haga* of line 1, such that the gnomic wisdom of the opening lines—sententiously general and impersonal—is “given breath, a face, a history” (212). Further, gnome and lament do not just “coexist” in the poem, but rather, “the jussive force of gnomic citations from a collective cultural ethic is expended against the insistent motif of lament” rooted in a “fictive personal history” (217). Finally, Gilles believes that the elegaic lament in OE poetry actually performs a subversively critical function, whereby the supposedly venerable and valuable gnomic wisdom of the past is interrogat-

ed and questioned. This is all somewhat complicated, of course, by the poem's closing lines, in which a gnomic narrator removed from the grieving speaker counsels that men should be silent about their griefs, and therefore, as Gilles indicates, there is no easy way to resolve the generic (and therefore, thematic) differences inherent in the poem.

Widsith

John Niles's work on the complex ideological and historical forces at work in OE literature continues to deepen our understanding both of Anglo-Saxon culture and of our own scholarly practices and assumptions. In "Widsith and the Anthropology of the Past" (PQ 78 [1999]: 171–213), he views *Widsith* as a mythopoetic pseudo-history that begs the question: "What is the point of the main narrative concerning Widsith and the Goths?" For Niles, this question is best answered with reference to tenth-century Anglo-Saxon politics, "deeply enmeshed in attempts to synthesize the heritage and aspirations of the peoples of various ethnic allegiance who were becoming part of an emergent English nation." Therefore, the poem reveals how the English-speaking people living in Britain during a critical period of state-formation were "constructing their historical present, with its various ethnic constituencies, out of a series of gestures toward the past." Niles's second main purpose is to suggest some of the ways in which anthropological methodologies can shed light on the role of poetry in early medieval culture. To that end, he devotes the first section of his essay, "Why an Anthropology of the Past?", to arguing the benefits of anthropological approaches to medieval literature. He begins by providing an overview of important work published in the "watershed" year of 1986 in the disciplines of history, archaeology, oral theory, and anthropology that gave to these disciplines a postmodern turn and redrew the boundaries that traditionally separated them. Niles then asks us to consider that "no scholarship is innocent," meaning that "we create our knowledge of the past from the knowledge of the present," and the historical past is therefore always a "complex cultural construction—in part 'ours' and in part 'theirs'—rather than ... a set of events that once occurred independent of observation." This is an observation shared by many contemporary historians, who also recognize that historical writing is more a mytho-narrative than a reconstruction of bare facts, but what seems lacking here is the question of ethics, where, regardless of the obvious epistemological difficulties, one is concerned with rendering as accurate an historical account as possible of those who might be called the voiceless citizens of the past (excellent work

has been done in this area that would enrich Niles's conception of our relationship to "the historical past," including Dominick LaCapra's *History and Memory After Auschwitz* and *Writing History, Writing Trauma*, and Edith Wyschogrod's *An Ethics of Remembering: History, Heterology, and the Nameless Others*). Even so, Niles convincingly makes the case that medieval studies cannot help but be enriched by comparative, cross-disciplinary approaches that help scholars to move beyond their acculturated "perceptual norms" in order to better recognize the unique "strangeness" of past cultures. Herein lies Niles's nod to ethics, via anthropology's insight that there are as many social logics as there are social groups and each group must be understood on its own terms. In the second section of his essay, "Widsith and Anglo-Saxon Mythopoesis," Niles turns to a reading of the poem as an agonistic, competitive mythistory that "exemplifies a discursive practice that connected a tenth-century social order to an imagined prior period that was associated with racial or tribal origins." In this reading, *Widsith* is a fictional proto-Saxon whose catalogue of ancient rulers reveals a creative ethnicity that privileges a pro-English view of history, whereby the Goths, Danes, Lombards, Picts, and other ethnic groups are seen as having been less instrumental than the Angles and Saxons in the new world order's political landscape. In the final section of the essay, "Poetry as Ritualized Discourse," Niles argues that *Widsith* is more *gewritu* ("writing") than it is poetry, and therefore similar to other tenth-century historical and geographical writings that promoted "an ideology of nationhood" in a society where inscription, whether on coins or stones or vellum, helped to establish and maintain power relations beyond kinship ties. For Niles, *Widsith* is a highly-stylized historical narrative that "through its quasi-ritualistic character ... lends the words of the speaker 'Widsith' an aura of authenticity that could not otherwise be obtained." Utilizing the OE *giedd*, which Niles interprets as a hybrid genre comprising verse as well as prose, *Widsith* is ultimately a written text masquerading as an oral performance that likely would have "activated the ethos of small group encounters in situations where the subjects of power are actually subsumed into much larger and more impersonal units." Poetry as Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon.

Wife's Lament

In his short essay "Eald is ðes eorðsele, eal ic eom oflongad: Psychology, Space/Time and Ecology in *The Wife's Lament*" (SELIM 8 [1998]: 157–70), Jorge Luis Bueno Alonso makes the unremarkable argument that *The Wife's Lament* is a poem that has as its the-

matic core the expression of mental suffering rooted in a perspective that is both deeply personal and universally general. Further, the “conceptual world” of the poem “spins around” three parameters: psychology, space/time, and ecology. The female narrator “basically chooses an almost exclusively psychological point of view to describe her past remembrances” (159); the psychology of the poem interacts with space because distance from the husband is “a cause for suffering,” and it interacts with time because the present is “the background for the psychological expression” (164–65); the natural settings of the wife’s *wuda bearwe* (“forest grove”) and *eorðsele* (“earth-cave”) and the husband’s *feorres folcondes* (“distant lands”) “describe metaphorically the narrator’s mental distress” (166). And all of this forms a poetic expression of a universal human experience.

The interpretive limitations of privileging the “heroic tradition” in the translation and criticism of OE literature is Susan Signe Morrison’s engaging subject in her essay “Unnatural Authority: Translating beyond the Heroic in *The Wife’s Lament*” (*Medievalia and Humanistica* 27: 19–31). Morrison begins with a survey of the various ways in which the “heroic mode” has dominated Anglo-Saxon scholarship, leading to a privileging of *Beowulf* and other heroic texts in the canon, and describes how some feminist scholars have challenged this tradition. Using *The Wife’s Lament* as a primary focus for her argument, Morrison explains how heroic *topoi* in OE poetry have traditionally “been read in a way that naturalizes gender, lending authority to male agents in texts and disempowering female figures” (20). Historically, *The Wife’s Lament* has been tagged as an elegy and grouped with the male-narrated elegies such as *Wanderer* and *Seafarer*, whereby the poem is legitimated with respect to how it is perceived to fulfill (or fall short of) the formal properties of a genre mainly comprising male voices. Feminist scholars such as Barrie Ruth Strauss, Jane Chance and Emily Jensen sought to read the Wife as an “active” hero equal in stature to a *Beowulf*, or as a religious figure equal to a Bede—therefore, as Clare A. Lees has pointed out, they tended to stay within the bounds of traditionally gendered *topoi*. Genre, therefore, influences and even forecloses how we read OE poetry, which Morrison sees as a hindrance to our understanding *The Wife’s Lament* on its own terms. A further impediment, she argues, are editors and their accompanying glossaries, which, although seemingly objective, “like translation itself, construct interpretation, particularly in term of gender” (23). After a brief overview of important work by Josephine Bloomfield, Carol Braun Pasternack, and

Carol Jay Clover to demonstrate how modern cultural biases have imposed particular concepts and relationships (particularly in the areas of kingship, family, and gender roles) onto OE and ON texts, Morrison proposes that we “develop a nongendered reading of certain key words in Old English in order to transcend the binarisms of active/passive and heroic/non-heroic, drawing *The Wife’s Lament* beyond the heroic” (24). To suggest how this might work, she traces the different lexical connotations ascribed by various editors to the OE word *sið*, as it has appeared in *The Wife’s Lament*, but also in *Beowulf*, *Genesis*, *Juliana*, *Andreas*, *Elene*, *Guthlac*, *Dream of the Rood*, *The Husband’s Message*, *Soul and Body I*, *Judgment Day I*, and *Resignation*, and variously glossed as “travel in a foreign land,” “peregrination,” “adventure,” “journey to hell,” “devil’s mission,” “religious pilgrimage,” “soul’s journey,” and “exile,” to name only some of its designated meanings. Morrison’s broad survey leads her to conclude that “*sið* and its variants appear much more often in religious texts than in heroic ones,” and further, *sið* has a “wide, non-gender-specific use” that, as a signifier, “could be pursued to deconstruct the heroic ethos read into the Old English canon” (25). Following this, Morrison wants to read *The Wife’s Lament* alongside *Resignation* within the web of connotations denoted by another non-gender-specific OE term, *fæst* or *fæstlic* (“firm,” “steadfast,” and “standing fast”), that she sees as conveying the ideal behavior of “resoluteness” in both religious and heroic texts, such as *Christ* and *The Battle of Maldon*, and which “constitutes what is truly praiseworthy in Anglo-Saxon texts regardless of literary genre or gender or performer” (26). Although the speakers of *The Wife’s Lament* and *Resignation* are clearly different in important respects—the speaker of *Resignation*, for example, accepts his fate, whereas the Wife is restless in her anxiety—the two poems’ coincidence of certain phrases such as *sið* and *wineleas wræcca* (“friendless exile”), and their close proximity in the Exeter Book, lead Morrison to argue that reading these two poems in conjunction is more fruitful than comparisons between *The Wife’s Lament* and elegaic or heroic poems such as *Seafarer* and *Beowulf*. Morrison believes that “resoluteness,” in the OE canon, is a much richer and more complex normative value than “activity” or “passivity” with which to examine each poem’s speakers, both of whom can be seen as exemplifying in their speech *actions* of resoluteness and steadfastness in the face of personal loss. This type of reading is not only non-gendered and inclusive, but is also sensitive to “how a word develops a complex texture according to the various contexts in which the word is situated” (27).

Wulf and Eadwacer

Wulf and Eadwacer is only briefly touched upon in Anne L. Klinck's essay, "The Oldest Folk Poetry? Medieval Woman's Song as 'Popular' Lyric" (*From Arabye to Engeland: Medieval Studies in Honour of Mahmoud Manzalaoui*, ed. A.E. Christa Canitz and Gernot R. Wieland [Ottawa: U of Ottawa Press, 1999], 229–52), but her essay provides important insight into understanding how scholars (English, French, German, and Spanish) have traditionally differentiated between "courtly" and "popular" female-voiced love lyrics without always understanding the questionable assumptions behind those generic categories. Klinck reminds us that medieval literary theorists did not use terms corresponding to our conceptions of "aristocratic" and "popular," although they did have an understanding, borrowed from the classical tradition, of "high," "medium," and "low" styles; nevertheless, there has been a strongly-held modern view that medieval "woman's song" is rooted in a preliterate, oral, primitive, and emotional tradition—a view clearly derived from a nineteenth-century "Romantic fascination with the folk and the eternal feminine" (231). Klinck argues that typifying a particular mode as popular "implies a set of questionable assumptions: that level of complexity, degree of sincerity, capacity for sensitivity etc. are somehow correlated, in either a parallel or inverse way, with social class" (233), and she sees the equation of orality with the lower classes as a "post-medieval bias." Klinck examines a broad variety of lyric texts, from the OE *Wulf and Eadwacer* to the Mozarabic *kharjas* of southern Spain to the *Carmina Burana* to the Provençal *trobairitz*, among others, in order to demonstrate how the medieval female-voiced lyric, although occasionally drawing upon vernacular styles and motifs, is clearly the poetry of an educated elite. Rather than lapse into a terminology that "reflects a fusion or confusion of medieval ideas about the courtly and the uncourtly with Romantic notions about the folk," Klinck suggests we discard the term "popular" and adopt the following as "typical features" of woman's song/woman's love poetry: "(a) in a woman's voice, (b) contrastive to male-voice love lyric, (c) apparently simple, (d) outspoken, (e) openly sensual" (243). Some of these categories, like "popular," also beg to be deconstructed.

In her short note "Dogode in *Wulf and Eadwacer* and King Alfred's Hunting Metaphors" (ANQ 13: 3–9), Marijane Osborn argues that, although she does not agree with Trautmann's and other scholars' idea that the three main personages of the poem are animals (whether dogs or wolves), "strong animal im-

agery clearly does run throughout the poem," and therefore "the nonce word *dogode* in line 9 should be retained and understood within the 'animal' context rather than emended." Because *dogode* does not occur elsewhere in the OE corpus, the verb has been emended by many editors and commentators, but Osborn believes that in a poem that names a character "Wulf" and also includes other canine- or lupine-related words, such as "whelp," we should consider that "the source of the derived verb **dogian* might be *docge*, 'dog,' and that it denotes some kind of traditional canine behavior," such as "tracking." According to Osborn, the possibility that *dogode* could denote an animal metaphor gains some credence by King Alfred's use of a similar hunting metaphor in his preface to his translation of Gregory's *Pastoral Care*, where Alfred imagines "God's servants" trying to follow (*spyrigeaen*) the track (*swæð*) of their predecessors. The idea here is that "those who serve God should be following with their minds the track (that is, the writing) of their elders with the same dedication with which hounds trace a scent," and this Alfredian diction may have served as a model for line 9 of *Wulf and Eadwacer*: *Wulfes ic mines widlastum wenum dogode* ("I tracked my Wulf's far journeys with [my] hopes").

E.A.J.

Works not seen

- Amtstätter, Mark Emanuel. "Elemente der Klanglichkeit und Sprachkomposition in der altsächsischen Genesisdichtung," *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 53 (2000): 87–121.
- Davis, Craig R. "Cultural Historicity in *The Battle of Maldon*," PQ 78 (1999): 151–69.
- Laszlo, Renate. *Ewig ist der Schöpfer: Caedmons Schopfunghymnus im Codex Exoniensis*. Marburg: Tectum, 106 pp.
- Reichardt, Paul F. "Bede on Death and a Neglected Old English Lyric," *Kentucky Philol. Rev.* 12 (1997): 55–60.

c. Beowulf

Text, Language, Meter

Bruce Mitchell and Susan Irvine, in *'Beowulf' Repunctuated*, OEN Subsidia 29 (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute and Rawlinson Center), have produced an experimental edition of the poem avoiding modern punctuation where the sense of a passage is clear without it. A raised point (·), used by Anglo-Saxon scribes, replaces the semicolon and other indicators of a signifi-

cant pause between clauses, the first comma not appearing until line 132b. The text is based upon that of Mitchell and Fred C. Robinson, *Beowulf: An Edition* (1998; rpt. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000). An Introduction and frequent notes explain the editors' choices. A brief sample from the opening lines of the poem:

HWÆT!

WE GAR-Dena in geardagum
 þeodcyninga þrym gefrunon-
 hu þa æþelingas ellen fremedon. (p. 33)

Michael Lapidge, in "The Archetype of *Beowulf*," ASE 20: 5–41, explains many of the errors involving a single letter in the text of BL Cotton Vitellius A. xv by proposing that the original version was written in the early eighth century in Anglo-Saxon set minuscule, a script which was unfamiliar to the two copyists of the poem in Cotton Vitellius. Scribe A, who copied the poem through line 1939, wrote in English vernacular minuscule which came into use around the year 1000, while Scribe B, who copied from line 1940 through the end of the poem, wrote in a more conservative Anglo-Saxon square minuscule, which went out of use at about the same time. The confusion between *a* and *u*, *r* and *n*, *p* and *w* [wynn], *c* and *t*, all suggest a date for the production of the archetype of *Beowulf* before the advent of Anglo-Saxon square minuscule around c. 900. The confusion of *d* and *ð*, Lapidge argues, suggests an even earlier *terminus ante quem* for the original, since after c. 750, "scribes consistently used the letter eth [ð] to distinguish the interdental fricative from the alveolar stop (represented as always by *d*), a practice which had become invariable by the time of King Alfred in the late ninth century" (34). Lapidge imagines at least three stages of transmission: 1) the original set minuscule version of the earlier eighth century, 2) "a recopying during the late ninth or early tenth century when the distinctive Early West Saxon linguistic features will have entered the transmission," and 3) "the final act of copying c. 1000 which produced Cotton Vitellius A. xv and introduced many of the features of Late West Saxon" (36).

Fidel Fajardo-Acosta asks us to "Think of Wulfstan: the Author of *Beowulf*" (*Essays on Old, Middle, Modern English*, ed. Gruber, 49–71). The admonition quoted in the title of this essay was first addressed to Fajardo-Acosta himself by the volume's honoree. In 1994 Fajardo-Acosta had analyzed the hero's name as a contracted form of *Beornwulf*, compounded from *beorn* 'man, son' + *wulf* 'wolf' = "man-wolf" or "son of the wolf." He had also speculated that the poet personally identified with his lycanthropic hero, at least

in part, by name. On this basis, two possible candidates for the authorship of *Beowulf* were proposed: the known Anglian poet Cynewulf (late eighth or early ninth century) or a "semi-hypothetical Mercian scholar" Werwulf, who may have been practicing his craft at the court of King Alfred in the later ninth century (50). Since presenting these hypotheses, however, Fajardo-Acosta has come to accept Kevin Kiernan's dating of the composition of *Beowulf* to the time of the manuscript itself, that is, the earlier eleventh century, perhaps during the reign of King Cnut (1016–35). This later date would, of course, nullify the candidacy of the two proposed *-wulfs*, but Tripp encouraged Fajardo-Acosta to make a case for *Wulfstan*, the famous homilist and Archbishop of York, who died in 1023 and "constructed a literary wolf-persona" for himself in his *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* (50). In addition to similarities of style and theme in Wulfstan's prose and *Beowulf*, Fajardo-Acosta finds the archbishop's personal "situation as an Anglian subject working for the West-Saxons in the days of Danish dominance" to be suggestive of a mind which must have mused, like the poet's, on the sad reversals of kingdoms and peoples through time (65).

Steven E. Smith, in "The Provenance of the *Beowulf* Manuscript," ANQ 13.1: 3–7, sketches a hypothetical "itinerary" for this text in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. After its copying c. 1000, the manuscript was possibly housed at St. Mary's priory in Southwick until King Henry VIII dissolved the monasteries in the 1530s. It may then have been acquired from St. Mary's by Sir William Cecil, from whom Laurence Nowell, the compiler of the first dictionary of Old English, obtained it in 1563. Nowell gave his collection of manuscripts to the antiquary William Lambarde in 1567, from whom Sir Robert Cotton, who died in 1631, may have obtained it directly or through intermediaries, possibly another Old English lexicographer, William Somner, or the antiquary John Selden.

Alfred Bammesberger's "The Superlative of OE *gód* in *Beowulf*" (NM 101: 519–21) addresses the problem of three trisyllabic half-lines in which this adjective appears: 947a and 1759a (*secg betsta* 'best man') and 1871b (*ðegn betstan* 'best thegn'). These half-lines fall short of the "canonical minimum" of four syllables (519); Bammesberger suggests that the original forms were respectively *secg bet[e]sta* and *ðegn bet[e]stan*. In "Old English *reote* in *Beowulf*, line 2457a" (N&Q 47: 158–59), Bammesberger speculates that the poet may have coined an abstract noun *ræte* 'joy' from the adjective *rot* 'glad, cheerful', the *o* and *e* later transposed

in copying. Why Grendel's mother should be referred to by a masculine pronoun has never been adequately explained, so Bammesberger asks again, "What Does *he* in Lines 1392b and 1394b of *Beowulf* Refer to?" (*N&Q* 47: 403–05). His answer is that this pronoun reflects the grammatical gender of a masculine singular antecedent, the noun *gang* 'track, trail' in line 1391b. Grendel's kinswoman's *trail* will not be lost, the hero is saying here, "go where it will!" In "Beowulf's Landing in Denmark" (*ES* 81: 97–99), Bammesberger makes a stab at the well-known crux in line 224a, *eoteles æt ende*. He suggests that *ende* 'end' should be understood in a local rather than temporal sense and that *eoteles* reflects the genitive singular of an earlier Anglian form *elet(c)* 'a separated place', influenced in the spelling of its first syllable by West Saxon *ea-* 'water'. The half-line should thus be interpreted "at the end of the place reserved [for the landing of vessels]." Hideki Watanabe, "Final Words on *Beowulf* 1020b: *brand Healfdenes*" (*NM* 101: 51–57), affirms the manuscript reading over suggested emendations and interprets the noun phrase as the direct object of *forgeaf* in line 1020a whose implied subject is Hrothgar. The whole of line 1020 should read: "He [Hrothgar] then gave Beowulf Healfdene's sword."

R.W. McConchie, "The Use of the Verb *mapelian* in *Beowulf*" (*NM* 101: 59–68), following Matti Rissanen (1998), sets out to refine our understanding of the conditions which favor the use of this particular "speech-introducing verb" over others (59). *Mapelian* occurs 26 times in *Beowulf*; in every case, it is used in the third person preterite singular (*mapelode/mapelade*), introduces direct speeches (averaging 36 lines apiece), occurs in the first half-line, and implies that the speech to follow is of a public and/or serious nature. It tends not to be used with speeches that contain a certain amount of predictable formality, as in courteous or dutiful remarks, but rather to introduce those which respond to a question with an answer that could not otherwise have been known, which adduce gnomic wisdom as appropriate to the situation or which reveal new material information of some sort.

Seiichi Suzuki's "The Metrical Reorganization of Type E in the *Heliand*" (*Amer. Jnl of Germanic Ling. & Literatures* 12: 281–90) compares the use of Sievers' fifth type of metrical half-line (/ \ x /) in this Old Saxon poem and in *Beowulf* (cf. Eduard Sievers, *Altgermanische Metrik* [1893]). In the Old English poem, type E shows a "consistent preference" for the second or b-verse, while in the *Heliand*, this preference is not as strong, but graded according to the composition of

the first three of the four positions in variants of this verse type.

Sources and Analogues

In *Beowulf and the Dragon: Parallels and Analogues* (Cambridge: Brewer), Christine Rauer presents the findings of her doctoral thesis on the possible sources of the dragon episode in lines 2200–3182 of the poem, with special focus upon previously neglected dragon-fights depicted in saints' lives. Rauer compares the episode in *Beowulf* to sixty examples of a fight between a saint and a dragon, as well as fifty more between a hero and a dragon in secular Scandinavian literature. She concludes that certain features of this hagiographical commonplace, in conjunction with the imagery of classical Latin and native Germanic versions of the topos, "probably influenced the composition of the dragon-fight in *Beowulf*" (5). In three substantial appendices, Rauer supplies text and translation of dragon-fights from Ovid to a nineteenth-century Danish folktale, a chronological bibliography of saints and dragons from St. Jerome (c. 390) to the *Breviary of Rennes* (1514), and another chronological bibliography of Scandinavian dragon-fights from *Völuspá* (c. 1000) to those of several fifteenth-century sagas.

Joyce Tally Lionarons, in "Sometimes the Dragon Wins: Unsuccessful Dragon Fighters in Medieval Literature" (*Essays on Old, Middle, Modern English*, ed. Gruber, 301–16), explores the significance of those rare instances when a dragon succeeds in killing its challenger. She finds three such victims: the god Thor in *Völuspá* and *Snorra Edda*, the hero Beowulf in his poem and the titular hero of the Middle High German *Ortnit*. Lionarons accepts René Girard's theory of the mythic function of monster-slaying in *Violence and the Sacred* (1987). Such myths, Girard argues, project the morally ambiguous, ongoing nature of hostility between human groups onto a single monstrous enemy of all people. By killing this solitary antagonist once and for all, without threat of further retaliation from its kin, the god or hero creates a new cosmic and political order where peace under his authority can prevail. In the case of Thor and Beowulf, we have the reverse of this pattern, "the end of order and the triumph of chaos, a myth of destruction" (307). However, the case of *Ortnit* is more complex. Unlike Thor and Beowulf, who bravely kill their serpentine foes before they die themselves, this hero is betrayed by his heathen father-in-law, carried off from sleep and sucked out of his armor by the dragon's hungry chicks. He is then avenged by Wolfdietrich, the titular hero of another poem with

which *Ortnit* is combined in all but one of the surviving manuscripts. A similar version of this longer story is told in the Norwegian *Þiðreks saga af Bern*. Lionarons follows Carl Voretzsch (1990) in arguing that *Ortnit* had been victorious over the dragon in an earlier form of the legend, but later became the dragon's victim when his story was subsumed into the cycle of the even more popular and powerful hero Dietrich.

Jonathan D. Evans, "The *Heynesbók* Dragon: an Old Icelandic Maxim in Its Legal-Historical Context," *JEGP* 99: 461–91, analyzes this manuscript illustration of a dragon and its accompanying motto: *Sem ormuren elskar gullit, svo elskar hinn agjarne rangfeingit fe* 'Just as the dragon loves the gold, so does the greedy love ill-gotten gain' (465, 491). Both image and scrolled maxim decorate the first letter of a chapter on inheritance in this early sixteenth-century copy of the *Jónsbók* law code adopted by the Icelandic Althing in 1282. Evans adduces the dragon gnomes of the Old English poems *Maxims II* (lines 26b–27a) and *Beowulf* (2275–77) to support his view that the image and proverb are intended to serve as a traditional warning against greed.

A.P. Church, "Beowulf's '*ana ben*' and the Rhetorical Context of the 'Hunferþ Episode,'" *Rhetorica* 18: 49–78, follows Gabriele Knappe (1996, 1998, 1999) in arguing that school exercises in classical grammar and rhetoric, especially for Church the Greek *progymnasmata*, influenced the presentation of material in Old English vernacular poetry. This influence can be seen in the exchange between the hero and "Hunferþ" in *Beowulf*. Church rejects the emendation of this character's name to Unferþ and insists on the seriousness of his role as *pyle* 'orator, spokesman'. Following Carol Clover (1980), Church accepts the episode as a conventional Germanic *flyting*, but finds evidence of the rhetorical strategies "confirmation, refutation and commonplace" in the way the verbal contest is developed by the poet. Church believes that these techniques of composition were introduced into the Anglo-Saxon curriculum by Archbishop Theodore of Tarsus, who assumed his see in 669.

Daniel Sävborg, in "Beowulf and Sonatorrek Are Genuine Enough: an Answer to Klaus von See," *Skandinavistik* 30: 44–59, defends his doctoral dissertation, published as *Sorg och elegi i Eddans hjälteediktning* [Grief and Elegy in the Heroic Eddic Poems] (Stockholm, 1997), against a critique by Klaus von See, published the following year in *Skandinavistik* 28 (1998). At dispute is whether there is a common Germanic tradition of poetic lament behind the "Eddic elegies,"

in particular, *Hamðismál* and the *Guðrún* poems. Sävborg cites the tenth-century Old Norse *Sonatorrek* of Egill Skallagrímsson and the Old English *Beowulf* as evidence for this common poetic tradition, rejecting von See's claims that grief is not the real subject of *Sonatorrek* and that *Beowulf* is "not genuinely Old Germanic." Sävborg counters that Old Germanic culture was not a single "homogeneous phenomenon," but that the poetic laments in both *Sonatorrek* and *Beowulf*, in their terminology and techniques, are similar enough to characterize a common traditional treatment of grief seen also in the elegies of the *Poetic Edda*.

Criticism

As we have seen in the previous section on sources and analogues, the year 2000 saw several fresh attempts to find an appropriate context for interpreting the hero's battle with his final antagonist. Zacharias P. Thundy explores the implicit symbolism of the monsters, especially the last, in "The Dragon in *Beowulf*: Cain's Seed, Heresy, and Islam" (*Essays on Old, Middle, Modern English*, ed. Gruber, 201–30). The manuscript says that Grendel had been condemned in *caines cynne* 'among Cain's kin' (107a). This genitive singular form of the name was corrected in the manuscript itself from *comes*, which Thundy believes to be the spelling intended by the poet, referring not to the first-born son of Adam and Eve, but rather to *Cam* or *Cham* = *Ham*, the third, cursed son of Noah. Thundy does not address the poet's assertion in the next line (108b) that the cause of this condemnation was the slaying of Abel. Instead, following Mellinkoff (1979), he cites Alcuin and others to show that the descendants of Cain and Cham/Ham were often confused or conflated in early medieval exegesis and historiography. Cain's giantish kin had all supposedly been destroyed by the Flood of Genesis 6, but the term "race of Cain" was sometimes applied in an extended sense to the similarly wicked descendants of Cham/Ham, among whom Thundy argues the Muslim Arabs are to be included as dangerous heretics from Africa. In addition, the dragon of the biblical Apocalypse was understood by some commentators to personify the heretical Antichrist of the last days, so it too came to be associated with Muhammed and the forces of Islam in the seventh and eighth centuries. The monsters in *Beowulf* thus represent a poetic Anglo-Saxon response to the threat of militant Islam during this period.

In "Warriors, Wyrms, and Wyrð: the Paradoxical Fate of the Germanic Hero/King in *Beowulf*," Es-

says in *Med. Stud.* 16: 1–15, Kevin J. Wanner examines the symbolism of the dragon-fight in the context of a fundamental paradox in pre-Christian Germanic society. This paradox is that heroes must win riches through spectacular violence in order to achieve political power, but also then attract “multiple sources of hostility as they attempt to protect what they possess” (12). The dragon represents the force of this inevitable hostility, even as it symbolizes the possessiveness of the doomed hero-turned-king himself who now fights obsessively to keep the wealth he needs to maintain his power.

Jeremy M. Downes offers a psychoanalytic study of the hero, monsters and poet in a chapter entitled “*Words and Works: Oral Epics and Preoedipal Concerns*,” in the author’s *Recursive Desire: Rereading Epic Tradition* (Tuscaloosa/London: U of Alabama P, 1997), 24–60. Unfortunately, a printer’s error has left pp. 24–25, 28–29, 32–33, 36–37, 44–45, and 48–49 blank. However, enough of Downes’ argument is present to make some reconstruction possible. A traditional epic hero such as Beowulf seeks to establish an independent identity for himself by striking out violently against a world which threatens to engulf him. This narcissistic aggression is expressed through a journey away from home in order to confront a monster, the hero’s own alter-ego, who personifies his antisocial desires: “a great part of Beowulf’s meaning as hero and character comes from the fact that he *is* Grendel” (58). However, in harming Grendel to help others Beowulf is also, in effect, trying to repress his own “insatiable narcissism in favor of coherence, community, and order” (55). He can never do so completely or permanently. The hero’s recursive desire for independent distinction leads him violently to reject engulfment by a mother-figure and finally to confront a monster which represents the overwhelming force of cosmic aggression against the self. Downes believes that this voluntary self-sacrifice is, psychologically, “a win-win situation for the hero” (60). It secures for him the changeless glory of positive personal achievement, even while “it allows the most thorough form of self-punishment for the narcissistic assertion” (60). In a parallel analysis, Downes believes that the poet’s violent *words* depicting the hero’s violent *deeds* are themselves a form of aggressive self-assertion against a tradition which threatens to engulf the poet’s individual voice. His poem is a way of striking out a timeless distinction for himself through a performance of such unique power that it supersedes all others.

E.V. Thornbury is more interested in the symbolism of the dragon’s barrow in “*Eald enta geweorc* and

the Relics of Empire: Revisiting the Dragon’s Lair in *Beowulf*” (*Quaestio* 1: 82–92, ill.). Following Brodeur (1960), Thornbury suggests that this image is a pastiche of features adapted from prehistoric barrows and Roman ruins: “The recognition of the Roman elements in the construction of the dragon’s mound ... allows our understanding of the scene to be tintured by the remembrances of departed worldly power and glory traditionally awakened by such ruins,” often called *enta geweorc* ‘the work of giants’, in other Old English poems (92).

Shunichi Noguchi’s “*Beowulf and the (In)effectiveness of the Ancient ‘Curse’*” (*Essays on Old, Middle, Modern English*, ed. Gruber, 125–38) argues that the *galdor* ‘spell, incantation’ which encircles the gold on line 3052b is not really a curse at all, at least not an effective one. Beowulf in no way suffers the dire punishments which ancient princes had proclaimed until doomsday for the plunderer of the hoard in lines 3071–75. Instead, he achieves the reverse: the *dom* ‘judgment, glory’ of the righteous (line 2820), in part for that very deed. The gold may be cursed, but not the hero, which is why the surviving Geatish warriors are “determined to bury the unhappy treasure again” (133).

Michael Stephen Lane offers different view of the dragon’s hoard in “June 1999: St. Beowulf?” *Triumph of the Past* June 1999: [1–4], and “Remembrance of the Past in *Beowulf*” (*In Geardagum* 21: 41–59). Lane resolves the pagan-Christian tension in the poem by suggesting that the poet had a far more coherent vision of Scandinavian and biblical prehistory than has been previously recognized. According to Lane, the poet imagines Hrothgar and Beowulf not as “noble pagans” but as the direct spiritual heirs of Noah. The dragon’s hoard is the mystical legacy of this noble progenitor. The hero sacrifices his life to recover it for the good of all humankind, fulfilling “the destiny of the Geatish nation” on earth, a people chosen by God for this very purpose (“Remembrance,” 42). Like the Old Testament patriarchs, Lane suggests, Beowulf becomes the forerunner of a new spiritual order, an “implicit saint”; “the monument enclosing his remains, with treasure taken from the earth-hall, represents a shrine” (58).

Gale R. Owen-Crocker, *The Four Funerals in ‘Beowulf’ and the Structure of the Poem* (Manchester/New York: Manchester UP), follows John Niles (1983) in finding the poem organized according to ring structures in which certain narrative sequences are replicated cyclically or in reverse order. In particular, she

argues that the poem revolves around four funerals: the sea-burial of Scyld Scefing at the outset, the cremation of Hildeburh's kin in the Finnsburh lay, the lament of the Last Survivor at the deposition of his people's treasure, and the elaborate obsequies for the hero himself at the end of the poem. This repetition reveals *Beowulf* as a kind of "funerary poetry," comparable to lost Norse works mentioned by Snorri Sturluson or to the various stanzas on graves in Celtic tradition. However, Owen-Crocker finds that this emphasis on funerals mitigates rather than intensifies the poem's pessimism. There is moral progress. The wise and gentle hero whose ashes are interred at the end of the poem has brought into a Christian ethical world the fierce virtues of Scyld Scefing whose ship-funeral began it. Beowulf "will be remembered not just as a great hero, but as a good man. His death is a major passing, but it is not the end. ... Beowulf's barrow is created as a landmark for seafarers, not the same seafarers he knew, but others who will travel the same seas" (238-39).

Phyllis R. Brown, too, finds the cyclical patterns in the poem more hopeful than its sad ending might suggest in "Cycles and Change in *Beowulf*" (*Manuscript, Narrative, Lexicon*, ed. Boenig and Davis, 171-92). The poem's pattern of "dramatic reversals" competes with an apocalyptic interpretation of its conclusion. Brown argues that a Gregorian view of the efficacy of virtuous action, even in pagan times, even in this transitory world, inspires the poet's depiction of a hero who bravely perseveres to do good through the inevitable revolutions of time.

In contrast, Raymond P. Tripp, Jr., in "The Homiletic Sense of Time in *Beowulf*" (*In Geardagum* 21: 23-40), finds a very strong, irreversibly linear representation of time-passing in the poem, not the "peculiar stasis" (25) of time perceived as an endless series of reversions. Tripp believes that much of the language with which the passage of time is expressed in *Beowulf* echoes the rhetoric of temporal brevity and "eschatological urgency" (32) found in Anglo-Saxon sermons. These stress the shortness of life on earth and the imminence of Judgment Day, after which all of human history will be seen to have appeared but for a moment.

Helena Soukupová more specifically studies the attitude of Beowulf himself to the passing of his life in "The Anglo-Saxon Hero on His Death-Day: Transience or Transcendence? (A Motivic Analysis of Beowulf's and Byrhtnoth's Death Speeches)," *Litteraria Pragensia* 18 (1999): 5-26. Unlike the Christian poet

in lines 2819a-20, the hero never mentions the fate of his own or anyone else's soul, but rather "keeps looking back [to] what he is leaving," not to "where he is going" (12-13). Soukupová concludes that the hero sees death more as a loss of this life than as a progress of the soul to some future condition. In the *Battle of Maldon*, on the other hand, Byrhtnoth prays fervently for the safe transit of his soul to God even as his body is cut down by Vikings. He "gives no political or moral account of his previous life," ignores the battle still raging around him and voices little interest in the fate of his men, the future of his people or the disposition of his body. Byrhtnoth is "a Christian hero of the new type, implanted into the traditional Germanic heroic world," one who can find "comfort and confidence [as] an individual at the point of death" (24).

In "*Beowulf* as Epic," *Oral Tradition* 15: 159-69, Joseph Harris develops his earlier arguments (1982, 1985) that the poem is a *summa litterarum*, a consummation of prior oral-traditional genres and literary epic in a comprehensive terminal form. *Beowulf* is also retrospective in an historical sense, which suggests to Harris a Mercian provenance in the later eighth or early ninth century, in part because he believes this Anglian kingdom may have had an ancient affinity with the old Scandinavian Geats featured in the poem. Among the structural devices with which the *Beowulf* poet organizes his material is that of *mise en abyme* or "nested narrative parallels" (164). This device can be illustrated by the Old Man's Lament for his executed son (lines 2444-62a), inserted as an epic simile into the hero's description of his grandfather Hrethel's grief at the slaying of that king's son Herebeald. This reduplicated scenario is that of an old man who has lived to see the death of a son but is too stricken with grief and years to hope to beget another to replace him. Harris notes that this double image is inserted into the hero's contemplation of his own imminent death and lack of a son. As in a hall of mirrors, Beowulf on his death-day sees an image of himself reflected in an endless corridor of sonless fathers. This infinite regress of compounded regret is nested in the yet broader implication that Beowulf's soon-to-be-ravaged people were the pagan forebears of the poem's Christian audience in England. Now these ancestors, too, are gone forever, so that the audience's gaze is quadruply driven down into the backward abyss of time. Harris develops this analysis at some greater length in "'Double Scene' and 'Mise en Abyme' in Beowulfian Narrative" (in *Gudar på jorden: Festschrift till Lars Lönnroth*, ed. Stina Hansson and Mats Malm [Stockholm/Stehag: Symposion], 322-38).

John M. Hill organized a special issue of *PQ* 78 (1999) devoted to "Anthropological Approaches to Old English Literature," 1-13. Stephen O. Glosecki begins the collection with "Beowulf and the Wills: Traces of Totemism?" (15-47), in which he suggests that archaic systems of clan affiliation have left vestiges both in the poem and in certain surviving testamentary documents in Anglo-Saxon England. In *Beowulf*, for example, the nomenclature of kinship is more detailed on the mother's than the father's side; inheritance is bilateral, implying some memory of matrilineal forms, associated with clan solidarity, in the legendary material the poet inherited. In the wills, a sororal nephew can sometimes receive as much as, or more than, a legitimate son, intimating that a sister's-son avunculate may not yet have been fully replaced by a more patrilineal model in Anglo-Saxon inheritance customs. Glosecki sees these older forms as maintaining a tenuous coexistence with the new patterns of social organization which came to supplant them.

In the same issue, John Hill himself explores "The Ethnopsychology of In-law Feud and the Remaking of Group Identity in *Beowulf*: the Cases of Hengest and Ingeld" (97-123). He argues that the two feud stories centering upon these figures are intended by the poet neither to criticize the revenge imperative nor to demonstrate the inherent instability of marriage alliance, but rather to show a justified, even admirable assertion of Danish or Heathobearic honor and group identity against a humiliating entanglement. In the case of Hengest, Hildeburh's "bitter appropriation of the funeral pyre" to burn both her brother and son "is a mute demand for retribution" (119). In the case of Ingeld, Hill cites Saxo Grammaticus to support the view that the Heathobearic king's acceptance of the Danish princess Freawaru is a shameful compromise of honor, a form of "luxurious gluttony ... unmindful of ancestral values" (99).

In the same issue, David Day's "Hwanaan sio fæhð aras: Defining the Feud in *Beowulf*" (77-95) concludes that the poet uses the term *fæhð* not "loosely to describe any sort of violence," as is sometimes understood, but "to describe only those conflicts having an ongoing, retaliatory character that define the relationship of the parties over time" (91). Marijane Osborn, in "'The Wealth They Left Us': Two Women Author Themselves through Others' Lives in *Beowulf*" (49-76), shows how three characters in the poem, one man and two women, can be seen to construct their own life-narratives in response to prior models. Beowulf publicly edits the account of his personal past

provided by Unferth, representing himself as a capable monster-slayer "who performs an unobligated deed for the good of the people." In doing so, the hero implicitly "counters Hrothgar's attempt to diminish his high intentions and to represent his coming as a 'duty'" (54). Wealhtheow, on the other hand, can be understood to have privately grasped the point of the tragedy of Hildeburh as told in the *Finnsburh* lay. She immediately takes public steps to avoid a similar disaster for herself. In like manner, Hygd the queen of the Geats contemplates the story of the ancient queen Thryth and judiciously selects those aspects of her predecessor's behavior which she wishes to emulate or avoid.

In "Sleeping after the Feast: Deathbeds, Marriage Beds, and the Power Structure of Heorot," *Neophil.* 84: 629-46, Brian McFadden argues that the poet uses the oral-traditional theme of sleeping after a feast, with its metaphoric extension of death or sexual union, to indicate subtle shifts of power at the Danish court during the hero's visit there. In particular, McFadden finds that the poet repeats some form of the words *bed* 'bed' or *ræst* 'rest, resting place, bed' to signal these changes verbally. Following Damico (1984), McFadden sees Wealhtheow as having an "influence in the court comparable to Hrothgar's," but he also agrees with Overing (1990) that the queen's role as peace-weaver ultimately limits and undoes her effectiveness in a society based upon masculine military power (631). Wealhtheow's words have persuasive force in her effort to fend off Hrothgar's proposed adoption of the hero, but her success simply makes possible the impending violence against her sons by their cousin Hrothulf.

Guillemette Bolens' "*Beowulf* et les Anneaux de la Squelette [*Beowulf* and the Segments of the Skeleton]," Chapter 4 (pp. 145-81) in her *Le Logique du Corps Articulaire: les Articulations du Corps Humain dan la Littérature Occidentale* (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes), analyzes the poet's conception of the body, the ways in which it is constructed, moves about and comes apart. She argues that bodies in *Beowulf* (people, monsters and weapons) were imagined less as static, spatial objects which were to be mapped by the poet in detail than as psychophysical forces of movement, energy, heat, and light, a survival of the pre-Christian heritage of the poem.

Several studies considered the ways in which archeology and *Beowulf* are mutually illuminating. Maximino Gutiérrez Barco, "The Boar in *Beowulf* and *Elene*: a Germanic Symbol of Protection," *SELIM* 9

(1999): 163–71, reviews the appearance and significance of this image in Old English vernacular poetry, Anglo-Saxon archeological finds and related classical and Scandinavian literature. In “The Two-Way Evidence in *Beowulf* Concerning Viking-Age Ships” (ANQ 13.2: 3–6), Marijane Osborn shows both how the design of excavated ships can help with the dating of the poem and how the poem itself can assist with questions about these vessels not yet clear from the archeological record. First, Scandinavian ships with a spiral prow came into use around AD 800 so that the synecdoche referring to Scyld’s ship as a *hringed-stefna* ‘coiled prow’ (32b) or the adjective referring to Beowulf’s ship as *wundenhals* ‘coil-necked’ (298a) would suggest that the poem was composed after this date. Conversely, the fact that the Danish coast-guard refers to Beowulf’s ship as *niwtýrved* ‘newly tarred’ (295a) supplies important missing evidence as to how these vessels were caulked and preserved.

Heinrich Härke undertakes to describe “The Circulation of Weapons in Anglo-Saxon Society,” in *Rituals of Power, from Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Frans Theuws and Janet L. Nelson, *Transformation of the Roman World* 8 (Leiden: Brill), 377–99, using evidence from archeological discoveries, documentary records and vernacular poetry, especially *Beowulf*. Only in this poem do all the identified forms of weapon transfer appear together: 1) “the gift from lord to retainer (or between peers),” 2) “the gift from retainer to lord (including the heriot),” 3) “the heirloom,” and 4) “ritual deposition” in earth or water (377). *Beowulf* also helps to illustrate the ways in which new weapons entered the exchange system: through manufacture or grave robbery, as loot or loans. The poem corroborates other evidence that some high-status weapons circulated for quite a long time, becoming even more valuable with age.

In the same volume, Jos Bazelmans, in “Beyond Power: Ceremonial Exchanges in *Beowulf*” (311–75), explores the whole system of social relationship which gift-exchange exemplifies and creates in the poem. Bazelmans’ presentation is based upon his 1996 doctoral dissertation, which D. Johnson translated as *By Weapons Made Worthy: Lords, Retainers, and Their Relationship in ‘Beowulf’* (1999), reviewed in YWOES 1999. Bazelmans’ model of the “socio-cosmic universe” of *Beowulf* is based upon the “insight” that valuable goods and a warrior’s “‘worth’ and probably also ‘life,’ ... were equivalent” (“Beyond Power,” 369). The receipt of expensive weapons and jewelry constituted a person’s inherent social or moral value. Bazelmans believes that elite Anglo-Saxon society was

engaged “in a grand ritual project” through the exchange of gifts. In particular, individuals passed from children to young adults to mature warriors, just as their lord or king was transformed at his expensive burial into an ancestor who would enjoy a special supernatural relationship with his people beyond his power over them in this life. Bazelmans thus sees Beowulf as a representative culture hero who moves through all the stages of an aristocratic Anglo-Saxon life-cycle and “who in his actions lays the foundation for society” (371).

Mark Dreisonstok’s “The Pagan-Christian Concept of Wealth and Its Relationship to Light in the *Heliand* and in *Beowulf*, with Consideration of Additional Anglo-Saxon Works” (Diss. Georgetown U; DAI 61A: 4766) argues that wealth and light are symbolically linked in these two poems composed in a common tradition of heroic verse by Christian poets. A distinction is made between money, which is used to acquire material possessions, and wealth, which “radiates” generously from a king or chieftain in the form of bright treasure. This wealth signifies the leader’s moral worth and may be compared to the biblical vision of a Heavenly Jerusalem, where the radiance of gold and jewels reflects spiritual beatitude.

Steven Fanning, “Tacitus, *Beowulf*, and the *Comitatus*,” *Haskins Soc. Jnl* 9 (1997): 17–38, follows Rosemary Woolf (1976) in disputing the view that the Germanic war-band, as idealized by the Roman historian Tacitus, can “be found in either historical records or in heroic literature of Anglo-Saxon England” (29). The image of the Anglo-Saxon *comitatus* loyally choosing to die with a fallen lord “is a fiction, for it is not an accurate depiction of actual Anglo-Saxon retinues” (29). Supposed evidence for the Tacitean ideal in poems such as *Beowulf* and the *Battle of Maldon*, Fanning asserts, are a misinterpretation of the much more complicated situations imagined there.

Stella Kuo Wang, in “*Beowulf*: Translating Old English *cyning*” (Diss. U of Rochester; DAI 61A: 603), argues for an increasing subjectification or internalization of a concept of kingship through pagan mythological, secular and Christian pious stages by tracing the semantic development of the term *cyning* ‘king’.

Mercedes Salvador Bello studies “The Arrival of the Hero in a Ship: a Common Leitmotif in OE Regnal Tables and the Story of Scyld Scefing in *Beowulf*,” *SELIM* 8 (1998): 205–21, arguing that use of this narrative topos was a conventional technique of asserting an Anglo-Saxon dynasty’s ancestral authority.

Gerald Richman, "Poet and Scop in *Beowulf*" (*In Geardagum* 21: 61–91), follows Fred Robinson (1985) in finding the voices of the Christian poet and Hrothgar's pagan scop to be "apposed" in three passages: 1) the creation hymn (90a–98), 2) the tales of Sigemund and Heremod (867b–915), and 3) the Finnsburh episode (1063–1160a). In each case the poet is singing of the scop's singing, slipping ambiguously but artfully from indirect to direct discourse, neither merely summarizing the scop's tale—as Lawrence (1915), Hoops (1932) and Klaeber (1922, 1950) believed—nor replicating the scop's performance verbatim in its entirety. Richman finds it regrettable that Klaeber's view that these passages are only paraphrases has prevailed, an interpretation indicated by the absence of quotation marks in his 1950 edition and followed by Dobbie (1953), Fry (1974), Chickering (1977), Jack (1994), and Mitchell and Robinson (1998), among others. Richman urges, following Bruce Mitchell (1980), a more flexible editorial practice by modern scholars with regard to punctuation of the poem, but a quick check of Mitchell's own new repunctuated edition with Susan Irvine (described above) reveals that they, too, have again decided against using any quotation marks in these passages. The reader is left to decide precisely where and how the apposition of voices works in these episodes, which different aspect of the story we may imagine that the scop or poet alternatively but simultaneously wished to emphasize. For his own part, Richman accepts Robinson's bifocal analysis of the Finnsburh lay, that the poet wants us to see beyond the heroic code of the Danes stressed by the scop to the grief of Hildeburh at the loss of her brother, son and husband which such terrible courage and loyalty has brought upon her.

E.L. Ridsen, in "Heroic Humor in *Beowulf*" (*Humour in Anglo-Saxon Literature*, ed. Wilcox, 71–78), recruits various theories of humor and models of conversational propriety (and their breaches) to estimate the humorous potential of several passages in the poem. In "Irony in *Beowulf*" (*Essays on Old, Middle, Modern English*, ed. Gruber, 139–49), Ridsen argues that the poet uses dry humor to show the ultimate hopelessness of heroism in a world without Christian faith, while not wishing to discredit entirely those old-fashioned heroic virtues he still admires. For instance, the poet gives the young hero an impressive motto, translated by Ridsen as, "Fate oft preserves the undoomed one if his courage holds" (lines 572b–73). This brave assertion is twisted ironically by its key qualification, "undoomed." Fate is actually pretty hard on warriors in this poem, most of them very doomed indeed. The idea that a few undoomed ones

can make it to the next battle if they really try is both funny and revealing. For an example of satirical irony, or laughter *at*, in the poem, Ridsen feels that we have to be amused, "if grimly," at those poor Geatish thegns who were too scared to help their king against the dragon only to discover that they are now really cooked without him (145). But the most telling irony in this passage for Ridsen is that the king has just sacrificed himself for unworthy men who are now going to die anyway at the hands of foreign enemies.

Raymond P. Tripp, Jr., in "Humor, Wordplay, and Semantic Resonance in *Beowulf*" (*Humour in Anglo-Saxon Literature*, ed. Wilcox, 49–69), believes that the poet learned a playful, even mischievous use of language from vernacular prose sermons (cf. the author's "Homiletic Sense of Time in *Beowulf*," summarized above). Tripp sees many puns, plays on words and other forms of paronomasia in *Beowulf* which, he argues, were inspired by the poet's dual perspective on his pagan subject matter. The poet is prepared slyly to exploit accidental homophonies or to insinuate undignified *double entendres* because his attitude toward his characters is rather ambivalent and uneasy; he is not able to treat them with unalloyed seriousness and respect. Paronomasia thus becomes a way for the poet to manage his mixed feelings of admiration and scorn for the pagan world he depicts. Some of the pun- and fun-making adduced by Tripp may seem a bit forced at times, as when he reads the opening invocation of the Scylding *imperium*, following Paul Edwards (1986), as "an extended alcoholic joke" (60). Tripp even scents a derisive edge of mockery in the futile "pagan baptism" with which Wiglaf tries to revive his fallen lord at the end of the poem. But the author's main hope in this essay is to relieve the "humorless 'high seriousness'" which he feels has been enshrined in Klaeber's 1950 edition of *Beowulf*. It took several centuries of scholarship, Tripp reminds us, before the full playfulness of *The Canterbury Tales* was properly recognized. He trusts we will come to a similar appreciation of the way in which "Chaucerian 'game' resonates in the *Beowulf* poet's 'earnest'" (69).

In "The Heroic Laconic Style: Reticence and Meaning from *Beowulf* to the Edwardians," in *Medieval Literature and Historical Inquiry: Essays in Honor of Derek Pearsall*, ed. David Aers (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), 133–57, Lee Patterson explores the English aristocratic tradition of heroic understatement as it appears in Old English secular poetry, mainly *Beowulf*, and as it reemerged as an ideal in the late nineteenth century, both in popular literature and in medieval scholarship, especially W.P. Ker's *Epic and Romance*

(1897). For Patterson, the various forms of rhetorical restraint "are ways of making meaning visible in the act of hiding it" (138). For example, the hero Beowulf reveals a shrewd awareness of the political situations in which he finds himself and a superior consciousness of the grim realities of the world in which he lives. These realities are hidden from many of his fellow-characters whom he tries to help or protect, but their situation would not be improved by an explicit assessment on the part of the hero. Beowulf's terse utterances reveal his determination to act bravely in spite of his intelligence of a world in which death is imminent and heroic action of dubious efficacy. Heroes are tight-lipped, Patterson believes, because they understand and feel their world not "too little but too much" (156).

Andreas H. Jucker and Irma Taavitsainen, in "Diachronic Speech Act Analysis: Insults from Flyting to Flaming," *Jnl of Hist. Pragmatics* 1: 67-95, set out to demonstrate that certain kinds of speech, like the insult in English, are most usefully studied as part of a complex field of related forms of verbal antagonism, "a multidimensional pragmatic space" (93), whose patterns of development can be traced through time. The authors begin with the Unferth episode of *Beowulf* which they interpret as a *flyting* or "exchange of verbal provocation between speakers," in which insult is joined by threat and boast "in a predictable and highly stylized way," ending either in silence or violence (77). In *Beowulf* the outcome is the happy silencing of Unferth: "Hrothgar, the king, is delighted because Beowulf's performance suggests that he might succeed against Grendel" (78). In *The Fight at Finnsburh*, in which the authors also find a stylized pattern of insult, threat and boast, the result is an outbreak of hostilities. The authors then adduce later instances of antagonistic verbal exchange in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, in medieval saints' lives and secular family letters, in Shakespearean name-calling, swearing and cursing, in the records of seventeenth-century court disputes, in the film *Monty Python and the Holy Grail* (1974), in "sounding" or "playing the dozens" among African-American teenagers, and finally in internet "flaming."

Dana Chetrescu, in "Beowulf—an Obsolete Variant of Superman?" *Brit. & Amer. Stud.* (Timisoara) 6: 78-85, compares the old heroes of epic, especially Beowulf, with contemporary fictional superheroes. Chetrescu notes a number of similarities between the two types of protagonist: 1) the episodic structure of their stories allows a dynamic variation upon familiar patterns of conflict with enemies, especially in the changing nature of the villains; 2) the superior hero is

committed to protecting ordinary people and values, often by means requiring an extra effort or a deliberately contrived vulnerability on his part; and 3) the hero's costume and accoutrements convey "metatextual" information about his essential character.

In *Beowulf*, Cliff's Notes (Foster City, CA: IDG Books Worldwide), Stanley P. Baldwin has provided a student guide to the poem, including background material on authorship and manuscript, maps, critical commentary on 13 sections of the poem in sequence, analyses of key characters, and essays on major themes and symbols. Peter S. Baker's *The Beowulf Reader*, Basic Readings in A-S England 1 (New York/London: Garland), is a paperback edition of his *'Beowulf': Basic Readings* (1995), the various contributions to which were reviewed individually in the *YWOES* 1995.

Translations and Translation Studies

An earlier printing of R.M. Liuzza's *'Beowulf': A New Verse Translation* (Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview), was reviewed in *YWOES* 1999, as was Seamus Heaney's *Beowulf* (London: Faber and Faber, 1999). Heaney excerpted the Introduction and first 490 lines of this translation in "From *Beowulf*," *Amer. Poetry Rev.* 29.1: 21-28, and then released the whole poem again as *Beowulf: A New Verse Translation*, Bilingual Edition (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux), with the Old English text of Wrenn and Bolton's edition (1973; rpt. Exeter, 1988) printed on the left-hand pages. In "Swimming Champ Disarms Intruder," *Shenandoah* 50.2: 163-68, R.T. Smith responds to this dual language version with a recollection of his own prior experience with translations of the poem, remarking that he "can't quite see the practical value of printing the original text without notes facing Heaney's occasionally unilateral translation" (167). But Smith admires the humane realism of the poem itself, its glimpse beyond our world of "men who can be no more than relatively good" (165) to one in which there are "real monsters ..., remnants of that ruthless 'scrimmage of appetite' we would like to believe we have left in the hands of our ancestors" (168).

In "The Philologist Poet: Seamus Heaney and the Translator of *Beowulf*," *Harvard Rev.* 19: 12-21, Daniel Donoghue seeks to justify the contemporary poet's strong northern Irish interpretation of the Old English poem. Donoghue suggests that Heaney has earned the right to make the poem over in his own idiom of modern English because the poet's prior work reveals such a deep influence from the forms of

Old English verse, especially in its lexical compounding and other kinds of structural apposition. Heaney should thus be seen as the living exponent an ancient poetic art represented by *Beowulf*, his rendering of the poem as "shaping and reshaping the tradition from within" (21). This reshaping has meant, however, that the *Norton Anthology* (which originally commissioned the poem) needs to supply as many notes to Heaney's Ulsterisms (e.g., *tholed*, *bawn*, *wean* [sg. noun], *hoked*) and Hibernicisms (*bothies*, *keens* [pl. noun], *brehon*) as they do for specialized Old English terms like *wergild* and *thyle*.

Stephen O. Glosecki, in "Skalded Epic (*Make It Old*)," *PN Rev.* 26.5: 52–55, describes the translator's difficulties in rendering both the sound and sense of the poem with accuracy and originality. He develops a conceit of smith-craft from Norse poetics to explain the OE prosody he is attempting to replicate: "It helps to visualize the bipartite Anglo-Saxon line as a concrete artifact—say, a filigreed brooch with two studs, one boss, and a smaller stud: *STUD STUD BOSS stud*" (53). Glosecki compares the making of successive drafts of his translation to forging in fire and then hammering and filing on an anvil. In conclusion, the translator asks us to compare the "structural sound-linkage" he has crafted for lines 2444–71 of *Beowulf* (Hrethel's grief at the death of his son) with Donaldson's literal prose translation (1966) and the "adventitious alliterative ornament" of Heaney's new verse rendering of these lines. (NB: Heaney's text, obtained from the internet ANSAX-L 12 October 1998, as quoted by W.L. Mensel, differs in a few details from the final version published in the various editions cited above.)

Alan Sullivan has written an introduction to Timothy Murphy's translation of lines 2510–2709 of *Beowulf* in "The Fire-Drake: the Translator's Tale or How Many Angles Can Dance on the Head of a Finn?" *Hudson Rev.* 52: 587–95. Like Glosecki, Murphy limits his vocabulary "wherever possible to words of Germanic origin" and attempts to imitate the meter and alliteration of the poem. However, the authors mistakenly believe that "*both* stresses in half-line 'a' alliterate with the first stress in half-line 'b'" (588; my italics), whereas only one of them *needs* to. The result may be the first modern English verse translation of a passage of *Beowulf* with even more alliteration per line than in the poem itself. Bertha Rogers, in *'Beowulf': Translation and Art* (Delhi, NY: Birch Brook), has produced an illustrated translation of the poem which was used as the basis of two stage performances in 1994, directed by Murray Changar. Fe-

lix Nobis' *Beowulf* (Cork: Bradshaw) has also adapted the poem for performance on stage in a 1200-line "dramatic paraphrase." In "*Beowulf Reduced*," *Agenda* 37.4: 84, Michael Alexander, another verse translator of the poem (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973), has composed an amusing, colloquial truncation of *Beowulf* into three brisk limerick-like stanzas.

Ellery McClintock, "Translation and *Beowulf* in Translation" (Diss. Georgia State U; DAI 61A: 4379), discusses theories and problems of translation since the classical period and compares twenty-one translations of *Beowulf* for accuracy, treatment of cruxes and obtrusive idiosyncrasies in otherwise worthy efforts.

C.R.D.

Works not seen

Daniel Donoghue, "Beowulf in the Yard: Longfellow, Alfred, Heaney," *Harvard Magazine* 102 (March–April 2000): 25–32.

d. Prose

2000 proved a rich year for the study of Old English prose, yielding over 60 items, including several valuable collections of essays. Jane Roberts and Janet Nelson edited *Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes in Memory of Lynne Grundy*; items treating OE prose include essays by Brookes, Clayton, Grundy, Hill, Irvine, Jackson ("Ælfric and the 'Uita Patrum'"), Scragg, and Szarmach ("Ælfric"), and are discussed individually below. Rebecca Barnhouse and Benjamin C. Withers edited *The Old English Hexateuch: Aspects and Approaches* (Publ. of the Rawlinson Center 2; Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan U); their "Introduction: Aspects and Approaches" (1–13), briefly describes the manuscripts and treats authorship, reception history, and problems of provenance and dating before offering previews of the essays contained in the volume. Items are discussed under the authors' last names: Menzer, Marsden, Barnhouse, Keefer, Richards, and Wilcox's items are included here. *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Mary Swan and Elaine M. Treharne (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), contains articles on prose by Pulsiano, Rosser, Swan, Teresi, and Wilcox, each of which is discussed below.

Paul E. Szarmach, with the assistance of Deborah A. Oosterhouse, has edited *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England 5 (New York and London: Garland). The volume con-

tains a brief introduction and reprints of a number of essential items: Janet M. Bately, "The Literary Prose of King Alfred's Reign: Translation or Transformation?" (3–27); Peter Clemoes, "The Chronology of Ælfric's Works" (29–72); D. G. Scragg, "The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies and Prose Saints' Lives before Ælfric" (73–150); Mary Clayton, "Homiliaries and Preaching in Anglo-Saxon England" (151–98); Milton McC. Gatch, "King Alfred's Version of Augustine's *Soliloquia*: Some Suggestions on Its Rationale and Unity" (199–236); Klaus Grinda, "The Myth of Circe in King Alfred's *Boethius*," trans. Paul Battles (237–65; noted in more detail below); Bernard F. Huppé, "Alfred and Ælfric: A Study of Two Prefaces" (267–85); M. R. Godden, "Ælfric's Saints' Lives and the Problem of Miracles" (287–309); Joyce Hill, "Ælfric's Use of Etymologies" (311–25); Paul E. Szarmach, "Ælfric, the Prose Vision, and the *Dream of the Rood*" (327–38); and Hans Sauer, "The Transmission and Structure of Archbishop Wulfstan's 'Commonplace Book'" (339–93). Five new items, by Cross, Disenza, Kleist, Roberts, and Wilcox, are described below.

Several references works also appeared in 2000. Aaron Kleist's "An Annotated Bibliography of Ælfrician Studies: 1983–1996" (*OE Prose*, ed. Szarmach, 503–52), updating Reinsma's 1987 bibliography, is an important and welcome resource: Kleist's work covers 162 items (he does not include dissertations, reviews, some foreign articles, and other bibliographies), offering full citations and brief summaries for each. The bibliography is divided into nine sections: Early Scholarship, General, Ælfric and Pagan Practice, Manuscripts, Source Studies, Stylistic Studies, Ælfric's Translations, Syntax and Phonology, and Individual Works (listing 19 separate works). Kleist cross-references items that fit more than one category. An appendix lists entries in *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici*.

In the same volume Nicole Guenther Disenza provides "Alfred the Great: A Bibliography, with Special Attention to Literature" (463–502). The bibliography, divided into primary and secondary items, focuses on Alfred's writings but offers many items relevant to history, manuscript studies, numismatics, and art history from the eighteenth century through 1997. Light annotations clarify the topic or nature of some items or refer readers to reviews and responses.

Finally, Greg Waite's splendid *Old English Prose Translations of King Alfred's Reign*, Annotated Bibliographies of Old and Middle Eng. Lit. 6 (Woodbridge and Rochester, NY: Brewer) provides exhaustive coverage of works by Alfred and his circle. History, lin-

guistics, manuscript studies, and other closely related fields are very well represented, while many more tangential but significant items are included. More than 1300 items from the Renaissance to 1996 appear, and even a few essential items from as late as 1999. The introduction traces the state of important questions connected with each text. Chapters on each text begin with manuscript information, then divide into editions, modern translations, and studies. Short, clear summaries accompany each item. A complete author index and a (somewhat less complete) General Index are complemented by extensive cross-references in the bibliography itself. The volume should prove valuable for everyone from interested undergraduates through senior scholars.

Hiroshi Ogawa's *Studies in the History of Old English Prose* (Tokyo: Nan'un-do) presents collected papers, some new, newly translated, or updated. The first item, "Towards a Philological History of the English Language: Retrospect and Prospect" (3–25), argues that 'philology' should mean the unified study of language and literature, then traces English studies in Japan from an early emphasis on diachrony to a greater appreciation for individual literary texts. In Item 2, "Problems of Old English Syntax—Elizabeth C. Traugott, 'Syntax' (*Cambridge History of the English Language* [1992]): A Review" (26–47), Ogawa criticizes Traugott's eclectic, linguistic approach in favor of a systematic and philological one. He regards her description of the 'grammaticalization' of auxiliary verbs as valuable, and praises her work on relative clauses, especially *þe* as a 'discourse marker', and her treatment of word order and 'topic-shift'. Item 3, "Old English Modal Verbs: Some Further Considerations" (51–68), argues that although modal verbs appear increasingly in later texts, they do not merely substitute for a declining subjunctive but have distinct functions, and different ones were favored by different authors. Item 4, "OE **Sculan*/*Willan* in Dependent Requests: A Note" (69–78), cites two non-Ælfrician late homiletic texts using *willan* for dependent requests after *biddan*. Ogawa argues that Ælfric's **sculan* represents an older usage. Similar examples of *willan* and other modals come from emendations Ogawa believes unnecessary: the original passages suggest that infinitive clauses could follow *biddan* and no modal is needed. Item 5, "The Use of Modal Verbs in 'Identical/Non-Identical Subject Constructions'" (79–104), compares usage of subjunctive and modal in identical subject constructions (where the person wishing, etc., performs the action of the other verb); non-identical; and 'quasi-identical,' where *man* stands in for the subject. Early texts use *man* only for indefi-

nite, non-identical subjects, but later texts for identical and quasi-identical subjects, especially with *wil-lan*, **sculan*, and **motan*. Ogawa traces chronological changes in the usage of modals and connects their expansion to a larger syntactic shift from parataxis to hypotaxis.

Item 6, Ogawa's edition of "Life of St Martin (MSS Junius 85-86): Text and Notes" (107-26), offers a brief explanation of editorial procedures and a semi-diplomatic edition of the complete text with notes on emendations and syntax. Item 7 argues that "The Retoucher in MSS Junius 85-86" (127-36) was not medieval but early modern and had an imperfect understanding of Old English forms and punctuation. Item 8, "The Use of Old English *þa* in the Ælfrian and non-Ælfrian *Lives of St Martin*" (137-63), argues that Ælfric reserves clause-initial *þa* for dramatic turning points or oppositional moments while using medial and final *þa* to express chronological sequence and varies *þa* with other adverbs. The Blickling homilist, in contrast, when translating the same source text uses *þa* more frequently and with little semantic distinction, for rhythmic purposes. Similarly, Item 9, "*þa* Temporal Clauses in Two Old English *Lives of St Martin*: A Study of the Prose Styles in the Blickling and Ælfrian Versions" (164-77), suggests that the Blickling homilist writes relatively crudely, not following the general development of later OE towards hypotaxis. Ælfric's postpositioning of temporal clauses highlights the main action and downplays chronology to emphasize causality.

Item 10, "Stylistic Features of the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*" (181-204), suggests that the romance genre affects style: Latin phrases tend to be rendered as OE clauses; formulas recur frequently; the OE preterite translates a variety of Latin tenses; simple sentence structures rely heavily on parataxis and *þa*-clauses; and direct discourse dominates. These features render the romance "realistic" and easy to read. Item 11, "Syntactical Revision in Wulfstan's Rewritings of Ælfric" (205-220), finds that in his rewriting of Ælfric, Wulfstan favored an expansive, paratactic style emphasizing verbs (perhaps 'low style') where Ælfric employed a compact style using apposition and subordination and emphasizing substantives ('high or literary style'). In item 12, "Notes on the Syntax in Some Late Anonymous Homilies" (221-34), Ogawa finds that the Blickling and Vercelli homilists prefer *þæt*-clauses to infinitive constructions, but they and the non-Ælfrian saints' lives utilize the infinitive more than Wulfstan. Some anonymous homilists follow Latin sources far more closely than Ælfric or

Wulfstan. Ogawa sees here different stages in syntactical development, though the diverse authorship of the anonymous homilies complicates the evidence. Item 13, "Initial Verb-Subject Inversion in Some Late Old English Homilies" (235-62), focuses on that inversion in declarative sentences, often complemented by alliteration and rhythm. While poetic or Latin influence may be a factor, in the Vercelli Homilies the order often signals a transition or recourse to authority; the Blickling Homilies, transition or contrast. Later variants of Vercelli homilies substitute SV order or otherwise clarify the action, indicating that the order has become archaic. These variants also reduce alliteration, doublets, and tautology, apparently for a more modern, prosaic style. Item 14, "A 'Wulfstan Imitator' at Work: Linguistic Features of Napier XXX" (263-85), questions the accuracy of this writer's usual characterization. The homilist borrows both phrases and whole passages from Wulfstan but employs many word pairs that Wulfstan did not; he shows a more modern word order, later uses of auxiliaries, different subordination and punctuation practices, less abstract and archaic vocabulary, and more adjectives. Wulfstan may have influenced the homilist, but he developed his own, contemporary style, which becomes more visible later in the homily as his confidence grew.

Jennifer Christine Brown explores "Writing Power and Writing-Power: The Rise of Literacy as a Means of Power in Anglo-Saxon England" (*Medieval Perspectives* 15.1: 42-56). Following Stock's definition of textual culture, Brown argues that the transition from oral to written culture occurs not after the Norman Conquest (*pace* Clanchy) but shortly after 597, when Anglo-Saxon kings adopted Christian texts and the "Roman" practice of writing laws (though their contents were distinctly Anglo-Saxon). Soon charters appeared in monastic and then lay dealings, and charters quickly moved from recording the occasions of agreements to being contracts themselves. Brown concludes by examining *Apollonius of Tyre*: oral exchanges at the court of King Antiochus conceal falsehood, but book-learning allows Apollonius to see the truth. Arcestrates's court, in contrast, guarantees truth in writing, and Arcestrate uses writing to solidify her feelings for Apollonius. At the end, Apollonius places his written accounts in the library and the temple, symbols of secular and religious authority.

Francesca Chiusaroli discusses varieties of early Germanic translation in "*Utraque lingua*: Teoria della traduzione e letteratura vernacolare nel medioevo germanico occidentale" (*Incontri linguistici* 22

[2000 for 1999]: 113–28). Chiusaroli mentions translations between vernaculars but focuses on translation from Latin. Translation began in bilingual glosses, and later prose translations tended to imitate Latin rhetoric. Carolingian policies encouraged textual study; some translators argued in prefaces for bringing Scripture into the common language, applying grammatical rules to the vernacular, and developing vernacular artistry in translations. Frankish translations include Otfrid's Gospels, the Old Saxon *Heliand*, and Notker's works. Turning to England, Chiusaroli emphasizes Alfred the Great's pedagogical aims and his formula "sometimes word for word, sometimes sense for sense" (which Ælfric adopts). Bede shows his awareness of the difficulties of translation when he renders Cædmon's *Hymn* into Latin, but Ælfric presents the most complete and explicit theory. Because teaching orthodoxy is his main concern, Ælfric champions an accessible style. While his flexible method allows for artistry, he believes in the primacy of Latin, extends its rules to English in his *Grammar*, and avoids innovation. Chiusaroli concludes that respect for authority and renunciation of originality characterizes early medieval translation.

In "Angels on the Edge of the World: The Geography of English Identity from Ælfric to Chaucer" (Diss. UC Santa Barbara; DAI 61A: 603), Kathryn Marie Lavezzo posits that a distinct English sense of identity developed much earlier than theorists such as Benedict Anderson have argued. Both written accounts and *mappae mundi* marginalized the English, yet they maintained significant contact with Rome, the site of Gregory the Great's legendary wordplay on *Angli* and *angeli*. Lavezzo argues that English writers figure the island's isolation, like that of the desert fathers, as preserving their purity and distinctiveness. A "national fantasy" projects an impossibly unified England against a backdrop of political, social and economic turmoil. Even their language, while seeming barbaric to Latin-speakers, served to set the English apart. Lavezzo first studies Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*, then later works: Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historiae regum britanniae*, Higden's *Polychronicon*, Chaucer's "Man of Law's Tale," and the *Alliterative Morte Arthure*.

Kathleen Davis begins "The Performance of Translation Theory in King Alfred's National Literary Program" (*Manuscript, Narrative, Lexicon*, ed. Boenig and Davis, 149–70) with Alfred's Preface to the *Pastoral Care*. Davis notes that "swæ swæ ic hie forstod" (Pref 7.23), commonly translated "as best I could understand it," actually means "just as I had understood

it" (151)—offering no apology or concession. Indeed, Alfred describes his translation practices as the traditional Christian process of understanding, then interpreting. In this Preface and the Preface to his *Laws*, Alfred emphasizes that he follows Christian tradition in the legitimate and even necessary activity of interpreting God's word. Alfred's terminology differs from ours and from Latin: *areccean* indicates the work of exegesis, while *awendan* figures translation as a "turning" and not simply "carrying over." Following Nicholas Howe, Davis argues that Alfred understands reading as counseling or explaining. While contemporaries lack basic reading skills, Alfred's achievement of the advanced *grammatica* (in Irvine's formulation) qualifies him to translate (as the *Pastoral Care* itself emphasizes that teachers must have proper training). His transformation of a traditional formula into "sometimes word by word, sometimes sense by sense" (162) reflects a need for both literal translation of sacred texts and freer translation for teaching purposes. In Alfred's program, "national language and national identity emerge together, each making visible and confirming the other" (162).

Gernot Wieland studies an unusual phrase from Alfred's Preface to the *Pastoral Care* in "Ge mid wige ge mid wisdom: Alfred's Double-Edged Sword" (*From Arabye to Engeland*, ed. Canitz and Wieland, 217–28). Alfred writes that the wise Christian kings in England expanded their territories, a claim contradicted by history. Wieland finds war and wisdom connected by authorities as diverse as the Old Testament, the Church fathers, and Germanic wisdom literature. In his portrait of Charlemagne, Alcuin had already forged a link for Carolingians between military success and the pursuit of God. Hrabanus Maurus took up this ideal with the dedicatory image to his *De laudibus sanctae crucis* showing Louis the Pious as *miles Christi*. Yet Louis was not a triumphant war leader; Hrabanus's image fits Alcuin's ideal, not historical reality. So too does Alfred present an ideal rather than historical reality in England as he urges the youth of his land to sharpen both the military and the sapiential sides of their two-edged swords. Wieland follows Szarmach's argument that for Alfred, pursuing wisdom means pursuing God, and God strengthens those who seek Him.

John H. Brinegar's "'Books most necessary': The Literary and Cultural Contexts of Alfred's *Boethius*" (Diss. UNC Chapel Hill; DAI 61A: 1826) explores the sources of the Old English *Boethius*. Scholars often assume that Alfred drew his additions concerning science, classical mythology and history, and Chris-

tian theology from commentaries on the Latin text, but, following Joseph Wittig and Janet Bately, Brinegar seeks Alfred's sources instead among classical and patristic texts. He concludes that the Wisdom books of the Old Testament had the greatest impact on Alfred's *Boethius*; works by Bede, Ambrose, Virgil (with Servius's commentary), Ovid, Eutropius, Orosius, and Gregory the Great also inform Alfred's translation. Others, such as Isidore of Seville and Claudian, may have influenced Alfred indirectly. Brinegar concludes that Alfred uses these sources to figure himself as Solomonic ruler while emphasizing divine wisdom over human philosophy. The king's treatment of Roman history and myth suggest that the Anglo-Saxons can emulate their greatness and even surpass it by avoiding pagan error.

Paul Battles translates Klaus Grinda's 1990 "Zu Tradition und Gestaltung des Kirke-Mythos in König Alfreds *Boethius*" as "The Myth of Circe in King Alfred's *Boethius*" (*OE Prose*, ed. Szarmach, 237–265). Alfred knows Homer only as an associate of Virgil and thinks this tale anonymous; Grinda (correcting Kurt Otten's misreading) notes that Alfred uses the term "leas spell" ("false story") and the verb "sceolde" to distance himself from the tale. Moreover, because he does not recognize Boethius's literary rearrangement of the material, he reorders the events himself. As in the Latin tradition, he links men's characters to the kinds of animals they become. Though ignorant of Homer's version, Alfred develops the erotic element that Boethius omitted into a new narrative logic: mutual love causes Odysseus to stay; his men then revolt, so Circe transforms them; finally, Odysseus leaves. Alfred's version simplifies the classical myth, omitting all mention of Hermes and his herb, moly (which protected Odysseus from magic), and rationalizing Circe's behavior. Noting strong resemblances to Homer despite Alfred's ignorance of the Greek poet, Grinda argues that Alfred used a commentary to develop his own didactic narrative. No such detailed commentary now exists; Grinda speculates that Asser might have supplied some now-lost Celtic exegesis.

In "Alfred, Alcuin, and the Soul" (*Manuscript, Narrative, Lexicon*, ed. Boenig and Davis, 127–48), Paul Szarmach explores the sources for two prose passages (XIV.2 and XXXIII.5) and one meter (20) in the *OE Boethius*. All three expand on the Boethius' connection between soul and body by describing the threefold soul, an Augustinian notion applicable to both the Trinity and the individual human soul. Augustine's descriptions of the soul were transmitted through Alcuin's *De ratione animae*. Examining a range of glosses

on the *De consolazione*, Szarmach finds that even those that mention the threefold soul do not much resemble Alfred's additions; the closest analogue is found in CUL Kk.3.21, a later text. Szarmach concludes that Alfred may draw upon the commentary tradition, perhaps in a version antecedent to CUL Kk.3.21, but the king's own fertile mind led him to speculate further on the subject of the soul along lines suggested by the source and its commentaries.

Marta Inigo Ros's 1999 University of Valencia dissertation, "Los terminos culturales en los textos latino y anglosajon de la *Consolatio philosophiae* de Boecio" has an English title and abstract in *DAI* 61C: 649, which lists it as "Cultural Terms in the Latin and Old English texts of Boethius' 'Consolatio Philosophiae' (Alfred the Great)" but is not available from UMI. From the abstract one learns that Inigo Ros, drawing upon Nord's revision of *skopos* theory, distinguishes primary cultural terms (unique to a particular culture and hence difficult to translate) and secondary cultural terms (which correspond to terms in other languages but only roughly). She then analyzes Alfred's strategies for translating problematic terms and finds him to be a learned, competent, and creative translator. She concludes with her own set of classifications for translation methods: "translation by equivalent or transference, cultural substitution, appropriation and omission."

In "The Treatment of Some Spanish Matters in the Old English *Orosius*" (*SELIM* 9 [1999]: 173–9), Salvador Insa Sales finds that the anonymous author mishandles Latin declensions, changing number in three place names and confusing personal names. Translating literally—without taking into account the difference between Orosius's orientation to Spain and England's—leads to other errors; outdated or simply wrong information produces a third kind. Insa Sales concludes that the translator knew little Spanish geography or history. Julia Fernández Cuesta and Immaculada Senra Silva ask, "Ohthere and Wulfstan: One or Two Voyagers at the Court of King Alfred?" (*SN* 72: 18–23).

Bengt Odenstedt has argued that Wulfstan was no voyager himself but merely translated Ohthere's accounts of two journeys ("Who Was Wulfstan?" *SN* 66: 147–57); these authors argue that Ohthere and Alfred's linguistic abilities may well have made a translator unnecessary. Despite the late West-Saxon dialect of the scribe of the Cotton MS, Ohthere's account shows more West Saxon features in morphology, vocabulary, and phonology, while Wulfstan's reflects a

Mercian dialect, a difference which suggests two travelers, not one.

A brief note by M. J. Toswell connects "Bede's Sparrow and the Psalter in Anglo-Saxon England" (ANQ 13.1: 7–12). In Bede's famous simile in his narrative of the conversion of Edwin of Northumbria, the sparrow is a human soul, a solitary traveler seeking not just temporary shelter in an earthly hall but the permanent haven which the next life offers. Bede would have found such language close at hand: Psalms 83 and 101 associate sparrows with homes, Ps 101 figures the bird as a solitary watcher, and Ps 123 compares human souls to a sparrow freed from a snare. Ælfric's *Lives* also imagine the human soul as a sparrow. Finally, as a passage in the D version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* reminds us, not even a sparrow falls without God's knowledge (Mt 10:29, Lk 12:6).

Scott D. DeGregorio redresses a perceived neglect of Anglo-Saxon spirituality in his U of Toronto dissertation "Explorations of Spirituality in the Writings of the Venerable Bede, King Alfred and Abbot Ælfric of Eynsham" (DAI 61A: 171–2). After considering various definitions of "spirituality" and various reasons why studies of medieval spirituality have virtually ignored the period, DeGregorio moves to his three key figures. He argues first that Bede's Scriptural exegesis emphasizes the active life even in its consideration of prayer and contemplation. He then turns to Alfred's OE works and Asser's Latin *Life of Alfred*, arguing that Asser's account is genuine, and important for understanding how literacy and spirituality are related for Alfred and how his texts model spiritual life. DeGregorio then studies Ælfric's attempts to avoid and correct religious error in contrast to the lives of Peter, Paul, and Andrew in the *Blickling Homilies*. He concludes that all three writers clearly share a concern with forming readers' spirituality, but that their treatments and interests vary greatly, providing fertile ground for further study.

In "Where the Boys Are: Children and Sex in the Anglo-Saxon Penitentials" (*Becoming Male in the Middle Ages*, ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen and Bonnie Wheeler [New York and London: Garland, 1997], 43–66), Allen J. Frantzen examines four Anglo-Saxon penitentials (c. 950–1050). Unlike Foucault, he finds medieval children's sexual behavior strictly regulated by adult norms, though (*pace* Ariés) with lighter penalties for young children. Of 66 canons mentioning children, only six concern heterosexual acts (suggesting little anxiety), while seven concern homosexual acts. Four or five treat sex between boys; three

or four, sex between boys and older males. First offenses between contemporaries bring relatively light punishment. When one participant is older, however, only the younger is punished, even if he did not consent. Frantzen argues the canons offer some protection, but more importantly demonstrate the severity of the sin. Yet the canons assume early punishments will not prevent the youths from later abusing younger boys. Frantzen argues that the handbooks present boys as temptations, not victims, from whom older males must be protected. Boys are conceived as men, already having the capacities and responsibilities of the adults they will become.

In "Shaping the Hexateuch Text for an Anglo-Saxon Audience" (OE *Hexateuch*, ed. Barnhouse and Withers, 91–108), Rebecca Barnhouse identifies similar alterations made by both Ælfric and the anonymous translations. All omit many problematic passages: dubious behavior by patriarchs and matriarchs (including deceit, polygamy, and magic), references to a 'jealous God,' and most mentions of circumcision. The translators add glosses to clarify that prophetic dreams come from God, define circumcision where a story requires it, and explain a few names. Occasionally, they simplify syntax or change words to improve the rhythm. Barnhouse concludes that both Ælfric and the anonymous translators use similar strategies to make the text more acceptable to Anglo-Saxon audiences.

Richard Marsden suggests "Translation by Committee? The 'Anonymous' Text of the Old English *Hexateuch*" (OE *Hexateuch*, ed. Barnhouse and Withers, 41–89). Consensus attributes specific portions of the *Hexateuch* to Ælfric and the remainder to Anonymous, yet Marsden finds significant variations in translating practice among anonymous sections. Some parts use Latin *capitula* to guide omission, while others rely little on them. Error rates in translations and explanatory additions vary as well. Finally, different sections show different preferences in rendering certain common Latin conjunctions, and some portions simply omit many of them. Marsden concludes that the non-Ælfrician parts of Genesis and Exodus through about Chapter 17 form one unit; the rest of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers 1–12, a second; and Deuteronomy, a third. He theorizes that a group of monks with diverse styles and different degrees of Latinity, perhaps aided in places by a now-lost Ælfrician text, divided the scriptures among themselves and then compiled Ælfric's translations together with their own. Marsden also outlines several directions for further research.

Mary P. Richards explores "Fragmentary Versions of Genesis in Old English Prose: Context and Function" (*OE Hexateuch*, ed. Barnhouse and Withers, 145–63). Two Hexateuch manuscripts contain complete copies of Genesis, but two large fragments also survive (Creation–Isaac, 1–24:22; and two copies of Joseph, 31–50). The first portion appears in a collection including Ælfric's Preface and one of his Lenten homilies involving Genesis; the scriptural translation complements the homiletic material. The Joseph story lacks commentary, but both manuscripts (apparently copies of a third) anthologize it with Ælfric's work and anonymous hagiography. The Joseph story was popular in Anglo-Saxon England, especially after the Benedictine Reform, when it became part of the monastic reading program. The texts seem to have circulated separately even as Ælfric and then other translators finished their Hexateuch; the fragments were valued as educational (and enjoyable) readings into the early Norman era.

What could be more natural, wholesome, and universal than laughter? And yet what is more ambiguous than a laugh we do not share? In "The First Laugh: Laughter in Genesis and the Old English Tradition" (*OE Hexateuch*, ed. Barnhouse and Withers, 239–69), Jonathan Wilcox demonstrates the complexity of reading even well-known scenes involving laughter. Patristic literature, he notes, generally disapproved of laughter (a behavior Christ never displayed). The saints in Ælfric's homilies sometimes laugh at their torturers in triumph and scorn, but otherwise laughter is mainly a sign of pride. The book of Genesis, however, has notable instances of laughter: Abraham laughs when told he will have a son (Gen 17), Sarah laughs when the three guests predict the same (Gen 18), and Isaac's very name means "laughter" (Gen 21). As Ælfric knew, the Church Fathers, including Alcuin, generally treated Abraham's laugh as astonishment or joy, but Sarah's as disbelief; Ælfric's translation of the first two scenes depicts both Abraham and Sarah as doubters, yet wonder and joy appear in Sarah's naming of Isaac. The Junius Book *Genesis A*, however, makes all three instances derisive, including that of both parents-to-be. The illustrations to BL Cotton Claudius B. iv reflect an Augustinian reading of the scenes: Abraham's first laugh is not pictured, but Sarah's laugh is implied in an illustration of the three visitors balanced by a large tent. Sarah is invisible but presumably inside the tent; the tent's bold colors are echoed in the robe of the first angel, whose big smile suggests her laughter, which is mentioned directly above the illustration. Three illustrated manuscripts of Prudentius's *Psychomachia* depict Sarah

and her laugh prominently. Wilcox admits that these laughs may not shed much light on the Anglo-Saxon sense of humor, they do show the development of different interpretations, some more nuanced than others.

In "Assessing the Liturgical Canticles from the Old English *Hexateuch*" (*OE Hexateuch*, ed. Barnhouse and Withers, 109–43), Sarah Larratt Keefer examines the influence of two liturgical canticles ascribed to Moses: *Cantemus Domino* (Ex 15:1–19) and *Audite Caeli* (Dt 32:1–43). Monks memorized these liturgical canticles, whose popularity may be due in part to Moses's image among Anglo-Saxons as war-leader and lawgiver. In place of the passage in Exodus, BL Cotton Claudius B. iv substitutes a paraphrase and an image showing Moses and other men in attitudes of joyful prayer that would remind readers of the canticle they knew by heart. When the translation resumes, it identifies Miriam as Moses's sister rather than Aaron's, a verbal correspondence that shows liturgical influence trumping scriptural. Oxford, Bodl. Lib. MS Laud Misc. 509 contains the paraphrase without the image. Both manuscripts translate the *Audite Caeli* aided by liturgical glosses from the *Romanum* psalter as well as the scriptural *Gallicanum*; again, recognition of the liturgical canticles influences the scriptural translation. Keefer concludes that Cotton Claudius B. iv seems to be meant for education but Laud Misc. 509 for meditation; both serve the aims of the Benedictine Reform and draw upon liturgical sources to render Scripture.

Mechthild Gretsche investigates "The Junius Psalter Gloss: Its Historical and Cultural Context" (*ASE* 29: 85–121). The Psalter (Oxford, Bodl. Lib. MS Junius 27), was probably written at Winchester under Edward the Elder. Its continuous OE gloss matches the type in the Anglian Cotton Vespasian A. i, but while the language has been made more West-Saxon in places, the text also includes Anglian and pseudo-Anglian phonological and lexical forms not in Vespasian. Gretsche locates the dialectal admixture in the cultural diversity at the court of the Kingdom of the Anglo-Saxons: either the writer imitated the language of prestigious Anglian scholarship, or the gloss was the unconscious result of this dialectal mélange. Junius 27 also contains a liturgical calendar combining prose entries with hexameters from the Metrical Calendar of Hampson. The Junius calendar is both more orthodox and shorter than the MCH; it lists mostly universal feasts and saints, but includes a few Northern French saints, an extra mention of Benedict, and brief notices of Alfred and Ealhswith's

deaths. Gretsch argues that the calendar was meant as the core for the new royal foundation of New Minster. Although Grimbald of St-Bertin died in the year of its foundation, his influence can be seen in the manuscript, probably executed for Frithestan, Bishop of Winchester. Bishop Æthelwold “studiously ignored” the manuscript, perhaps because tensions between King Æthelstan and Frithestan turned young Æthelwold against Frithestan’s legacy (120). Gretsch concludes with the observation that philology must work with other disciplines to enliven the seemingly dry study of psalters—and shed light on Anglo-Saxon intellectual life.

In “Anglicized Word Order in Old English Continuous Interlinear Glosses in British Library, Royal 2.A.xx” (ASE 29: 123–51), Joseph Crowley identifies five distinctive patterns of syntactic anglicization in interlinear glosses to Latin prayers and canticles in the Royal prayerbook. He compares all other OE continuous interlinear glosses and finds that only nine of the 47 exhibit similar anglicization—and these nine involve only seven scribes. Crowley examines but rejects such factors as education, region, and date; scribes in Mercia, Winchester, and Canterbury sometimes lapsed into English word order, perhaps in informal contexts, or perhaps before their superiors reminded them to maintain Latin word order. Some Latin and Greek additions in the Royal manuscript are likely in the same hand. Crowley concludes that the folios containing *Oratio Gregorii Papæ* and its OE gloss are, as others have conjectured, originally from the Royal prayerbook. He dates the additions in the manuscript to c. 950–75 (not Ker’s s. x¹) and suggests that the glosses show a religious man of weak education, glossing texts to help clerics learn major prayers as the Benedictine Reform brings more men into more regular monastic life.

The late Phillip Pulsiano illuminates the methods and context of “The Old English Gloss of the *Eadwine Psalter*” (*Rewriting OE*, ed. Swan and Trehearne, 166–94). Detailed examples demonstrate that the several scribes used an A(C)-type exemplar and many independent additions, then corrected using the D-type *Regius Psalter*, to produce a consistent gloss; Pulsiano dubs the later scribes “editors” rather than “correctors.” He suggests, “how fitting to gloss a dated Romanum text, one that has elsewhere been supplanted by the Gallicanum, with an equally dated gloss” (194). Their care in writing and editing a complex OE gloss with an Anglo-Norman interlinear gloss (a unique combination in psalters) indicate that the scribes did understand the language. Pulsiano emphasizes that

we must view the Psalter in the context of a score of OE manuscripts written in whole or in part in the twelfth century.

E. Wiesenekker analyzes “Translation Procedures in the West Saxon Prose Psalter” (*Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 53: 41–85) by comparing translation procedures in three OE interlinear glosses. He judges the Prose Psalter an accomplished free translation rather than a paraphrase. He classifies a variety of lexical choices, examines context, doublets, and different translations for the same Latin word, and notes influence from patristic commentary, variant Latin versions of the Psalter, and other glosses. He then turns to the 35 shifts in translation in the 50 Prose Psalms: changes in part of speech, in inflections, alterations from word to phrase or vice-versa, and variation in the use of auxiliaries (he also notes shifts from passive to active voice, but does not mention that OE lacked a true passive). Wiesenekker concludes that the prose translator showed flexibility and great independence from Latin, but still followed Latin structures from the morpheme to the sentence closely enough to be a true translator, not an explicator.

R.M. Liuzza’s *The Old English Version of the Gospels, Volume Two: Notes and Glossary* (EETS o.s. 314; Oxford and New York: Oxford UP) features chapters rather than line-by-line commentary. Vol. 2 begins with a few errata from Vol. 1. Chapter 1, “The Latin Original of the OE Version,” studies early gospel manuscript traditions and then specific readings in the OE version. Liuzza finds many non-Vulgate readings and identifies several Latin manuscripts that bear close resemblance to the translation. Chapter 2, “The Work of Translation,” characterizes the translators’ method as “literal but relatively idiomatic” (50) before examining “Additions and Paraphrases,” “Omissions,” “Harmonizations,” “Errors and Bad Translations,” and “Translation and Style.” Liuzza concludes that the translators exercised stylistic choice primarily in small matters and often seem to have worked “very near the limits of their competence” (98). Chapter 3, “Authorship,” finds little evidence of the ‘Winchester’ vocabulary and notes that variations in word choice and syntax suggest that the work was done by a team of translators, not an individual. Chapter 4 is a detailed account of the “Orthography and Language” of each manuscript. Chapter 5, “Transmission,” treats “Errors in the Transmission of the Text” and “Adaptations for Liturgical Use.” Each chapter collects and analyzes verses relevant to its topic; an “Index of Biblical Passages Discussed” makes it easier for readers to use the book as a traditional *seriatim* commentary keyed to verses. A

"Glossary" and "Latin-Old English Wordlist" conclude the volume.

J.E. Cross surveys "Vernacular Sermons in Old English" (*The Sermon*, ed. Beverly Mayne Kienzle, *Typologie des Sources du Moyen Age Occidental* 81-83 [Turnhout: Brepols], 561-96), focusing on collections of homilies and sermons c. 950-1150. He begins by distinguishing the homily, which explicates a specific scripture, from the sermon, which uses scriptural support to teach a broader lesson. He also notes, however, the inconsistency of terminology in both English and Latin, suggesting that pedagogical effectiveness outweighed generic considerations. Cross then explains the difficulties of dating and placing the many anonymous homilies and recognizing whether texts were for private reading or oral delivery and for clergy or laity. Cross contrasts Ælfric and Wulfstan's concerns and styles before turning to questions of diffusion and the texts' historical value. He concludes with a brief discussion of editing methods, a list of editions and sources of information on manuscripts, and a sample text, a translation of Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi*.

In "Quoting and Re-Quoting: How the Use of Sources Affects Stylistic Choice in Old English Prose," (*SN* 72: 6-17), Mark Atherton analyzes discourse markers in pre-Ælfrician homilies. While intended for oral delivery, homilies drew authority from texts and authors. Vercelli homilies often explicitly refer to books to alert listeners to pay attention, mark transitions between internal sections or from one source to another, and emphasize the authority of an upcoming passage. Often a past tense verb of speaking appears (as in earlier Alfredian texts), focusing on the moment of speech. In hearing and copying texts, it is easy to miss transitions or ends of quotations; vague ascriptions such as 'a teacher' may avoid misattribution. Atherton concludes that reading and listening were both part of monastic meditative reading: through quotations, the listener learns directly from God and the Church fathers.

J.A. Proud examines lives by Ælfric and anonymous homilists in all relevant manuscripts for "Old English Prose Saints' Lives: Influences upon Composition and Copying from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century" (Thesis, U of Manchester; *Index to Theses* 49: 827, item 49-5057). The first chapter reviews manuscript production and saints' cults in the period to establish context. Chapter 2 argues that the copying of certain lives promotes their cults, as the saints' emergence in liturgical calendars demonstrates. Conversely, increased interest in particular saints affected the selection of lives by

Ælfric and others. Remaining chapters examine particular manuscripts, their exemplars, and the practices and objectives of scribes and compilers.

In "The English Saints Remembered in Old English Anonymous Homilies" (*OE Prose*, ed. Szarmach, 433-61), Jane Roberts examines in detail anonymous vernacular homilies on seven English saints: Augustine, Chad, Guthlac, Mildred, Neot, Paulinus, and Seaxburh. The lives appear in various manuscripts, with greatly varying lengths and literary merits; some show a strict reliance on Bede, but the origins of others are of unknown date, language, and history. Roberts also notes difficulties of genre and purpose: whether scholars have classified a life as 'homiletic' or 'for private reading' may have more to do with its length than anything else. Dating these texts proves very difficult; Roberts reviews several arguments for particular texts and concludes that without other evidence, we cannot assume the lives are older than the manuscripts which contain them. The broad range of dates and hagiographical styles contained in these texts indicate that the lives of English saints maintained an enduring popularity even after the coming of the Normans.

Medieval audiences enjoyed several versions of the life of Mary of Egypt; Andrew P. Scheil traces such fascination to hermeneutic structure in "Bodies and Boundaries in the Old English *Life of St Mary of Egypt*" (*Neophil* 84: 137-56). The story, fairly racy by hagiographical standards, is well known: the monk Zosimus's near-perfect asceticism leads to pride, and he seeks a mentor in humility. Where he expects a desert father, however, he finds a woman, a former prostitute with black skin and white hair. His revulsion and fear suggest a demonic apparition and should make him flee, following the model of St Antony, yet he pursues her—in this and other ways, the narrative repeatedly thwarts both his expectations and the reader's. Mary's body is both repulsive and desirable: is Zosimus's attraction spiritual or sexual? Scheil argues that such reversals, questions, and silences engage the audience actively in the text as they seek answers. Liminal settings enable the formation of new identities: Zosimus must leave his lifelong home and cross the Jordan (though mysteriously he cannot cross the dry riverbed to Mary); Mary's violations of her own body exclude her from the Holy Sepulchre until she repents. Ritualistic exchanges bring Mary's wildness and Zosimus's civilization (figured by his mantle and lentils) into communication, where the characters tempt each other: Mary's naked body provokes Zosimus's chase but ends with his gift of the mantle, and Zosimus's queries force Mary to revisit her past and the world's

temptations. Mary passes the test and partakes of the Eucharist, and a year later Zosimus finds and buries her body. He remains bound to her as he interrs her in his old mantle; the flesh cannot be completely overcome. Scheil concludes that the *Life* explores masculine temptation and asceticism but always calls upon the reader for answers.

Donald Scragg describes and edits "An Unpublished Vernacular Exhortation from Post-Conquest England and Its Manuscript Context" (*Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 511–24). He begins with a detailed account of the manuscript; Pope described it as "a miscellany," but Scragg suggests principles of arrangement within and between its booklets. One main scribe did the original copying; annotations and added quires are in other and later hands. The original organization suggests that the scribe did not copy from one exemplar but collected selected items by Ælfric. The "Exhortation" edited by Scragg is a short item, previously unpublished, which seems to have been added at the end of a booklet; Scragg discusses its language, comments on possible sources, and presents the text with parallels and analogues.

The late J.E. Cross returned to Latin manuscripts for "The Notice on Marina (7 July) and *Passiones S. Margaritae*" (*OE Prose*, ed. Szarmach, 419–32). He identifies an unedited passion previously confounded with BHL 5303 because of its similar incipit. After giving brief notices for its five manuscripts, he compares and contrasts excerpts from the new version with the known main source and Marina's notice in the *Old English Martyrology*. When Marina was renamed Margaret, many copyists thought these were two separate saints; Cross points out that Marina's presence in English calendars indicates that her cult entered English tradition before her renaming.

M.J. Woodcock's "An Edition of an Old English Homily for the Dedication of a Church (*Hom S49*). Based on the Later Text as Preserved in London, Lambeth Palace Library MS. 489 art. 7: The Text and Its Context" (Thesis, U of Wales at Lampeter), is listed in *Index to Theses* (49: 407, item 49-2536), but without an abstract.

2000 was an unusually good year for Ælfric studies as well; pride of place in any survey must certainly be given to Malcolm Godden's *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, EETS s.s. 18 (Oxford: OUP), a work of heroic learning and dedication that completes the EETS edition of Ælfric's

Catholic Homilies (the Second Series edited by Godden, the First Series by Peter Clemoes, which Godden helped bring to press after its editor's death). This introductory volume provides an indispensable complement and companion to the two volumes already published. The introduction outlines Ælfric's life before treating the nature, date, origin, style, sources, and methods of the *Homilies* (because of the length of the text and the volume of existing scholarship, Godden omits a discussion of language). The 671-page commentary gives an introduction, notes, and sources for each homily. A substantial glossary defines words according to Ælfric's usage and provides two representative instances from each series as well as grammatical information; it also identifies proper nouns.

Mark Griffith studies "Ælfric's Preface to Genesis: Genre, Rhetoric and the Origins of the *ars dictaminis*" (*ASE* 29: 215–34). Ælfric did not restrict his Preface to Genesis, but refers to the tabernacle from Leviticus. He knew his patron intended to join his portion of Genesis with another's conclusion to Genesis, and perhaps with more. Most scholars would date *ars dictaminis* later (with extant handbooks), but Griffith argues that Ælfric draws upon its conventions and expects audience recognition. As Ælfric knew, patristic prefaces were generally letters. His use of the tabernacle echoes Jerome's *prologus galeatus*, which explains its symbolism as a kind of authorial dedication, but Ælfric does not use the image as a dedication. His letter does follow a five-part structure (marked by changes in person, parallel phrasings, and sometimes manuscript format): formulaic *salutatio*; modest *exordium* nearly refusing the commission; *narratio* introducing Genesis; *petitio* to his patron; and *conclusio* cautioning scribes. The whole Preface transfers responsibility: to God as author, to Æthelweard as patron, to scribes as copyists. Ælfric cannot use the tabernacle passage as a dedication because his refusal of responsibility leaves him nothing to dedicate. Griffith concludes that Ælfric knew epistolary rhetoric and carefully structured his prefaces.

The late Lynne Grundy's reflections on "Ælfric's Grammatical Theology and Theological Grammar" appropriately open Roberts and Nelson's memorial volume for her (*Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 1–14). Ælfric's famous anxiety about Scriptural translation was caused by his fears of how the ignorant might misconstrue the Old Testament; he regarded grammar as a cure. Those who have been granted learning must teach, just as Christians must respond to grace. Ælfric ful-

filled his responsibility and emphasized the parallel by using the same terminology, often in threes, to explain grammatical and theological ideas. Grundy furnishes several specific examples, and compares and contrasts Ælfric's grammatical illustrations to the treatments found in Donatus and Priscian. For Ælfric, she concludes, books offer a means to salvation.

Melinda J. Menzer begins "The Preface as Admonition: Ælfric's Preface to Genesis" (*OE Hexateuch*, ed. Barnhouse and Withers, 15–39) by arguing for the appropriateness of Ælfric's Preface; although it introduces the whole Heptateuch and not just Genesis, his warnings about misunderstanding Scripture apply to more than its first book. In other prefaces, Ælfric establishes his own authority to guarantee the translation; here he emphasizes his reluctance to translate, worries that uneducated readers will fall into error, and then offers perplexing exegesis of particular verses. Elsewhere Ælfric elucidates clearly and simply; here he leaps from one idea, secondary source, or Scripture passage to another. Menzer argues that in translating non-Scriptural texts, Ælfric freely simplifies or omits difficult matters, as he acknowledges in their prefaces. Yet he cannot add explanations to or delete difficult passages from Genesis, and he knows that parts have even been rendered by another translator. Menzer concludes that the Preface remains deliberately obscure in order to force readers to recognize the insufficiency of their own interpretive skills.

Peter Jackson explores Ælfric's use of sources in "Ælfric and the 'Vita Patrum' in *Catholic Homily* 1.36" (*Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 259–72). The first part of Ælfric's *Natale Omnium Sanctorum* relies heavily on the anonymous *Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis*. Yet his lines 111–117 comment independently on the *Vita patrum* (Ælfric prefers the singular *vita*, like Gregory of Tours, who explains that the fathers truly shared one life). The title covered a variety of texts and collections, so Jackson examines texts known to Ælfric that might bear the name: *Verba seniorum*, *Historia monachorum*, and several individual lives, including both desert saints and Cuthbert's *vitae* (which use *topoi* from the lives of desert saints). None matches all the details; Jackson concludes that Ælfric collects multiple sources, all of which he considers *vita patrum*. Ælfric generally seems uncomfortable with anchoritic *vitae* and always adapts them to his own uses. Here he shows no interest in distinguishing between texts, but remembers them as a unity from which he can draw what he needs.

In "Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* in the Twelfth Century" (*Rewriting OE*, ed. Swan and Treharne, 62–82), Mary Swan samples several twelfth-century redactions of the *Catholic Homilies*: compilations of parts of multiple Ælfrician texts (with varying degrees of coherence and unity); adaptations that use substantially different language and modify details for a new audience; and short excerpts from Ælfric used to gloss other texts. Swan concludes that the scribes and compilers using Ælfric's texts in the twelfth century were often unaware of his authorship, sometimes drew on the texts from memory and not from an immediate written source, and did not distinguish them from anonymous homilies. These texts and fragments were transmitted not because of Ælfric's authority but because they continued to hold value for twelfth-century readers and writers.

Ælfric's account of Esther is generally assumed to rely on the Vulgate, but Stewart Brookes paints a more complex picture in "Ælfric's Adaptation of the Book of Esther: A Source of Some Confusion" (*Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 37–63). The original Hebrew Esther lacked explicit reference to religion; supplements appeared to fill the gap. Differing Hebrew and then Greek texts produced multiple, widely varying Old Latin translations. Jerome returned to the original Hebrew for his Vulgate, but someone added Latin translations of the supplements to the end. Ælfric's text frequently agrees with the Vulgate but sometimes only with the Old Latin, and a few elements appear only in Greek, suggesting that Ælfric used a Latin text not currently known. Brookes concludes that Ælfric most likely used two source texts, Vulgate and Old Latin, either in manuscript form or from memory.

In "Ælfric and Æthelred" (*Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 65–88), Mary Clayton notes that 984–93 saw such misrule that Æthelred's later diplomas repeatedly declare his repentance and restore monastic property, while the epithet *unræd* seeks to excuse the young king's mistakes as resulting from poor counsel. Though Ælfric never addresses Æthelred directly, he says much about kingship. His comments look general and have Latin sources, but repeated references to *ræd* recall Æthelred's nickname. He also addresses specific, widely recognized weaknesses in Æthelred: mistreatment of monks, failure to protect the kingdom, and leaving vacancies in high offices. Ælfric offers positive examples of kingship and advocates good counsel and strong subordinates. Clayton argues that *Wyrdwriteras* is not, as often said, a defense of Æthelred for letting gener-

als lead armies in his place, but a plea for the king to appoint good ealdormen. Clayton argues that Ælfric's self-criticism for silence in the face of unrighteousness is too severe: his writings clearly address the failings of the current king and exhort him to good kingship according to a Benedictine Reform model.

James W. Earl discusses "Violence and Non-Violence in Anglo-Saxon England: Ælfric's 'Passion of St Edmund,'" (PQ 78 (1999): 125–49). The 990s were a time of monastic renewal, literary productivity—and Viking warfare. Ælfric's account of Edmund's martyrdom, while chilling, conveys less horror than Abbo's version or Viking traditions, which both include execution by the gruesome 'blood-eagle' method. Ælfric's restraint partakes of his general reticence towards both violence and Vikings. The homilist occasionally advises warriors to defend their homeland, but he does not count the king among these warriors; instead, king and Church must pray for the people but endure "virtuous suffering" (132). Æthelred's uneven policies may represent conflicting influences from Wulfstan's party and Ælfric's "royal pacifism" (135). Non-violence realized great success in Olaf's conversion; the wolf guarding Edmund's head represents the converted Viking. Anglo-Saxons could not simply demonize the Vikings, with whom they had intermarried: Vikings were not just "Other," but a more primitive version of Self. In Earl's concluding Freudian reading, Christian non-violence represses both the instincts and history, which *is* violence. Well aware of the reality and costs of violence and non-violence, Ælfric advocates paying in this world to win the next. He refuses Wulfstan's discourse of war, revealing "Anglo-Saxon Christianity at its best" (147).

In "Ælfric and the Purpose of Christian Marriage: A Reconsideration of the *Life of Æthelthryth*, lines 120–30" (ASE 29: 235–60), Peter Jackson explores Ælfric's concluding exemplum, the story of a layman who spent thirty years in chaste marriage after he and his wife had three sons. As Jackson and Gordon Whatley independently determined, the story derives from Rufinus's *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*: Paphnutius asks laymen about their good deeds, and the third describes his charity and chaste marriage. Ælfric's version stresses the couple's chastity. Ælfric promoted chaste religious life and widowhood, and appropriate sexuality within marriage; Jackson argues that Æthelthryth's two chaste marriages disturbed Ælfric, because at least one of her husbands did not consent to chastity. She fails to submit to male authority or assume her proper role in marriage, yet she is a popular saint whom Ælfric cannot ignore. His added ex-

emplum gives more credit to the lay wife than Rufinus's version, for here she shares the charity. Jackson argues that Ælfric does not so much deemphasize the female as reassert the Augustinian model of marriage.

Paul Szarmach begins "Ælfric and the Problem of Women" (*Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 571–90) by admitting that experts on OE prose, gender studies, or theology often remain unaware of important developments in one another's fields, but to study Ælfric requires some familiarity with all three. He offers Ælfric's account of twice-married virgin Queen Æthelthryth: at one level, his text exhorts the virtue of chastity; at another, it sheds light on problems of power and royal succession; at a third, it suggests that Æthelthryth uses her chastity as a way of maintaining control over her life and body. In *Catholic Homily* II.18 Ælfric's presents Constantine's mother Helena, finder of the True Cross, and Severiana, wife and then widow of a Roman emperor who helps establish the cult of the martyrs executed by her husband. The two stories share a "theme of triumphant suffering" (584), but Szarmach argues that a more significant motif is the relation between secular and ecclesiastical power, a relationship in which female agency plays a crucial role. Szarmach concludes by warning that feminists are mistaken to expect a later medieval presentation of the Virgin Mary in Ælfric's work. Because so many apocryphal texts and ideas circulated about Mary, Ælfric treated her with extreme caution. Much has been done, but much remains to be done, to unite the studies of Old English prose, feminist theory, and theology in a better understanding of the complex works of Ælfric.

Liesl Ruth Smith explores Ælfric's construction of virginity in "Virginity and the Married-Virgin Saints in Ælfric's *Lives of Saints: The Translation of an Ideal*" (Diss. U of Toronto; DAI 61A: 4379). Examining first the Latin vocabulary of chastity from Ambrose to Aldhelm, Smith argues that virginity is not, as some modern scholars read it, simply a denial of sexuality and a means of controlling female bodies. Ælfric's own vocabulary in his letter to Sigefyrth and his homily for the Nativity of Mary reveals not only the influence of patristic ideals but a wider emphasis on virginity as a form of service to God for religious and laity of both sexes. In his passions of three married virgins, Julian and Basillissa, Cecilia, and Chrysanthus and Daria, he values male and female virginity equally. The narratives have different emphases, but each concentrates less on the physical inviolability of the saint than on virginity as a sign of spiritual purity. Smith's conclu-

sion places Ælfric's *Lives* within a broader Anglo-Saxon context.

Leslie A. Donovan translates eight *Women Saints' Lives in Old English Prose* (Library of Medieval Women; Cambridge: Brewer, 1999): Æthelthryth, Agatha, Agnes, Cecilia, Eugenia, Euphrosyne, Lucy, and Mary of Egypt, all from Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* (though four are anonymous). In her introduction, Donovan argues that these lives, though composed and later translated by men, reveal real women's concerns about their bodies and place in society. She then offers brief overviews of early hagiography, especially women's; Anglo-Saxon religious history; Ælfric's goals and methods; and the roles of women in Anglo-Saxon society and religion. In a note on the translations, Donovan refers readers seeking close literal translations to Skeat, and explains her practices. Each translation has its own short introduction and footnotes covering history, translation problems, and secondary literature. In a final essay, "The Gendered Body as Spiritual Problem and Spiritual Answer in the Lives of Women Saints," Donovan argues that women's bodies present danger but also empower women who exert control over their own bodies. She relates this understanding of unity between body, mind, and spirit, and this insistence on female self-determination, to the modern women's movement. The volume concludes with Suggested Readings and an index.

In "I am God's handmaid: Virginité, Violence, and the Viewer in Medieval and Reformation Martyrs' Lives" (Diss. U of Iowa; *DAI* 61A: 3183), Beth Holycross Crachiolo employs feminist and cultural criticism to explore violence and "regendering" in her texts: female martyrs become masculinized to maintain their virtue, but violence rewrites their bodies as female. The first chapter treats Ælfric's *Life of Eugenia* and the anonymous *Life of Euphrosyne*, texts about female saints who perform as men. Chapter 2 examines OE prose lives, while later chapters consider *The South English Legendary*, the Katherine Group, and Protestant martyrs in texts by Askew, Bale, and Foxe. Crachiolo concludes that from the Anglo-Saxon era through the Reformation, in both Catholic and Protestant texts, a consistent set of rhetorical strategies define women's gender.

Carla Morini's "La Passio S. Agathae: La tradizione medievale inglese" (*Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale* 42: 49–60) surveys versions of Agatha's passion, concentrating mainly on the post-Anglo-Saxon period. She traces the text's transmission to England to Augustine's mission, Aldhelm's Latin version, Bede's

summary, and Ælfric's Old English, and follows it through several later medieval versions in Latin and Middle English. She concludes that the passion showed a high degree of continuity, with only occasional alterations or additions for didactic purposes.

Shari Horner counters common views of Old English literature as dreary and misogynistic in "Why do you speak so much foolishness? Gender, Humor, and Discourse in Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*" (*Humour in Anglo-Saxon Literature*, ed. Wilcox, 127–36). She sees both humor and inversion of gender hierarchies in the stories of weak virgins who triumph over powerful male persecutors. The women's speeches provoke their tormentors by proving the women wittier than the men, while the persecutors' excessive literalism allows audiences to feel superior, laugh, and learn. God's power preserves the saints from pain and sometimes even heals their wounds, but it is the women's own power that is operative in their effective wordplay.

Stephen Pollington's *Leechcraft: Early English Charms, Plant Lore, and Healing* (Hockwold-cum-Wilton, Norfolk: Anglo-Saxon Books) collects much significant material. His introduction briefly outlines his view of the religious context of Anglo-Saxon medicine from conversion through the tenth century. The chapters that follow introduce the traditions informing early English herbal study; the intersections of medicine, magic, and religion; the medical manuscript tradition, with brief references to specific manuscripts; and OE plants and plant names. The heart of the book is three editions with translations: the *Lacnunga* manuscript, the Old English *Herbarium* (MS V), and Book III of Bald's *Leechbook*. Extensive appendices complement these texts: on healing by spell, knife, and herb; on the composition of amulets; on theories of disease; on charms; on methods of divination; on tree lore. Pollington also provides over two dozen illustrations, some from medieval manuscripts and some from modern botany. Many complex topics, from religious matters to charms and dreams, are covered quite briefly, yet the texts, translations, glossary of plant names, and index make the volume useful and might encourage further study.

In "Women and Language in the Anglo-Saxon Leechbooks" (*Women and Language* 23.2: 41–50), R. A. Buck investigates gendered attitudes in Bald's *Leechbook* and *Leechbook III*, two texts in London, BL Royal 12.D.xvii. In both texts, learned male compilers address primarily professional leeches but also domestic healers, including patients treating themselves. *Man* refers to patients of any genders and age; female ail-

ments are not separated from other illnesses, while the term *gecynd* includes all female reproductive organs indiscriminately. Both compilations reveal “folk attitudes” towards women, but *Leechbook III* moreso than Bald’s: it offers a medical cure for women’s “chatter” or “harangue.” Buck concludes that though male learned culture produced both texts, the two reveal different approaches to women, not a monolithic attitude.

László Sándor Chardonens presents “A New Edition of the Old English ‘Formation of the Foetus’” (*N&Q* 245 n.s. 47: 10–11). Cockayne’s, the only previous edition of this text, contains inaccuracies but was reprinted (with some changes) by Deegan and Mitchell; Chardonens edits the text (found in London, BL Cotton Tiberius A. iii) from microfilm. He retains MS punctuation and capitalization, indicates MS initials, rubrication, and abbreviations, and notes differences from Cockayne, Deegan, and Mitchell.

In “The Art of Beekeeping Meets the Arts of Grammar: A Gloss of ‘Columcille’s Circle,’” (*PQ* 78: 359–86), Martha Dana Rust draws upon Martin Irvine’s work on *grammatica* to interpret this charm for keeping swarming bees at the monastery, found in the prefatory material to BL Cotton Vitellius E. xviii. The reformed Benedictine community at Winchester, where this MS was produced, would have used beeswax candles and wax writing tablets as well as honey. “Columcille” combines the name of Saint Columba with *cella*, a ‘cell’ for monks or bees. The scribe used masculine forms for feminine *apis*, perhaps because Latin writers characterize bees as warriors or monks. The community and industry of bees was a model of monastic life, and Columba’s legendary devotion to reading and writing encouraged clerical textuality. This charm’s power is realized not in its recitation but by carving a figure on stone, creating a textual site of divine power. Saints’ skills at reading nature and wielding divine power parallel the grammatical arts of *lectio* (reading) and *enarratio* (interpretation). The manuscript glosses the figure by naming it “Columcille’s Circle,” and Rust argues that the inscription within, “Sāh,” abbreviates *scribam hanc*, ironically recalling *in corde eorum scribam eam*, “I shall write my law in their hearts”—as opposed to stone—from Jeremiah, Hebrews, and Augustine’s commentary on Ps 118. Rust concludes that the charm sheds light on the pervasiveness of *grammatica* in the eleventh-century Winchester community.

Jonathan Wilcox begins “The Wolf on Shepherds: Wulfstan, Bishops, and the Context of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*” (*OE Prose*, ed. Szarmach, 395–418) by

noting how Wulfstan frequently reused his own material to produce multiple versions of passages or texts. The meaning of concepts like ‘author’ and ‘text’ are difficult to establish in such a complicated set of traditions; his examples in this essay are Wulfstan’s directives to bishops. Wulfstan developed the same instructions in different ways for new audiences or occasions. His ends were urgently practical: he repeatedly admonished bishops and sometimes priests to pray, work with books (learning or teaching), and “cry out” against the sins of their contemporaries. Wulfstan’s prayers have left little mark, but his “book-work” and “crying out” are evident in his writings and in the life of his namesake and nephew, Saint Wulfstan of Worcester, whose *vita* survives in William of Malmesbury. Untangling a complex set of textual redactions, Wilcox argues that Bethurum’s standard edition of Wulfstan imposes a false unity and simplicity upon a complex corpus that reveals the writer both living his ideals and adapting his rhetoric to make the same points powerfully in different contexts.

Wulfstan’s homilies were popular in the eleventh century, but Jonathan Wilcox finds a very different story in “Wulfstan and the Twelfth Century” (*Rewriting OE*, ed. Swan and Treharne, 83–97). Wulfstan’s vernacular homilies were copied into only one manuscript collection; one filled a gap in Ælfric’s homilies, and only one adaptation and two slight echoes indicate other uses (his Latin homilies fared slightly better). Wilcox examines in some detail the single adaptation, of “Be Godcundre Warnunge” (Bethurum 19)—Wulfstan adapted a Leviticus text to his own times, but the twelfth-century homilist omitted or altered many of his contemporary references. The amount of change required to render his work relevant to post-Conquest conditions, and perhaps the fact that his apocalyptic rhetoric seemed overblown by the twelfth century, might explain why Wulfstan lost popularity after the Conquest while Ælfric maintained his.

Ælfric and Wulfstan are often placed in contrast, but Joyce Hill focuses on their similarities in “Ælfric and Wulfstan: Two Views of the Millennium” (*Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 213–35). While the Anglo-Saxons did not worry whether the millennium began in 1000 or 1001, the division was not simple. Patristic versions of the ages of man usually counted six ages, but some had five; Ælfric used whichever tradition suited his exegesis of a particular passage. Ælfric’s use of different divisions implies what Byrhtferth explains at length: these ‘millennia’ were not literally one thousand years long. Ælfric also emphasized that the exact time of the end was

unknown. His multiple treatments of apocalypse respond to popular feeling that the millennium might be the end, a belief which he both corrects and uses for moral lessons; he continued to use his own millennial homilies after 1000. Wulfstan, who borrowed from Ælfric, expresses more direct social concerns, but he too uses the apocalypse to exhort readers to amend, focusing on morals and not on a specific date or the ages of the world. Byrhtferth, Ælfric, and Wulfstan followed orthodox monastic teaching: they used the millennium imaginatively, not literally, as a means of reaching their audiences.

Martin is the only saint who appears in both Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* and his *Lives of Saints*; Susan Rosser studies one version in "Old English Prose Saints' Lives in the Twelfth Century: The *Life of Martin* in Bodley 343" (*Rewriting OE*, ed. Swan and Treharne, 132–42). Bodley 343, a late twelfth-century MS containing unique copies of some Ælfrician texts, abbreviated the longer *Lives of Saints* version, suggesting that the shorter *Catholic Homilies* version was unavailable to the compiler. BL Cotton Julius E. vii divides the longer *Life* into numbered sections; Bodley 343 has no numbers, but its omissions correspond to complete sections. The biographical opening and closing (and first and final miracles) remain, but the compiler omits sections on historical background, monastic practice, and Martin's correction of heresy. Where two or more miracles seem similar, the compiler keeps only the shortest account. No explanations or transitions are supplied to bridge the gaps caused by these omissions, leaving the narrative sometimes choppy and unclear. Perhaps the compiler assumed that the audience would know the story or that homilists would select coherent extracts. In either case, he appears to have respected the integrity of Ælfric's text, not adding material or cutting across sections.

Susan Irvine returns to Bodley 343 in "Linguistic Peculiarities in Late Copies of Ælfric and Their Editorial Implications" (*Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 237–57). With a text as extensively preserved as the homilies of Ælfric, the great number of MS variants poses a significant problem for an editor, and Irvine takes issue with Pope's and Godden's decisions to omit variants from their editions of the *Catholic Homilies*. Bodley 343 preserves the only copy of some genuine Ælfrician material, which raises an even thornier set of editorial issues. Irvine notes that despite the contemporary leveling of final inflections, the scribe uses *-um* for dat. sg. nouns, strong and weak, of all genders. Whether one calls these 'errors' or 'variants', they are almost

certainly not Ælfric's. Michael Lapidge has endorsed the practice of correcting the scribe to recover the authorial text; Irvine prints a passage attempting to reconstruct Ælfric's original language, and the apparatus is longer than the passage itself. Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe has suggested using a facing-page presentation of the reconstruction and the diplomatic text; this might work better, Irvine notes, but makes it difficult in traditional print editions to include the Latin source of a text. Irvine concludes that the spellings are not scribal errors, and to amend them for clarity misrepresents the manuscript. The practical solution is to follow the manuscript's unusual spellings, and provide textual notes explaining the sense.

Loredana Teresi studies "Mnemonic Transmission of Old English Texts in the Post-Conquest Period" (*Rewriting OE*, ed. Swan and Treharne, 98–116) through one anonymous homily, *Be Heofonwarum* & *Be Helwarum*. This twelfth-century text, for which no direct sources have been found, appears to be a rare post-Conquest compilation. Examining several specific passages, details, and structures, Teresi finds numerous analogues but no verbal echoes, and notes confusions between two different versions of the same story or idea. Most strikingly, though it is a homily on Judgment Day, the text treats the separation of soul from body, an event which is said happen at an individual's death, *not* at Judgment. She argues that the combination of details, patterns, and formulae from various and sometimes conflicting sources, ultimately points to a compilation from memory, not from a set of source-texts; the possibility that texts can be transmitted by memory may be difficult to incorporate into the traditional practice of source study, but Teresi's essay suggests that it may yield interesting and important results.

N.G.D.

4. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works

a. General

In 1999 Alan Hood published a generally laudatory review of David Howlett's signature arithmetical analysis of Insular Latin texts (reviewed in *YWOES* 1999). The essay "A Response to 'Lighten Our Darkness'" (*Early Med. Europe* 9: 85–92) is Howlett's answer to Hood's criticism: Insular writers did not learn from manuals but evidently picked up their techniques by doing ("... Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides did not write dramas as they did because they had read Aristotle"). And all Howlett's critics are answered by further numerical analyses—on a hagiographic text, on charters, on personal letters, on Abelard's *Historia calamitatum*, on inscriptions and so forth. Howlett closes with what might be termed "the strong version" of his theory:

[Dr Hood] can be assured that any feature of any analysis I have published, no matter how counter-intuitive it might seem at first sight, can be paralleled dozens, if not scores or hundreds, of times in Insular texts from the Roman period to the end of the Middle Ages, some of them in most, if not all, of the languages written in these islands: Aramaic, Hebrew, Arabic, Greek, Latin, Welsh, Irish, English, Norse and French. I have furnished both models that implicitly exhibit 'the rules' and commentaries that explicitly discuss them in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin texts from antiquity which were known to Insular writers from the beginnings of our literary history, and published compositions in prose and verse, in literary and diplomatic and epigraphic traditions, among Welsh, Cornish, Breton, Irish, English and Scottish writers, without a break of so much as one generation from the end of the Roman period to modern times (92).

One might be inclined to say, though, that the defense illustrates its own weakness—the ubiquity of examples and the ease with which they are discovered by Howlett, but by precious few others (all but three of the twenty-seven footnotes are references by Howlett to Howlett). A skeptic might consider the findings to be an artifact of the method, in which case the piling up of examples suggests that their potential number is unlimited. More convincing might be evidence entirely independent of Howlett's analyses. Thus Hood was not so much asking for an explanation as to why

numerical composition did not appear in manuals as he was asking for independent evidence confirming the existence of the style. His remark that the style left no reception history is in the same vein. Extraordinary claims call for extraordinary proof. Howlett's claims expressed in the quotation above are very great indeed.

How far did medieval attitudes about history differ from our own? Medieval readers received the Song of Solomon and the book of Revelation as mutually informing historical documents! In Dominic Janes' "The World and its Past as Christian Allegory in the Early Middle Ages" (*The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes [Cambridge], 102–13) medieval views of the past are presented as deeply shaped by belief in a theocentric universe and in the bible as a text through which god communicates history, moral instruction, and religious cosmology. For Anglo-Saxonists, the most relevant of Janes' examples is Bede. The *HE* not only combines complex didactic aims guided foremost by religious principles, but also interprets past events in the same highly metaphorical or symbolic manner that characterizes Bede's works of spiritual exegesis.

All scholars who have not made a special study of the medieval sermon and its various forms and conventions will welcome Tom Hall's "The Early Medieval Sermon" (*The Sermon*, ed. B. Kienzle [Turnhout], 203–69), which clearly and succinctly provides a basic typology of the subject. In a brief forty-odd pages of exposition (with an additional twenty pages of sample texts), this accessible primer to the medieval sermon brings the uninformed reader to a state of considerable sophistication. An introduction discusses the semantic field of the Latin lexicon of sermons, and explains the modern distinction between sermons proper (hortatory remarks on a given topic) and homilies (addresses drawn from a scriptural reading). Further points of interest include the development of sermon types in the early middle ages, as well as innovative milestones throughout the period (Section II). Section III, entitled "Diffusion," discusses the distribution and transmission of sermons/homilies and gives a very full inventory of homiliaries and sermonaries. Section IV, "Problems of Interpretation," presents many caveats: Were texts delivered orally or in writing? Who was the audience, and especially what was the role of the secular audience? In Section V, Hall guides readers through the previous

literature on his topic and presents them with an inventory of writers/preachers in alphabetical order. Section VI considers the value of sermons as historical witnesses. A closing appendix includes two works, a homily of Gregory the Great and a sermon of Caesarius of Arles.

Joyce Hill clears up something of a mystery in "The *Litaniae maiores* and *minores* in Rome, Francia and Anglo-Saxon England: Terminology, Texts and Traditions" (*Early Med. Europe* 9: 211–46). Scholars have seen puzzling inconsistency in Anglo-Saxon writers' use of the term *litaniae maiores*, or major litany, to name the three days before Ascension which are elsewhere called the minor litany. Hill demonstrates by thorough investigation of medieval usage that the Anglo-Saxon practice follows the established custom of Gallican observance.

In "Hagiography in the British Isles 500–1550: Retrospect (1968–98) and Prospect," (*Hagiographica* 6 [1999]: 69–80, appendix by Rosalind C. Love, 81–89), Michael Lapidge surveys the study of Insular hagiography, taking stock of editions of primary texts (the Bollandists and the Rolls Series are praised), of reference works (e.g., *Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature* and *Handlist of Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540*), of monographs (such as Rolleston's *Saints and Relics*). Subsections briefly address each geo-national region of the British Isles. Some stimulating general observations elaborate these particularities—that the scope of Insular hagiography can now for the first time be seen, that new editions with proper apparatuses and careful assignment of sources are needed, that translations should assume a necessary role in editions and presumably in critical works, and "that there is a palpable need for a hagiographical manual in English ... in which the various hagiographical genres ... are distinguished and in which the origins and growth of medieval hagiography are explained." In an appendix Rosalind Love introduces the *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici*, with examples.

Rosamond McKitterick's "Les femmes, les arts et la culture en Occident dans le haut moyen âge" (*Femmes et pouvoirs des femmes à Byzance et en Occident (VI^e–XI^e siècles)*, ed. Stéphane Lebecq et al. Centre de recherche sur l'histoire de l'Europe du Nord-Ouest 19 [Villeneuve d'Ascq, 1999], 149–61) examines the participation of women in higher culture from four perspectives—their artifacts (garments and other products of manual arts such as books, etc.), their gifts to institutions (especially books), the reception of literary works dedicated to them, and their patronage

4. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works

of artists and writers. McKitterick's focus is strongly Continental. Besides a couple of Irish intellectuals at the court of Charlemagne, it is Alcuin with his close ties to the women at the Carolingian court that represents Anglo-Saxon connection to women who sponsor and encourage culture and the arts.

b. Early Anglo-Latin, exclusive of Bede

In "On Hiberno-Latin Texts and Anglo-Saxon Writings" (*The Scriptures and Early Medieval Ireland*, ed. T. O'Loughlin [Turnhout, 1999], 69–79), J.E. Cross elaborates a theme common in his numerous articles: the weighty influence of Hiberno-Latin texts on Anglo-Saxon authors, especially homilists. In addition to a good many quite specific individual examples, Cross considers the evidence of Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 25. This is a homiliary of Continental origin but representative of the Irish-influenced collections of Anglo-Saxon England. Pieces such as *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* and *Catechesis Celtica*, for example, are reflected in such important collections as "Wulfstan's Commonplace Book" and BL Royal 5.E.xiii. In more particular cases, Hibernian sources are suspected for such odd details as the "extra-scriptural" jawbone used by Cain to kill Abel, a tradition repeated as late as Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.

Catherine Cubitt's "Memory and Narrative in the Cult of Early Anglo-Saxon Saints" (*The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Hen and Innes, 29–66) is a well documented and wide ranging study that explores (1) the relationship between the literary forms of the period and their social contexts and (2) the structural principles of monastic memory in contrast to those of secular society. Broadly speaking, Cubitt's description of these lives is not surprising—highly conventionalized portraits of static characters. Yet in her consideration of the *vitae* in the social landscape, her analysis takes on life and sharply differentiates one writer from another, one hero from another, one community for another. Her subject matter is four *vitae*, one of Boniface, two of Cuthbert (one anonymous and the other by Bede), and one of Guthlac (by Felix). She shows how memory is socially negotiated, only a few examples of which I can mention here. In his letters, Boniface, for example, is shown to be self-consciously imitating hagiographical models both in his thought and actions. This close following of convention promoted his assimilation into the hagiographical tradition, and his narrative in turn controlled his future commemoration. The anonymous *Life* of Cuthbert contains a wealth of local detail, making him a touchpoint of social identity for those who commem-

orated him. Bede, in turn, removed these parochial flourishes to make the saint a model of sanctity in the late antique mold. Felix's *Life* of Guthlac, Cubitt further shows, "was shaped by his conformity simultaneously to saintly and heroic archetypes," a relatively rare reminder of the warrior society in which these aristocratic churchmen had grown up. Cubitt views narrative as a fundamental means controlling the commemoration of saints. Another important means, "the backbone" of saintly remembrance, was the liturgy, but its disconnected song and recitation were unable to present a coherent picture of the saintly personality. Only the saint's life could show the cause and effect of saintliness in rich detail.

Because of his role in christianizing England, Gregory the Great was a figure of immense importance for Anglo-Latin writers. The authenticity of his *Dialogues*, a seminal work promoting the idea of purgatory, has been challenged. Marilyn Dunn ("Gregory the Great, the Vision of Fursey and the Origins of Purgatory," *Peritia* 14: 238–54) reinforces that challenge with fresh evidence and presents good reason for believing the *Dialogues* were composed in England, probably in Northumbria, in the late seventh century. Dunn finds little or no mention of post-mortem purgation in the authentic works or in works by Gregory's circle. She traces developments of the belief in purgatory to Ireland and English, mentioning specifically the *Vita* of the Irishman Fursey, while the earliest influence of the *Dialogues* is found about 670; subsequent inclusion of purgatory (or something like it) in Bede's *HE* gave the idea considerable currency. The *Dialogues*, Dunn suggests, combine native Insular ideas on purgatory with authentically Gregorian material. The prestige of Gregory's name in Northumbria, where his cult was being developed and promoted in the seventh century, probably prompted the anonymous writers to assign their work to him.

The title of Arturo Echavarren Fernandez' "La Influencia del Apocalipsis de San Juan en la denuncia a los cinco reyes de *De excidio Britanniae*" (*Actas, II Congreso hispánico de latín medieval* (Léon, 11–14 de noviembre de 1997, ed. Maurilio Pérez González [Léon, 1998], 401–05) is self explanatory: Gildas' condemnation of five Celtic kings is patterned after the Apocalypse of John. The influence is seen in two ways, first in rhetorical structure and second in the symbolic use of animal imagery.

In "The Myth of Hiberno-Latin Exegesis" (*RB* 110: 42–85), Michael Gorman summarizes and expands upon earlier refutations of Bernard Bischoff's "Wende-

punkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese in Frühmittelalter" (1954) and "Il monachismo irlandese nei suoi rapporti col continente" (1957) (both reprinted, the latter with revisions, in Bischoff's *Mittelalterliche Studien* [Stuttgart, 1966]). Edmondo Coccia attacked the logic of Bischoff's articles in 1967 ("La cultura irlandese precarolingia: Miracolo o mito?" *Studi Medievali* 8: 257–420), while in 1997 Gorman himself controverted Bischoff's remarks in "Wendepunkte" on the Irish character of certain anonymous biblical commentaries ("A Critique of Bischoff's Theory of Irish Exegesis: The Commentary on Genesis in Munich Clm 6302 (Wendepunkte 2)," *Jnl of Med. Latin* 7: 178–233). Bischoff's arguments are based, Gorman argues, not on the certainly Irish items in the "Katalog der hiberno-lateinischen und der irischn beeinflussten lateinischen exegetischen literatur" appended to "Wendepunkte," but rather on works whose Irish origins are at best hypothetical. Moreover, the certainly Irish items are not actual biblical commentaries, whereas the commentaries Bischoff does fit into the title's categories are placed there on the basis of "vague" and "commonplace" (49) symptoms (derived from a paleographic model unsuited to literary analysis) which generally do not occur in the undoubtedly Irish texts. Bischoff's imprecise "Irish symptoms" and the "Wendepunkte" catalogue misled, to varying degrees, Robert McNally, Joseph Kelly, Michael Lapidge, Richard Sharpe and Charles D. Wright in the preparation of "essentially derivative" (51) lists of their own, while transcription and study of the texts has remained at a virtual standstill. Academic effort should be shifted to the latter tasks: although the texts do not warrant full scholarly editions, transcriptions for the World Wide Web would allow Bischoff's claims to be studied, and Gorman has posted such transcriptions of material on Genesis (the website, <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/jod/genesis>, is password protected as of this writing, June 2003). There is, Gorman concludes, virtually no evidence for the composition of biblical commentaries in medieval Ireland. Bischoff, writing without direct access to the manuscripts and in a time when early exegesis had been little studied, fits into a nineteenth-century view of Ireland, a surprisingly enduring mythology in which that island preserved and retransmitted to Europe the learning of antiquity. The article concludes (59–85) with an updated bibliography on the items in the original "Wendepunkte" catalogue. [Reviewed by John Houghton]

In "The Early Liturgy of Echternach" (*Die Abtei Echternach 698–1998*, ed. Michele Camillo Ferrari et al. [Luxembourg, 1999], 53–64) Yitzhak Hen examines the manuscript sources for knowledge of the liturgy at Echternach. While these are quite incomplete, the

Anglo-Saxon element, especially during the period of Willibrord's influence, is predominant: "Willibrord and his companions ... preserved in Echternach the liturgy of their native homeland, Anglo-Saxon England. ... As time passed the Anglo-Saxon influence ... became less obvious, and the abbey opened its gates to some local Frankish influences."

In "Feasts of Saint Michael the Archangel in the Liturgy of the Early Anglo-Saxon Church: Evidence from the Eighth and Ninth Centuries," (*Leeds Stud. in Eng.* 31: 55-79) Richard F. Johnson makes an exhaustive survey of the evidence for the cult of the archangel among the Anglo-Saxons, and despite the title, includes a discussion of the development of the cult from Roman times. He concludes that the early popularity of the cult was in Celtic and northern areas and that it became "the norm in the aftermath of the tenth-century Benedictine reforms."

Lawrence Martin's "The *Catechesis Veronensis*" (*The Scriptures and Early Medieval Ireland*, ed. O'Loughlin, 151-61) introduces an early ninth-century homily collection related to the *Catechesis Celtica*. The matter at hand is to set forth various introductory points—the manuscript setting, scribal habits, biblical and patristic sources (among them Bede), and "themes" ("ways of writing and thinking")—all of which indicate that "the Verona collection is a reflection of the Irish tradition of Biblical exegesis practised on the continent in the eighth century." Martin will complete and publish an edition left unfinished by the late Robert McNally.

The text known as *Hisperica Famina* is famous for the difficulty of its abstruse vocabulary, and criticism has been generally of a narrow, precise nature. In "The *Hisperica famina* as Literature" (*Jnl of Med. Latin* 10: 1-45), Andy Orchard takes a new approach in an essay that sets out to "explore a wider literary context ... by considering the use of such rhetorical and literary devices as repetition, parallelism, metaphor, simile, and paronomasia, all of which ... lend structure and meaning to a[n amorphous] body of material." After a consideration of sources and social setting, Orchard isolates some dozen subsections of the text, each indicated (in one version) by manuscript heading, dealing with such topics as the sky, the sea, the earth, etc. Calling these "*aenigmata* sections" (from the similarity in form and subject to Aldhelm's riddles), Orchard sets forth instances of parallelism that mark off the beginning and end of each segment (these are presented clearly in tabular form). Verbal formulae and parallelism are found to abound elsewhere in the text as well, a noteworthy fact given

4. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works

their relative scarcity in *aenigmata* and other Insular Latin texts and their relative frequency in the OE riddles and in vernacular Celtic texts. The remainder of the paper is taken up with analyses of metaphor and simile (especially martial figures of speech), of numerological figures (a feature of a "widespread seventh-century Hiberno-Latin wisdom tradition"), and of color symbolism. These considerations, along with an appreciation of the faminators' polished handling of sources, leads Orchard to conclude that the texts "display considerable literary as well as linguistic sophistication."

In a tribute to Heinz Mettke, who explored the Old High German glosses to Aldhelm's works (Jena, 1957), Kerstin Riedel has examined the OHG glosses to the prologue of Aldhelm's *Carmen de uirginitate* in a study of considerable erudition entitled "Lateinisch-althochdeutsche Prolog-glossen zum *Carmen de uirginitate* Aldhelms von Malmesbury" (*Septuaginta quinque: Festschrift für Heinz Mettke*, ed. Jens Hausstein et al., Jenaer germanistische Forschungen n.s. 5 [Heidelberg], 295-315). After situating Aldhelm historically, she describes the tradition of OHG glosses to Aldhelm's oeuvre. Mettke describes the glossing tradition as Frankish (i.e. southwestern), and promotes Fulda as a likely origin, a view independently confirmed by Werner Schröder. Riedel herself supports the same hypothesis. Here Riedel traces Latin and OHG glossing in the prologue found in five manuscripts and three glossaries. The manuscript descriptions are of tremendous value, as are the tables of textual affiliation. The conclusions may be summarized as follows: Sang. 242, Tur. C 59 and Flor. VI, 5 are closely related, to which family we could also add Clm. 23486. Sang. 263 has some independent glossing, with connections to Tur. C 59 and Sang. 242. Vind. 969 also betrays a more idiosyncratic tradition. Riedel does not settle on a place of origin for the OHG glosses, but has reasons to prefer the Frankish area over the upper German linguistic domain (as the dialect of the glosses could imply). Riedel concludes from the variety and density of annotations that the *Carmen* (or sections) could have been read in a school. [Reviewed by Scott Gwara]

The Hiberno-Latin poem *Altus Prosator* "describes the relationship of the three persons of the Trinity to each other, the relationship of God to the universe, the place of sin, how the 'machina mundi' was set up, how it works, and how it will end, ranging through the Bible from end to end." In a long and richly detailed essay ("*Altus Prosator*," *Celtica* 23: 326-68), Jane Stevenson looks at the poem from every conceivable

angle in order to determine a time and place of composition. She examines, for example, content, diction and syntax, prosody, transmission history, manuscript setting, sources, and evidence for knowledge of the poem (in the *Hisperica Famina*, in Aldelm, in early Anglo-Saxon glossaries). Her compelling conclusion is that the poem "was written at Iona in the second half of the seventh century." Thus she refutes an earlier tentative ascription of the poem to Columba.

To what degree was the early Anglo-Saxon cult of the saints based on Roman models? Many will be surprised to learn from Alan Thacker that in practically every feature the early English, roughly up to the time of Bede, followed Roman practice rather than the Gallic practice that would eventually eclipse it. ("In Search of Saints: The English Church and the Cult of Roman Apostles and Martyrs in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries," in *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West*, ed. J. M. H. Smith [Leiden], 247–77). To mention just a few of the many aspects of Roman veneration of saints—the choice of apostolic saints, the construction of churches over the graves of saintly martyrs (rather than translating the saintly remains), the desire to leave saints' resting places undisturbed and the subsequent preference for "contact" relics rather than anatomical relics of the saints, and the absence of stories about posthumous miracles. The changing fashion in saintly veneration is signaled by Bede when he addresses native saints such as Cuthbert and includes miracle stories among his narratives.

Welsh chronicles date Arthur's victory at Badon Hill to the year 518. Howard Wiseman's "The Derivation of the Badon Entry in the *Annales Cambriae* from Bede and Gildas" (*Parergon* 17.2: 1–10) shows how the history of Gildas, and Bede's interpretation of it, could have suggested exactly that date to the tenth-century authors of the *Annales Cambriae*.

c. Bede

Christian Aggeler's "The Eccentric Hermit-Bishop: Bede, Cuthbert, and Farne Island" (*Essays in Medieval Studies* 16 (1999): 17–25), an essay in a volume called "Out of Bounds," uses Foucault's concept of "heterotopia," as refined by Kevin Hetherington ("spaces of alternate ordering" whose primary importance lies in "what they perform in relation to other sites," *The Badlands of Modernity: Heterotopia and Social Ordering* [London: Routledge, 1997], 13 and 49) to consider Bede's portrait of Cuthbert in the prose *Vita* as a hermit on Farne Island. Discussions of Bede's Cuth-

bert have tended to see Bede suppressing Cuthbert's monastic side in order to present him as the model bishop—missionary, teacher, preacher, pastor (e.g., Alan Thacker, "Bede's Ideal of Reform," *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society*, ed. Patrick Wormald [Oxford, 1982], 130–153). Aggeler's essay proposes rather that Bede attends to Cuthbert's liminality, his eccentricity (in the root sense), and makes it a critique of the church's leadership. Aggeler's reading of Bede's prose life in comparison to his anonymous source finds a deliberate emphasis on the eremitic. For example, the earlier life begins with the story of the childhood prophecy that Cuthbert would be a bishop: Bede reproduces the story, but gives it second place in his text, after a quotation from Jeremiah, which is interpreted as praise of *anachoresis*. In his account of Cuthbert's life, Bede points out each of the elements which, in a homily [CCSL 122: 64–65], he lists as steps toward the life of a hermit. Bede also gives a more detailed account than does his source of the physical setting of Cuthbert's eremitical life, both on St. Cuthbert's Isle (omitted in the source) and on Farne Island, whose isolation he stresses. Bede's picture of Farne, however, does include a guesthouse, visitors, and (unlike the anonymous *Vita* but very much in the fashion of the life of St. Anthony) Cuthbert preaching to the crowds. This preaching from a place of isolation becomes a critique of the center—what the heterotopia performs with respect to ordinary space—and in particular of episcopal greed. This early eremitical emphasis continues throughout Bede's *Vita*. Even when Cuthbert becomes bishop, he insists on his ties to Farne, to which he knows he will shortly return; his closest friend throughout is his fellow hermit Hereberht; and in the five days before his death he renews his combat with demonic forces, still the spiritual champion his *askesis* has prepared him to be. Though this Cuthbert does frequently present Bede's own opinions (we may doubt whether the historical Cuthbert devoted his last breaths to condemning the Irish computus), the portrait goes beyond its author's own concerns to highlight a life called to liminality. [Reviewed by John Houghton]

In "Early Medieval Science: The Evidence of Bede," (*Endeavour* 24: 111–116), Liam Benison reads Bede's computus in the context of *De doctrina Christiana* using Faith Wallis's 1999 translation (*Bede: The Reckoning of Time* [Liverpool: Liverpool UP]). He argues that Augustine's expansion of rhetorical proof into teaching with examples frees Bede to approach natural phenomena empirically and thus to anticipate modern science by several centuries. Aimed at the non-specialist (e.g., "Fathers of the Church" is de-

fined, somewhat unclearly, on 113), the essay outlines the Northumbrian Easter problem and the *computus*, then describes Augustine's application of "spoiling the Egyptians" to the use of pagan learning: such teaching authorizes Bede to use the writings of antique natural science. The Augustinian interest in exhibiting proof leads to similar elements in Bede's teaching, for example the explanation of the apparent size of the moon (Ch. 26) and the relation of leap years to the position of the sunrise at the vernal equinox. The essay then discusses Bede's account of the tides (Ch. 29), drawing attention to his use of observation and of mathematics and to his refinement of earlier explanations. That Bede discusses a subject little considered by his patristic sources and not directly tied to his ostensible topic indicates an interest in empirical knowledge beyond the limits of Christian doctrine. Bede was limited, however, by the systems of calculation at his disposal, and Ælfric's English version of *De temporum ratione* shows by its omissions that future generations did not universally inherit his wide-ranging curiosity. Nonetheless, Bede's work demonstrates that early medieval thinkers were far more scientific than conventional history-of-science references to the Dark Ages would suggest. [Reviewed by John Houghton]

Did Bede read Vergil directly or only through secondary sources? In "El tratado *De orthographia* de Beda: Virgilio y los gramáticos" (*Actas, II Congreso hispánico de latín medieval*, ed. Pérez González, 269–75), Carmen Blanco Saralegui compares the citations of Vergil in *De orthographia* with the late antique grammars from which Bede borrowed. The comparison doesn't entirely settle the question, but a number of the grammatical errors in Bede's quotations of Vergil are in fact copied from intermediate sources.

Early medieval readers interpreted the bible as metaphor, and wrote and read the saints' lives which the bible inspired and informed; this correspondence is the thesis of Sandra Duncan's "Signa de caelo in the Lives of St. Cuthbert: the Impact of Biblical Images and Exegesis on Early Medieval Hagiography" (*Heythrop Jnl* 42: 399–412). Thus, the water in Cuthbert's well (from the anonymous life) reflects the water Moses struck from the stone which in turn reflects the rock which is Peter. Several similar examples are offered, and Duncan is even able to discern fine nuances of didactic purposes between the metaphors of the anonymous *Life* and that of Bede.

Carmela Vircillo Franklin opens "The Date of Composition of Bede's *De Schematibus et Tropis* and *De*

4. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works

Arte Musica" (RB 110: 199–203) by noting that while earlier views dated these two interlinked treatises toward the beginning of Bede's career, similar opinions were once held with respect to his *De Orthographia*. But Carlotta Dionisotti moved the date of *De Orthographia* to after *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum*, itself dated by a reference in the dedication no earlier than 709 ("On Bede, Grammars, and Greek," RB 92 [1982]: 111–140). After summarizing Arthur Holder's argument that Bede's description of Cuthbert as "conlevita" in *De Arte Metrica* does not require us to believe that it was written before Bede's priestly ordination in 702 ("[Un]dating Bede's *De Arte Metrica*," *Northumbria's Golden Age*, ed. Jane Hawkes and Susan Mills [Sutton, 1999], 390–395), the essay argues that because *De Schematibus*, like both *In Lucae Evangelium Expositio* and *Retractatio in Actus Apostolorum*, comments on the interpretation of Ps 2:2 given in Acts 4:26–27, while the *Expositio* does not, *De Schematibus* must postdate the *Expositio*. The essay concludes by suggesting some reasons for thinking that the *De Schematibus* may antedate the *Retractatio* (716 x 735). [Reviewed by John Houghton]

Donald K. Fry is working on what promises to be the most ambitious reference work on Bede to date, an exhaustive two-volume bibliography on the entire corpus of works, whether genuine, doubtful or spurious, and on the secondary literature as well. His "A Bede Bibliography Preview Hymn 6: *In Ascensione Domini*" (*Essays on Old, Middle, Modern English*, ed. Gruber, 73–90) is a sample of things to come, addressing only the short text named in the title. The bibliography on the primary work lists titles, beginning and ending lines, editions (more than twenty-five), translations, and editions of Old English translations. The bibliography of secondary literature lists relevant works from 1473 (the date of the first edition) to 1998.

According to its abstract, J. Hart-Hasler's Cambridge thesis "Vestigia Patrum Sequens: the Venerable Bede's use of Patristic Sources in his Commentary on the Gospel of Luke" (*Index to Theses* 49: 1578) examines how far Bede depended on the fathers and how far he injected his own original thinking: "The thesis establishes Bede's particular place among the various traditions of western Biblical interpretation." The subject matter is the twenty biblical commentaries, which Hart-Hasler sees as gradually moving from slavish imitation to bold originality. The commentary on Luke marks a midway point in Bede's career, and as such preserves characteristics of his earlier working habits even while hinting at later developments.

Matthias Karsten's *In epistula Iacobi expositio [Beda Venerabilis], Kommentar zum Jakobusbrief* (Fontes Christiani 40 [Freiburg im Briesgau and New York: Herder]) presents a study and modern German translation of Bede's commentary on the New Testament book of James (from his early commentary on the seven catholic epistles). Introductory material examines Bede's career as a student, teacher and author, and analyzes his commentary of James in relation to his theological works, whose primary aim is orthodox teaching—an aim all the more dangerous in this instance where there was no patristic model for Bede to follow. Karsten's base text is that of Hurst in CCSL; his translation and attribution of sources owe a debt to Hurst as well.

In "Coping with the Legacy of Universalism: Bede and the Trouble with the Roman Empire" (*Storia della Storiografia* 37: 27–40), Harald Kleinschmidt argues that, in the process of moving from the particularism of the barbarian tribes to the universalism of the Empire as represented by the Catholic Church, the nations of Western Europe changed, over the eighth and ninth centuries, from "cold" to "hot" societies. An introduction compares and contrasts Levi-Strauss's cold-hot dichotomy to the older distinction between tradition and history: the cold/traditional society commemorates the past with a focus on continuity and stability, the hot/historical attends to processes of change. But whereas a society can move from tradition to history, Levi-Strauss assumes that the status as hot or cold is immutable. The second section of the essay points to royal genealogies (that of Ine of Wessex serves as an example) as indicators of a large body of particular narrative tradition which served a quasi-legal function in setting unchanging norms and standards for the individual community, as the genealogies served to legitimize the royal house and commemorate its alliances with other families. These particularist traditions become sources for such writers as Jordanes and Bede, while Asser's account of Osberh teaching Alfred suggests both the survival of such traditions into the tenth century and women's role in transmitting them. By the twelfth century, however, universal institutions had supplanted the normative functions of traditions, e.g., the church's ritual of coronation had made royal genealogies merely antiquarian. The failure of the attempted merger had three causes: adoption of a more universal form of time reckoning, incorporation of reports about the north seas into the antique world picture, and the spread of Augustinian ideas about historical change, in the context of concerns c. 1000 for renovation of the Empire. Noting briefly Bede's

role in popularizing universalized time reckoning, the essay turns to the titular topic in an *obiter dictum* constituting a large portion of the fourth section. Bede's careful word choice in the title of his *Historia Ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* both associates the book with and distances it from the universalism of imperial and church history. By producing a critical text in literary Latin and defending the Roman norms introduced by Augustine of Canterbury, Bede adopts universal assumptions for use in writing the history of a people who had actually destroyed the institutions of empire. Thus Bede is forced to present the Church as the continuation of the Empire in its character as the final world state of Biblical prophecy. But this solution enshrines the idea of change as part of the universalist concept of the past. In the OE *Orosius* the effect of seafarers' reports (Ohthere and Wulfstan) was to modify the antique *mappa mundi* and to confirm water routes from Ocean to the Mediterranean, but they show that the Baltic does not connect to the Barents Sea. Thus, again, change had been admitted to a universal concept. While change was undeniable, and while Augustine had provided in the *De Civitate* the theoretical framework to explain it, the old particularist traditions and Christian theology agreed in taking a negative view of change, and Augustine's teaching was regularly ignored by historiographers from Orosius on. Millennial fears for the end of the world—the ultimate change—and dissent about rule of the Empire facilitated movement toward a hot society. The essay's argument is somewhat obscured by counterintuitive word choices ("commemorated up," for "learned," 30; "precedence" for "precedent," 35), the lack of OE characters ("Cu wine," etc., 32), and punctuation irregularities (e.g., a dependent clause beginning with "insofar as" is set as a sentence, between two real sentences, either of which it might modify, 30). [Reviewed by John Houghton]

Duncan Steel is an astronomer with extensive professional and popular publications. Two chapters from *Marking Time: The Epic Quest to Invent the Perfect Calendar* (New York: John Wiley and Sons) are pertinent to Anglo-Saxon studies. Chapter 9, "The Synod of Whitby (A.D. 664)," largely mirrors a chapter entitled "An Eclipse Whodunit" from his earlier book *Eclipse: The Celestial Phenomenon which has Changed the Course of History* (London: Headline, 1999; Washington: Joseph Henry Press, 2001). In both cases, Steel presents and expands upon the work of Daniel McCarthy, Aidan Breen and Jennifer Moreton with regard to the astronomical background of Whitby. McCarthy and Breen set out the basis for this position in "An Evaluation of Astronomical Observations

in the Irish Annals, *Vistas in Astronomy* 41:1 (1997): 117–138, and “Astronomical Observations in the Irish Annals and their Motivation,” *Peritia* 11 (1997): 1–43. Having established the skill which would have been required to make the various observations recorded in the Irish annals, McCarthy and Breen ask why only some of the many phenomena that must actually have been observed show up in the annals. They conclude that the annalists generally selected only those events which had apocalyptic significance. The reports of the eclipse of 1 May 664, in the annals and in *HE*, are the first records of an eclipse observation in Ireland and England, respectively. In fact, the eclipse of 664 is the only such observation Bede reports, and, as has long been known, he gets the day wrong, making it the third (.v. nones) rather than the first. The paschal calendar debate at the Synod of Whitby and the May eclipse have in common the moon, and the authors suggest that that common element points to a deeper connection. Assuming that Bede’s remark at the opening of *HE* IV.1 (that in the year of the eclipse and subsequent plague, Colman, defeated at Whitby, returned to the north and, on 14 July, Deusdedit of Canterbury died) gives the proper sequence of events, they suggest that the occurrence of the eclipse and the plague produced apocalyptic terror in Oswy, who summoned the synod in response, choosing Whitby as the site because it lay almost directly in the center of the path of totality (which also encompassed all of Oswy’s other “Columban monastic foundations”). As the Roman Dionysian calendar, for which Wilfrid argued at Whitby, predicted the new moon (and thus the eclipse which preceded it) for 3 May, the date of the eclipse had to be changed to fit, and Bede omits any reference to the eclipse as a factor in calling the synod. Pope Vitalian’s letter of 667 announcing the death of Archbishop-designate Wighard preserves a reference to the eclipse in its claim that Oswy has been converted to the apostolic faith by the “shielding right hand of God” (*HE* III.29), i.e., the moon sending its shadow over the Columban foundations. In a later article (“The Lunar and Paschal Tables of *De ratione paschali* attributed to Anatolius of Laodicea,” *Archive for History of the Exact Sciences* 49:4 [1996]: 285–320), McCarthy goes on to argue that the text and tables of *De ratione paschali* as they came to Bede had been altered by Wilfrid to conceal their actual support for Colman’s position. Steel simplifies this argument most often by omission, e.g. of the initial observation that recorded eclipses are generally ones with apocalyptic significance. He begins his own discussion by noting that the exact date of the synod is unknown, and says that it “in fact ... seems” that it was concealed as “part of a subterfuge designed to fool potential op-

ponents of the Roman church” (123). He then introduces the eclipse, and comments that perhaps no-one before McCarthy and Breen had noted the potential association of synod and eclipse because “the records were fudged deliberately” (123). Citing the date and path of the eclipse, and the coming of the plague, he omits the evidence from Bede’s text for their having preceded the synod, claiming simply that Vitalian’s letter confirms both the role of the eclipse and the sequence of events. The date of the eclipse, he continues, must have been falsified to agree with the Dionysiac tables. After discussing the degree to which the Dionysiac tables would have agreed with the actual date of visibility of a new moon in Whitby or Rome, he proposes that Wilfrid and his party “bluffed” (126) at the Synod, claiming that the eclipse happened on the third and depending on the fallibility of memory and the lapse of several weeks to prevent people from saying that it was actually on the first. Steel realizes that his proposed “double-bluff deceit” (126) would itself be problematic, since a lunar-solar conjunction (and thus the eclipse) on the third would entail seeing the new moon on the fourth or the fifth. If Wilfrid and his party had realized this interval, they could have accepted an eclipse on the first and claimed full agreement with the new moon, visible as they predicted on the third. If they were not aware of the interval, they must have moved the date of the eclipse to the third as deliberate subterfuge.

Whether one is persuaded by this line of reasoning in either its academic or its popular form will depend on the evaluation of several points. For example, although Bede’s comment at the beginning of *HE* IV.1 may suggest the order eclipse-plague-synod-death of Deusdedit, the same sort of reading would note that the first mention of the eclipse comes in the opening of III.27, after the description of the synod in III.25 and of Tuda’s episcopate in III.26, suggesting that the synod came before the eclipse. Bede also says that the plague came first to the south of England and only later to Northumbria, and Tuda and St. Cedd (who was active at the synod) are both commemorated as having died of it in October. If Oswy was in terror of the plague soon after the eclipse, it seems that it was from a distance. While Vitalian might refer to the moon as the “protecting right hand of God,” the argument seems to require that Oswy saw it rather as a threat than a protection. Even if the date of the eclipse may have been deliberately moved between 664 and Bede’s day, it seems unlikely that the change could have been made at a time when, *ex hypothesi*, the event loomed so large in the popular mind as to create a national emergency, and Oswy would have sent messengers throughout the

realm to determine the path of totality (implicit in his knowing that it encompassed the Columban foundations and that Whitby was at the center).

After suggesting that Bede (in the *Chronica Maiora*) called the eclipse "well-remembered" as a subtle way of indicating that he knew the date had been tampered with, Steel's Chapter 10, "The Venerable Bede (A.D. 725)," gives a mostly unremarkable account of (1) Bede's role in popularizing the Anno Domini system, (2) the indiction, and (3) various starting days for the year. Steel then claims that Augustine's response to contemporary apocalyptic ideas based on an *Annus Mundi* beginning around 5509 B.C. (with the last days to begin A.M. 6000), was to adopt instead an A.M. based c. 5200 B.C.; Bede, faced with a similar crisis in A.D. 801 on this second A.M. system, developed a third epoch, beginning in 3952 B.C., postponing the endtimes until the 21st century. This date, however, Steel says, put the apocalypse too far in the future to be useful for terrifying peasants, so Bede used Dionysius' years from the Incarnation, which had a millennium, if not The Millennium, at a convenient distance. [Reviewed by John Houghton]

For other articles on Bede, see Janes, under "General" works, and Cubitt, under "Early Anglo-Latin."

d. Carolingian, exclusive of Alcuin

Franz Brunhölzl's "Über die Verse de Karolo rege et Leone papa" (*Historisches Jahrbuch* 120: 274–83) argues that the anonymous author of the poem is an Irishman. General patterns of thought are found to be Hibernian, but it is the author's relationship to the king that particularly reminds Brunhölzl of the praise-singers at the Irish court. Support for such an assumption is found in the letters of Alcuin, who writes cryptically about the crowd of "Egyptians" (i.e., Irishmen) in Continental circles.

F.S. D'Imperio's "Le glosse ai quattro Vengeli nel ms. St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 50" (*SM* 3rd ser. 41: 549–90) examines in detail a densely glossed ninth-century gospel manuscript composed at St. Gall. She views the manuscript, the result of a long and organized corporate effort, as evidence for a cultural unity established at the monastery by a series of strong abbots, to whom she attributes the post-Carolingian florescence. Much of the paper is a source study; the interesting connection for Anglo-Saxon studies is the prominence of Bede and Alcuin, whose exegetical works (e.g., Bede's work on Mark and Alcuin's on John) were incorporated in abbreviated form in the marginal commentary.

e. Alcuin

Andy Orchard explores Alcuin's "Englishness" ("Wish You Were Here: Alcuin's Courtly Poetry and the Boys Back Home," *Jnl of Med. Latin* 10: 1–45): "By examining a series of poems which can be linked closely both to Alcuin and to York, including works perhaps composed both by his teacher and by his students, we can see how the regional flavour which Alcuin brought to the Carolingian court ... can be balanced by a desire in the cloisters of York to keep up with the courtly endeavours on the Continent." Orchard uses the letters and the York poem to spell out the Alcuin side of the York-Alcuin connection: his student days at York under Master Ælberht are cherished and publicly acknowledged throughout Alcuin's long career. Alcuin's penchant for jocular nicknames is further attributed to his Insular character, as is his repetitive and formulaic poetic technique. Orchard compares a poem plausibly assigned to Ælberht with Alcuin's own poetic compositions and finds striking similarities of diction, which are also found in poems by Alcuin's Continental students. Orchard also edits and translates a mediocre poem on St. Ninian (many of its lines are cribbed), which he argues was written by Alcuin's unimpressive former students at York.

In "Alcuino, monaco umanista" (*Citta di vita* 54 [1999]: 225–28) Luigi Picchi argues that Alcuin as a paragon of the Carolingian renewal is a precursor of Italian humanism. Specifically, Alcuin's poetic meditation on his monastic cell (which Picchi translates into Italian) foreshadows Petrarch's celebration of the scholarly life in *De vita solitaria*.

f. Ninth Century

Mark Atherton's "King Alfred's Approach to the Study of Latin" (*History of Linguistics* 1996, ed. Cram et al., II.15–22) examines ninth-century conceptions of second-language acquisition. A relevant example is the familiar story from Asser's *Life of Alfred* in which Alfred, a neophyte student, memorizes a book and as a reward receives it as a gift. But if Alfred were illiterate, how then did he manage to learn the text? Atherton analyzes Alfred's ideas of foreign language learning by looking at the *Life* and the OE *Pastoral Care*, with a side glance at colloquies. The article describes a practice and theory strongly influenced by monastic schooling: reading begins as a cooperative oral-aural affair undertaken directly with a tutor; it continues with a thorough mulling over, or *meditatio*, in which the student associates the sounds and meanings at several different levels of generality. "Latin is studied

by careful listening, speaking aloud, repetition, and meditation on the words of texts. Such methods form the essential background ... of the minority who went on to the close analytical study of Latin."

g. The Tenth-Century Reform and Beyond

Abbo of Fleury was a Frankish scholar who spent two years as a teacher in England and later became abbot at Fleury. Anglo-Saxonists know him because of his important connections to the Benedictine reformers. He was a personal friend of Dunstan and Oswald, his *Passion of St. Edmund* was translated into English by Ælfric, and his teaching at Ramsey was developed in a self-conscious way by the community there, notably by Byrhtferth. Elizabeth Dachowski's interesting essay, "The English Roots of Abbo of Fleury's Political Thought" (*RB* 110: 95–105) demonstrates that the influence was not only from the Continent to England, but that Abbo was significantly influenced by the political ideas and practices of the English Benedictines. Among the more important of these practices, elucidated in Abbo's *Collectio canonum*, is the movement to bring the bishoprics under monastic influence, the election of bishops without interference on the part of influential local lords, and the forging of a close alliance between the monarchy and Frankish monasticism which would involve abbots and bishops in an advisory capacity to the king. Abbo acknowledges none of these ideas as English in origin, but Dachowski's reading of Abbo's *Passio* shows him to be knowledgeable of English ecclesiastical politics.

In "Staging Place/Space in the Eleventh-Century Monastic Practices" (*Medieval Practices of Space*, ed. Hanawalt and Kobialka [Minneapolis and London], 128–48), Michael Kobialka offers a postmodern analysis of the Easter ceremony of the Reform customary *Regularis Concordia*. The author's obscure language makes it almost impossible to squeeze sense from the essay—a task that is less urgent for Anglo-Saxonists because of the author's unlikely and entirely unsupported thesis that the manuscript in question, BL Cotton Tiberius A. iii, was copied after 1066 during Lanfranc's tenure at Canterbury.

Michael Lapidge's "A Metrical Vita S. Iudoci from Tenth-Century Winchester" (*Jnl of Med. Latin* 10: 255–306) edits, translates, introduces, and annotates a poem on Saint Iudoc, a seventh-century Breton whose remains were transferred to Winchester early in the tenth century. Among other considerations, Lapidge reviews the sources, hagiographic and otherwise, for Iudoc's biography, sources for the poem (primarily a

4. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works

prose *Life*), the language of the poem (firmly in the hermeneutic tradition popular among the tenth-century Benedictines, and especially at Winchester), and the metrics of the poem (typically Insular in its choice of metrical half-lines but in other regards unusual). The anonymous author had a noteworthy knowledge of Classical writers (Vergil, Horace, Ovid, Lucan, and Martianus Capella, in addition to such Christian authors as Prudentius and Aldhelm).

At the intersection of liturgiology and codicology, Richard W. Pfaff summons forth the bishop from late Anglo-Saxon England and the book from which he performed his episcopal rites ("The Anglo-Saxon Bishop and His Book," *Bull. of the John Rylands Univ. Lib. of Manchester* 81.1 [1999]: 3–24; the paper was written for oral delivery as the 1998 Toller lecture). Pfaff's approach is generalizing—not a particular bishop, nor a particular book, but any or all bishops and any or all pontificals are his theme. The approach has limits, and much of the discussion centers on acknowledging the wide differences in the tiny handful of extant manuscripts (about a dozen and a half) designed for the ceremonial use of bishops—the books vary greatly in the size of their scripts and pages, and in their overall length. One might suppose that bishops had pretty much the same duties, but the contents of the volumes vary as much as their physical sizes, and appear in no fixed order. How would the books have been put into actual use? There are no traces of tables of contents or bookmarks, though stage directions for the rites are a prominent feature, albeit they are written in curiously unparallel Latin. Given all these puzzlements, what then can be positively asserted about the pontifical? Pfaff sees the bishop using the volume deliberately and selectively, using it to shape the particulars of each service. As he explains, the pontifical is "a complicated book," but his fluent expositions clarify those complications without oversimplifying.

When confronted with long and short versions of a text, an editor must establish which is prior. But how to do so is exactly the question posed by A.G. Rigg's "The Long or Short of it? Amplification or Abbreviation?" (*Jnl of Med. Latin* 10: 46–73). Among his examples are the two *Lives of Æthelwold*, the longer by Wulfstan of Winchester, the shorter by Ælfric (available in one volume, ed. Lapidge and Winterbottom). On the basis of use of sources, Wulfstan's has been judged to be the earlier, and Rigg establishes quotation of sources as one of the editor's principal tests of priority.

D.P.

Works Not Seen

- E. Emerton, *The Letters of Saint Boniface* (1940; new introduction and bibliography by Thomas F. X. Noble). New York: Columbia UP. xxxv, 181 pp.
- Cunnen, Janina. *Fiktionale Nonnenwelten. Angelsächsische Frauenbriefe des 8. und 9. Jahrhunderts*. Anglistische Forschungen 287. Heidelberg: Winter. xi, 364 pp.

- Gneuss, Helmut. "Zur Geschichte des Hymnars." *Mittelateinisches Jahrbuch* 35: 227–47.
- Patzold, Steffen. "Konflikte im Kloster Fulda zur Zeit der Karolinger." *Fuldaer Geschichtsblätter* 76: 69–162.
- Marocco Stuardi, Donatella. *Alcuino di York nella tradizione degli "specula principis"*. Collana "Gioele Solari" 29. Milan: Engeli, 1999. 135 p.

5. Manuscripts, Illumination, Charters

This section leads off with the newest in scribal technology. Linda Ehsam Voigts and Patricia Deery Kurtz's CD-ROM *Scientific and Medical Writings in Old and Middle English: an Electronic Reference* (Ann Arbor) "was originally envisioned as a volume providing for the medieval English vernacular the kind of information found in Lynn Thorndike and Pearl Kibre's *A Catalogue of Incipits of Mediaeval Scientific Writings in Latin*" (2). The latter has the advantage of being more transparently named: Voights and Kurtz is also a catalogue of incipits. The former has the advantage of being in electronic form and thus nearly five pounds lighter than Thorndike-Kibre. The data is divided into Old and Middle English, with Old English leading, so Anglo-Saxonists have the scrolling advantage over colleagues in later periods. Each entry gives the incipit, designation, location of manuscript, and pertinent bibliographic information. One icon leads to further information (editor, translator, etc.), and another provides more detail on the manuscript context of the entry. The data is searchable by keyword, but also includes indices of incipits, authors, titles, manuscripts, subjects, translators, and equivalents in Thorndike-Kibre. This CD is an extremely useful tool; the compilers are to be commended for using electronic publication still in or near its infancy. Given the speed at which this field progresses, however, the search engine for Voights and Kurtz seems fairly clunky a mere two years after its creation, and, compared to current programs, sometimes downright counterintuitive. I strongly suggest doing something normally anathema to anyone of my bloodline: namely, printing out the instructions and reading them before using this CD.

Susan E. Kelly's *Charters of Abingdon Abbey, Parts I and II*, Anglo-Saxon Charters 7-8 (Oxford and New York) is the first of these charter collections that runs to two volumes. The first volume contains historical background, analysis and commentary. Abingdon Abbey maintained that it was founded by King Cæd-

walla of the West Saxons 686-88, but that later kings had "confiscated the minster's lands and built on the site an *aedificium regale*" (xxxv)—an act later laid at the door of Alfred. The abbey was re-established under Eadred, and the church "completed and dedicated some time after Æthelwold was consecrated as bishop of Winchester on 29 November 963" (xxxviii). The abbey was dissolved in 1538. 149 pre-Conquest (or purportedly pre-Conquest) documents survive; only 18 predate 900. 139 are Latin royal diplomas, mostly dating from the tenth century, recording grants of land. There are also "two royal writs in the vernacular ... and one episcopal writ in Latin ... [as well as] a small number of miscellaneous documents," including the Old English will of Archbishop Ælfric (xlvi). "Nine of Abingdon's Anglo-Saxon charters survive in single-sheet form [and seven of nine of these are probably originals] ... Another twelve single-sheet diplomas, since lost, were transcribed by Robert Talbot in or before 1558.... But the principal witness for the great majority of texts in the archive is the Abingdon chronicle-cartulary, extant in two recensions: [one] from the late twelfth century ... and [one] from the early thirteenth century" (liii).

For the earlier history of the abbey, the information in the chronicle may well be suspect: "Close analysis shows that the compilers of the Abingdon chronicle had access to very little precise information about the earlier house: so they extrapolated from and interpreted the materials to hand, plucking the names of abbots from witness lists and unrelated documents, and fashioned a narrative which reflected their concern to demonstrate antiquity and continuity.... In effect, they created a 'prehistory' for Æthelwold's monastery, which is for the most part a fictional construct" (xxxvi). "It was clearly very important for Æthelwold that his monastery was not a new foundation, but one with a history that stretched back into the era of Bede and beyond.... An undistinguished past came to be an embarrassment to later generations of Abingdon

monks. Invention filled the gaps" (cxciv). The preponderance of the charter collection deals with estates of the tenth and early eleventh century. Some of these later texts may represent work of a temporary royal 'chancery': "It is clear that, at certain times in the tenth century and in certain circumstances, regional and local production of diplomas on behalf of the king was permitted" (lxviii). Demonstrating that truth can be as entertaining as fiction, Abbot Spearhafoc (c. 1047-51) who had been the king's goldsmith, "is reputed to have fled abroad when his elevation to the bishopric of London was thwarted," taking gold and gems given him to make a royal crown for the king (xliii).

The charters of Exeter seem to have played similar roles in historicizing fiction and creating a regional diplomatic style, according to C. Insley's 1998 Oxford thesis, *The Anglo-Saxon charters of Exeter: an edition and commentary*. I quote from the summary in *Index to Theses* 49: "A critical edition of the charters which were part of the Anglo-Saxon episcopal archive of Exeter.... The introduction provides the analytical framework for the charters, placing them in their historical, archival and diplomatic context. This underlines the part played by the charters in creating a historical background for the Church in the Anglo-Saxon South-West. They reveal much about the attempts of Bishop Leofric to restore the possessions of his see and the part charters played in that restoration. The charters copied in Leofric's episcopate also give a valuable insight into the way the bishopric viewed and even reconstructed its past. The Exeter charters are also unusual among surviving Anglo-Saxon charters in that most of them survive as single sheets, allowing us to add a paleographical dimension to their studies. This, in concert with diplomatic analysis, establishes the existence of a distinctive regional diplomatic tradition in the South-West.... Most of the surviving Exeter charters, many of them for lay beneficiaries, were produced locally ... [supplying] clear evidence that Anglo-Saxon charters were not necessarily invariably produced by royal clerks in the tenth and eleventh centuries" (1618).

Patrick W. Conner continues the focus on Exeter in "Exeter's Relics, Exeter's Books" (*Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 117-56), concentrating on the history and provenance of the 'Leofric Missal' (Oxford, Bodl. Lib., MS Bodley 579) and the relic list contained therein. Conner proposes that "[T]he sacramentary was commissioned from St. Vaast for the use of the renewed foundation at Exeter in the time of King Æthelstan.... The need

to list the items in [the cathedral's] collection of relics would have been obvious nearly from the time of their donation.... [If] the present first gathering of the Leofric Missal is a cancel for an earlier, tenth-century gathering, then we have evidence for an earlier inventory of relics.... Each relic originally would have been identified with labels, now lost, which can be largely reconstructed by a collation of the surviving relic-lists. The earliest listing made from these labels was, I am suggesting, the list made in the mid-tenth century and copied into the first gathering of the Leofric Missal. The surviving mid-eleventh-century copy of that list in what I take to be a replacement gathering at the beginning of the Missal and the relic-list in London British Library, MS Royal 6.B.vii are witnesses to this first lost inventory" (144). The economic importance of an important collection of relics for pilgrim trade could in turn support a "thriving scriptorium" capable of producing manuscripts such as the Exeter Book (151).

The importance of books, particularly Gospel books, is underscored in Michelle Brown's Jarrow lecture, "In the Beginning was the Word" (Jarrow, 2000), which studies the "role of the book in a nascent Christian culture and ... its value as a cult object, with particular reference to the cult of St. Cuthbert and the Lindisfarne Gospels" (1). Books were "peripatetic, and at a time when church buildings and a parochial structure were in such early stages of development sacred texts might act as focal assembly points" (13). Brown discusses how the Insular Gospel book itself becomes an icon, "the sacred incipits and monograms of its Gospelbooks growing to occupy the entire page as vehicles of *contemplatio* intimately combining word and image" (3); the decorated Scripture may be "the Insular world's most complex and sacred image, or semi-abstract *figura*, of the Godhead" (13). Entering into the Gospel itself, Brown analyzes the way the Matthew miniature works on two levels. First, it harmonises the Old and New Testaments: "the book held by the figure behind the curtain represents the law, contained within the Tabernacle, which is integrated with the New Testament being written by the Evangelists." Second, the peeping figure unites the concepts of the true believer, "a symbol of the Church/Communion of Saints," and the "scribe/teacher/preacher, also symbolised by the writing figure of the evangelist whom he so resembles" (17). On a broader scale, Brown postulates that the Lindisfarne Gospels may have been created as a "contribution to the shrine of St. Cuthbert" (9), perhaps modeled on Irish books such as Durrow and Kells, which "served a similar symbolic and protective function for Co-

lumba's cult" (11). As evidence that the gospels originated in Lindesfarne, she adduces stylistic parallels provided by Cuthbert's coffin, pectoral cross and altar. John Ezard reviews the salient parts of Michelle Brown's arguments and repackages them for the general reader in his "Revealed: Hidden art behind the Gospel Truth," *Guardian* 30 May 2000, p. 3.

The practical rather than symbolic meaning of religious books motivates the engaging and entertaining style of Richard W. Pfaff's "The Anglo-Saxon Bishop and his Book," *Bull. of the John Rylands Univ. Library of Manchester* 81/1 (1999): 3–14, and reflects its origins as the Toller Memorial Lecture delivered at the University of Manchester in 1998. Pfaff employs an "imaginative extrapolation from the extant pontificals and benedictionals" to suggest what functions these books performed for bishops during divine service. Although some rites or portions of rites would surely have been memorized, for others, such as consecration of churches, exorcisms, undertaking pilgrimage, or ordeals, which are rarer or more complex, "we must suppose that the officiating bishop needs all the help he can get from his book" (12). Grammatical rubrics display inconsistency between subjunctive, indicative and imperative with no immediately discernable pattern, but "the passive voice [likely] indicates something the bishop himself does not do," relegating it to a lowlier cleric (12). Books will also underscore "other points to which the bishop must be alert, [including] singulars and plurals [for example, for blessing one or more altars], Roman numerals, cross-references and fill-in-the blank names" (13). Some volumes contain rubrical indications as to volume or pitch of voice to be used for sung sections of the text, although Pfaff regards it as doubtful that bishops paid much attention to them; these indications principally signpost the distinction between sung vs. spoken portions of the liturgy. Pfaff's topic, which he unfairly characterizes as "dry as its title is bland, keeps spilling over into large areas of fascination" (19), and Pfaff provides us with wonderful images of bishops wielding razors as they tonsure priests, or "a complete prostration by a middle-aged or elderly man in episcopal vestments [which would tend] to be distinctly ungraceful" (17). This learned but accessible article would be a fine addition to any syllabus for an Introduction to Medieval Studies.

The religious man as subject rather than as performer is the topic of Nicholas Orchard's "St. Willibrord, St. Richarius, and Anglo-Saxon Symptoms in Three Mass-Books from Northern France," *RB* 110: 261–83, an expansion of his 1995 ASE paper on a

mass adapted for use on the feast of St. Richarius. Orchard adduces three other books which have masses for St. Richarius. First is BNF lat. 9432. The sanctoral includes a mass on 9 October, commemorating the translation of the saint's relics to St-Riquier, with prayers "clearly copie[d from] the prayers assigned to St. Willibrord at Echternach" (265). This sanctoral also contains a mass for the feasts of St. Erasmus and of St. Nicander, a saint venerated in Naples who was "of considerable importance in early Anglo-Saxon England" (265). Orchard postulates that if these texts, along with the 'Metrical Calendar of York' contained in the same manuscript, "are not descendents of those current in Italy in the sixth or seventh centuries, then they could in theory descend from those employed in southern England and possibly at Anglo-Saxon houses in Frisia and Bavaria" (267). The separate sanctoral may also point "towards England and houses connected with English men and women" (273). Another mass for St. Richarius is contained in Ambrosiana DSP 1027 bis, an early eleventh-century sacramentary from Bobbio; Orchard supposes this is "a copy of a missal (or sacramentary) either from Saint-Riquier itself or a house close by" (277). Finally, Vienna, ÖNB lat. 193, a fourteenth-century missal from St-Riquier, contains a version of the standard mass for St. Richarius that "has been broken up and its prayers dispersed" (282). As a note of side interest, BNF lat. 9432 contains "the earliest surviving sacramentary to provide a mass for the alleged translation of St. Benedict's remains to Fleury on 4 December" (274), and Ambrosiana DSP 1027 bis contains masses for SS Brigid and Patrick, "both of which are older than the earliest surviving Anglo-Saxon and Irish versions by at least half a century" (278).

Nancy Netzer provides a fascinating glimpse into the working practices of two important late seventh- and early eighth-century scriptoria in "Die Arbeitsmethoden der Insularen Skriptorien. Zwei Fallstudien: Lindisfarne und Echternach" (*Die Abtei Echternach 698-1998*, ed. Camillo Ferrari et al., 65–83). Netzer looks first at the four "Prachtevangeliiare" from the Lindesfarne scriptorium, the Gospel Books of Lindesfarne, Durham, and Echternach, as well as Oxford, Lincoln College MS 92, fols. 165ff., and then at later manuscripts that drew on these for inspiration: the Royal Gospel and the Gospels from Gotha and St. Petersburg. This output "bestärkt das Bild des Skriptoriums von Lindisfarne um 700 als das einer geschäftigen Werkstatt, in der wohl mehrere verschiedene Vorlagen für Evangeliiare zur Verfügung standen und womöglich nebeneinander gebraucht wurden, mit dem Ergebnis, daß die drei aus dieser Zeit

erhaltenen Evangelienbücher ... je eine verschiedene Vorlage benutzt hätten.... Eine große Anzahl von Evangelien wurde benötigt, um das Christentum überall in Englands kirchlichem 'Hinterland' zu festigen, was dazu führte, daß weniger aufwendige Bücher schnell und sparsam hergestellt wurden" (73). Turning to Echternach, early on we find a type of factory-line production. The size and layout of quires of the Augsburg and Maeseck Gospels are the same, "was darauf schließen läßt, daß eine bestimmte Reihe von Lagen im voraus zubereitet wurde" (75). This type of mass production is not surprising, as Willibrord would have needed at least a Gospel Book, if not also a Psalter, for each of his new foundations. The later Trier Gospel has varying sizes of quires, and draws on another exemplar as well as that for the two earlier Gospels. "Diese Handschrift [sollte] ein sorgfältigeres Produkt werden, für das mehr Mittel, wenn nicht sogar mehr talentierte Schreiber zur Verfügung stehen sollten" (76). Two artists with quite different styles seem to have shared the same Mediterranean exemplar for the Canon Tables of Maeseck and Trier and the use of Mediterranean models for the miniatures may reflect Willibrord's desire to establish a new, direct link to Rome. The Echternach scriptorium attempted "insulare, mediterrane und merovingische Elemente ... miteinander zu verbinden" (82), laying the groundwork for the more synthetic blend that arose in Carolingian scriptoria.

Echternach's connection to Anglo-Saxon culture is also the focus of Barbara Obrist, "The Astronomical Sundial in Saint Willibrord's Calendar and Its Early Medieval Context," *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Age* 67: 71-118. Obrist examines the oldest known illustration of the horologium (depicting solstitial and equinoctial sun paths) found in a calendar that is part of an early eighth-century manuscript (Paris, BNF lat. 10837) once belonging to St. Willibrord. The drawing in question, likely added at Echternach after Willibrord's lifetime, consists of a circle containing three other concentric circles, divided into eight segments by diagonal lines. A central medallion contains an inscription identifying the figure as an horologium; other inscriptions in Latin identify salient aspects such as hourly divisions and spatial orientation, as well as interpretations of Greek and Latin names for the cardinal directions and allegorical associations (i.e. the cardinal directions and the ages of man). Obrist places this unusual illustration within the context of ancient cosmological diagrams; much of the information created by the layout fuses knowledge of two ancient devices: on one hand, the hemispherical, concave instruments in stone and

5. Manuscripts, Illumination, Charters

bronze used to measure the longest and shortest days, known as *scapha* or *horologia*, and on the other armillary spheres, or models of the universe. Translating these three-dimensional models into two-dimensional form, this horologium was designed "for the determination of the cardinal directions and of the solstitial and equinoctial points and dates, and not daily hours" and likely played a practical role in the process of ecclesiastical and monastic life (82). The heretofore unseen relationships of the figure in question with ancient, late antique and early medieval illustrations of horologia suggests that it derives from a learned understanding of ancient science, sensitively adapted to local conditions (the northerly latitudes) of Anglo-Saxon monasteries. Consideration of the possible ecclesiastical context and historical background of the horologium demonstrates the degree that Anglo-Saxon cultural centers were instrumental in the transmission of ancient understanding of astronomy, cosmology and related disciplines.

Rosamund McKitterick questions the very concept of a major scriptorium at Echternach in the gorgeously illustrated "Le scriptorium d'Echternach aux huitième et neuvième siècles," *L'Évangélisation des régions entre Meuse et Moselle et la fondation de l'abbaye d'Echternach (V-IX^e siècle)*, ed. Michel Polfer (Luxembourg), 501-22, claiming that "[l]e prétendu scriptorium d'Echternach des huitième et neuvième siècles est comparable au chat du Cheshire dans Alice au Pays des Merveilles de Lewis Carroll; je veux dire par cela qu'il disparaît continuellement alors qu'on l'observe" (501). McKitterick systematically looks at manuscripts that have been attributed to the Echternach scriptorium, and, without questioning their provenance, offers alternatives as to their origins. For example, charter evidence regarding Vergilius, possibly the scribe of the Prophets manuscript, and Laurentius, the scribe of the Martyrologium Hieronymianum, does not definitively tie these scribes to Echternach. Charter transactions "pouvaient être consignées probablement de trois manières différentes. Les monastères pouvaient fournir leurs propres scribes pour enregistrer les transactions et établir des chartes au nom de donateurs. Les donateurs eux-mêmes pouvaient fournir un secrétaire. Ou encore un notaire (qui pouvait être le prêtre local), associé aux assemblées et cours de justice locales, pouvait établir des chartes pour des donateurs.... Il est par ailleurs frappant qu'aucune des premières chartes d'Echternach n'ait été établie à Echternach même.... [I]l soit concevable que Laurentius et Virgilius aient été requis, en tant que membres de la communauté d'Echternach, pour écrire des chartes, leur maîtrise de la pratique diplomatique

franque indique qu'ils ont plus probablement été actifs en tant que scribes rédacteurs de chartes en dehors de la communauté. Ils peuvent probablement être liés, en qualité de prêtres desservant la région, à la cour ducale de Heden de Thuringe, à des membres de l'aristocratie de Toxandrie, ou à la cathédrale de Trèves" (505). Furthermore, the four important early manuscripts often attributed to Echternach were written by three different scribes, and "il n'y aurait eu aucun lien évident en terme de discipline d'écriture ou de formes de lettres. La présence de quelques individus capables de copier des livres au sein d'une communauté ne constitue pas en soi un scriptorium" (505). Other early manuscripts associated with Echternach, with their Irish or Northumbrian characteristics, "reflètent probablement les origines diverses des membres de la familia de Willibrord et ne peuvent être considérés comme des preuves de l'existence d'un scriptorium" (507). McKitterick continues her paleographical, codicological and historical examination to the early ninth century, emphasizing the close connection of Echternach with Trèves, particularly through the abbots Hetti and Radbod, who both served for part of the time simultaneously as archbishop. During this later period, "il est très difficile de distinguer avec la moindre certitude dans le corpus existant les livres provenant d'Echternach d'autres écrits réalisés à Trèves" or the religious houses, particularly Oeren and Pfalz, associated with the archbishopric (513-14). McKitterick even suggests the possibility that the province of Trèves functioned as a center for the training and employment of Carolingian court scribes.

In "Angelomus and Manuscripts from the Luxeuil Library," *Aevum* 74: 431-40, Robert G. Babcock convincingly demonstrates that the ninth-century codex of Bede's commentary on Mark's Gospel (Yale, Beinecke Library MS 389) may "have a Luxeuil origin as well as a Luxeuil provenance" (437). This manuscript shares many features with the almost identically-sized Luxeuil copy of Smaragdus' *Expositio libri comitis* (London, BL Add. 21914), including the fact that, as for other Luxeuil manuscripts, "the ink used for the Uncial letters is a pinkish-orange color and is so faded that in many places it has virtually disappeared.... In both manuscripts, simple two- to four-line square capitals in red or brown introduce each section of the manuscript.... Jones' plate from the Smaragdus manuscript shows a marginal correction which is linked to the text by three dots. The same sign is occasionally used in the Bede volume for the same purpose" (440). The annotations in both manuscripts provide evidence of considerable study in the ninth century.

Babcock suggests that these manuscripts may be "the very copies of Bede and Smaragdus that Angelomus read and from which he quoted. If so, they preserve in their corrections and annotations fascinating insights into the study of the Bible in the school at Luxeuil in the middle of the ninth century," as well as "useful guideposts for the study of the Luxeuil scriptorium" at this period (440).

A look at later scriptorial practice is provided by Richard Gameson's discussion of the comparative production of the scriptoria of St. Augustine's and Christ Church in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries in "Books, Culture and the Church in Canterbury around the Millennium," *Vikings, Monks and the Millennium: Canterbury in about 1000 A.D.* (Canterbury), 15-41. The MS evidence for St. Augustine's demonstrates that there was a thriving community from c. 930 onwards, "using the Rule of St. Benedict, before the 'official' reform got under way" (37). "By the close of the tenth century the main impetus for building up the book collection seems to have been coming to an end.... External circumstances may have contributed to the apparent decline in scribal effort, for owing to its position outside the city walls, Saint Augustine's was particularly vulnerable to disruption from the Viking raids that began in the 990s" (30). In fact, St. Augustine's scriptorium never seems to have recovered after the sack of Canterbury in 1011. The one outstanding exception is the Old English Hexateuch; however, "the volume appears as an isolated, abandoned monument.... [I]ts isolation and the dearth of other material suggest a general loss of direction" (34). Christ Church, on the other hand "burst into productivity" in the second half of the century. (30). "The visual articulation of the Christ Church texts was heavily indebted to the styles that had been developed at Saint Augustine's Abbey: the same decorative vocabulary of Type II initials plus distinctively formed coloured capitals was used" (32). In particular, the early work on the Harley Psalter "provides an impressive testimony to the scribal and artistic resources that Christ Church could muster at this time" (33). But the books produced by the cathedral scriptorium "suggest a backward-looking, non-academic community, that was preoccupied with the divine services. And if such a characterisation is wholly reasonable for a Benedictine house without an intellectual at its helm, it is nevertheless slightly troubling for what was also the mother house of the English church as a whole" (35). At this time, we have the development of a new, higher Carolingian Minuscule, which appears to be "the creation of the Christ Church scribe, Eadwig Basan" (36), and he may in-

deed be the stimulus for the rich production of the scriptorium in the early eleventh century. "Although a monastic reform may energise a house scriptorium, and though a Viking raid might depress it, scribal activity equally had its own internal dynamic defined by the personnel involved, the needs of the community, the nature of its patrons, and the size of its 'hinterland' at a given time" (39).

Gameson concentrates on the description of a single volume in "The Hereford Gospels" (*Hereford Cathedral: a History*, ed. Gerald Aylmer and John Tiller [London and Rio Grande, OH], 536–43). After careful analysis he concludes that "the evidence of codicology, texts, script and decoration indicates that our manuscript is more strongly affiliated to the Irish or Celtic tradition of book production than to the Anglo-Saxon one, without being especially close to either.... Whether written in Wales or western England, the Hereford Gospels is a key survivor from an area that is drastically under-represented in the corpus of early books; and as such it sheds some light on the extent to which centres in such regions were both linked to, yet at the same time distinct from other Insular scriptoria. It is also an important member of another under-represented class of manuscripts: the non-deluxe gospel book.... The Hereford Gospels gives the impression of being the *magnum opus* of a minor centre.... [I]t provides insight into the various functions that such an 'ordinary' volume could fulfil: it was a copy of the sacred gospels, a gospel lectionary for use during the divine services, and latterly it became a repository for the land transactions of a Herefordshire family.... [T]oday in its battered and worn state, it is an evocative reminder of the continuity of the church in the region for more than a millennium" (542–43).

Moving more certainly into Welsh territory, Helen McKee's nicely presented discussion on the nationalities of the scribes of CUL MS Ff.4.42 (1285) in "Scribes and Glosses from Dark Age Wales: The Cambridge Juvenius Manuscript" (*CMCS* 39: 1–22) has only a tenuous connection with this bibliography, as the purpose is to distinguish between Irish and Welsh glossators. On the top of fol. 36r is a cryptogram which begins *Cemelliauc prudens prespiter*. "*Cemelliauc* (Modern Welsh *Cyfeillig*) does not seem to have been a particularly common name in Wales at this period.... [T]he one bearer of that name worth mentioning ... seems to have been active during the same general period in which the Cambridge Juvenius was being glossed. This person is the bishop mentioned in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* who was captured in Eryng by the Vikings and subsequently ransomed for £40

5. Manuscripts, Illumination, Charters

by King Edward" (21). Not nearly, it seems to me, as interesting as "Scribe E's embarrassing rendition of John the Baptist's well-known exhortation *penitentiam agite* (Matthew 3, 2: 'Repent!') as *patientam agite* (fol. 3r, 'Have patience!')" (12).

This year's trophy for Best Collector of Really Cool Glosses goes to Daibhí O'Croínín for his richly-illustrated study of "The Old Irish and Old English Glosses in Echternach Manuscripts (with an Appendix on Old Breton Glosses)" in *Die Abtei Echternach 698–1998*, ed. Camillo Ferrari et al., 85–101. "The earliest Echternach manuscripts reserve some of the oldest ink and dry-point glosses, both in Latin and in the vernacular languages, from the areas of the Irish and Anglo-Saxon mission fields.... A number of the Old Irish glosses ... are the oldest such original ink glosses known", while the Old English dry-point glosses in the Augsburg Gospels belong to our earliest linguistic monuments of Northumbrian, and those in Old High German have been categorised as the oldest glosses of the German-speaking territories (86). O'Croínín presents Latin glosses from the Willibrord Calendar, Echternach Gospels, and books of the Prophets; OE glosses from the Augsburg Gospels, Old Irish glosses on Priscian, Etyches *De uerbo*, Echternach Gospels, books of the Prophets and the miscellany of fragments recovered from bindings of Echternach codices (Paris, BNF lat. 10399, fols. 35, 36); and Old High German from the Augsburg Gospels and Echternach Gospels. "The Old Irish and Old English material has been authoritatively dated to the foundation period of the monastery (i.e., c. AD 698–720), and the OHG glossing activity doubtless followed by imitation. The Old Breton and Old Welsh glosses in the later (s. ix) Priscian manuscript (and perhaps also in the Pelagius commentary) reflect a later influx of manuscripts and texts from centres of insular activity outside Echternach. The scriptorium at Echternach from the eighth century onwards takes on a more pronounced Anglo-Saxon look in its scripts, although it is possible, of course, that manuscripts of the library written in caroline minuscule may conceal Insular (particularly Irish) originals" (95). In an appendix O'Croínín reproduces Lambert's edition of the Old Breton and Old Welsh glosses on Priscian, which "represent different strata and different periods of activity but most of them appear to belong to the ninth century, and in some cases are clearly based on earlier glossing activity by Irish scribes" (96).

P. Vaciago's Oxford dissertation on *The Transmission of Early Anglo-Saxon Glossarial Material on the*

Continent—Texts, Index and Analysis addresses “a group of about twenty glossaries containing primarily biblical material in a form of *glossae collectae*, produced mainly on the Continent, dating from s. viii–xii and comprising part of what is known as the Leiden group. Frequently studied in the past, especially with reference to its vernacular component, the material has recently attracted renewed interest on account of its connection with Canterbury and the school of Theodore and Hadrian. Much of it, however, has not been printed before. The core of the thesis is a semi-diplomatic transcript of each glossary in turn. This is complemented by a detailed index performing the function of apparatus and collation between the various glossaries. The introduction provides a summary account of the manuscripts in which the glossaries are found, and focuses on the complex question of the development and interrelationship between these glossaries” (*Index to Theses* 49: 1577).

Mechthild Gretsch does an admirable job of localizing and contextualizing the Junius Psalter gloss and calendar in “The Junius Psalter gloss: its historical and cultural context,” *ASE* 29: 85–121. Examining the phonological and lexical differences between Junius and the Vespasian Psalter gloss, the type of which served as a model for Junius, Gretsch concludes that “the Junius Psalter provides us with a tantalizing mixture of tradition and innovation: traditional adherence to a Mercian exemplar by a West Saxon Glossator (who occasionally even augments its distinctively Mercian features), and innovation with respect to this Glossator’s overall treatment of the dialect features and the vocabulary of his exemplar” (97–8). Gretsch hypothesizes that Mercian traditions may have been accorded respect in Wessex firstly due to the political alliances of the new Kingdom of the Anglo-Saxons, with concomitant “family ties and a strong Mercian presence in the royal entourage,” and secondly because “in matters of Latin scholarship and the use of the vernacular for literary and scholarly purposes, a certain prestige seems to have been conceded to the Mercians and their dialect” (103). The Junius Psalter gloss, then, contains “a supradialectal language which, though not a standard, reflects in one way or another the contemporary political order” (106). As there are only 126 fixed entries in the Junius calendar, Gretsch hypothesizes that this forms “the core of a liturgical calendar for a newly founded church. Given the Winchester connections of Junius 27 and given the lavish character of the manuscript, one wonders whether the church in question may have been the New Minster, founded by Edward the Elder in 901” (115). Evidence such as the choice of holy days “com-

bines to suggest the liturgical and, perhaps, personal devotion of one of the leading figures of the Alfredian *renovatio*, Grimbald of Saint-Bertin” (119); Gretsch further suggests that Grimbald’s legacy was preserved by Frithestan, bishop of Winchester from 909 to 931.

Joseph Crowley continues the focus on Mercian glossaries in “Anglicized word order in Old English continuous interlinear glosses in British Library, Royal 2.I.xx” (*ASE* 29: 123–51). Crowley is largely concerned with matters discussed earlier in Section 3 under ‘Prose’: namely, the fact that the Royal glosses “frequently render certain Latin verb phrases and noun phrases into Old English with English word order rather than Latin, in contrast to almost all other surviving interlinear glosses of the same prayers” (123). The glossator seems to have been translating and glossing simultaneously, as demonstrated by several redundancies in which, “when he came, usually after several words, to a Latin word near the end of the phrase which was glossed by an Old English word toward the beginning of the Old English rendering—now at a relative distance—he wrote the Old English gloss term a second time, directly above the Latin” (131). The glossator is not a professional scribe, but demonstrates an “inadequate grasp of Latin and English grammar;” this leads Crowley to speculate that his purpose “may have been to give pious laypeople access to these important Latin prayers, in recognizable or usable Old English phrasing” (132). Comparing the Royal to other anglicized glosses, Crowley puts forward the tentative hypothesis that “such anglicizing of word order was practised more in the scriptoria of Mercia and Canterbury than in those of other regions of Anglo-Saxon England” (146–47).

Concentrating on models rather than glosses, Christopher Jones, in “Ælfric’s Exemplar of Amalarius: An Additional Witness” (*ANQ* 13.2: 6–14), argues that Ælfric, when composing his homily for Septuagesima Sunday, must have worked from an exemplar of Amalarius’ *Retractio Primo* not used by the modern editor, R. Hanssens, but rather a variant text such as that found in a later copy in Salisbury Cathedral Library MS 154. The two sections of Salisbury 154 that do not provide models for Ælfric’s elaborations are written on erasures. But appended to the Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.11.2 version of the *Retractio Primo*, which “shows in the main part no traces of our variant passages,” is a section containing the Good Friday section of the variant *Retractio* as copied in Salisbury 154, but with an unchanged portion which could easily have served as a model for Ælfric.

Antoni Peris looks at the possible sources for a version of Aldhelm's *Voces Animantium* in a Spanish manuscript in "Una lista inédita de *Voces Animantium*, basada en la d'Aldhelm en un manuscrit de el Escorial," *Studia Philologica Valentia* n.s. 4: 101–116. Peris begins with a general overview of the genre of *Voces Animantium* from the now-lost listing of Suetoni to high medieval listings. He then breaks down the manuscripts containing the Aldhelm listings into two groups: those which are basically complete, and those which are missing lemma 26 "Equi hinniunt." Peris then gives scribal characteristics of the Escorial manuscript containing Aldhelm's catalog that lead him to date it to the mid-fourteenth century. This list has 68 lemmas, of which 64 have direct counterparts in Aldhelm's register of 77; two others are partially based on Aldhelm. (The final two seem to be modeled on the *Liber Glossarum* or a list copied from this.) Peris finishes by providing an edition (accompanied by a photograph) of the 68 entries in the Escorial manuscript; my dog Sadie was very pleased to discover that even back then *canes baubantur*.

Models and influences of a visual nature are at the heart of Carol A. Farr's "The Gandersheim Casket Compared with Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts," in *Das Gandersheimer Runenkästchen. Internationale Kolloquium Braunschweig*, 24–26. März 1999, ed. Regine Marth (Kolloquiumsbande des Herzog-Anton-Ulrich-Museums 1. Braunschweig: HAU Museum), 53–62. Farr describes elements of the decoration of the casket now at Gandersheim, focusing on the types of animals and plant ornament depicted, their placement and arrangement within the panels. She enumerates points of comparison with details from Anglo-Saxon MSS of the eighth and ninth centuries, ranging from the Lindisfarne Gospels, the Durham Cassiodorus, the Vespasian Psalter, the Stockholm Codex Aureus, the Tiberius Bede, the Cuthbercht Gospels, and the Book of Kells. By far the most important and closest visual connections with the casket's ornament is to be found in the Barbarini Gospels, a manuscript attributed to Southumbria in the late eighth century which itself displays significant continental and Mediterranean influence. Warning that in the end, stylistic comparisons are of limited use, Farr nonetheless concludes that the manuscript evidence supports a dating of the casket to the late-eighth or early ninth century, most likely in a Southumbrian context that prized the associations of luxury and magnificence of its continentally-influenced decoration.

We return briefly to wrap up discussion on Celtic topics. In "Bischoff's Theory of Irish Exegesis and

the Genesis Commentary in Munich clm 6302: a Critique of a Critique," *Jnl of Med. Latin* 10: 115–75, Charles D. Wright challenges Michael Gorman's rejection of Bischoff's schema for determining Irish influence on Biblical commentaries, claiming that Gorman dismisses Bischoff's arguments "with such confidence that one hardly notices the paucity of detailed counter-evidence or substantive counter-arguments. Moreover, [Gorman] inaccurately represents certain aspects of Bischoff's case and often omits reference to corroborative findings in subsequent research" (115–16). Gorman's critique is "often based upon misunderstandings or misrepresentations of Bischoff's case. Gorman's representation of the paleographical evidence, for example, is inaccurate, and obscures considerations favourable to the possibility of Irish authorship or influence for these commentaries" (120–21). Wright provides a listing of texts "which may well have been written in Ireland, or are arguably connected in some way with Ireland, or which survive only in Irish copies written on the Continent" (122–3). This list also includes several manuscripts in Anglo-Saxon hands and one post-Conquest English document that display Irish influence (126–30, 134). Wright goes on to support Bischoff's methodology: "Gorman devotes much of his critique to Bischoff's list of Irish symptoms, rejecting the diagnostic value of each in turn, but only rarely documenting his assertions in any detail. Bischoff was well aware that few of these symptoms were exclusively Irish, and pointed out himself the patristic or occasionally apocryphal sources of several of them. Simply to restate that they *have* such sources, which is mainly what Gorman does, does not in itself disprove the proposition that their distribution in the early Middle Ages was concentrated heavily in Irish contexts" (143). As a test case, Wright examines the Genesis Commentary in Munich clm 6302, which "reveals many distinctive formulations that are paralleled almost exclusively in known Irish sources and other 'Wendepunkte' commentaries" (145): for example, use of triads such as the red, blue and white martyrdoms, the ranks of virgins, penitents and married women, and *leges naturae, litterae and prophetarum/evangelii*; or the contrast between the life *actualis* vs. *theorica*. On the basis of preliminary analysis, Wright concludes that "the circumstantial evidence for an Irish origin [for the Genesis commentary] seems much stronger than Gorman allowed" (173).

Pushing the envelope of Anglo-Saxon studies in the other direction, Rosamund McKitterick's "Die Karolingische Renovatio" (in 799: *Kunst und Kultur der Karolingerzeit*, ed. Stiegemann and Wem-

hoff [Mainz, 1999], 668–85) provides an elegant and clearly-presented introduction to the linguistic, literary, educational, and general intellectual life of the Carolingian Empire. McKitterick focuses first on the course of scholarly and religious education, and the classical and religious texts that lay at its core. McKitterick then goes on to describe the flourishing of libraries and scriptoria. She finishes by addressing the original contributions of the Carolingians. Development of new genres included commentaries, biographies, yearbooks and historical epics, the *Liber Pontificalis*, and the imperial annals, whose dating was calculated from the birth of Christ. Furthermore, the court produced poetry, essays on science, and music. McKitterick attributes this to the 'Schirmherrschaft' of Charlemagne: "Statt also gelegentlicher Wohltäter in Erscheinung zu treten, unterhielt der karolingische Herrscher über einen langen Zeitraum Gruppen von Künstlern, Schreibern und Handwerkern, um Werke gemäß seinen erklärten Zielen schaffen zu lassen. Seine 'Schirmherrschaft' war darauf ausgerichtet, seine königliche Macht als christlicher Herrscher zu fördern und den christlichen Glauben durch die Verbreitung von Schlüsseltexten, auf denen dieser Glaube basierte, zu festigen" (685).

David Ganz remains in Frankish territory in "Roman Books' Reconsidered: The Theology of Carolingian Display Script" (*Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West: Essays in Honour of Donald A. Bullough*, ed. Julia M.H. Smith [Leiden, Boston and Cologne: Brill], 297–315). Ganz builds upon the work of Donald Bullough's "Roman Books" in examining "the late antique parallels for the monumental capitals without elaborate foliate serifs" used on the opening pages of the Carolingian court group gospel books (315). In particular, Ganz focuses on "the court group manuscripts with their use of gold and silver letters, often within a black or red ink outline and on purple parchment [which] represent a new and magnificent splendour" (301); the purple and gold both carry religious symbolism, and thus even "the choice of ink serves to affirm the Gospel message: it is not merely splendour, but an entirely fitting theological symbol" (313). Ganz's paper would be greatly enhanced by illustrations demonstrating this splendour, although he does what he can to make pictures with fewer than a thousand words. "The detailed investigation of the gospel openings, where court calligraphers articulated the redemptive message of the most significant of all Carolingian texts, demonstrates that their range of experimentation and the splendour of their creations marks a comparable high point of the Carolingian renaissance" (315).

Anglo-Saxonists interested in the influence of Carolingian manuscripts, especially the Utrecht Psalter and its illustrations, will certainly wish to read Gerhard Karpp's study of two mid-ninth century Carolingian drawings preserved in Dusseldorf (Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek MS B 113, fol. 5rv) in his "Karolingische Federzeichnungen aus der Schule von Reims. Zum Bildinhalt eines Düsseldorfer Fragments (9. Jh.) Im Stil des Utrechter Psalter," *Scriptorium* 54: 230–251. The two illustrations are traditionally identified as Christ Healing the Leper and the Healing of the Man with the Withered Hand; drawn in the rapid ink-outline style inspired directly from the School of Reims, they are associated with the Pericopes contained with this Evanglisty. Karpp revisits the question of the identification of these illustrations and their original manuscript context; a major portion of the article is devoted to the examination the manuscript's layout and a reconstruction of the structure of the gathering containing the illustrations.

Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century, ed. Mary Swan and Elaine M. Treharne (Cambridge) is the first collection to examine "the manuscripts compiled between c. 1100 and c. 1200 ... as witness to the continuation of a tradition of written composition in the vernacular" (2). Treharne herself begins the collection with a richly-illustrated study of "The production and script of manuscripts containing English religious texts in the first half of the twelfth century" (11–40). She provides "a codicological and paleographical framework for manuscripts written in English in approximately the first half of the twelfth centuries, to allow for comparison between" five major manuscripts, and "and to attempt a more precise dating than previously" (38). After a discussion of twelfth-century English codicology and scripts, Treharne considers in turn CCCC 302, London, BL Cotton Faustina A. ix, Oxford, Bodl. Lib. Hatton 116, CCCC 303, and BL Cotton Vespasian D. xiv. "These manuscripts can be seen as a group since they are linked by date and by content, in that they all contain English homiletic and religious texts, most of which are copies of pre-Conquest material" (13). Interestingly in both CCCC 303 and Vespasian D. xiv, "the least visible scribe (in terms of the amount of material copied) [is] the most important from the perspective of the manuscript's production as well as from the perspective of dating" (31). Further, the "approximate codicological uniformity" shown by these manuscripts might "suggest co-operation between scriptoria, perhaps by the lending of exemplars, and a concerted, albeit small, attempt to provide instructional materials in English" (38–9).

Susan Irvine picks up the theme of how and why these manuscripts came into being in "The compilation and use of manuscripts containing Old English in the twelfth century" (41–61). Irvine focuses on manuscripts for which there is reason to attribute the choice of material to the period of the extant copy (as opposed, for example, to merely reproducing an existing exemplar *in toto*). She examines the constitution of CCCC 303, Cotton Vespasian D. xiv; CUL li.1.33, and Oxford, Bodl. Lib. Bodley 343. These "all give evidence having been carefully compiled in the twelfth century, but the particular purpose each compiler had in mind cannot easily be ascertained. Since it is probably through their association with the large monastic centres of the twelfth century that the manuscripts survived, then it is probably there also that they were used. The lack of evidence for direct preaching use suggests that the manuscripts may well have fulfilled a need for devotional reading material in English for monks and nuns in the twelfth century. But for monasteries like Worcester and Rochester, particularly given their connection with cathedral churches, it might have been vital to have material in English available to the priests who were to instruct the lay people. The manuscripts written there may represent reading-books that could be assimilated and drawn on for preaching" (61).

Joanna Proud changes the focus from compilation to content in "Old English prose saints' lives in the twelfth century: the evidence of the extant manuscripts" (117–131). "Very few vernacular lives were composed in the twelfth century," she notes (118); rather, "the demand for English saints' lives had become concentrated upon saints with first-grade status, such as those provided in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*" (131). This affected the work of copyists, who "modified the collections in their exemplars accordingly" (123). Proud surveys the twelfth-century MSS containing saint's lives, commenting on their content and arrangement, and concludes that "the copying activity that has produced the extant collections is often a cumulative phenomenon, and one that spans several centuries. Where twelfth-century work can be isolated it appears that copyists do not edit the texts substantially or produce new composites from older material" (130).

R.M. Liuzza provides a fascinating "chance to look over the shoulders of the scribes as they worked" (151) in "Scribal habit: the evidence of the Old English gospels" (143–165). For his data, Liuzza takes three consecutive copies of the Old English version of the gospels: Oxford, Bodl. Lib. Bodley 441 (s. xi), London,

BL Royal 1.A.xiv, a copy of this manuscript from the middle of s. xii, and Oxford, Bodl. Lib. Hatton 38, a copy of the Royal MS from s. xii/xiii; he presents parallel texts from Matt 7:15–27 to show how successive scribes altered or emended their exemplars. The question posed is whether they copied the visual image—that is, created an exact copy of the original—or the sense of the text in front of them, thus modernizing and adapting to their own dialect in the copying process. "A manuscript is as close as we shall ever get to the testimony of a living speaker of medieval English; the scribes' copying habits may tell us something, however indirectly, about their speaking habits" (164–65). This is not always a straightforward process, however: "[a] scribe's spelling habits may well have been constrained at any moment by conflicts between what was seen in the archaisms of an exemplar, what was heard in the patterns of his or her own speech, and what had been learned in whatever orthographical training the scribe may have possessed, in English or Latin or French" (145). Liuzza subjects the various scribal outputs to close scrutiny, and concludes that "[a] comparison of [Hatton] with its exemplar gives the impression of a book made with care and understanding by a highly competent scribal editor, not a visual transcriber; a comparison of [Royal] with its exemplar suggests an active and earnest struggle to understand and improve an old text" (157).

Wendy Collier concentrates on a single scribe in "The Tremulous Worcester Hand and Gregory's *Pastoral Care*" (195–208). She begins with a summary of what is known of the Tremulous Hand scribe, and then focuses on his annotations in three manuscripts of the *Regula Pastoralis*, one Latin version (Glasgow, University Library, Hunterian 431) and two OE versions (CCCC 12 and Oxford, Bodl. Lib. Hatton 20). "The Latin version ... appears to have been a seminal text for the Tremulous Hand. He obviously made considerable use of the Latin text for his linguistic glosses in Hatton 20 and CCC 12. It seems very likely that the marginal headings noting topics, the names of biblical authors and books similarly extracted, and the rhetorical comments such as *nota* and *exemplum* ... were influential in his own annotating work, and his annotations often appear in similar positions in the Old English texts" (205). "A close analysis of his annotations reveals clearly that he is marking for a variety of theological and pastoral topics, and many of these relate to matters which, whilst always of interest and importance to the clergy, were of particular importance in England in the years after the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. At a time when French was the vehicle for teaching Latin, and Latin the vehicle

for teaching theology and pastoral topics, The Tremulous Hand, in a part of England where a comparatively conservative form of the English language was still used and understood, was attempting to produce vernacular teaching and preaching material. There were no new books available to him in English, and he had to do what he could with the old texts in the Cathedral Library" (207).

John Frankis addresses what we might term 're-writing Old Norse' in "Sidelights on post-conquest Canterbury: towards a context for an Old Norse runic charm (DR 419)," *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 44: 1–27. Frankis argues that the Canterbury Runic Charm which appears across the bottoms of fols. 123v–124r in London, BL Cotton Caligula A. xv (written in Christ Church c. 1085) is not a marginal addition, but rather a deliberate inclusion by the main scribe. "One scribe compiled the whole text of the Easter Tables on fols. 122–4 to the notes on the mass on fol. 141v including all five OE charms and, judging by the appearance of the pen and ink used, he may also have copied the Runic Charm." Frankis proposes that this collection forms a "scriptorial enterprise of asserting the value of writings in English" (12); a similar motive can be imputed to the post-Conquest copying of "vernacular chronicles and gospels, with all that these imply for civilisation, that were unparalleled in Normandy or indeed anywhere else in the world" (9). Why the Old Norse rune? "It seems to me not intrinsically absurd to suppose that a man of Danish descent, the son of one of Cnut's followers, might have become a monk at Canterbury, perhaps with the intention of in some way atoning for the murder of Archbishop Ælfheah, whose remains were translated from London to Canterbury in 1023 by Cnut.... As it happens, we do know of at least one Christ Church monk in the latter part of the eleventh century whose name is Scandinavian, the celebrated Osbern of Canterbury, who was educated there when young, remained there as a monk, becoming precentor and subprior, and died some time after 1093" (17). But Frankis makes no claim for bilinguality on the part of the scribe. "It is ... reasonable to suppose that the copyist knew something of the content of the runic texts but that his understanding was partial and imperfect; he may have felt that it was ... a piece of writing with intrinsic magic power" (13). (This essay is further discussed under *Literature: Charms*).

Scribes continued to employ Anglo-Saxon script well beyond the Conquest. Peter J. Lucas' generously-illustrated "Scribal Imitation of Earlier Handwriting: 'Bastard Saxon' and Its Impact" (*Le Statut du*

scripteur au Moyen Age, ed. Marie-Clotilde Hubert et al. [Paris], 151–56 + plates), describes later medieval use of Anglo-Saxon characters, particularly in "documents from abbey archives which provided proof of rights, privileges, and especially land-holdings for the abbey. These documents were designed to persuade and convince, or even to bolster self-delusion, in the event of any dispute." In certain cases, Anglo-Saxon characters were even erroneously inserted into copies of Latin documents, "providing documentary evidence that is super-authentic, so that the very excess of authenticity is itself now ground for doubting the authenticity it seeks to invoke" (155). Lucas provides a nice case study of "a scribe learning on the job, showing an improvement in the imitation of archaic script features as his work progressed" in the copying of Anglo-Saxon letter forms on fols. 10ff. of the *Liber abbatiae de Hyde*, "a chronicle and cartulary relating to Hyde abbey. i.e. New Minster, Winchester, written probably in the first half of the fifteenth century" (153). Elizabethan scholars were "susceptible to being impressed by later medieval documents purporting to come from Anglo-Saxon times"; this manuscript was used by Parker for his edition of *Alfredi Regis res gestæ*, which he had printed "in Anglo-Saxon types that had been made specially for him... 'for the purpose of revering the antiquity of the original'" (156).

Parker's great collection of medieval manuscripts is described both briefly and at greater length. In "Thanks to Nosy Parker," *The Times*, 14 June 2000, 14–15, Simon Tait provides a journalistic overview of the history and contents of the Parker Library, discusses the plans the library has made for future storage and digitization, and finishes with a sketch of the life of Matthew Parker. He mentions here the appointment of Christopher de Hamel as the first full-time librarian of the collection.

That Christopher De Hamel's *The Parker Library: treasures from the collection at Corpus* (Cambridge) is probably more accurately described as a demi-tasse-table book than a coffee-table book is due only to its size rather than to its quality. This volume provides 65 beautiful reproductions from "the earliest major antiquarian collection ever assembled in England" (8), ranging in date from the sixth-century gospel book of Augustine to the first edition of Newton's *Principia Mathematica*, published in 1687; most of the material is medieval. Following a brief biographical sketch of Matthew Parker, the book is divided into sections according to topic: dragons and lions; patriarchs and prophets; saints and bishops; battles and kings; poets and dramatists; scribes and artists; musicians and

mathematicians; elephants and unicorns; explorers and travelers; donors and benefactors. Not all of the illustrations are illuminations: for example, there are pictures of the Parker Chronicle entry for 1066, the acrostic giving the name of the scribe of the life of St. Guthlac contained in MS 307, fols. 52v-53r, and Cardinal Woolsey's letter "to the king's ambassadors in Rome proposing his own election as Pope" (36). The commentary, while not scholarly, is engaging and interesting. I particularly enjoyed the discussions on illustrations of medieval scribes, elephants, and the wedding feast of Henry V to Matilda which "includes what must surely be the oldest surviving illustration of a pretzel" (40-41).

Hans Sauer, "The Transmission and Structure of Archbishop Wulfstan's 'Commonplace Book'" (*OE Prose*, ed. Szarmach, 339-93), is an English translation of a classic article originally published in 1980, supplemented with references to selected studies published since. Sauer catalogues some 11 manuscripts, from which he reconstructs the probable structure of the earliest versions of the Commonplace Book and considers how much Wulfstan relied on the collected texts for his own compositions.

Another candidate for inclusion on a syllabus for an Introduction to Medieval Studies is Christina Nielsen's "Dedications, Coronations, and Royal Intrigue: The Active Social Lives of British Library, Cotton MS Tiberius A. II," *Scrittura e civiltà* 23 (1999): 133-55 + plates, which also wins this year's award for Best Title. Nielsen recounts the "'biography' of a medieval Gospel Book ... whose life story is inextricably bound to the biographies of two of its past owners: Æthelstan, an Anglo-Saxon king of England, and Sir Robert Cotton, a seventeenth-century gentleman" (135). She traces the book from its donation to Æthelstan by the future Holy Roman Emperor Otto and his mother Mathilda. Two inscriptions which record the gospel book as Æthelstan's gift to Christ Church, Canterbury are on a folio that originally was "an insert placed at the beginning of the Gospel Book in the tenth century" (140). One of these poems refers to the jeweled binding that Æthelstan added, making the book "a glorious focal point for the eyes of the congregation or for the brethren who performed the liturgy" (144). When Cotton acquired the book after the Dissolution, he made his own mark on it. Nielsen assumes "it was Cotton who displaced Æthelstan's dedicatory folio as the first page of the volume, moving it to its current position as folio 15, a preface to the Canon Tables" (150), then replacing it with a new title page of his own—a "composite fantasy" that spoke to

"Cotton's fascination with regalia and heraldry" (151). The most important part was the "striking inscription, written in gold script on a purple background, that proclaims that this Gospel Book was a part of the coronation regalia for Anglo-Saxon kings" (151), thereby transforming Æthelstan's Gospel Book into the "Coronation Gospels." This invention was a political boon for Cotton: "As owner of this historical Gospel Book which supposedly was included in the regalia for medieval coronation ceremonies, Cotton could expect to play a role...in the ceremonies for the Coronation of Charles I in 1626" (153). Only an accident of the tide that swept Charles' barge down the Thames kept Cotton from presenting these gospels so the new king could swear his coronation oath on them.

The only thing that might keep Svetlana Dobrusina, Denis Tsypkin, Nadezhda Kulikova and Tatiana Velikova's "An Irish Gospel from the Eighth Century," *Restaurator* 20 (1999): 245-60, from becoming required reading for every Introduction to Medieval Studies is the fact that the English in which it is written is occasionally difficult to interpret. The members of the Document Conservation Department of the National Library of Russia describe the experiments they undertook prior to undertaking conservation on the badly preserved MS F.v.I.8, an eighth-century Gospel perhaps created in Northumbria. Using both sixteenth-century and modern parchment, the conservationists pre-tested various treatment options with an eye to preserving features such as relief and linear dimensions of the characters, and color and spectral characteristics of the illustrations. Judging from the pictures in this generously illustrated and documented study, their research paid off in the restoration of the original.

The Old English Hexateuch {London, BM Cotton Claudius B. iv} received a great deal of attention this year. Rebecca Barnhouse, "Pictorial Responses to Textual Variations in the Illustrated Old English Hexateuch," *Manuscripta* 41 (1997): 67-87, provides a much needed systematic study of the relationship of the text and illustration contained in the manuscript. As she notes, there has been a variety of opinions offered concerning this matter, with previous scholars suggesting a close, very literal relationship while others stress connections with early medieval pictorial conventions. To address this problem, she considers the text from several different perspectives, including lexical and syntactical variations and shows that the illustrations more often than not follow the Old English translation. She supports this contention fur-

ther by showing that at times the illustrations follow scribal errors, omissions, reordering, or additions peculiar to the OE text (indeed some found uniquely in Claudius B. iv) and differ significantly from standard pictorial conventions, again strongly suggesting that the artist closely followed the text at hand. She concludes that while some illustrations display details that differ from the text, betraying the influence of an exemplar, in general the artists of the manuscript take a very literal approach to their task and closely follow the Old English text that accompanies the pictures, as she writes “the invention of pictures for this new translation parallels the process of the making of the new text” (67).

The Old English Hexateuch: Aspects and Approaches, ed. Rebecca Barnhouse and Benjamin C. Withers (Kalamazoo) is a collection of essays addressing both manuscripts and art. The editors assert that “[t]he Old English Hexateuch, so often overshadowed by the poetic *Genesis* or by manuscripts with ‘higher quality’ illustrations, is a wonderfully complex and intriguing social document. The essays in this volume cover the original writers and illustrators of the Hexateuch, as well as its audiences, uses, and reception over a millennium, from the end of the tenth century to the late twentieth century” (12–13). The importance of such a study is demonstrated by “the fact that for the last hundred years, [the manuscript] has been exhibited to the public in the British Library alongside the Magna Carta and, more recently, the Beatles’ manuscript lyrics of ‘Let It Be’” (3). Four of the essays are reviewed in this section; the editors have provided fine summaries of these, so I will let them speak for themselves, and quote from the volume’s introduction (9–12):

David F. Johnson [“A Program of Illumination in the Old English Illustrated Hexateuch,” 165–200] approaches the question of reception by postulating a monastic audience for the illustrations. Johnson identifies a previously overlooked pictorial program, a “visual typology,” that depends on color-outline technique to distinguish the story of Abraham. Johnson explains that the illustrations in Claudius B. iv utilize full-body color, that is, the figures and their drapery are completely painted. At the beginning of the story of Abraham, the artist draws his figures in a striking color-outline technique. The change in technique sets this episode of Abraham’s life off from the rest of the book. To demonstrate that this is not an accidental occurrence, Johnson reviews the designer’s careful control of the layout of text

and illustration. The visual typology, Johnson argues, directs the reader to contemplate the monastic vocation. Many previous commentators have stressed the possible lay readership for the Old English text and illustration; here, by contrast, Johnson stresses the importance of Abraham, who left his family and native land for the love of God, as a prototype for the monastic reader. Because of this attention to Abraham, Johnson suggests that the manuscript was meant to be used within a monastic setting, either by a visiting layman who takes part in monastic services, or “for certain members of the monastery itself,” namely illiterate or monolingual monks.

Catherine E. Karkov’s essay [“The Anglo-Saxon Genesis: Text, Illustration and Audience,” 201–238] focuses on another potential audience: women. While she recognizes that “different groups or individuals would approach the narrative on different levels,” Karkov notes that Ælfric willingly differentiates between male and female readers in his treatments of Old Testament figures such as Judith. Armed with this awareness of different audiences, Karkov focuses on the unusually lengthy illustration of patriarchal genealogies in Genesis 4 and 5. To do so, she compares the Hexateuch’s illustrations with those of the other great Anglo-Saxon translation of Scripture, the poetic version of Genesis in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11. She observes that while the Latin Old Testament genealogies do not mention women, the pictorial genealogies in both Anglo-Saxon manuscripts depict them in their roles as wives and mothers. Women are here imagined as playing a major role in the production of genealogy and history, a capacity that Karkov argues an eleventh-century female reader may have integrated or recognized in historical figures such as Emma of Normandy.

The translation, compilation, and reception of Claudius B. iv in the eleventh century only begins the story of the importance of the manuscript for English culture. Layers of marginal commentary cover its folios and reveal that Claudius B. iv was read and appreciated long after the initial impetus for its creation lapsed. The last section of this collection turns to this overlooked afterlife of the paraphrase and its illustrations. Timothy Graham [“Early Modern Users of Claudius B. iv: Robert Talbot and

William L'Isle"] details the fates of Claudius B. iv and Laud Misc. 509 after the dissolution of the monastic libraries, as they travel among a series of owners and readers, particularly Robert Talbot, Robert Cotton, and William L'Isle. Graham's essay details for the first time the role that the Old Testament translations played in the first serious, early modern studies of the Old English language. Graham outlines William L'Isle's ambitious project to publish an edition of the Old English Old Testament based on his reading of the Claudius and Laud manuscripts, supplemented by his extensive examination of Anglo-Saxon homilies, in which he hunted for vernacular scriptural parallels. Graham's essay underscores the fact that without readers such as L'Isle and Talbot, the manuscripts could hardly have survived until the present day; the significance of these men's interest can be seen in Talbot's transcription of the Old English text of Ælfric's Preface to Genesis from Claudius B. iv. A portion of this text is now missing due to the loss of the first folio of Claudius B. iv. As an appendix to his study, Graham gives us here a valuable edition of Talbot's transcription of this text.

The final essay in the collection, by Benjamin C. Withers, ["A Sense of Englishness: Claudius B. iv, Colonialism, and the History of Anglo-Saxon Art in the Mid-Twentieth Century"], examines how the style of Claudius B. iv's illustrations has been "read" by twentieth-century art historians. These images have long been considered stylistically inferior to other Anglo-Saxon productions: in the mid-twentieth-century studies by Thomas Kendrick and Francis Wormald, this inferior style was directly linked to foreign intrusion. Such an identification allows Wormald to date the production of Claudius B. iv to the "second quarter" of the eleventh century, a date that has been widely accepted by subsequent studies of the illustrations even though, as Withers shows, it is methodologically flawed. Withers suggests that the reason for the acceptance of Wormald's dating scheme is that it appeals to the ideological underpinnings of modern academic disciplines, such as art history and philology, in the construction of a national cultural heritage. In particular, Withers locates a "post-colonial" perspective in this process. By associating the "grotesque" qualities of the Hexateuch's illustrations with degenerate, foreign

5. Manuscripts, Illumination, Charters

"tastes," Wormald places Claudius B. iv on the margins of "pure" English artistic production. Like the colonial periphery, this marginal, foreign style frames, defines, and constructs an image of the colonial center; the Hexateuch's impure style is a point of difference by which a national identity can be defined.

The Hexateuch plays a strong supporting role in Cyril Hart's, "Bayeux Tapestry and Schools of Illumination at Canterbury," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 22: 117-67. This essay builds on the author's previous study of the Bayeux Tapestry by seeking to demonstrate the continuity of visual motifs in the proposed milieu of its construction, the "Canterbury Schools of Illumination" that arose after the reform of the monasteries of Christ Church and St. Augustine's from 978 to the late eleventh century. Canterbury produced an impressive number of the surviving examples of late Anglo-Saxon illumination, both for their own libraries and for export to other English and continental houses; Hart assumes a close working relationship and artistic collaboration between the monks of the two foundations, in spite of their recorded arguments over rights and privileges. His study aims to provide an outline of the types of visual motifs transmitted and borrowed as these artists shared and searched for sources for their output.

The article is composed of three separate lists or catalogues of manuscripts pertaining to the production at Canterbury. The first catalogue lists "surviving manuscripts which played a major part in the transmission of *motifs* at Canterbury" (119) including well-known manuscripts generally accepted to have been in the possession of one or the other houses such as the St. Augustine Gospels, the Utrecht Psalter, the Old English Hexateuch, as well as examples of a more contested provenance such as Junius 11. The second list provides attributions of surviving manuscripts to the respective libraries of the two houses; as the author notes "some of these attributions are far from certain" (126). The third list comprises the bulk of the article and outlines the individual scenes and motifs transmitted or borrowed over the two centuries of artistic endeavor at Canterbury. Hart provides detailed descriptions and remarkable line drawings to link thirty-seven different motifs that appear in several of the surviving sources, most notably the Old English Hexateuch and the Bayeux Tapestry.

Canterbury manuscripts provide many of the visual examples that inform *Anglo-Saxon Gestures and the Roman Stage* (Cambridge), C.R. Dodwell's study

(posthumously prepared for publication by his former research assistant Timothy Graham) of the influence of gestures found in illustrated manuscripts of Terence on some illuminations in the late tenth-century and first half of the eleventh. Concentrating on the Vatican Terence (perhaps produced at Corvey in the early ninth century) Dodwell first discusses evidence, drawn from parallel details in third-century art including hair, dress, expression, and masks, that the illustrations in this Carolingian manuscript follow an exemplar based on actual knowledge of stage practice at the time of Terence. "There are also slight indications that the models for the Vatican miniatures may derive from North Africa" (20). He then goes on to identify eighteen specific gestures that were stylized for the Roman stage, necessitated by the vastness of the outdoor arena. Crucially, this constitutes a "vocabulary of moods" (93), as opposed to the signed catalogue of items or people devised by the Benedictines for use during mandated periods of silence. The use of some of the Terentian gestures in "the Canterbury Hexateuch, the Isidore from St. Augustine's, the Sacramentary of Robert of Jumièges, the Junius manuscript, the Harley Psalter, the Bury Psalter and the Eadui Psalter ... leads us to the assumption that an illustrated copy of Terence was available [in Canterbury]" (147–8). This manuscript gave the Canterbury artists "access to the 'language of the hands' of the classical theatre. From this—if we exclude the universal ones for pointing and speech itself—they extracted six gestures for their own use: those for puzzlement, for grief or sadness, for acquiescence or approval, for supplication, for apprehension or fear, and for pondering. If these seem a small number, it is still a majority of those used in the art of the late Anglo Saxons, and it was a repertory that was very much their own. Except for an occasional overlap, it is not to be found in the art of the Continent, whether of Germany, France, Italy or Spain. Nor was it known to those in England who came before them or to those who came after: there is no evidence of its existence in England before c. 1000, and it disappears once the Normans have taken possession of the land" (154). The thorough analysis is matched by the generous number of illustrative plates; I wish all scholars would follow this example of glossing all quotations.

Issues of pictorial language also inform the last entry in our category this year, Magdalena Elizabeth Carresco's "The Construction of Sanctity: Pictorial Hagiography and Monastic Reform in the First Illustrated *Life of St. Cuthbert* (Oxford, University College MS 165)" (*Stud. in Iconography* 21: 47–89). While Anglo-Saxonists who are interested in the cult of St.

Cuthbert, the text of Bede's *Life* of the saint himself will appreciate Carresco's forays into the patristic and early medieval exegesis current at Durham, the principal audience of this article will be those concerned with the structures of medieval narrative, especially of the pictorial kind. The manuscript in question is the "earliest extant post-Conquest manuscript with a extensive cycle of religious narrative illustrations and the oldest surviving English representative of the illustrated *libellus*." Art historians, most notably Otto Pächt, have identified this manuscript as key witness to the development of pictorial story-telling. Carresco ably selects a few important examples from the approximately fifty-three found in the manuscript and demonstrates that the artist relies on a greater variety of narrative structures than previously thought. These structures, she argues, are in turn "intimately linked to the central problem of conveying Cuthbert's spirituality as conceived by the newly-reformed monastic community at Durham." She points in particular to the ways in which the illustrations emphasize "notions of continuity and permanence" and simultaneity as well as aspects of the saint's particular spiritual personality and his attributes as a role model for the reader (52). The physical size of the manuscript and the absence of liturgical supplements make it likely that it was meant for private devotion; for this reason, she suggests that it "provide[s] eloquent testimony" to the intimate relationship of the saint to his spiritual heirs, the monastic reader (51). Carresco notes that the manuscript likely dates to c. 1100, which puts it at an important point in the post-Conquest development of the saint's cult, after the replacement of secular canons with a Benedictine community by Bishop William of St-Calais and the extensive campaign to enlarge the shrine and cathedral and promote the cult through a series of historical writings that sought to explain and justify these changes. By relating selected details of the text and adding further details, the illustration conditions the reader's understanding, effectively asserting "continuity between the newly reformed community and the earlier monastic life at Lindisfarne." The figure of the saint emerges once again as a pivotal figure, an heir to both the Old and New Testament traditions, an example of virtue, a model to be emulated as he connects the *vita apostolica* with the community at Durham at the turn of the twelfth century.

L.O., B.C.W.

Works not seen

Rhodri Pugh, "The Lost Treasures of Wales," *Cambria* 3.5: 12–23.

6. History and Culture

a. General

Several important collections of previously published articles appeared in 2000. David A.E. Pelteret has edited *Anglo-Saxon History: Basic Readings* (New York: Garland), the sixth volume in Garland's *Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England*. The volume reprints fifteen previously published articles and publishes for the first time one by Patrick Wormald on Archbishop Wulfstan (see below). Pelteret has prefaced the collection with a short introduction that explains the importance of the individual papers. The works date from the 1960s to the present and represent new directions of research. They are divided into two groups: a general collection followed by "Special Approaches." The general works are D.A. Bullough, "Anglo-Saxon Institutions and Early English Society" (1965); Eric John, "The Social and Political Problems of the Early English Church" (1970); D.P. Kirby, "Bede's Native Sources for the *Historia Ecclesiastica*" (1966); Nicholas Brooks, "The Development of Military Obligations in Eighth- and Ninth-Century England" (1971); Barbara A.E. Yorke, "The Bishops of Winchester, the Kings of Wessex, and the Development of Winchester in the Ninth and Early Tenth Centuries" (n.d.); Niels Lund, "The Settlers: Where Do We Get Them From—And Do We Need Them?" (1981); Simon Keynes, "The Declining Reputation of Æthelred the Unready" (1978); Patrick Wormald, "Archbishop Wulfstan and the Holiness of Society" (2000); and James Campbell, "Some Agents and Agencies of the Late-Anglo-Saxon State" (1987). Special Approaches offer works from perspectives such as anthropology, art history, and place-names. These works are Margaret Clunies Ross, "Concubinage in Anglo-Saxon England" (1985); Martin Biddle, "*Felix Urbs Winthonia*: Winchester in the Age of Monastic Reform" (1975); Carol Neuman de Vegvar, "A Paean for a Queen: The Frontpiece to the *Encomium Emmae Reginae*" (1982); Peter Sawyer, "Early Fairs and Markets in England and Scandinavia" (1986); Peter Robinson, "Mapping the Anglo-Saxon Landscape: A Land-Systems Approach to the Study of the Bounds of the Estate of Plaish" (1988); H.P.R. Finberg, "Charltons and Carltons" (1964); and Christine Mahany and David Roffe, "Stamford: The Development of an Anglo-Scandinavian Borough" (1983). The collection assembles publications scattered in various sources and makes them readily available to students. While anyone else charged with the task would come up with a different set of articles, at least half of Pelteret's selections would also be in this reviewer's hy-

pothetical collection. It is curious how the work of the 1990s has been avoided. Some of it would show the direction of new work and would reflect better than the older pieces the interests and questions of current scholarship. Pelteret shows a particular attraction to those who work extremely well in small places, which is, after all, where most Anglo-Saxon historians do their best work. This volume should stimulate discussion and interest in those entering the field.

A second collection of articles for 2000 is James Campbell's *Anglo-Saxon State* (London and New York: Hambledon). The focus of these studies is what can be called the Campbellian thesis—the Maximalist view that the Anglo-Saxon kingdom was centralized and powerful enough that historians need not employ qualification and scare-quotes when labeling it a state. The works are well-known to historians and represent much of Campbell's work in the 1980s and 1990s. The collection includes "The Late Anglo-Saxon State: A Maximum View" (1994); "The United Kingdom of England: The Anglo-Saxon Achievement" (1995); "The Impact of the Sutton Hoo Discovery on the Study of Anglo-Saxon History" (19); "Elements in the Background to the Life of St. Cuthbert and His Early Cult" (19); "The East Anglian Sees Before the Conquest" (1996); "Asser's *Life of Alfred*" (1986); "England, c. 991" (1993); "Was It Infancy in England? Some Questions of Comparison" (1989); "Some Agents and Agencies of the Late Anglo-Saxon State" (1987); "The Sale of Land and the Economics of Power in Early England: Problems and Possibilities" (1989); "Stubbs and the English State" (1989); and "Stenton's *Anglo-Saxon England*" (1994). Campbell provides a brief introduction that is principally a rebuttal of some remarks in Norman Davies's recent history of the British Isles. In response to Davies' poorly researched and prejudice-laden comments against continuity in early English history, Campbell pluckily wonders whether the hide lies behind the construction of Stonehenge, and if Neolithic peoples created England's coaxial landscape. The introduction supplies additional pleadings on ways to read the evidence in order to see the continuities in English history and to avoid assuming discontinuities. The approach of the introduction, indeed of a fair number of the articles in this collection, reminds one of H.M. Chadwick's work: they begin at a very small point or observation, apply a critical mind and imagination, and then move backwards toward possible sources. Campbell uses the introduction not only to trounce Davies but also to reassert his

principal thesis: "It is very hard to deny that by the eleventh century England was, by any reasonable criteria, a nation state, arguably the first such in Europe" (xxi). Furthermore, Campbell will not shy away from questions now often considered anachronistic or, at best, quaint: "There is, at least in my mind, no sensible reason for avoiding studying history as, in part, the history of liberty. And it does indeed look as if the history of constitutional liberty has important beginnings in Anglo-Saxon England" (xxix). This is a useful collection representing the clearest statements from one end of the historiographical spectrum.

Nicholas Brooks' *Anglo-Saxon Myths: State and Church, 400-1066* (London and Rio Grande, OH: Hambledon) is a collection of twelve essays written over the last quarter century, a companion volume to an earlier collection on communications and warfare. Topics addressed in the collection include historical forgery, the early history of Kent and Mercia, the ecclesiastical topography of Canterbury, the community at Anglo-Saxon Canterbury, the career of Dunstan, recent work on Anglo-Saxon charters (updated), and Romney Marsh in the early Middle Ages. One new essay examines the Hengist and Horsa stories in the *Historia Brittonum* for their contribution to the English origin myth. Brooks concludes that this version of the story is a "late eighth century Northumbrian-Anglian version of an original story told at the court of the Kentish kings," (87) but for a Welsh audience and for the purpose of promoting a British identity.

This year saw the reappearance of several translated sources. Llanerch Press is to be congratulated for reprinting two volumes of importance to Anglo-Saxon historians: F.L. Attenborough's *The Laws of the Earliest English Kings* (originally published in 1922) and A.J. Robertson's *The Laws of the Kings of England from Edmund to Henry I* (first published in 1925). These two volumes not only supply standard texts of all of the laws of the English kings from Æthelberht to Henry I, but also useful annotations, not yet superseded. Users nevertheless will want to consult Patrick Wormald's *Making of English Law* (1999, see below for review) for current attribution and evaluation of the individual codes.

Michael Swanton has produced a revised version of his translation of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, now retitled *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles* (London: Phoenix). Its principle purpose is to eliminate the typographical errors of the 1996 edition (which are indeed gone). The only other visible changes (since there is no new preface to identify them) are two lists of ap-

pendices of maps and genealogies and a new cover. This was and is a very useful edition for students at all undergraduate levels.

The turn of the millenium seems to have inspired little from Anglo-Saxon historians. *History Today* offered in 2000 a series of snapshots by leading historians of what Britain had been like in 500, 1000, and 1100 (among other years). The first, by James Campbell, will be held over to next year. For the second, Ann Williams provides "Britain: AD 1000" (March 2000: 35-41), and paints with a very wide brush. Alfred and Kenneth MacAlpin as well as Æthelred and Domesday population figures make their appearance. The focus is almost always on England, occasionally follows English and Viking armies into Scotland, but it ignores Wales. The Welsh kings, we are told, issued no coins, had monasteries that doubled as urban centers (because Wales lacked true towns), and while England could support 2,500,000 people and Scotland's population was 500,000, all we are told of Wales' population is that it was "probably less." Leaving aside the Welsh gap, the account covers English history quite well—from royal lines to classic villages, from church reform to plague. Brian Golding's "Britain: 1100" (April 2000: 10-17), finishes the series for us and takes Henry I of England's reign as its base. The bias is again English and assumes an historical England toward which the semi-literate denizens of the past were struggling. Old tales of Anglo-Saxon resistance after Hastings reappear despite revisionist work. The piece does not treat Wales or Scotland at all. The series suggests the public's continuing interest in early English history, but marketing trends and intellectual goals towards writing British history are still ahead of where our thinking actually remains.

Some important monographs appeared (new or revised), as well as articles that spoke broadly to the period. D.P. Kirby has produced a revised edition of *The Earliest English Kings* (London and New York: Routledge), a work he first published in 1991. The original edition was up-to-date and offered a narrative filled with analysis of the political history from the settlement to Alfred. This revised edition has been only lightly adjusted to take account of research over the last decade. The chapters and sections remain the same, and the text has been altered in only the smallest ways. Typical is Kirby's revision of his discussion of the *bretwaldas*. His first edition contrasted the A chronicle's "*bretwalda* ('ruler of Britain')" with BCDE's "*brytenwealda* ('wide ruler')" and added that "there is no doubt that the original word was *brytenwealda* and that *bretwalda* is a scribal error, though

brytenwealda came in the tenth century to acquire the meaning ruler of Britain" (18). The revised edition changes this to "*bretwalda* ('ruler of Britain') (A) or more correctly *brytenwealda* ('ruler of Britain' or 'wide-ruler') (BCDE)" (18). The old gloss becomes an adverb while the note (102) replaces "E. John's *Orbis Britanniae*, p. 7" with rumors of debate and articles by T.M. Charles-Edwards and Simon Keynes. More often, new work is simply appended to existing notes. New work in archeology, which has been the growth field of the 1990s, has not increased its share of the research here.

Rosamond Faith's *The English Peasantry and the Growth of Lordship* (London and Washington: Leicester UP, 1997) is a major contribution to the social and economic history of Britain from the sub-Roman period to c. 1300. Working from diffuse and difficult sources, Faith attempts to recover the process by which the seigneurial culture of post-Conquest England evolved from the "extensive lordships" of the early Anglo-Saxon period. Central to her argument is the distinction between "inland" and "warland," a distinction which she believes historians have failed to appreciate. "Inland" appears in the sources as directly exploited lands, usually tax exempt in Domesday Book and inhabited by the most dependent peasants. "Warland" was, in some ways, everything else, areas of production only loosely related to estate centers by older obligations of public service. The distinction is important because Faith argues that the sources privilege the "inland" peasantry, leading to the belief that all English peasants were similarly dependent. While she demonstrates this was not the case, the bulk of the book describes the process by which "warland" inhabitants did become more closely tied to estate centers over time with the proliferation of small estates whose inlands were not sufficient to support their owners. Public service obligations owed by warland peasants were increasingly commuted to agricultural service; hence the gradual emergence of the manorial economy. Faith recognizes that the process was not linear and rejects a rigidly chronological model. Instead, she argues for a "series of associations between settlement morphology and the nature and degree of seigneurial exploitation of land and peasants" (224). In addition to its complex analysis, this book contains a wealth of information about key economic and social concepts such as bookland, folkland and the hide, marriage and inheritance patterns, and social status. It is thus a useful work of reference in addition to a model for understanding social and economic change in the early and central Middle Ages.

Kathleen Herbert's *Peace-Weavers and Shield Maidens: Women in Early English Society* (Hockwold-cum-Wilton, Norf.: Anglo-Saxon Books, 1997) is a transcript of a talk given in 1994/5 to a meeting of *Pa Englisca Gesiþas*. It holds the very long view of English identity—Tacitus is the first to describe them—and is celebratory of various archetypal women in Anglo-Saxon history and literature. The author, while not discriminating in her use of sources, and without the tools of the trade (the *Angli* appear regularly as the *Anglii*), does try to present a coherent and provocative portrait to a general (if presumably overzealous) audience.

In "Betrothal and Marriage, Invasion and Conquest" (*Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 89–115), Julie Coleman explores the impact of Viking settlement and the Norman Conquest on the terminology of marriage. Employing complicated statistical analysis and a lexico-semantic approach, Coleman comes to several important conclusions. The first is that the Viking settlement left no obvious mark on the lexis for marriage, while the Norman Conquest clearly did. The difference, she finds, resulted not from intermarriage *per se*, but from changes in the practice and regulation of marriage, in particular inheritance patterns. The introduction of common law and the influence of canon law are thus the catalysts, Coleman concludes, for a precipitous drop in the survival of Old English words in the twelfth century.

The rationale behind the collection of essays entitled *Social Identity in Early Medieval Britain*, edited by William O. Frazer and Andrew Tyrrell (London and New York: Leicester UP), is the belief by the editors and presumably many of the contributors that the history and archaeology of early medieval Britain is under-theorized, and the volume promises to correct the situation. If indeed the premise is correct some essays are more successful than others. Frazer's "Introduction: Identities in Early Medieval Britain" (1–22) outlines the agenda of the collection and reviews the contribution of each of the authors in some detail. John Moreland's "Ethnicity, Power and the English" (23–51) challenges any understanding of the fifth and sixth centuries that suggests diverse Saxon cultures can be recognized in the English evidence (the so-called "culture-history approach"). He argues, somewhat obviously, that ethnicity is "constructed through the process of interaction between people," (40) which explains why there is so little obvious differentiation between tribes themselves and between "Saxons" and native Britons. Barbara Yorke's "Politi-

cal and Ethnic Identity: A Case Study of Anglo-Saxon Practice" (69–89) analyzes the terminology of ethnicity and identity in the documentary and narrative sources, including Bede and the Tribal Hidage, and concludes that identity in early Anglo-Saxon England was less a matter of ethnicity than it was about political allegiance to a particular king. In "Community, Identity and Kingship in Early England" (91–109), Alex Woolf considers the topic from a "structural functionalist" perspective, which echoes Yorke's argument that membership in the *gens Anglorum* was forged not at regional levels based on ethnicity but through the interplay of local, county and national social and political networks. In "'Cockle amongst the Wheat': The Scandinavian Settlement of England" (111–35), Dawn Hadley revisits archaeological, linguistic, onomastic and sculptural evidence to argue that the binary "us" versus "them" was quickly replaced in the Danelaw by assimilation and interaction. She argues that tenth-century identities tended to be regional rather than ethnic, and that the Danelaw was no exception. Andrew Tyrrell's contribution, "*Corpus Saxonum*: Early Medieval Bodies and Corporeal Identity" (137–55), reviews the interdisciplinary theory as it relates to the body, focusing on a 1995 study of the correlation between grave goods and ethnicity. He concludes that the concept of ethnicity is largely inapplicable to the early Middle Ages. In "Posthumous Obligation and Family Identity" (193–208), Julia Crick revisits the corpus of Anglo-Saxon wills as a means of understanding value-laden terms such as kinship and family. She considers both the expectations conveyed in the wills and, where possible, the various outcomes, and concludes that nobles promoted a variety of interests, personal and collective, at the same time. Tom Saunders' "Class, Space and 'Feudal' Identities in Early Medieval England" (209–32) studies the development of social identity within the framework of "the archaeology of feudal class formation." An impressive defense of the Marxist approach to understanding identity, this essay argues that the aspirations of the landed elite can be viewed in the landscape of nucleated settlement and town planning. Finally, Catherine Cubitt's "Monastic Memory and Identity in Early Anglo-Saxon England" (253–76) takes a fresh look at early Anglo-Saxon hagiography and concludes that the memories of early Anglo-Saxon monastic communities depended largely on their traditions of great men, such as founding fathers and important abbots.

Michael Wood's *In Search of England: Journeys into the English Past* (London: Viking/Penguin, 1999) presents an eclectic collection of topics about "his-

tory and identity and the transmission of tradition," all surrounding what Wood calls "the Matter of England" (xi). Instead of a "broad-sweep view" like that offered in the 1930s by H.V. Morton's similarly titled and very popular work, Wood offers "a few close-up details, deep sections of English history" (xi) which he has chosen from the medieval period. In each of the three sections (roughly myth, manuscripts, and landscape), Anglo-Saxonists will find chapters of interest. The book itself takes readers on a delightful journey. The first chapter on the Norman Yoke, for example, moves from young Michael's identification with cartoon Saxons of the 1950s, to his penning a letter to the *Sunday Times* under Harold Godwinson's name (his first publication?) disputing Field Marshal Montgomery's analysis of Hastings and Norman virtues, to his trip to the House of Lords for a face off with Montgomery (recognized as a descendent of the oppressive Normans), a meeting with Clement Attlee (who raises the Yoke for the first time), and then off to university, Christopher Hill's Norman Yoke, Levellers, and then the facts from Domesday Book and prosopography, finishing up around a camp fire near the mounds and ruins of the Montgomery motte talking about the brutality of the conquest with Phil Barker, the archeologist of the site. The blending of the personal and the professional is superb and almost seamless. Other chapter topics of interest are Arthur, Robin Hood, the origins of English identity, Alfred and Asser (real or Pseudo), the lost life of Athelstan, the history of an Athelstanian MS (Cotton MS Galba A. xvii), a sunken Anglo-Saxon workshop hut still in use in the 20th century, the location of *Brunanburh*, the long history of Bury Barton, and finally Bede's Jarrow. Read, learn, and enjoy.

b. Sub-Roman Britain, Anglo-Saxon Settlement, and Celtic History

In *An Age of Tyrants: Britain and the Britons, AD 400–600* (Stroud: Sutton, 1998), Christopher A. Snyder pulls together available historical and archaeological evidence to demonstrate the uniqueness of this period, which he believes historians have undervalued by thinking of it in reference either to the preceding Roman or the succeeding Anglo-Saxon periods. The first two parts of this book establish the fourth and fifth century political context before Part III delves into a detailed analysis of the sociopolitical terminology employed by contemporaries such as Patrick and Gildas. Snyder mines their works, as well as continental works, to illuminate contemporary meanings for terms such as *Britannia* and *Britanni*, *patria*, *cives*, *reges* and tyranny. Part IV is a comprehensive and

systematic review of recent archaeological evidence. Here Snyder demonstrates unequivocally that the material culture of Roman Britain survived well into the fifth century, thus dispelling the notion of cataclysm. The book concludes with a synthesis of what we can (and cannot) know from the written and archaeological records about this fascinating if murky period. Among Snyder's conclusions is that tyrants, defined by contemporaries as former Roman *curiales*, are the link between imperial government and dynastic kingship. More than thirty maps and photographs and an impressive bibliography accompany this text.

Frank Reno's *Historic Figures of the Arthurian Era* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland) is the follow-up to his *The Historic King Arthur* (1996). Like most products of the "historical Arthur" publishing industry, these two works utilize evidence from tenth- to thirteenth-century insular sources to construct a case for a fifth-century Arthur. From such "lateral thinking," Reno arrives at Ambrosius Aurelianus as the "real" Arthur (both "Arthur" and "Riothamus" are seen as titles for Ambrosius) and Wales and the Midlands—not the Southwest—as his proper sphere of activity. In *Historic Figures*, Reno adds to his theory by discussing other supposed fifth-century figures like Vortigern and Vitalinus and speculates in some detail on the locations of Arthur's twelve battles.

"Why Did the Anglo-Saxons Not Become More British?" asks Bryan Ward-Perkins in an article for the *English Historical Review* (June 2000). Ethnic identity has become a hot topic among scholars studying Iron Age Celts as well as those studying the various Germanic groups of the early Middle Ages, so a broad examination of early Anglo-Saxon and British identities is most welcome. Is there a racial or ancestral difference between Anglo-Saxons and Britons, asks Ward-Perkins, or is this difference "culturally acquired and mutable" (513)? Ward-Perkins argues ultimately for the latter, with a large number of the recently conquered Britons (here estimated as outnumbering the Anglo-Saxon emigrants four to one) having "thoroughly anglo-saxonized" themselves. Evidence cited to support this view includes Ine's Laws, which mandate lower wergilds for *wealas* than for *Englisc* at the same rank. Ward-Perkins compares the British situation to former Roman (and Christian) areas like Gaul and North Africa, but sees Britain as different because 1) Roman ways disappeared quickly after the departure of Roman troops, and 2) the Britons mounted a fierce resistance against English expansion. Ironically, he argues, the military successes of the Welsh discouraged their English neighbors from

adopting the British culture of their conquered subjects, as the Franks did with the Gallo-Romans whom they conquered. Then again, the Franks had previous contacts with the Gallo-Romans, but for the Saxons the British truly seemed "foreigners."

Unfortunately, old stereotypes and misconceptions linger in Paul Cavill and Michael Jackson's chapter, "From Rome to Augustine: Britain Before 597" in *Not Angels, But Anglicans: A History of Christianity in the British Isles* (Norwich: Canterbury Press), 9–15. We are told that, faced with "wave after wave of Germanic invaders," the Romans departed from Britain, "civilised and Christian at least in parts" (9). While this volume is clearly aimed at a wide readership, does the laity need to hear that the early Saxons did not "have much concept of personal cleanliness" (9), or that the Irish are "nobodies from nowhere" (13)? The Christian Britons are all but ignored here, though Jackson's discussion of early Christian Ireland is a good précis. Here, as elsewhere in the book, well chosen illustrations aid the lay reader. [For more chapters from this volume, see section 6.f below.]

Steven Bassett's aim in "How the West Was Won: The Anglo-Saxon Takeover of the West Midlands" (*ASSHA* 11: 107–18) is "to offer new thoughts on the question of how and why the west midlands appears to have become thoroughly Anglo-Saxon by the late seventh century" (107). First Bassett sets his Britons in the countryside as densely as they are assumed to be elsewhere in lowland Britain, and with greatest confidence at places where Roman roads traverse rectilinear fields which survived both road and, presumably, Anglo-Saxon conquest. How the fields and the people who plowed them survived remains undecided. Bassett rehearses the hypotheses, notes that they were all devised to explain the processes in southern and eastern England, and worries that conditions in the midlands were so different as to require "fresh hypotheses specific to the region's own circumstances" (117). He does suggest the strong survival of Christianity—including its bishops—in the region, so that he can finish with the suggestion that "there were far more British Christians in the region who became English than there were Germanic immigrants who became Christian" (117).

Susan Oosthuizen's "The Origins of Cambridgeshire" (*Ant J* 78 [1998]: 85–109), studies the impact of Anglo-Saxon migration into the valley of the Cam, a frontier zone between East Anglia and Mercia, and finds evidence of "an unexpected degree of continuity in landscape use between the Roman and Middle

Saxon period" (85), long before the county itself was created in 917 by Edward the Elder. Oosthuizen enters the continuity debate caught between two bodies of negative evidence: C.C. Taylor's exposition of the lack of archeological support for discontinuity and E. Cleary's observation that there is yet little conclusive evidence for continuity. Approaching this question by texts (e.g., the Tribal Hidage and Domesday Book), Roman villa sites, Anglo-Saxon cemeteries and dykes, Oosthuizen argues that "east of the Cam Germanic settlers came into a landscape which may well have continued to be administered by Romano-British landowners and their successors under overall East Anglian control. West of the Cam the Romano-British order disintegrated into smaller independent political units" (105). Principal support for this thesis comes from Domesday estates representing Romano-British villas near which Anglo-Saxon cemeteries had been established, especially as supported by concentrations of place-names derived from Latin loan words.

c. Missions and Early Kingdoms to c. 800

Ian N. Wood's contribution to a collection of essays on conversion, "Some Historical Re-identifications and the Christianization of Kent," (*Christianizing Peoples and Converting Individuals*, ed. Guyda Armstrong and I. N. Wood, *International Medieval Research* 7 [Turnhout], 27–35), challenges the static model of "pagan versus Christian" in the years on either side of the year 597 AD. Using letters from Pope Gregory the Great's collection, Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, contemporary continental writings, and archaeological evidence from the entire Germanic world, Wood argues for a much more fluid religious situation than previously thought. In particular, he contends that allusions to a pagan *fanum* (shrine or temple) and a priestly caste, which are unparalleled except in Frisia, may reflect the influence of Roman Christianity on Anglo-Saxon paganism. Wood also suggests that Augustine's questions to Gregory the Great reflect unease not with pagan practices, but with British Christian practices. In short, Wood sees a Germanic paganism transformed by its contact with the Roman world and a British Christian Church, if not thriving then at least active in the late sixth century.

The collection *L'Eglise et la mission au VI^e siècle: la mission d'Augustine de Cantorbéry et les églises de Gaule sous l'impulsion de Grégoire le Grand; Actes du Colloque d'Arles de 1998*, ed. Christophe de Dreuille (Paris: Cerf) commemorates the 1400th anniversary of the ordination of Augustine of Canterbury. The first section contains five essays about Gregory the Great, touch-

ing on such topics as the idea of mission as Gregory understood it, the mission to England in the context of other missions, the influence of Gregory's letters on the English mission, and the tensions between the active and the contemplative that characterized the nascent Church. A smaller section on the early English Church follows, with articles on the cultural implications of Augustine's arrival, the personalities of Augustine and Aidan, and the development of the Church through 1066. Another six essays about St. Virgil and the Church in Gaul in the sixth century are followed by 48 of Gregory's letters translated into French.

Nicholas Brooks enters the ethnogenesis fray with his "Canterbury, Rome and the Construction of English Identity" (*Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West: Essays in Honour of Donald A. Bullough*, ed. Julia M.H. Smith [Leiden: Brill], 221–45). Brooks' goal is "to suggest that Canterbury's prolonged campaign of *imitatio Romae* was an essential element in the process of English ethnogenesis, that is in a programme of constructing a single *gens Anglorum*" (222). He concludes that the conversion of Æthelberht's folk by Roman missionaries and the choice of Canterbury as capital of this new religion "was designed to enable a mixed British and Anglo-Saxon population to accept a common 'English' identity" (222). In Brooks view, the early archbishops were keen to possess *Romanitas*—not just in liturgy and architecture but also in the very choice of a Roman city as a see, rather than the more obvious choice of some royal vill of the local king. Such cultivation was deliberate, Brooks argues, though at times the evidence seems stretched. For instance, the fact that Augustine scavenged from Roman buildings for the materials for his new church in Canterbury is not so much an affirmation of *Romanitas* as a realistic appreciation for the nearness and quality of the local building materials. Brooks points out that even before the mission, the Angles, Saxons, and others had imposed their material culture, language, and possibly religious beliefs on surviving Romano-British inhabitants of the lowlands. An unfortunate "collective amnesia" has obscured much of this process, down to its actual existence, which leaves historians with Bede and their own varying degrees of skepticism. Brooks recounts evidence of Romano-British Christian survival—cults, buildings, place-names, funerary rites—but acknowledges that "it may be that by c. 600 the British origin of a significant part of the Kentish population was well on the way to being deliberately forgotten" (242). So while the real Romans were passing into a historical and cultural void, the *Angli* et al. in Kent were learning to wear and be buried in Roman style clothing. Brooks concludes with a paradox: in his es-

timation, "English identity was best strengthened by asserting in every possible way how Roman was Canterbury and how Roman was royal power in the Christian English kingdoms, while yet omitting all interest in the Romano-British history of the church of Canterbury" (246). This is a provocative, if speculative, essay, and contributes to the ongoing debate about English identity.

In "Lindisfarne 1998," (*Offa* 56 [2000 for 1999]: 407–20), Michael Müller-Wille surveys, in German, the history of Lindisfarne from its foundation by the Irish monk Aiden in 635 to its abandonment in the wake of Viking activity in the late eighth century. The author pays particular attention to the episcopacy of Cuthbert, the development of his cult, and the migration of the saint and see to Durham via Norham-upon-Tweed and Chester-le-Street.

Mark D. Laynesmith's "Stephen of Ripon and the Bible: Allegorical and Typological Interpretations of the *Life of St Wilfrid*" (*Early Med. Europe* 9: 163–82), investigates the role of biblical models and analogues in Stephen of Ripon's *Vita Wilfridi* (709) and finds two things. First, that Stephen used the "pattern of sacred history" in the Bible to shape his Wilfrid; in part one of the *Vita*, Wilfrid is an Old Testament prophet, while in part two, he has become St. Paul, "the New Testament man" (176). Stephen did this to present the kind of authority that the Bible possessed. And more, in Stephen's hands, Wilfrid "epitomizes the Word incarnate" (177). Such pleading by Stephen raises our suspicions, as Kirby noted and Laynesmith reminds us, that "Stephen may have been trying to salvage a has-been's reputation" (177) and so used new rhetorical tricks. Second, Laynesmith concludes that the virulent nature of Stephen's invective—reaching for its power into the New Testament's anti-Judaism—"ought to be interpreted as a sign that he was consciously writing against the flow of ecclesiastical opinion concerning Wilfrid" (178). The unusual choice of the pennamen "Stephen" further signals his motivation. Stephen in the Acts of the Apostles was famous for "his stinging attack on the Jews for their consistent persecution of God's chosen" (178). Thus the author of Wilfrid's *Vita* becomes a new Stephen, writing *apologia*, not *vita*. The timing in the composition was not simply Wilfrid's death the year before, but the troubling state of Wilfridian communities, under stress and needing a reminder of who had founded them and what was really at stake.

Lawrence P. Morris's "Did Columba's Tunic Bring Rain? Early Medieval Typological Action and Mod-

ern Historical Method," (*Quaestio* [Cambridge] 1: 45–65), investigates the possible historicity of a miraculous episode in Adomnan's *Vita S. Columbae* through a consideration of the devotional context of such miracles. Chapter 44 of the *Vita* relates how a tunic and a book associated with the saint brought rain to a drought-stricken Iona after being taken around the field. Morris acknowledges a possible literary debt to a similar story in Gregory's *Dialogi*, but argues that all of the elements—association of sin with disaster, walking around fields in processions of penitence and the use of relics—were common in contemporary *vitae*, conciliar legislation, penitentials, letters, and the works of Bede. Moreover, Morris justifies using literary sources to uphold the historicity of other literary sources by reminding us of the early Church's emphasis on unoriginality and the importance of typological actions. In other words, underlying many *topoi*, Morris argues, were real events.

Two works in a recent collection treat the missionary activity of the English abroad. Anna Maria Luiselli Fadda's "The Vernacular and the Propagation of the Faith in Anglo-Saxon Missionary Activity" (*Missions and Missionaries*, ed. Pieter N. Holtrop and Hugh McLeod, *Stud. in Church Hist.*, Subsidia 13 [Woodbridge and Rochester, NY], 1–15), looks at the most important point of contact in converting pagans to Christianity—the use of the native language by missionaries. She wants to answer the questions "how pagans learned about Christianity and how was their language able to communicate the concepts of the new religion?" First she surveys the lesson learned by the English in the course of their own conversion; it is often missed how much depended on the work of translators, whether Franks traveling with Augustine or Oswald and Cedd in the north, and thrived under the guidance of men like Aldhelm, who sang sacred texts to the people as if he were a secular *scop*. Continental missions were equally aware of this need. In England, missionaries with Latin invented and recast to create a Christian vocabulary in Old English—loan-formations, semantic loans, and loan-creations (here basing much on the work of H. Gneuss). Luiselli Fadda attributes the success of the mission to the *Angli* to the "Roman missionaries' policy of overcoming the language barrier with pragmatic solutions" (14). This is a necessary, not a sufficient condition, but is worth remembering nonetheless. The second piece, by Eugène Honée, "St Willibrord in Recent Historiography" (18–31), surveys the last half century's work on Willibrord looking for trends. What does Honée see? That in the mid-twentieth century, Willibrord was set in an Anglo-Roman context, while from the 1970s, the Irish

elements of his mission had risen in profile. Honée's starting point is W. Levison's work on Willibrord, and the link forged between Willibrord and the Romanist Northumbrian Wilfrid. New insights came in the 1970s and 1980s as new attention was paid to Willibrord's early life at Ripon and in Ireland. Here A. van Berkum and M. Richter loom large, and are primarily responsible for recasting Willibrord in an Irish-Columban mold. From this perspective, Willibrord's mission is seen as most likely motivated by the same forces that sent Egbert, his English abbot in Ireland, to try to reach the continent in pursuit of his lifelong *peregrinatio*. He failed, but from his abbey—and perhaps for similar reasons—went Wigbert, Willibrord and company, White Heward, and Black Heward. The links to Ireland remained after Willibrord reached the continent, according to work in the 1980s by D. ÓCróinín. The abbeys he founded were not Benedictine but Irish in character—not surprising in an age before the universal dominance of Benedict's *Rule*. Thus also fell the distinction between England's professional missionaries and the wandering ascetics Ireland unloaded on the continent. In Francia, scholarship has revised the role of Pepin in favoring Echternach, from patron of missions to consolidator of power in his locale. Not that Willibrord has gone completely green; new work tries to include Hiberno, Anglo, and papal influences to explain this complex missionary. Of contemporary historians, it is Arnold Angenendt who is most closely challenged by Honée, who sees Angenendt's position on Willibrord's consecration as a Roman archbishop of Utrecht as a return to Levison's. On the other hand, Honée is more supportive (with reservations) of Angenendt's idea that Willibrord was busy creating an Irish-style *paruchia* in Germany, with head and subordinate houses.

Lutz von Padberg's *Heilige und Familie: Studien zur Bedeutung familiengebundener Aspekte in den Viten des Verwandten- und Schulerkreises um Willibrord, Bonifatius, und Liudger* (2nd ed., Quellen und Abhandlungen zur mittelhessischen Kirchengeschichte 83 [Mainz: Gesellschaft für mittelhessische Kirchengeschichte, 1997]) is a second edition of his thesis, originally printed in a slightly shorter form than was submitted for his degree in 1981. It investigates the representation of natural and spiritual family bonds in the words of the hagiographers of missionary saints who had chosen exile among the Germans (and consequently separation from family and land). In particular, von Padberg is interested in the tension between kin and religious obligations and its effects on the saints' careers. His focus is always on the sources. After carefully considering the discussion of family bonds at various key

points in the surviving *vitae* of Willibrord, Boniface, et al., von Padberg finds that these missionaries, coming as they did "from a social tradition in which one existed within the kin group" (182), felt tension from a religious calling that told them, in both testaments, to abandon family. Von Padberg describes how this gets worked out in the prologues and early chapters of each *vitae*.

Josef Semmler, in "*Instituta Sancti Bonifatii: Fulda im Widerstreit der Observanzen*," (*Kloster Fulda in der Welt der Karolinger und Ottonen*, ed. Gangolf Schrimpf, Fuldaer Studien 7 [Frankfurt am Main, 1996], 79–103), traces in great detail the role played by Boniface's circle in the transition of early Carolingian Fulda "from the shapeless and diffuse mixed observances to the multiform Carolingian *consuetudo* or the *ordo monachorum* and of the *ordo canonicorum*—and in Fulda, the change from the *Instituta Sancti Bonifatii* to the *consuetudines* of the decree of 816/17" (103).

Arguing against the dominance of *emporia* in studies of eighth-century economies, John Moreland's "The Significance of Production in Eighth-Century England" (*The Long Eighth Century*, ed. Inge Lyse Hansen and Chris Wickham [Leiden, Boston, and Cologne], 69–104) adopts a more holistic approach, considering other economic processes like consumption and production as equally, perhaps more important than markets. He claims that "the economies of eighth-century England cannot be understood in terms of a series of active cores (the *emporia*), surrounded by conservative, autarkic peripheries" (69). His principal historiographical target is to adjust and refine Richard Hodges' *Dark Age Economics* (1982), where *emporia* loom large and serve to channel strange goods to royal courts. This "classic model" includes the assumption that economies move from simple gift-economy to more developed commodity economies. Moreland argues that both model and assumption are flawed, since, for example, anthropological work shows that gift- and commodity-economies can and do coexist. Moreland would replace this package with an awareness that production, more than other elements of the economy, changed first, some time before the eighth century, and this change drove the development of *emporia* and the economy as a whole. His *emporia* are fully embedded in their countrysides and are the "consequence" of economic growth, not its cause. He ranges widely through site reports and finds that "there is no sign ... of an autarkic and self-sufficient countryside, or of isolated and divorced trading centres," and that "there are clear indications that these economies were integrated at

the regional level through a hierarchy of settlements" (96). In the classic model, the king plays an important part; in Moreland's, the kings do not monopolize exchange, which is firmly in the hands of secular and ecclesiastical elites as well as of the king. As he concludes, "although, the king ultimately remained the real 'hidden hand' behind the system, this hand had a power which was nowhere near as singular and as unbridled as is assumed in the 'classic model,' nor was it the only one which profited directly" (103).

Ian W. Walker's *Mercia and the Making of England* (Stroud: Sutton) starts with the succession of Offa in 757 and, instead of leaping onto the West Saxon bandwagon in the early ninth century, keeps its focus on Mercia clear through to the mid tenth century. The Mercia of the *Making* part of the title, then, has two contributions: first, the ambitions of Offa, which "suggested the possibility of English unity under one ruler but no more than this" (21), and second, the individuals living in what used to be the kingdom of Mercia who contribute to the creation of a unitary kingdom of the English in the late ninth and tenth centuries. Perhaps it is too partisan of Walker to see the creation of the kingdom from an amalgam of other kingdoms (including most importantly Wessex and Mercia) as principally "the result of a number of dynastic accidents" (205). Nevertheless, the work is readable, illustrated with some wisdom, and serves as a refreshing introduction to English history from an uncommon perspective.

Keith Bailey's "Clofesho Revisited" (*ASSAH* 11: 119–31), considers the location of the important but mysterious site of at least ten councils between 716 and 825. Bailey excludes all of England except the kingdoms of Kent, Mercia, and the East Saxons, as well as what is called Middle Anglia, for political and missionary reasons, and even here prioritizes, with central Mercia and Kent looking unlikely. He adopts Catherine Cubitt's notion of "meeting-place-ness" as a principal tool, and begins his search. The predominance of the London area for meetings during the period of Mercian hegemony "tips the balance of probabilities" towards it as the site. He narrows the area further to the "core territory of the Middle Saxons" (123), though for reasons that need to be spelled out. The next clue is the name itself, meaning "at the cloven spurs," a plural form for a word applied to steep-sided valleys. He looks for "meeting-place-ness" where Simon Keynes says it might be—the diocese of Leicester, and argues for the Chiltern region as the most likely candidate. Bailey now employs the political geography of the 670s to identify vicinities (rather than the field it-

self): Royston, Dunstable, and Hertford. In the sorting, Royston only rates a "possible," while Dunstable is "distinctly possible, but not proven" (125–6). Hertford emerges as the leading candidate. It has steep-sided valleys, water access, roads, and was "the meeting place of five territories denoted by *-ingas* endings" (127). He further narrows his attention to "a fifty-acre detached portion of Great Amwell, a part of London in Lincoln diocese, very close to Ermine Street and the head of navigation on the Lea, near to the important spring at Chadwell, and with a prominent barrow on its eastern boundary ... [with] at least two *hoh*-names and a twelfth-century field name *Aldwic* in the vicinity" (129–30). In the end, he concedes that this is merely a very good candidate, perhaps the best, but, like Dunstable, "not proven."

Jonathan Harris, "Wars and Rumours of Wars: England and the Byzantine World in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries" (*Mediterranean Hist. Rev.* 14.2 [1999]: 29–46), investigates English openness to influence from Byzantium in the Middle Saxon period. The historiographical impulse comes from warnings by, e.g., Michael McCormick, that the influence could not have remained constant in this period. Harris argues that, sensible as these warning may seem, "the English present a rather different case" than other early medieval western kingdoms by remaining open to Byzantine influence even when no influence was detectable (30). In support he compares the English and Byzantine reactions to the Vikings and other nasty Others and considers the authenticity and significance of Alfred's correspondence with Elias, Patriarch of Jerusalem. After surveying scholarship on contact and evidence of influence before and after the eighth and ninth centuries, Harris discredits the few pieces of evidence for contact during those centuries. Nevertheless, despite a failure of contact due to crises in the Byzantine world, the English looked outward in their own crises and kept the memory of Byzantium alive through recording the empire's wars, especially with advancing Arab armies. Pilgrims' tales worked to maintain a similar continuity in the English mind. Lastly, Alfred's correspondence with Elias, patriarch of Jerusalem, noted in Asser's biography, shows the ecumenical attitude of the English. Here Harris undermines A.P. Smyth's contention that the name in "Pseudo-Asser" is "Abel," not "Elias" (*MS ab El*), which reaffirms that the patriarch was indeed Elias in 879–907, a patriarch also writing to Frankish rulers soliciting building funds. Harris calls this letter a "circular"—making it our first evidence of junk mail solicitation in the west. Alfred's response for the churches of Judaea (not India) was real, and the au-

thenticity of the medical advice from Elias recorded in a contemporary medical treatise in England “not in the least implausible” (40).

d. Ninth Century and Scandinavian Invasions and Settlements

Although the passing of the commemorative year of Alfred's death gave scholars a chance to catch their breath, one important work on the king did appear. In *Herrschaft und Repräsentation: Studien zur Hofkultur König Alfreds des Grossen* (Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Ergänzungsband 36 [Vienna and Munich: Oldenbourg]), Anton Scharer investigates the court culture of Alfred the Great through a close analysis of texts associated with Alfred, such as Asser's *Vita* and the liturgy of consecration. Of particular interest are Scharer's conclusions about the origins of the first English *ordo*, which he believes should be found in the first half of the eighth century, and his confidence in the authenticity of Asser's text, which has been the subject of some controversy.

If scholars of Alfred were resting, scholars of Alfred's foes were not. This year saw much important and stimulating work on Scandinavians in England. Simon Keynes's elegant chapter “The Vikings in England, c. 790-1016” (*Oxford Illustrated History of the Vikings*, ed. Peter Sawyer [Oxford and New York, 1997], 48-82), provides a portrait of Viking England that begins with a series of statements about contemporary work to distinguish it from that of earlier generations: we are a more skeptical generation, distrustful of texts, trusting of archeological evidence and asking questions about impact on everything from institutions to English identity. Most importantly, we disagree with each other on many of the answers to these questions. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first, “Viking Raids in the 8th and 9th Centuries,” tells the familiar tale, incorporating evidence of excavations and *burh* creation with Asser and the Chronicle. Keynes finishes here claiming that “the most significant aspect of the Viking impact on England in the ninth century is the impetus which the raids gave to the emergence of a sense of common identity among the English peoples, and the context they provided for the formulation of a distinctively Alfredian political order which lasted for about forty years” (62). The second section covers the contentious issue of “Scandinavian Settlements in the Danelaw,” describing the types of evidence, and offering a useful set of models to represent different hypotheses on Danish settlement (e.g., large armies and peasant migra-

tion? or remnants of small armies who exerted political and cultural dominance?), and then the question of how a kingdom of the English was created. Last, Keynes turns to the “Viking Raids During the Reign of King Æthelred,” breaking these attacks into four phases and treating the thorny issues of Æthelred's reign such as his troubled defense policy and the St. Brice's day massacre (here not of settled Danes but of “any remaining groups of mercenaries, or paid-off and provisioned members of the army who had now outstayed their welcome” [78]). Interestingly, Keynes ends in 1016 with Ashington, not with the death of Harthacnut a quarter century later, and so does not cover the period when the Vikings got to enjoy the fruits of all that sailing and fighting.

Dawn Hadley's *The Northern Danelaw: Its Social Structure, c. 800-1100* (London and New York: Leicester UP) examines the vexed question of how the settlement of Scandinavians in northern England between the ninth and eleventh centuries affected the development of English society. She finds that in matters of territorial and social organization, language, and religion, the Scandinavian impact is often indistinguishable in the historical record from the earlier and contemporary Anglo-Saxon developments. We will not, she wisely argues, make much progress asking questions about the scale of Scandinavian settlement. In any case, any answers to those questions have little ability to explain the *nature* of northern society. Her wide-ranging study addresses many old shibboleths; in her estimation, F.M. Stenton's waves of free Danes no longer establish the freemen and sokemen of the Danelaw, but instead merely shape status by altering “lordship and estate management” (215)—no doubt a bit of a come down for these northern pirates. Hadley offers similarly salutary criticism throughout the study. Her approach is interdisciplinary, though at times this leaves her with questions and doubts instead of conclusions. Her section on status utilizes recent continental scholarship and is impressively comparative; her work with language is not conceived as broadly as it needs to be to approach this pesky body of evidence. On the whole, however, this book is a very useful contribution to the intensifying debates about the impact of Scandinavians in England.

Dawn Hadley was also co-editor with Julian D. Richards of a stimulating collection of articles on the impact of the Vikings on England: *Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries* (Stud. in the Early Middle Ages 2 [Turnhout: Brepols]). Five of the fifteen papers have a principal focus on history. The editors' “Introduc-

tion: *Interdisciplinary Approaches to the Scandinavian Settlement*" (3-15) lays out the aims of the volume to re-examine theories of rapid assimilation by Scandinavians in English society and finds instead "that the processes of accommodation, assimilation, and integration were gradual and complex, displaying important regional variations" (3). They seek to ask new questions and contextualize their answers to a greater extent than they hitherto believe has been done. The papers of the volume are divided among five sections and will be discussed in the order they appear. Part 1, "Problems and Perspectives," consists of the Introduction and Simon Trafford's "Ethnicity, Migration Theory, and the Historiography of the Scandinavian Settlement of England" (17-39). Trafford evaluates the past forty years of scholarship and finds that, unlike work on the Anglo-Saxon settlement, scholarship on the Scandinavian settlement has resisted new ideas from anthropology and a necessary reorientation around the findings of archeology, both of which have invigorated studies of early medieval migration and settlement. Trafford traces the twists and turns in settlement studies, from Sawyer's thesis to the present, offering innumerable insights into why we are where we are. He sees us caught between the warring maximalists (using place-names) and minimalists (wielding archeology), both of whom reject the authority of the other side's evidence. He then offers a salutary comparison to Anglo-Saxon settlement studies, which advanced because of the perceived importance these settlers had to the creation of the English. He suggests some ways forward, but is not prescriptive.

Part 2, "Lordship, Language, and Identity," is the largest section and includes three papers principally focused on history. The first, Paul Kershaw's "The Alfred-Guthrum Treaty: Scripting Accommodation and Interaction in Viking Age England" (43-64), turns the treaty into a component of Alfred's campaign to resurrect England and the English. The *frith* agreed between the two kings provided the opportunity for the promotion of a common English identity; it gave Alfred "a specific opportunity to breath life into the notion of Englishness" (58). Guthrum is no mere spectator in this process; the treaty becomes a reflection of his new Christian kingship over not just his *here*, but over "a mixed population of settlers and pre-existing inhabitants" (57). Matthew Innes follows with "Danelaw Identities: Ethnicity, Regionalism, and Political Allegiance" (65-88), where he challenges usual notions of the creation of the Danelaw. Innes argues that English kings in a sense created the Danelaw as a way of taming Danishness and separat-

ism in the north. Nevertheless, regionalism in Northumbria remained "Danish" up till the 1065 rebellion. One problem with this thesis is that Innes assumes the call for Cnut's law in 1065 is a recognition of Danish customs. It may be, but it also may simply be a call for some old law of indeterminate ethnicity. Cnut was not only a Dane; he was also a king of the English. The last historical work in this section is Dawn Hadley's "Hamlet and the Princes of Denmark: Lordship in the Danelaw, c. 860-954" (107-32). Hadley flips the arguments used for the creation of Englishness in Alfred's court in tenth-century Wessex (and beyond), and argues that once these southern kings had appropriated "Angle-ness," the northerners were left to borrow "Scandinavianness" as their only alternative identity. Hadley works forward from the sensible recognition that the Scandinavian character of the north is not the product of a simple mathematical equation (i.e., more Scandinavians do not equal more Scandinavianness); instead, her regional identity is the creation of Scandinavian lords who were savvy about adopting local forms of lordship, the lack of unified identity among the settlers, and the identity campaign in the south.

Part 3, "The Scandinavian Settlement and the Church," has two chapters. Lesley Abrams's "Conversion and Assimilation" (135-53) turns the certainties and orthodoxies back into questions with a skeptical study of the adoption and spread of Christianity in the Danelaw. The principal problem, she points out, is that for almost any question we would like to ask, there is not sufficient evidence to provide an answer. She does try to suggest better ways of considering conversion, drawing inspiration from Richard Fletcher's idea of conversion as a "cultural package" offered to converts (137). She considers two models for conversion: the missionary enterprise and conversion as "influence" or "infiltration," and finds that there is no evidence for or against the idea that southern priests were sent north to preach the word, or that sufficient clergy survived in the north to be sources of influence and infiltration. Julia Barrow has more luck reaching dry land with her "Survival and Mutation: Ecclesiastical Institutions in the Danelaw in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries" (155-76). Rather than ranging as broadly as Abrams, she picks her targets: changes in diocesan territory and the appointment of bishops; the role of the "Oda-Oswald-Oscytel-Thurcytel family"; the Benedictine abbeys in the Fens; and lastly, pastoral care in the tenth century. She finds that while the cathedrals other than York foundered, nevertheless "many of the pre-Viking churches in eastern England did survive the Dan-

ish invasions." The reason for the survival appears to be the desire by landowners for proprietary churches—just as was moving landowners and founders in the south. Her family of clerics played "an unusually prominent role in the development of ecclesiastical institutions in the Danelaw in the 10th century" (161). Their work of founding was one of the ways they established *amicitia* with other lords as a means of survival in a politically volatile period. Other chapters in this collection will be dealt with in others sections of this year's reviews. The high quality of the entire volume is remarkable; this is one of the most stimulating and learned works on Scandinavian settlement in many years and its beneficial effects on future scholarship will last for some time.

Another collection with useful articles, primarily on Viking-age England, is *Peace and Negotiation: Strategies for Coexistence in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. Diane Wolfthal (Arizona Stud. in the Middle Ages and Renaissance 4 [Turnhout: Brepols]). Three pieces are of particular interest. Ryan Lavelle's "Towards a Political Contextualization of Peacemaking and Peace Agreements in Anglo-Saxon England" (39–55) approaches the topic broadly, asking questions about the "political realities" of peace in England, composition processes, differences between truce and peace, negotiation and its code, and "the 'strategic dimension' that was intrinsic to peace" (41). Most of the article is devoted to analyses of Alfred Guthrum, II Æthelred, and *Dunsæte*, all of which enshrine some sort of agreement between less than friendly parties. Like many of the current works on these treaties, Lavelle observes that "by regulating contact and defining specific boundaries, the leaders were actually defining themselves and their jurisdictional territory" (54). This is the greater political context as Lavelle sees it. The worry here—as with the many works that make similar observations—is to mistake result for goal, the unforeseen for the foreseen, although Lavelle certainly shows the complexity of peace, real or ideal, in the English context. John Edward Damon's "Advisors for Peace in the Reign of Æthelred Unræd" (57–78) tries similarly to understand the context for the advice the *witan* gave Æthelred to buy peace with gold. It was Byrhtnoth's death at Maldon that tilted the balance toward *gafol*-favorable Archbishop Sigeric. Sigeric was one of a group of those favorable to peace through tribute—part of their strategy to effect the conversion of the Vikings rather than simply their defeat. Damon identifies a more Byrhtnothian faction as well and shows dissension in the *witan* between these groups playing out in actions and policies. His study offers sensible caution

to those who would condemn the policy of appeasement as such based on the final results of 1013–16; tribute and conversion were good policy for Alfred and the Frankish kings, and there was no reason to think them anything but still a worthwhile strategy in the late tenth century. Both Lavelle's and Damon's articles will stimulate new thoughts about war and peace in this period. Lastly, Jonathan Wilcox considers the role of Wulfstan in "The St. Brice's Day Massacre and Archbishop Wulfstan" (79–91). In 1002, Wilcox argues, Wulfstan reserved brotherly love for Christian brothers and did not extend it to all of his kind. Wulfstan may have been complicit in the massacre; in fact, it would be stranger to imagine that he was not involved. In the years following the massacre, however, Wulfstan became a force for peaceful assimilation, as demonstrated by the law codes he drafted for Æthelred (e.g., VI Atr in 1008).

Colleen E. Batey and John Sheehan's "Viking Expansion and Cultural Blending in Britain and Ireland" appears in a book published to accompany the Viking exhibition sponsored by the Smithsonian (William W. Fitzhugh and Elisabeth I. Ward, *Vikings: The North Atlantic Saga* [Washington and London], 127–41). While the text follows an eccentric course (occasionally into misdirected emphasis), the quality of the illustrations is excellent. The chapter on England includes both usual suspects as well as fresh items (e.g., 8.6 is a woman's skull, probably a slave, who was killed by a ritual murder).

Wulfstan's *œuvre* receives a reappraisal by Patrick Wormald in "Archbishop Wulfstan and the Holiness of Society" (191–224), a new study included in D. Pelteret's *Anglo-Saxon History: Basic Readings*. Wormald tries to unite what Whitelock divided; his Wulfstan combines statesman and homilist (and other things) in what needs to be seen as a typical description of the kinds of things bishops did in the tenth and eleventh centuries. More than that (because Wulfstan was so prolific and so well-connected and involved in statecraft), Wormald argues that Wulfstan's "career had a coherence and a dynamic that puts him in the front rank among early medieval state-builders" (192). The bulk of the article offers detailed comparison and analysis of various works—legal, penitential, and homiletic—by Wulfstan (or said to be by him). The article is filled, as Wormald warns, with little here-sies. He dismisses the label *Excerptiones Ecgberhti* as misconceived and throws cold water on the notion of the 'commonplace book', a label used to describe various manuscripts connected to Wulfstan. Given his reappraisal of Wulfstan the person, he also adjusts

the canon of Wulfstan's works. In an appendix, titled "Wulfstaniana True and False," Wormald argues that we should no longer accept the combined text *Rectitudines Singularum Personarum* and *Gerefa*, nor the *Northumbrian Priests' Law*, as Wulfstan's. The arguments are primarily lexical and he uses for his standard the "Peace of Edward and Guthrum," identified by Whitelock as Wulfstan's. The two falsely attributed texts, nevertheless, show Wulfstan's influence; *RSP* and *Gerefa* were produced by a reviser who "was a near-contemporary who shared some of the archbishop's ideas, and even a few of his stylistic mannerisms, and was perhaps influenced by the measures he was promulgating in the king's name" (211), while the *Priests' Law* "was written by someone who knew his [Wulfstan's] views and mannerisms well but had rather different priorities," possibly by one of Wulfstan's two successors at York (213).

e. Tenth Century to the Norman Conquest

In "Athelstan's Urban Reforms" (*ASSAH* 11: 173–86) David Hill provides an update and evaluation to Martin Biddle's 1971 study of "Late Saxon Planned Towns." Hill seeks to extend the implications of his conclusions about evidence for royal planning in the layout and siting of *burhs*, particularly their transformation under Æthelstan to towns with commercial capabilities, rather than simple fortresses. Working principally from the laws of Æthelstan's reign, Hill argues that for Æthelstan, *burhs* were no longer primarily defensive (or offensive), but combined *burh*, mint, and port in a single place. Where are these new towns? Hill utilizes evidence for new mints to locate them: they are at places such as Totnes, Dorchester, and Barnstable. Hill admits that coinage and narrative sources for Æthelstan's reign are weak and so some of what he says is speculative. Sometimes it is supposition alone that links sites known from Edgar's reign with some earlier existence or formation under Æthelstan. Hill surveys the sites, offers plans, considers William of Malmesbury's second source on Æthelstan. He adds Newark to the list of possible foundations—its plan runs along lines parallel to those of Æthelstanian (or pre-Edgar) *burhs*, and concludes that the evidence for "an early-tenth-century reformation of the urban pattern of England" is strong: forts were abandoned, replaced at times by fortified towns of smaller size than before 919, and much points to the hand of Æthelstan rather than his father.

There are a few pages of interest to Anglo-Saxon historians in David Crook's "Nottinghamshire and the Crown: the County and its Institutions from its

Origins to the Black Death, c. 900 to 1350" (*Trans. of the Thoroton Soc. of Nottinghamshire* 104: 21–36). It is mainly descriptive, summarizing scholarship on the Anglo-Saxon and Conquest periods. It misses some interesting twists in the Scandinavian era—most notably the existence of so-called "small hundreds" and the levy of the murder fine in only part of the county, a legacy of Watling Street as a boundary. Crook dates the creation of the shire not with C.S. Taylor to 1008, but to some point early in the tenth century, most likely after 942 when the English regained control of the Five Boroughs.

Victoria Thompson considers "the nature of women's power and legal agency, and the extent to which that power was real or rhetorical" (1) in her "Women, Power and Protection in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century England" (*Medieval Women and the Law*, ed. Noël James Menuge [Woodbridge and Rochester, NY: Boydell & Brewer], 1–17). Using the *Encomium Emmae Reginae*, the *Vita Edwardi*, *Beowulf*, and wills, she finds "a limited autonomy within closely defined parameters" (3). She may be overly optimistic about finding the woman's voice in sources for which women were only patrons (or recipients), but does well with these sources as reflections of their patrons' desire to rewrite the past to exert some control of the future. In an analogous way wills written by women but made public before their deaths could give the *testatrices* power to shape the future relationships through anticipation by heirs of what was to come: usually movable goods like tapestries, linens, and valuable household items. The bulk of the article combines the taciturnity of Ælflæd's will to the eloquent statements of *Beowulf's* Queen Wealhtheow as a way of enhancing the voice of the will to express the role of gift-giving in context. Coincidence of the vocabulary of gift-giving helps Thompson make her case. Thompson's women, then, are savvy enough to manipulate what little they had of property to gain some control of their surroundings. They also are willing to employ creative reconstructions of the past to reach the same goal. She acknowledges that the examples she studies ended not with women gaining from their acts, but ultimately losing. She concludes that "what little survives of our evidence for the power of individual women is as insubstantial as a thread from one of their vanished tapestries" (17). An expansion of the evidentiary base by replacing interest in voice with interest in status and role might have led to a happier result.

In "Virginity and Misogyny in Tenth and Eleventh-Century England" (*Gender & Hist.* 12: 1–32), Cathe-

rine Cubitt examines the corpus of Ælfric's writing to determine his attitudes to virginity as well as the impact the monastic reform may have had on these ideas. Virginity had become a predominantly male attribute by the late tenth century, despite Ælfric's own regard for the virgin martyrs of late antiquity. Cubitt argues that throughout his works there is a palpable undercurrent of negativity toward female sexuality, even the virginity of the women religious, because—unlike their male counterparts—Ælfric believed that women religious were not really up to the challenge of reformed Benedictinism. As a result, women's communities failed to thrive in the same way that they had centuries before, when virginity was a predominantly female attribute. The effect of Benedictine reform, according to Cubitt, was to privilege male virginity as a way of distancing new monks from old, monks from clergy and laity, and men from women.

Adding some important insights to the "Lotharingian connection," Michael Hare's "Cnut and Lotharingia: Two Notes" (*ASE* 29: 261–78), links Cnut's baptismal name Lambert not to Liège, where St. Lambert was martyred in 705, but to his Polish mother, whose family favored the name Lambert. Hare suggests persuasively that Cnut was baptized as Lambert as an infant, perhaps even at birth, given Peter Sawyer's portrait of Swein Forkbeard as a Christian for most of his life. The alternative is that Cnut may have been sent to the court of his Polish uncle, Boleslaw Chrobry, and there become Lambert in the eyes of God. The second "note" concerns Cnut's visit to Cologne in c. 1027; Hare argues that it may have been this visit that laid the foundation for the connections between Cnut and Lotharingia and led to the arrival of Lotharingian clerics in England in succeeding years.

Pauline Stafford begins her "Queens and Treasure in the Early Middle Ages," (*Treasure in the Medieval West*, ed. E.M. Tyler [York: York Medieval Press], 61–82) with a lengthy discussion of a story in Gregory of Tours' *History* involving the enormous dowry of the Merovingian princess Rigunth. The story, Stafford explains, "shows us queens *with* treasure, and queens and princesses *as* treasure," as well as a queen's ability to operate in the political and economic rituals surrounding marriage in the early Middle Ages (69). Leaving sixth-century Francia, Stafford surveys some of the other 22 or so recorded instances of queens and treasure in the early medieval West, though only a few of these cases involve England. These appear rather late and include the murderous Eadburh, who Asser says fled the Wessex court laden with treasure after her poisonings; Emma, who took control of

Cnut's treasure in the succession crisis of 1035; and Edward the Confessor's queen Edith, who was denied treasure in 1043 and 1051. No general rule can be deduced for Anglo-Saxon queens, for most of the cases are linked to the complex successions of 1035, 1087, and 1100.

Elizabeth M. Tyler's essay in the same volume, "When Wings Incarnadine with Gold are Spread": The *Vita Ædwardi Regis* and the Display of Treasure at the Court of Edward the Confessor" (*Treasure in the Medieval West*, ed. Tyler, 83–107), examines the role of treasure in eleventh-century England through an analysis of this central text. Focusing on descriptions of royal gift-giving, the two gold ships given to Edward, and royal dress, Tyler shows how treasure, at least in this text, "was a site of conflict, between secular and religious values, between male and female roles, and between native and foreign" (107).

After surveying what is known and what is suspected about trade between England and the continent before the eleventh century, Mark Gardiner's "Shipping and Trade between England and the Continent during the Eleventh Century," (*Anglo-Norman Stud.* 22: 71–93) attempts "to construct a general picture of trade by combining the fragments of information for sea voyages, references to traders and their goods, and the evidence for ports" (74). Sailing times were short (wind and tide cooperating); no place on the northwest coast of the continent was more than a few days sailing from southern England. Archeological data (mostly *ostraka*) show trade was usually conducted with the closest point on the opposite coast. This observation itself shows that what we might call international trade was more local than international. The reason for choosing the closest point was not economic advantage so much as caution; storms were fierce and sank many ships, and spending too long on the water exposed you to the threat of piracy and war. Not everyone, however, sailed in such short bursts; one might encounter the English herring fleets ranging far from their home ports. Where does all this lead? Since the ports were located as close as possible to the cross-Channel trading partners, the concentration of ports in the southeast shows Flanders to have been the major trading partner in the first half of the eleventh century. The growth of trade and the identity of trading partners can be traced in the expansion of ports and creation of new ports in other parts of England. This was not merely a revival of old patterns from before the viking age, but flowed in new directions and established new enduring patterns of trade.

f. Church, Local, and Regional History

Kenneth Hylson-Smith's *Christianity in England from Roman Times to the Reformation; Volume I: From Roman Times to 1066* (London: SCM, 1999) is the first in a three-part series on the history of the English Church to the Reformation. Nine chapters are divided into three parts—Roman Britain, Sub-Roman Britain and Anglo-Saxon England. The narrative tends to alternate between the political history of the period in question and its religious history, doubtless an attempt to be comprehensive. The survey is stronger in the first half than the second, but would nevertheless be very welcome in the classroom or for general reading. Its usefulness is further enhanced by its readability and by its continuous engagement with current scholarship and major debates.

H. R. Loyn's *The English Church, 940-1154* (Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education, Longman) is a short but elegant survey of the fortunes of the church in England from its recovery after the first Viking age through the reign of King Stephen. Unlike previous surveys, which break at 1066, this book emphasizes the continuity of native English traditions by taking a broad view of the period. The approach is chronological. The first four chapters deal with monastic reform in the tenth century, the age of Ælfric and Wulfstan, the church from Cnut to Edward the Confessor, and the Norman Conquest. These are followed by a brief review of the Domesday evidence for ecclesiastical resources. The remaining two chapters on the Anglo-Norman church are followed by a synthetic chapter entitled "Doctrine, Belief and Ritual." Throughout, the emphasis on the achievement of individuals is balanced by a concern for the development of the church as an institution. David Bates, the series editor, summarizes that this book "conveys admirably a sense of the general, of the importance of the individual to the full story, and of the place of the Church as an organization seeking both to maintain a pastoral and spiritual role and to make sense of turbulent times" (vii). Meant for a general audience, this work is lightly footnoted, but it is nevertheless essential for anyone interested in the history of the English Church in these formative centuries.

Mick Aston, *Monasteries in the Landscape* (Stroud and Charleston, SC: Tempus), considers how monasteries affected the landscapes in which they were built and how landscapes, in turn, influenced the activities of monasteries. Four of book's nine chapters deal with the development of Anglo-Saxon monasticism. Chapter One is concerned with the social and eco-

nomic roles of monasteries, while Chapter Two surveys the Egyptian, Roman, Celtic, Irish, Scottish and Welsh backgrounds of monasticism. Chapter Three outlines the growth of English monasteries before the Viking Age, while Chapter Four considers Saxon and Norman monasteries. The remaining chapters are devoted to later medieval developments, including the emergence of the new orders, their buildings and estates, the effect of the Dissolution, and an overview of monasticism from the Dissolution to the present. This is a comprehensive general survey accompanied by many useful maps and figures and nearly 150 photographs.

Not Angels, but Anglicans: A History of Christianity in the British Isles (consulting ed. Henry Chadwick [Norwich]) is a collection of thirty essays which ran as weekly installments in the *Church Times* several years ago, chronicling the history of the English Church from the sixth century to the present. It is a well-illustrated volume geared toward a general audience. For a review of Paul Cavill and Michael Jackson's chapter, "From Rome to Augustine: Britain Before 597" (9-15), see section 6.b above. Paul Cavill's contribution, "A Dangerous, Wearisome and Uncertain Journey" (17-24) tells the story of the Augustinian mission by focusing on early successes, the emergence of monasteries, and ecclesiastical culture. David Rollason's "To Whitby for Easter: Wilfrid's Triumph" (25-31) challenges the belief that the Synod of Whitby was such a decisive victory for the Roman Church that it marked the end of Irish influence on the English Church. He concludes that its greatest contribution was to make Bede the "master of computus" in the western Church. In "Rape, Pillage and Exaggeration" (33-9) Catherine Cubitt assesses the impact of the Viking invasions on the English Church. Cubitt's position in the "savage versus long-haired tourist" debate is somewhere in the middle. While she acknowledges the destruction of communities, she also points out that the decay of learning famously lamented by King Alfred the Great was underway before the worst of the Viking raids. Simon Keynes' contribution, "Apocalypse Then (AD 1000)" (41-7), explores the evidence for apocalyptic fears in Anglo-Saxon England at the turn of the first millennium. Although he finds no direct evidence, Keynes points out that the writings of churchmen like Ælfric and Wulfstan, increased royal benefaction of churches, and heightened interest in the intercessory power of saints are indicative of anxiety, but concludes that it was more likely the result of renewed Viking activity than any specific fear of the end of the world. In "The Norman Arrow Finds a Ready Target" (49-57) Giles Gasper revisits some traditional interpretations of the

Norman Conquest's impact on the English Church and finds them exaggerated. The first myth he tries to debunk is that Lanfranc's attitude toward native English traditions was wholly negative. More significantly, Gasper points out ways in which Norman innovations were aspects of reform already underway in England.

D.M. Palliser's contribution to *Beverley Minster: An Illustrated History* (ed. Rosemary Horrox [Beverley]), "The Early Medieval Minster" (23–35), explores the early history of this monastery purportedly founded by John, bishop of York, c. 700. Bede refers to a monastery where St. John was buried, but the community's history is obscure from the late eighth century until the eleventh, when it re-emerges as a college of secular canons. Later accounts held that the monastery was destroyed by the Vikings and refounded as a secular community by Æthelstan, but Palliser finds no evidence to conclude that there had to be a break in the its history simply because it evolved into a secular college. Palliser discusses the privileges and likely community of the Anglo-Saxon minster before turning to a brief discussion of its post-Conquest history.

Tim Tatton-Brown's *Lambeth Palace: A History of the Archbishops of Canterbury and Their Houses* (London: SPCK) is an illustrated history of the London residence of the archbishop of Canterbury in the central and later Middle Ages. Lambeth was not built until the end of the Anglo-Saxon period nor used by archbishops until Anselm's pontificate, so Chapter One discusses the likelihood that the residence in the Anglo-Saxon period was in Canterbury itself, perhaps originally outside the walls at St. Augustine's before moving inside the walls for protection. Tatton-Brown notes, however, that archbishops spent time at and collected food rents from their extensive estates in Kent, Middlesex, Surrey and doubtless enjoyed the hospitality of royal manors. Thus they had many residences from which to choose in the Anglo-Saxon period.

Douglas Dales's *Shepherd and Servant: The Spiritual Legacy of Saint Dunstan* (Fairacres Publ. 135 [Oxford: Sisters of Love of God]) is a brief but insightful examination of Dunstan's spiritual vision based on analyses of the major texts associated with his pontificate. These include the line drawing attributed to the saint, the *Regularis Concordia*, the coronation *ordo* of 973, the Sherborne Pontifical, and the *vita*. Among the topics Dales explores are the saint's understanding of monastic spirituality, the close ties he helped to forge between church and state, and "the Christology that lay at the heart of all that Dunstan stood for as abbot and archbishop" (22).

Dominic Marner's *St Cuthbert: His Life and Cult in Medieval Durham* (Toronto: U of Toronto Press) is a beautifully illustrated examination of a late twelfth-century illuminated version of the *Life of St. Cuthbert*, whose production Marner believes was part of a revival of the saint's cult in that period. The volume begins, however, with a rehearsal of the evidence contained in two early lives for Cuthbert's career and the development of the Anglo-Saxon cult.

Rebecca Rushforth's "The Medieval Hagiography of St. Cuthbert," (*AB* 118: 291–324) is an edition of and commentary on the post-Conquest *vita* of this late seventh/early eighth-century royal saint. Cuthbert was the sister of King Ine of Wessex who married King Aldfrith of Northumbria but left him to become a nun at Barking and ultimately establish Wimborne Abbey in Dorset. She is not mentioned in Bede, but there is evidence (in Aldhelm, Boniface, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and calendars) that she was considered a saint throughout the Anglo-Saxon period. Three versions of her *vita*, which Rushforth tentatively dates to the late eleventh/early twelfth century, are extant in fourteenth-century manuscripts.

Frances Shaw's translation of *Osbern's Life of Alfege* (London: St. Paul's, 1999) affords interesting, if somewhat stylized, glimpses into the life of the archbishop who was murdered by the Vikings in 1012. The volume also contains Osbern's account of Ælfege's translation, which took place in 1023.

Written for a general audience, Norman Sneesby's *Etheldreda: Princess, Queen, Abbess and Saint* (Haddenham: Fern House, 1999) is a short, elegant survey of the saint's life and religious career. As a local historian Sneesby exhibits great sensitivity to the landscape and history of Ely as well as to his subject, and while much of his narrative is necessarily speculative, it is highly reasoned speculation based on the author's reading of the evidence for the early Anglo-Saxon kingdoms as well as the slim evidence for Etheldreda (Æthelthryth) herself. Topics include the physical and political geography of East Anglia, potential early royal and religious influences, Etheldreda's two political marriages, and her dedication to the monastic life, which included the foundation of Ely Abbey.

In "Peculiaris Patronus Noster: The Saint as Patron of the State in the Early Middle Ages," (*The Medieval State*, ed. Maddicott and Palliser, 1–24), Alan Thacker compares the development of saints' cults in early Francia, Lombard Italy and Anglo-Saxon England to determine if supra-regional cults were promoted

by royal as well as ecclesiastical authorities. Based on a variety of hagiographical, liturgical and other evidence, Thacker shows how saints like Martin of Tours and Denis of Paris were promoted in Francia and John the Baptist and Michael the Archangel in Italy by kings as representatives of the political community as well as the ecclesiastical. Thacker notes, however, that similarly useful saints were less forthcoming in Anglo-Saxon England. While Cuthbert and Gregory the Great enjoyed relatively wide patronage, no West Saxon saint emerged to represent Alfred's house in quite the same fashion as St. Denis.

Diana Webb's *Pilgrimage in Medieval England* (London and New York: Hambledon) begins with a chronological survey of the topic in three chapters. Changes over the course of the Middle Ages include a shift from an Anglo-Saxon emphasis on miracles performed by the living saint to post-mortem miracles preferred by Anglo-Normans, and from miracles performed for local communities to those for outsiders and at long range. Coleman's *Life of St. Wulfstan* and William of Malmesbury's reworking of it exemplify this shift—the former emphasizes Wulfstan's life and pastoral mission, while the latter shows “the breadth and celebrity of Wulfstan's operations” (38). The widening of the worldview of saints' cults, Webb argues, can be attributed to changes in population in the central Middle Ages that necessitated new pastoral and financial strategies. Chapters 5–10 are thematic, but largely focus on the later Middle Ages. Topics include images, royal pilgrimage, unofficial pilgrimage, indulgences, topography, and criticism of penitential pilgrimage.

“Pagans and Christians: 400–1150” is Christopher Daniell and Victoria Thompson's contribution to a collection entitled *Death in England: An Illustrated History*, ed. Peter C. Jupp and Clare Gittings (Manchester, 1999; New Brunswick, NJ, 2000), 65–89. The article is divided into two essentially chronological parts that consider first pagan and then Christian Anglo-Saxon burial practices and attitudes to death. This is an overview, but because it summarizes a great deal of recent archaeology, it has much to offer historians. At the end of the Roman period in Britain, inhumation burials in large cemeteries, such as Poundbury in Dorset, predominated. Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries such as Spong Hill in Norfolk, however, feature cremation burials. From the fifth to the seventh centuries, a new emphasis on princely burials is evident, particularly in East Anglia. Grave goods were common in all of these early burials. From the eighth century onward, however, simpler graves asso-

ciated with Christian churches predominated, and although grave goods were not necessarily at odds with Christian beliefs, they were increasingly less common as new forms of taxation associated with death, *heriot* and *sawlscof*, diverted the wealth of the dead to the king and the Church. Other topics treated briefly include the burial of death penalty cases, the emergence of royal burial processions, and the minimal effects of both the Viking invasions and the Norman Conquest on later Anglo-Saxon burial practices.

Catherine Cubitt sets an impressive task for her article “Sites and Sanctity: Revisiting the Cult of Murdered and Martyred Anglo-Saxon Royal Saints” (*Early Med. Europe* 9: 53–83). Not only does she want readers to rethink the perspective from which they view these cults—substituting religious devotion by the non-elite laity for the high royal politics currently seen behind these cults—but also argues that these cults “should be regarded as a manifestation of popular religion” (54). She thinks on the whole historians of Anglo-Saxon religion have been overly cautious about finding “popular features” in their evidence (56), in reaction to Germanist primordialism, the growing awareness of the sophistication of medieval hagiographers, and the elitist origin of most sources. As Cubitt points out, “all of these are sensible cautions but have resulted in a curious state of affairs where it is respectable for a historian to discuss popular practices in any period from about 1100 onwards but not for the earlier centuries” (57). To show that we can know something of English popular religion before 1100, Cubitt turns to the cults of martyred and murdered royal saints. Why these saints? Unlike such works as Bede's life of Cuthbert and the eleventh-century *Vita Æthelwoldi*, which follow the Bible or models like the *Vita s. Martini*, the *vitae* of these royal saints are filled with the violence and magical nature that seem to derive from pre-Christian beliefs. They also give priority to lay devotion to the saints, are very rooted in locale, and are filled with vengeance miracles. From these Cubitt elicits “the religious practices of the ordinary Anglo-Saxon” (58). She surveys her saints: the martyrs Edwin, Oswald, Edmund, and a large number of assassinated kings and princes (e.g., Oswine, Ælfwald, Edward the Martyr, and Kenelm), acknowledging that the distinction between the two groups is modern and probably artificial. In each cult, she points out features suggesting the role of the laity: in Edmund, for example, the layman who was the first source and the precedence of local initiatives in the establishment of Edmund's cult. Her lay folk prefer their cult subjects headless—originally a pre-Christian interest now absorbed into

Christianity. For murdered saints, she finds similar unconventional aspects of cult in texts which suggest the cult was not a learned invention foisted upon the unlearned, but a genuine lay non-elite development. While these cults may have originated spontaneously among ordinary people, Cubitt points out that they were "neither exclusively low-status nor shunned by the church" (79). Post-conquest generations were less stirred by beheadings and murders; such elements in Anglo-Saxon popular cults may be the source of the limited disapproval similar cults receive from Walter of Evesham and Anselm of Canterbury. Although Cubitt finds popular lay devotion in these *vitae*, she is less sanguine about finding any historical facts or accurate traditions. Such elements as betrayals had become *topoi* in such cults. She appears here to want to have it both ways, and maybe that is how it should be. She concludes with an interesting series of observations about popular piety from the hagiographies, positing a lively oral culture concerning these saints, their powers, and their violent ends.

Sarah Foot's *Veiled Women* (Aldershot, Hants, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate) is a two-volume synthesis of recent scholarship with the specific aim: to explain the disappearance of Anglo-Saxon nuns after the First Viking Age. The first volume proceeds both chronologically and thematically, touching on every conceivable aspect of the religious life of Anglo-Saxon women. Foot's most important conclusion in this first volume is that nuns did not, in fact, disappear from Anglo-Saxon England with the First Viking Age. Rather, they are obscured from view by the language of the tenth- and eleventh-century evidence, which tends to conceal non-Benedictine alternatives to the expression of female piety, in particular the less formal lives led by consecrated virgins and widows, which became popular in the tenth and eleventh centuries. She credits the transition from royal double monasteries to more private arrangements to changes in female landholding patterns, the disruption caused by the Vikings, and the pressure of Benedictine reform for the changes themselves. The second volume is a work of reference, an alphabetical list of sixty-one recorded communities of cloistered women or vowesses in England from Alfred to 1066.

In "*Cherchez la femme. Queens, Queens' Lands and Nunneries: Missing Links in the Foundation of Reading Abbey*," (*History* 85: 4–27), Pauline Stafford investigates the histories of three English abbeys, Reading, Chelsey, and Leominster, which ultimately made up the endowment of the abbey refounded at Reading by King Henry I in 1121 on the occasion of his sec-

ond marriage, which took place nearby. Stafford first takes on the claim made by the re-foundation charter that the endowment came from the lands of three defunct English monasteries, showing that there is no conclusive proof that any were defunct. What the evidence does show, however, is that the lands of these three, and many other English monastic foundations, were in royal hands in both 1066 and 1086, and the bulk of the article traces their movement in and out of the not always benevolent control of Anglo-Saxon queens.

In "Bishops as Contenders for Power in Late Anglo-Saxon England: The Bishopric of East Anglia and the Regional Aristocracy" (*Negotiating Secular and Ecclesiastical Power: Western Europe in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. Arnoud-Jan A. Bijsterveld et al., *International Med. Research* 6 [Turnhout, 1999], 89–106), Christine Senecal illuminates the network of social relations forged between bishops of North Elmham and local elites and freemen. Senecal argues on the basis of evidence for lordship in Little Domesday Book that bishops of Elmham were able to attract local commendation on par with secular elites, but that they had little success in attracting freemen and sokemen away from the powerful and wealthy monastic foundations of Ely and Bury St. Edmunds.

In "The Preferment of Royal Clerks in the Reign of Edward the Confessor" (*Haskins Soc. Jnl* 9 [1997]: 159–73) Mary Frances Smith charts the practice of elevating priests in the royal chapel to the episcopate and questions the historiographical tendency to note this preference as evidence of the decadence of the English Church. Smith instead sees a king who wanted and needed loyal servants in such important positions, where they could represent "his manifold ecclesiastical and political interests at court and in the dioceses" (160). Smith's reading of these bishops—given in this instance of Edward's Lotharingian imports—is that they were "loyal clerks who were by no means spiritually inferior on account of their worldliness" (168). Edward of course was first attracted to this career path for his clerks not because it was *au courant* on the continent, or because of their piety; the high politics of his first decade convinced him that he would do well to shore up some support where he most easily could. These placements "helped him weather the storm at court and beyond" in the turbulent 1050s and 1060s. Edward had created a church his Norman mentors would have admired, filled with loyal and well-rewarded clerks. As Smith concludes, "when we recall that many of these royal priests, in particular Giso and Leofric, were reforming bishops,

the sharp distinction often drawn between the pre-Conquest English church and the Anglo-Norman Church is further eroded in important ways" (173).

Jean-Guy Gouttebroze argues in his "Deux modèles de sainteté royale: Edouard le Confesseur et saint Louis," (*CCM* 42 [1999]: 243–58) that Edward the Confessor and Louis IX present two rival kinds of holiness in kings and that the difference can be explained by chronology. As notions of royal power changed, so too did the notion of a holy king. This was no mere silent evolution. Louis IX, Gouttebroze claims, knew and rejected Edward the Confessor's kind of holiness, and in doing so created a new type of royal piety (and consequently a new form of saintly king).

Despite the dearth of evidence, textual or archaeological, for Anglo-Saxon Birmingham, Steven Bassett's "Anglo-Saxon Birmingham" (*Midland Hist.* 25: 1–27) attempts to reconstruct the area's early medieval land units. Using "some unconventional and sometimes difficult sorts of evidence" (3), including later parish boundaries and disputes, place-name evidence and Domesday Book, Bassett formulates several important, albeit tentative conclusions. Arguing against traditional assumptions, Bassett first dispels the notion that early Anglo-Saxon Birmingham was little more than woodland. Instead, he argues that rural life continued, perhaps next to a minor Romano-British trading center. He further posits the existence of a large territorial unit focused on the 'Beormingas' clan, belonging to the bishopric of Lichfield and served by a single old minster at Harborne.

Francesca Tinti's "Tra monasteria e minsters: Il dibattito storiografico sulle origini dell'organizzazione ecclesiastica inglese" (*Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 36: 495–522) is a detailed review in Italian of the historiographical development of the minster hypothesis and its critics.

In "The Church at Rochester, 604–1185" (*Faith and Fabric: A History of Rochester Cathedral 604–1994*, Kent Hist. Project 4 [Woodbridge and Rochester, NY, 1996], 1–27) Martin Brett surveys the cathedral's history based on very limited evidence. Brett is especially interested in some of the unusual aspects of the see, including its relationship with Canterbury, the absence of monastic competitors in the diocese, the likelihood that invasions were endemic, and Rochester's relative poverty. The see's landed wealth and its library are also examined. Significant attention is paid to post-Conquest innovations, including the installation of monks, the building of a new cathedral, the

extension of the see's patrimony, and its subjection to Canterbury.

Simon Keynes opens the impressive volume, *Hereford Cathedral: A History* (ed. Gerald Aylmer and John Tiller [London and Rio Grande, OH]) with a review of its pre-Conquest history entitled "Diocese and Cathedral before 1056" (3–20). Because the minster was burned in 1056, very few pre-Conquest documents survive. Keynes nevertheless exploits Bede, episcopal lists, charters, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and Domesday Book for its early history under the authority of Mercian kings, its tenth-century incorporation into Wessex, and its eleventh-century trials against the Vikings and the Welsh. Julia Barrow picks up where Keynes leaves off in "Athelstan to Aigueblanche, 1056–1268" (21–47) by examining the careers of two Lotharingian bishops, Walter (1061–79) and Robert (1079–100). While the former's pontificate was unremarkable, the latter's saw the assimilation of continental ideas, including the appointment of archdeacons, the acquisition of many books, and the establishment of a chapel.

"The Early Medieval City and Its Buildings," Alan Thacker's contribution to *Medieval Archaeology: Art and Architecture at Chester*, ed. A. Thacker (BAA Conference Trans. 22 [Leeds]), 16–30, examines the history of the city and its buildings from the sub-Roman period to the thirteenth century. Few know the history of Chester better than Thacker, and he has produced a lucid and detailed survey based on years of research for the Victoria County History Chester volumes. The chapter begins with an examination of the slim archaeological and problematic textual evidence for the city's pre-tenth century occupation. Thacker argues that there was a settlement there when Æthelflæd re-fortified Chester as the leading Mercian *burh* and that by 1066 it was a thriving commercial, administrative and religious center with upwards of 3000 inhabitants. Its significance is underscored by its post-Conquest history as the seat of the powerful earldom of Chester, after initially suffering as a result of its association with revolts against the Conqueror. Thacker concludes with an examination of the city's late twelfth-century developments, including the establishment of a short-lived bishopric and the monasticization of St. Werburgh's minster.

In "St. Mary's, Brading: Wilfrid's Church?" (*Proc. of the Isle of Wight Nat. Hist. and Archaeol. Soc.* 16: 117–35) John Margham examines evidence for the tradition that St. Mary's is the oldest church on the Island of Wight and founded by Wilfrid. Because the

documentary and archaeological evidence is eleventh century at the earliest, the argument for attributing such antiquity to this church is based on reasoned inference from the church's later history.

In "South Saxon Cerney" (*Trans. of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeol. Soc.* 117 [2000 for 1999]: 119–36) Michael Oakeshott uses charters and Domesday Book to recover some of the estate's late tenth century history. Two charters show how the widow of the ealdorman of Mercia was illegally dispossessed of the estate by the next ealdorman, who in turn lost it after he was exiled for unspecified acts of treason. The estate was then given back to the widow, with reversion to Abingdon Abbey. Oakeshott argues that it was a particularly desirable estate because its site was initially a buffer zone in southern Gloucestershire between the kingdoms of Mercia and Wessex and then a prized agricultural center in the eleventh century.

Jamie Sewel explores the origins of a parish boundary on the Isle of Wight in "An Investigation into the Origin and Continuity of the Parish Boundary of Carisbrook, Isle of Wight" (*Proc. of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeol. Soc.* 55: 31–45). Sewell begins with a review of current theories that suggest parish boundary origins are to be found in Roman villa and/or Anglo-Saxon royal estate boundaries. These theories are possible, the author argues, but if so the boundaries reflect administrative rather than agricultural units. Likewise, it is possible that there was a minster church associated with the royal manor of Bowcombe, from which the parish boundaries developed. Sewell thinks it more likely, however, that the parish boundary was a mid to late-Saxon creation by a mother church that needed to identify the extent of its *parochia* for the purposes of the tithe.

The Cambridge Urban History of Britain is a three-volume series pursuing a "systematic historical investigation of the rise of British cities and towns over the long durée" (xxi). Volume 1, edited by D.M. Palliser, (Cambridge: Cambridge UP) spans the years 600 to 1540 and is divided into five parts—Introduction, the Early Middle Ages, the Later Middle Ages, Regional Surveys, and Conclusion. Nine essays comprise Part II, the Early Middle Ages, and although there is some overlap, each investigates a particular aspect of the rise of Anglo-Saxon towns. The essays also pay more than lip service to developments in Wales and Scotland, as the title indicates. One strand that unites these essays is the proposition that the recovery of urban life in Anglo-Saxon England was predicated on the development of royal and aristocratic

administrative rather than economic centers, which tended to follow. Part II begins with Grenville Astill's "General Survey 600–1300" (27–49), which traces the re-emergence of urban life via *wics* and *burhs*, with an emphasis on the importance of ecclesiastical institutions in the recovery of urban life. Astill establishes from the beginning the significance of aristocratic consumption over long-distance trade in stimulating economic growth. James Campbell follows in "Power and Authority 600–1300" (51–78) with a review of the evidence for the development of royal and aristocratic control over urban political and economic life through the restriction of commerce to towns, what he calls "shire-related urban monopolies." The origin of internal town government, especially hundred-type organization, is also considered. An essay on the social history of early towns follows in Richard Holt's "Society and Population 600–1300" (79–104). As in the preceding essays, Holt finds that towns were initially more about meeting the needs of aristocrats rather than they were about commerce. Not surprisingly, evidence for the demography of pre-Conquest towns is slim, so the essay pays particular attention to post-Conquest developments such as industrial relations and dissent, Jewish communities, urban living standards, and the emergence of self-regulation. Richard Britnell's "The Economy of British Towns 600–1300" (105–26) follows with a consideration of supply and demand, money and credit, urban employment, and the regulation of trade. Once again, the best evidence is post-Conquest, but Britnell reiterates the theme that "commercial impetus to urban growth was closely associated with large households, with their consumption of imported goods" (112) and that there was a "close relationship between patterns of lordship and the formation of towns" (108). Julia Barrow's "Churches, Education and Literacy in Towns 600–1300" (127–52) underscores the importance of ecclesiastical communities in the development of urban life in this period. Among Barrow's arguments is that the practice of siting early episcopal sees in old Roman towns was not continued in relation to the *burhs* after 900, which she attributes to a deliberate policy of West Saxon kings of excluding bishops from exercising urban political and economic power. The practice of establishing urban sees was revived after the Conquest, a period which saw the proliferation of small churches and new forms of Christian life, many of them specifically urban. The essay also considers the development of urban schools and literacy to satisfy "an appreciative audience" by the late twelfth century. "The Topography of English Towns 600–1300" (153–86) is then examined by D.M. Palliser, T.R. Slater, and Patricia E. Dennison. Topics include the shape of

towns, from the simplest single-street layouts to the planned grids of the high Middle Ages; plot patterns, which grew shorter and broader over time; defenses, such as castles and walls; public and private spaces; ecclesiastical precincts; domestic and commercial buildings; and suburbs. Derek Keene's "London from the Post-Roman Period to 1300" (187–216) surveys the history of the city in two chronological periods, 400 to 900 and 900 to 1300, before considering specific aspects such as commerce and manufacture, power and government, cultural identity, and the emergence of the idea of a capital city. Although it boasted a continuous history, London was not a center of political importance until the reign of Edward the Confessor, who shifted the focus of the court away from Winchester and toward the city where he built Westminster Abbey. By the reign of Edward I London was the capital city, the focal point in English political geography. In Keene's words, "London's distinctiveness was rooted in its size and wealth, in the extent and diversity of its trade and manufactures, and in its close links with the Continent" (216).

The last two essays in Part II cover some of the same ground, but nevertheless have much to offer. David Hinton's "The Large Towns 600–1300" (217–43) rehearses the numismatic and archaeological evidence for the emergence of *emporia* such as London, Hamwic, Ipswich and York followed by the tenth-century *burhs*, paying close attention to the buildings and infrastructure of Anglo-Saxon England's greater towns. John Blair finishes with "Small Towns 600–1270" (245–70), which focuses on processes rather than size categories. Like many of the authors in this collection, Blair uses the terminology "pre-urban nuclei," "proto-towns" and "primary towns" to distinguish settlements for whom the number of inhabitants is not an adequate measure, even if the evidence were more plentiful. Blair emphasizes the importance of cathedrals and minsters in the early period and entrepreneurship and planning from 1086 to 1170.

Nigel Tringham's "Leek Before the Conquest" (*Staffordshire Histories: Essays in Honour of Michael Greenslade*, ed. Philip Morgan and A.D.M. Phillips [Keele, 1999], 5–12) is a brief investigation of the pre-Conquest origins of the Staffordshire manor of Leek. According to Tringham's reconstruction of the evidence, Leek was probably an administrative and/or ecclesiastical center of some importance, even though there is no evidence of a minster. Leek was held by Earl Ælfgar before the Conquest and was a place of political importance as a "way station" between Cheshire and the East Midlands.

Tom Williamson's *Origins of Hertfordshire* is the fifth in a series dedicated to the exploration of each shire in the early Middle Ages (Manchester and New York: Manchester UP). The concentration in these volumes is on geography, topography, settlement and territorial organization, and this volume is no exception. Chapter One surveys the physical geography of this small county, which made up less than one percent of the kingdom's total land. Chapters 2–4 examine settlement patterns, concluding that in the fifth and sixth centuries Hertfordshire was divided among distinct tribal groups based on sites of late Roman importance, territories that were then subsumed into larger kingdoms eventually controlled by the Mercians and East Saxons. Chapters 4–6 explore the territorial organization of the county by tracing multiple large and predominantly royal estates, alienated and then fragmented over time. Williamson then uses Domesday Book to construct a model of estate patterns throughout the county. Ecclesiastical estates and towns are also considered before the volume concludes with a discussion of the impact of the Norman Conquest and Hertfordshire in the later Middle Ages.

"The Construction of the Early Scottish State" is Alexander Grant's contribution to *The Medieval State*, ed. Madicott and Palliser (47–71). Adopting an approach similar to James Campbell's for early Anglo-Saxon England, Grant here examines some of the socio-political factors in the construction of the Scottish state before its "Normanization" in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Predictably, Scotland in this periods proves to possess a mixture of Gaelic, Pictish, and English political elements. From these, Grant constructs a political model for early medieval Scotland that includes a relatively strong kingship, a bipartite system of crown lands and earldoms, the use of local landowners as royal agents, thanes and thanages, and royal defense and justice systems (70–71).

g. Law

This year's work on Anglo-Saxon law achieves sufficient mass to require a separate section. Pride of place must go to Patrick Wormald's *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century*, Vol. 1, *Legislation and its Limits* (Oxford and Malden MA: Blackwell, 1999). This massive book is the result of the author's work over the past two decades on English law before and immediately after the Norman conquest. Wormald's thesis is deceptively simple. He argues that English kings did not promulgate legislation because they were concerned about crime waves, lawlessness, and the like. The kings appear to have

been active in administering justice without referring to extant codes. But while English kings may have administered justice in response to immediate social needs, they made written law because of ideology. As Wormald writes, "the legislative impulse of the Old English kingdom waxed and waned with its imperial consciousness" (444). In chapter 1, Wormald guides us from the treatises of Hale, Brady, and Blackstone, through the suppositions of the nineteenth-century *Rechtschule*, Pollock and Maitland's *History*, and Liebermann's monumental edition. In chapter 2, Wormald sets the great contrast between south and north that dominates his analysis. Chapter 3 asks "What would be known of written law-making in England before Henry II had no law-codes survived?"—the sum total of indirect witness from Asser's account of Alfred (and what it does not say about his laws) to William of Malmesbury's much disputed claims in the twelfth century. Next (chapter 4) Wormald turns to the twenty manuscripts holding legal texts and categorizes them according to the company their legal texts keep (e.g., historical narratives or homilies). The "extant legislative texts" themselves are then viewed in the longest and crucial chapter of the book (chapter 5) as "a contextual stratum" and ordered within their contexts—from Alfred's *dom-boc*, through the anonymous codes, and into the early-twelfth-century treatises, translations, and apocrypha. Next, chapter 6 considers law-making and law-codes as acts of ideology, especially imperial ideology of English kings, pondering whether "it is possible to explain the behaviour of English codes, perhaps even their very existence, in literary and ideological terms" (417). Lastly (chapter 7), Wormald finishes with a compact conclusion on legislative mentalities. Wormald here asserts that "in the tenth century, the law of the English kings intruded into their subjects' lives to an extent that had no Anglo-Saxon precedent. It also had no European parallel On the continent, the gulf between the age of the *Volksrechte* and that of the Learned Laws was opening. English law was meanwhile moving to the position where, metaphorically if not literally, the king's writ would run throughout his realm" (483). Readers may come away from *Making* thinking that Wormald, by approaching each layer of the evidence on its own, has fragmented the picture of English law into a thousand pieces, but Wormald knows he can not allow readers to race through the complex world of Anglo-Saxon law, as one in a sense could read through most of the faux-narrative in volume one of Pollock and Maitland's *History*. Anglo-Saxon law has no single narrative; instead, it has multiple stories with hazily visible plots and witnesses of uncertain trustworthiness. Insights abound. Banish

all thought of lost codes; we have most or all there ever was (414-5). Royal codes adopt new guises: e.g., III Atr, King Æthelred's Wantage code, famous for its "jury" and as a Danelaw code, now shows the king's desire not to preserve and authorize Danish customs *per se*, but only to let local folk work out their own details, whatever those details might be, just as English kings typically had done since Æthelstan. The anonymous codes that Liebermann inserted between Æthelred and Cnut begin, in one of Wormald's most compelling sections, to cling to the other codes and their legislating kings. Traditionally, for example, Æthelstan has been assigned six codes (numbered I-VI in Liebermann's edition). Leaving aside the new context Wormald lays out for them, he is also able to link to these six codes an additional three anonymous codes (*Ordal*, *Be Blaserum*, and *Dunsæte*) which may represent local responses to the king's legislation. *Ordal*, for example, describes in Æthelstanian language the actual process of the ordeal and would have formed a useful supplement to the lengthy regulations on the subject in Æthelstan's Grately code (II As). *Be Blaserum*, which deals with killings and arson, shares language with the king's authentic codes and Wormald concludes that borough folk responsible in the Grately code for handling the lawless "were here reformulating its commands at ground level" (368). The treaty called *Dunsæte*, covering relations between the English and the Welsh, probably represents some local initiative resulting from Æthelstan's fixing of the River Wye as the border between the English and the Welsh c. 930. On a broader issue, Wormald's variegated approach eliminates any dichotomy between practical and ideological or cultural motivations behind lawmaking. All motives, sources, and mentalities play a part. Lastly, Wormald makes great and persuasive claims about the purpose and significance of preconquest law. As such, he can say that the story of the birth of the Common Law as we now have it, where preconquest law-making is labeled an evolutionary dead end and ignored, "is probably—not certainly but probably—wrong" (xi). Wormald's *Making of English Law* boldly assimilates his well-known opinions to the fuller study of manuscripts and texts required of a comprehensive treatment. It is an important book for not only legal historians, but also for any who are interested in power, kingship, and textuality in Anglo-Saxon England.

Carole Hough published two articles concerning Anglo-Saxon law in a narrower context. She contests the common belief in the close relationship between penitential literature and secular law-codes in her "Penitential Literature and Secular Law in Anglo-

Saxon England" (ASSAH 11: 133–41). By distinguishing between allusions to penance and actual references to penitential handbooks, Hough is able to conclude that "there is little evidence of a close link between the penitentials and secular law," and that despite a few influences, "the two forms of legislation appear to have operated largely independently until at least the end of the ninth century" (139). It is Wulfstan who is responsible for combining the two. The bulk of the article considers claims made by Oakley and Frantzen about the references to penance in early codes, reduces the presence of penance in Alfred's laws, and describes the appearance of penance in laws from Æthelstan's Grately code (II As) to the Norman conquest. In the penitentials, Hough interprets the few references to secular law as meaning that the Church sought to benefit from the authority of secular law, rather than (as Oakley and Harding argued) the reverse. Oddly, the Wulfstan forgery known as the "Laws of Edward and Guthrum" appears among the penitentials, though it is intended to pass as a secular code like the treaty of Alfred and Guthrum. Perhaps that is where it belongs, because its purpose was pastoral. This issue raises the problem of deciding where to assign various codes. It is not always very clear whether a code is secular law or ecclesiastical, and thus ascertaining the influence of one on the other may draw one into an intellectual quagmire. Be that as it may, this piece prompts a reconsideration of the textual relationship between penitentials and secular law.

Hough's second study, "Cattle-Tracking in the Fonthill Letter" (EHR 115: 864–92), addresses two *hapax legomena* of the Fonthill letter by adducing comparative evidence from Anglo-Saxon and continental Germanic laws. The words in question—*speremon* and *sporwreclas*—occur in the description from the letter of how a man tracked Helmstan and found the cattle he had stolen. Unlike M. Gretsch's *speremon*, who is a cattle herd wielding a goad and a servant of cattle-stealing Helmstan, Hough's is a tracker whom landowners were required to provide according to the codes of Edmund and Æthelstan. Such trackers also appear as early as *Lex Gundobada* and in Rothari's *Edict* as semiofficial informers or guides for posses. Such "tracking" was likely a regular rather than an occasional activity since the name *Speremon* in various forms occurs "as an occupational surname from the late 13th century" (880). Turning to *sporwreclas*, Hough again disagrees with Gretsch's suppositions and again reaffirms the traditional understanding of the word as meaning "[animals] tracked after being driven off" (882). In two further comments—on the

words *unlædan* and *ahredde*—Hough disagrees with Gretsch's renderings and finds instead that, e.g., in the case of *unlædan*, the word meant "straying" first, and then transferred to issues of sin, where it picked up a host of unpleasant denotations like "wretched" and "accursed." It would be wrong, she argues, to read these later denotations back into the poor cattle of the Fonthill letter. Hough's new translation of this sentence in the letter where all of these words occur eliminates a passage whose translation was explicitly marked as a problem by Keynes/Whitelock and adds what might be a new official to the growing bureaucracy of the Anglo-Saxon state.

Eric Gerald Stanley's *Die angelsächsische Rechtspflege und wie man sie später aufgefaßt hat* (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 2 [Munich, 1999]) shows Stanley ranging far from his customary fields of study and into the difficult and technical field of Anglo-Saxon legal history. His aim is to follow the development of the myth of the English jury, a myth of continuous protection of English liberties favored in contemporary politics by Euro-Sceptics (of whose number Stanley is not). In the course of tracing the jury's distorted history through Blackstone's *Commentaries*, the *Proverbs* of Alfred, and Jakob Grimm et al., Stanley also describes the origins of the Anglo-Saxon jury as a jury of presentment, rather than of guilt or innocence verdicts (which develops in the early thirteenth century). The focus however is on the twists and turns of the institution in the hands of politicians and poets, jurists and historians, from Blackstone to our own day.

Two less useful works on legal history also appeared. Daniel R. Coquillette's *The Anglo-American Legal Heritage: Introductory Materials* (Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press, 1999), is a twentieth-century vision from a U.S. law school. The chapter on the Anglo-Saxon period is not, like Stubbs' charters, a selection of key legal texts from various codes by the likes of Æthelberht, Æthelstan, and Cnut, but a brief and misleading introduction, followed by a few short English sources (Alfred, some oaths, a few charters, all taken from Stephenson and Marcham), among which is included the longest primary source: the proceedings of the Althing over the killing of Thord Freedmansson in *Njal's Saga*! Last come selections on "Primitive Law" from Maitland (1898), Redfield (1964), Hasluck (1967), and Llewellyn (1930), which together are supposed to serve as commentary. It is no wonder lawyers have such strange understanding of early English law. The chapter on the Norman conquest is only slightly less perverse.

The second work is even less useful. What to do with Kurt von S. Kynell's *Saxon and Medieval Antecedents of the English Common Law* (Stud. in Brit. Hist. 59 [Lewiston, Queenston, and Lampeter: Edwin Mellen])? Kynell claims to be arguing for long continuity in English law—an Anglo-Saxon origin for the basic system. What ensues on the pages of his monograph, however, is a riot of misprisions and purple prose, whose only moments of relief come when the author takes a shot at the Latin of his sources. One sample passage should suffice: "Though in its infancy, the democratization of society and law was well under way in Saxon Common Law and immemorial custom. William the Conqueror swept most of this away, almost at once substituting by force of arms and autocratic rule in place of the far more easy going Anglo-Saxon laws and ideas. Rampaging everywhere, even after the Duke's coronation as King, his troops sacked, burned, looted, and pillaged countless English villages and hamlets, slaughtering livestock, burning crops, raping women, and displacing entire populations. The new monarch ultimately stopped the open savagery, for despite his uneducated, unenlightened policies, he did crave order, accomplishing this by angry edicts" (27). The famous line about the crafting of the Angevin assizes, "multis vigiliis excogitatus et inventam," we are told means "constant vigilance as leading to thought and invention" (3). I kid you not.

h. Norman Conquest and Settlement

This year's Conquest studies are a mixed bag. We are grateful for the publication in one place of a number of very important works by E.M.C. van Houts. *History and Family Traditions in England and the Continent, 1000-1200* (Variorum Collected Stud. Ser. CS663 [Aldershot, Hants, and Brookfield, VT: Ashgate/Variorum, 1999]) publishes her essays on the interaction between England and the Continent, with an emphasis on Norman history and literature. The fifteen essays are divided into four sections: Norman Literary Links, Anglo-Continental Prose Texts, Latin and Vernacular Anglo-Norman Poetry, and History, Family and Women. Topics include Norman literary links with Byzantium and Scandinavia; the poems "Jezebel," "Semiramis," "Moriut," and the *Carmen de Hastingae Proelio*; Wace as Historian; hagiography at Saint-Wandrille; politics in the *Gesta Normannorum Ducum*; the *Brevis Relatio*; the Norman Conquest through European eyes; and women and the writing of history in the early Middle Ages. Of particular interest to English historians will be the essay on Semiramis, which van Houts believes is a veiled

reference to Emma after she turned her back on her sons and married King Cnut.

There were some important stirrings of the feudal revolution (or rather its malcontents) in 2000. David Bates's "England and the 'Feudal Revolution'" (*Il feudalesimo nell'alto medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 47 [Spoleto] 2: 611-49), promises both a survey and an argument. The survey seeks to chart the divergent courses of English and French historiography on the "Feudal Revolution," where English historians have disliked abstractions like "feudalism" and have refused to look over a long period to observe change. The case is, of course, their adoption of 1066 as a chronological divide—falling as it does within or just outside of the *mutation* in France, it muddies the waters and seems to demand a wholly different approach for English historians interested in power and authority. The result has been England's exclusion from debates over the Feudal Revolution/*l'an mil*. Now the argument. Bates argues that the conquest "should not be so centrally placed in the history of English feudalism" and he thinks we should apply the lessons of Domesday Book to conclusions about French history drawn principally from charters. Bates charts the narrowing of the Channel as historians of all sorts find much in common between England and the continent (e.g., works by J. Nelson, C. Wickham, R. Fleming, and R. Faith). Bates moves through the similarities, tying together much recent work, tending to agree with those who diminish the disruption of the conquest and who see similarities across the Channel. Even for Domesday Book Bates is willing to conclude that "continuity and evolution are the predominant characteristics" (633). In the end, Bates argues that England was not "in many respects" different from France (642). But Bates is a believer in "an evolutionary interpretative framework," and so he also sees different patterns of evolution in each place. In this sense, his England is feudal long before 1066. But Bates will have it both ways—his Old English state is just that, with more regal rights, if not necessarily any greater efficiency than its continental peers.

Andrew Wareham also enters the lists of the feudal revolution debate with his "The 'Feudal Revolution' in Eleventh-Century East Anglia," (*Anglo-Norman Stud.* 22: 293-321). Wareham seeks to find "the extent to which a revolution at the tenurial level filtered through into the relationships between lords and peasants and the organisation of the agrarian economy in East Anglia" (293). His methodology is to employ econometric models which, he points out,

"provide the only effective means by which to analyse the complex inter-relationships between a series of resources and values" (294). Wareham lumps together Norfolk and Suffolk, since both were under a single earl from 1042 to 1075, and wades into a broader regional analysis. The first half of his paper presents the issues emerging from his econometric methodology. The second half analyzes the models and offers some conclusions about peasants and lords. As to the econometric models, I cannot speak with any authority. What Wareham pulls from them, however, is interesting both narrowly for East Anglia, as well as broadly for the processes at work throughout England in the decades after 1066. East Anglia's freemen were a feisty lot, unwilling to be suppressed despite some commonly held beliefs among historians about this. Wareham directs attention to three case studies in order to examine how lords financed castle building, since this would also tell us about their exploitation of their estates. In the end, Wareham's use of econometric models "to measure the influence of power and status upon rents and incomes" shows not an increase in oppressive lordship, but rather that, *inter alia*, "resources such as meadowland, woodland and freemen were not exploited very differently during the pre- and post-Conquest eras" (320). Free peasants were able often to keep rents fixed or declining in a land where estates were rising in value, and find markets for goods produced or grown outside the tenurial relationship. Lords went softly with these peasants lest they commend themselves to another lord, and so "neither [the freemen's] rents nor their labour contributed in a significant way to the creation of a new landscape of lordship" (320). The rise to power of a number of lay lordships in East Anglia was not ultimately a product of "aristocratic violence and disorder," but rather of a nurtured "profitability of demesne agriculture" and a "careful strategy" towards the free peasantry (321).

Some new thinking on Hastings appeared this year. In "Observations upon a Scene in the Bayeux Tapestry, the Battle of Hastings and the Military System of the Late Anglo-Saxon State" (*The Medieval State*, ed. Maddicott and Palliser, 73–91), M.K. Lawson offers a closer inspection of one hillock on the Bayeux Tapestry's coverage of the Battle of Hastings, suggesting that "the scene in which the French attack English infantry on a hillock is vital. It both casts doubt on views about the scale of the battle which have prevailed for the last century, and suggests (with other evidence) that Anglo-Saxon armies fought in varied and reasonably complex ways which have never been properly acknowledged" (73–4). With that hook Law-

son wades into the flaws in E.A. Freeman's map of the battle, the taciturnity of contemporary sources on the numbers involved, and the location and significance of the hillock. First, Lawson dismisses small estimates of both English and Norman forces, finding ample evidence that both sides could produce large forces—numbering, especially in England, in the tens of thousands. As he says, "the late Anglo-Saxon state geared its people for war to an extent that the English were perhaps not to see repeated until the war of 1914–18" (85). As for tactics and equipment, Lawson interprets the men of the tapestry as showing the English fielding armored shield-wall infantry, as well as light infantry and spear-wielding peasants. The realism of the Tapestry's placement of these soldiers in battle scenes bespeaks its accuracy as a record. These soldiers all appear to perform different tasks on the battlefield, many of which required training. Lawson suggests that the D Chronicle's claim that Harold was attacked before he was ready may refer to the difficulty in setting up a shield wall on the field of battle. To understand this difficulty, Lawson turns to Spartan hoplites and Roman legions, which worked as phalanxes only when the smaller units that composed them worked. He wonders whether Old English words we translate as "troop" or "company" (e.g., *eored-heap*, *scild-truma*) might be hiding such small trained units of larger forces accustomed to establish just such a shield wall. Lawson admits it will be difficult given the evidence to overturn older estimates of the size of the two armies, but thinks it a "reasonable supposition" that the Hillock battle he has studied "records an important phase of the battle" which occurred not on the crest of the ridge with the shield wall, but, as Freeman thought, some ways away. This suggests a "more extensive" English deployment—which is of course what Lawson says we should expect from something as powerful, organized, and wealthy as "the late Anglo-Saxon state" (89).

Julie Warne and Jennie Fordham's *Battle Abbey and the Battle of Hastings: A Teacher's Handbook* (London: English Heritage) is a handbook produced by English Heritage for teachers planning to take classes to the site of the Battle of Hastings and the abbey ruins, preparing them to guide students through the history, geography and art history of the site through a variety of classroom and on-site activities.

According to Francis James West ("The Colonial History of the Norman Conquest," *History* 84 [1999]: 219–36), no historians of the Norman conquest (including this reviewer) use "colonial" and its offshoots either with specificity or technical precision. In his

view, "medieval historians who have used the colonial analogy have not been consistent, either in the meaning or in the models of empire and imperialism, colony and colonialism. Where Le Patourel borrowed a juridical definition from political science, and Holt one from sociology, Bates, Golding and O'Brien employ the terms of current political usage," while Bartlett silently employs an idea of "informal empire" conceived in 1940 (225). West's criticism, that historians willfully disregard the benefit of "one word, one thing" may be fair. But historians, medieval historians perhaps more so than others, are not social scientists (except at Chicago), and to ask them to parrot the vocabularies agreed in social scientists' conclaves is unrealistic. Historians who focus on language are also well aware that there is no such thing as "one word, one thing" in the very nature of language. West's more successful point is that historians lose control of their ideas when they use, without full and explicit understanding of all their connotations and denotations, words like "colonial" which pack such a modern charge. West is also an acute critic of the "expansion" (Norman or European) that summons notions like colonization to the historians' service—here taking on Le Patourel, Searle, Bates and Bartlett for spending time finding *necessary conditions* without offering any of the more important *sufficient conditions* that would "explain why, when and where any particular expansion actually happened" (230). West recommends for models "French colonial theories of assimilation" (233), though he despairs that any of us will figure out what a model might actually be.

Pauline Stafford's "Women and the Norman Conquest," originally published in the *TRHS* in 1994, has now been reprinted in Lester K. Little and Barbara H. Rosenwein's *Debating the Middle Ages: Issues and Readings* (Oxford and Malden, MA, 1998), 254–63. The article has revised our understanding of both the status of women before the conquest as well as the impact of the Normans; this important work will now be more accessible, and can be read alongside other provocative works on medieval women (e.g., Janet Nelson's "Queens as Jezebels") and medieval society in general.

Four works concentrating on the evidence of Domesday Book were published. The first, among the more controversial monographs this year, is David Roffe's *Domesday: The Inquest and the Book* (Oxford and New York: OUP), the central thesis of which is that the history of the inquest and the history of the book need to be uncoupled; in short, the book was not, according to Roffe, the intended result of the inquest.

The inquest, he argues, was concerned with geld and knight service, at a time when William the Conqueror needed both soldiers and money in the face of possible invasion. The book, however, was commissioned by William Rufus and compiled under the supervision of Rannulf Flambard "from the records of the inquest after 1089 and is best interpreted as a response to the revolt, and consequent tenurial chaos, of 1088" (ix). The argument is partly predicated on the failure of Domesday Book as a register of title, which current orthodoxy holds it to be. Citing evidence of the ambiguity of the scribes toward the question of rights to land, Roffe concludes that "its business was to collect evidence for further action, whether it be fiscal, administrative, or judicial" (67). A summary of arguments does not, however, do justice to the complexity of the analysis and the wealth of detail contained in this book. Whether one accepts the conclusions or not, anyone interested in this period will benefit greatly from depth of knowledge displayed by Roffe. The bulk of the book, in fact, is a very detailed discussion of the means by which the data were collected and written, the meaning of the data, and an examination of the texts that were produced, including the so-called satellite surveys.

K.S.B. Keats-Rohan's *Domesday People: A Prosopography of Persons Occurring in English Documents, 1066–1166; I: Domesday Book* (Woodbridge and Rochester, NY: Boydell, 1999) is the latest in a series of indices to Domesday Book produced by the author. The title is a bit misleading as the index does not reference pre-Conquest landholders, and it is a bit cumbersome to use, but Keats-Rohan's obvious knowledge of continental sources makes this an invaluable contribution to Domesday studies. Four introductory chapters discuss in some detail the problems associated with Domesday prosopography, the continental connections of England's new elite, in particular the significant Breton contingent, and concluding remarks about origin, estate, surname, etc. The bulk of the volume, however, is a description of nearly 2,500 individuals and ecclesiastical communities, with references not only to the Domesday text but to various other contemporary and modern authorities where possible.

The third study, P.R. Newman's "The Yorkshire Domesday *Clamores* and the 'Lost Fee' of William Malet" (*Anglo-Norman Stud.* 22: 261–77), sets the history of this fee firmly in the military context of the volatile years 1068–70, when York was not a city but "first and foremost a fortress in development" (263). The fee, which lasted only two years and at the end

consisted of at least 60 manors, appears as a ghost in Domesday Book, and then only in the *clamores* for Yorkshire. Nevertheless, the evidence is sufficient to claim that the Malet fee "was created both for military reasons (like a castlery) and for the subsistence, in the broadest sense, of Malet as sheriff of a county most of which had no continuum of Norman control" (264). Newman bases most of his argument on the location of the manors, which, he thinks, were designed not merely to support Malet's household, but also to "forewarn Malet and his York garrison" of any hostile forces approaching from, especially, the invasion coast in Holderness. Lastly, Newman disputes the charge made by some historians that Malet held his lands illegally. In Newman's estimation, the jurors accepted William's son Robert's claim to his lands. And even though Robert was unsuccessful in the end, the jurors' declaration shows that they thought William had legal right.

The last begins with Domesday Book but moves far forward. While it may make no comment on pre-Conquest legal arguments and norms, John Hudson's "Court Cases and Legal Arguments in England, c. 1066-1166" (*TRHS* 6th ser. 10: 91-115) does carry implications for late Anglo-Saxon law. Hudson's thesis is relatively straightforward: although historians have focused most often on the informality and flexibility of proceedings in high medieval courts, where "personality and power, honour and shame came into play, implicitly and explicitly," they ought to reconsider the presence and importance of legal norms which underpin cases and guide decisions (91-93). These are not just societal norms, but, in some cases, demonstrably legal norms (albeit ones most suitors in a court could understand). One of the richest sources for these norms is Domesday Book. Hudson mines it rigorously in both its record of disputes as well as its lists of customs, both of which betray the existence of norms governing procedure concerning "jurisdiction and financial benefit from court proceedings" and "offences against the person or concerning moveable goods" (96-97). In particular, the course of the Norman conquest "must have stimulated comparison of land-holding practice, and hence thinking about norms" (99). Hudson finds his norms not presented as abstract rules which are then used to decide the outcome of a case—the later medieval and modern legal syllogism (rule, fact, outcome)—but as legal "facts charged with a strong normative underpinning" (100). Although Hudson stays quite firmly on the Anglo-Norman side of 1066, there is little reason his method cannot be applied to the records of English law before the conquest. Admittedly, it is a much stickier task to discern legal norms

in sources which are either ideological statements or perhaps unrepresentative records of odd cases. Hudson has at least implicitly laid out a direction for scholars of Anglo-Saxon law to travel.

Two articles treat post-Conquest writers who offer important testimonies to pre-Conquest culture. Mark Philpott's contribution to the festschrift for James Campbell, "Eadmer, His Archbishops and the English State," (*The Medieval State*, ed. Maddicott and Palliser, 93-107) examines Eadmer's hagiographical works of Anglo-Saxon archbishops, including Bregwine, Oda, Dunstan, Wilfrid and Oswald, for what they might tell us about early twelfth-century discussions of "church and state." Philpott analyzes passages from various lives of English saints, including Dunstan and Wilfrid, to evaluate Eadmer's methodology as historian and hagiographer, concluding that while Eadmer often rewrites history, his work nevertheless shows a surprisingly "rational, circumspect and rather irenic championing of the Christ Church version" (101).

In "Der Historiker als Apologet der Weltverachtung: Die 'Historia Anglorum' des Heinrich von Huntingdon" (*FS* 33 [1999]: 125-68), Bernd Roling makes the case that Henry of Huntingdon's well-known letter on contempt for the world, as it often awkwardly appears in his *Historia Anglorum*, is the key to the *Historia*, which is in fact structured around the same principle, because the historical past served to prove the wisdom of Henry's advised contempt. Roling also offers a discussion of the place of Henry's letter in the genre of contempt literature, most notably the influence of Boethius.

M.F.G., B.O'B.

[M.F.G. reviewed Astill, Aston, Barrow "Athelstan," Barrow "Churches," Bassett "Birmingham," Blair, Brett, Britnell, Brooks *Myths*, Campbell "Power," Cavill "Dangerous," Coleman, Crick, Cubitt "Monastic," Cubitt "Rape," Cubitt "Virginity," Dales, Daniell and Thompson, Dreuille, Foot, Frazer, Gasper, Hadley "Cockles," Hinton, Holt, Houts, Hylson-Smith, Keats-Rohan, Keene, Keynes "Apocalypse," Keynes "Diocese," Loyn *English*, Margham, Marner, Moreland "Ethnicity," Morris, Müller-Wille, Oakeshott, Palliser "Early," Palliser Slater and Dennison, Philpott, Roffe, Rollason, Rushforth, Saunders, Sharer, Senecal "Bishops," Sewell, Shaw, Sneesby, Stafford "Cherchez," Tatton-Brown, Thacker "Early" and "Peculiaris," Tinti, Tringham, Tyler, Tyrrell, Warne and Fordham, Webb, Williamson, Wood "Some," Woolf, and Yorke.]

[B.O'B. reviewed Abrams, Attenborough, Bailey "Clofesho," Barrow "Survival," Bassett "West," Bates "England," Batey and Sheehan, Brooks "Canterbury," Campbell State, Crook, Cubitt "Sites," Damon, Gardiner, Golding, Hadley "Hamlet," Hadley *Northern*, Hadley and Richards, Hare, Harris, Hill "Athelstan's," Honée, Hough "Cattle-Tracking," Hough "Penitential," Hudson, Innes, Kershaw, Keynes "Vikings," Kirby, Kynell, Lavelle, Lawson, Laynesmith, Luiselli Fadda, Moreland "Significance," Newman, Padberg *Heilige*, Pelteret, Robertson, Smith, Stafford "Women," Swanton, Thompson, Trafford, Walker, Wareham, Wilcox, Williams, Wormald "Archbishop," and Wormald *Making*.]

Works from previous years included here are Faith, Snyder (reviewed by M.F.G.), Herbert, Coquillette, Gouttebroze, Oosthuizen, Roling, Semmler, Stanley, West, Wood (reviewed by B.O'B.). The editors gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Chris Snyder, who reviewed Cavill and Jackson, Grant, Reno, Stafford "Queens," and Ward-Perkins.]

Works not seen:

- Fenn, R. W. D. "The Character of Early Christianity in Radnorshire." *Trans. of the Radnorshire Soc.* 70: 15-46.
- Goodridge, Esther. *King Ælfred the Great*. Peacehaven, East Sussex: Protestants Today, 1999. 12 pp.
- Halpin, Patricia Alexandra. "The Religious Experience of Women in Anglo-Saxon England." Diss. Boston College. DAI 61A: 4898.
- Hill, Norman. "Hitchin's First King." *Hertfordshire Countryside* January 2000: 28-29, ill.
- Keynes, Simon. *Anglo-Saxon England: A Bibliographical Handbook for Students of Anglo-Saxon History*. Rvsd ed. ASNC Guides, Texts, and Stud. 1. Cambridge: Dept of Anglo-Saxon, Norse, and Celtic, U of Cambridge. [ii], 165 pp. + maps.
- Lapper, Ivan, and Christopher Gravett. *The Norman Conquest*. Landmarks in Hist. Oxford: Osprey. 47 pp. ill.
- Loyn, H.R. "The Vikings in Britain." *The Historian* 61 (1999): 21-22, ill. [bibliographic review]
- Maddison, John. *Ely Cathedral: Design and Meaning*. Ely: Ely Cathedral. viii, 152 pp. ill. ["Etheldreda and Anglo-Saxon Ely," 1-11]
- Senecal, Christine. "The Regional Aristocracies of Late Anglo-Saxon England." Diss. Boston College. DAI 60A: 3477.
- Stuckey, Douglas. *Alfred the Great 849-899*. Newton Toney, Salisbury: Wessex Books. 29 pp. ill.

Deferred until next year:

- Bailey, Keith. "Vendere potuit: 'He Could Sell', to Coin a Domesday Phrase." *Records of Buckinghamshire* 40 (1998-2000): 73-87.
- Bates, David. *Re-ordering the Past and Negotiating the Present in Stenton's 'First Century'*. Stenton Lecture 1999. Reading: U of Reading. 22 pp.
- Behr, Charlotte. "The Origins of Kingship in Medieval Kent." *Early Med. Europe* 9: 25-52, ill.
- Bullough, Donald A. "Die Kaiseridee zwischen Antike und Mittelalter." 799: *Kunst und Kultur der Karolingerzeit. Karl der Große und Papst Leo III. in Paderborn*. Ed. Christoph Stiegemann and Matthias Wemhoff. Mainz: Zabern, 1999. 36-46, ill.
- Campbell, James. "Britain: AD 500." *Hist. Today* February 2000: 29-35, ill.
- Corning, Caitlin. "The Baptism of Edwin, King of Northumbria: A New Analysis of the British Tradition." *Northern Hist.* 36: 5-15.
- Eales, Richard. "Politics and Society in Canterbury around 1000 A.D." *Vikings, Monks and the Millennium: Canterbury in about 1000 A.D.* Lectures Delivered to a Meeting of the Canterbury Archaeological Society on 30th March 2000. Canterbury. 1-13, ill.
- Heighway, Carolyn. "Britons and Saxons in Gloucestershire: Back to the Saxons." *Glevensis* 33: 5-6.
- Higham, N.J. "King Edwin of the Deiri: Rhetoric and the Reality of Power in Early England." *Early Deira: Archaeological Studies of the East Riding in the Fourth to Ninth Centuries*. Ed. Helen Geake and Jonathan Kenney, with preface by Martin Carver. Oxford and Oakville, CT: Oxbow. 41-49.
- Hill, David. "Offa versus the Welsh." *Brit. Archaeol.* 56: 18-23, ill.
- Jesch, Judith. "From Scandinavia to the Wirral." *Wirral and Its Viking Heritage*, ed. Cavill et al., 11-16.
- _____. "Scandinavian Wirral." *Wirral and Its Viking Heritage*, ed. Cavill et al., 1-10.
- Loseby, S.T. "Power and Towns in Late Roman Britain and Early Anglo-Saxon England." *Sedes regiae (ann. 400-800)*. Ed. Gisela Ripoll and Josep M. Gurt. Barcelona. 319-70, ill.
- Lowe, Christopher. *Angels, Fools and Tyrants: Britons and Saxons in Southern Scotland AD 450-750*. Edinburgh: Canongate, 1999. 64 pp. ill.
- Loyn, H. R. *Domesday Book Commemoration 10 Years Later*. Cardiff: Centre for the Study of Medieval Society and Culture, Cardiff U, 1998. [iv], 20 pp.
- Maddicott, J. R. "Two Frontier States: Northumbria and Wessex, c. 650-750." *The Medieval State*, ed. Maddicott and Palliser, 25-45.

- Meaney, Audrey. "The Practice of Medicine in England about the Year 1000." *Social Hist. of Medicine* 13: 221-37.
- Nelson, Janet L. "Power and Authority at the Court of Alfred." *Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes*, ed. Roberts and Nelson, 311-37.
- Padberg, Lutz E. von. "Missionare und Mönche auf dem Weg nach Rom und Monte Cassino im 8. Jahrhundert." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 111: 145-68.

- Sadler, D. John. "The Battle of Carham 1018." *Tyne and Tweed* 54: 26-35, ill.
- Sampson, Fay. *Runes on the Cross: The Story of Our Anglo-Saxon Heritage*. London: Triangle. x, 166 pp.
- Studd, Robin. "Recorded 'Waste' in the Staffordshire Domesday Entry." *Staffordshire Stud.* 12: 121-33.
- Thornhill, Philip. "St. Alban and the End of Roman Britain." *Mankind Quarterly* 41: 3-42, 147-55.

7. Names

In *Wirral and Its Viking Heritage* (Nottingham: EPNS), P. Cavill, S. Harding, J. Jesch and others tell the story of the Wirral Viking settlement from various foci. Two of the chapters are reviewed separately immediately below, but Chapter 1, "Scandinavian Wirral" by J. Jesch will be of particular interest to place-name scholars since it integrates history with place-name studies, particularly those done by G. Fellows-Jensen and M. Gelling. In "Major Place-Names of the Wirral: A Gazetteer" (125-47), P. Cavill, besides providing a gazetteer of all the major place-names of the Wirral with the early spelling, dates of sources, and meanings when possible, also provides a section on the sounds of Old English and Old Norse letters and a list of place-name elements in the names along with meanings. In "Locations and Legends" (108-24), S. Harding shows the impact of Scandinavian settlement in the Wirral with maps showing place-names in *carr* from ON *kjarr*, *holm(e)* from ON *holmr*, *intake* from ON *inntak*, *rake* from ON *rák* possibly reinforced by OE *hraca* and OE **racu* 'a hollow, the bed of a stream', and *by* from ON *býr*. Harding also discusses the use of the word *clint* in Cheshire to describe "projecting rocks, cliffs" from the Danish *klint* from ON *klettr*. The legends referred to in the title include the story of King Cnut ordering the waves on the Wirral to turn back and the water not to rise and one of the clints called *Thor's Stone* which is said to be the final resting place of the head of Thor's hammer, Mjöllnir.

Several other essays also have very broad foci. In "English Field-Names forms from Personal Names" (*Onomastik: Akten des 18. Internationalen Kongresses für Namenforschung, Trier, 12-17. April 1993, Band IV: Personennamen und Ortsnamen* [Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1999], 187-93), J. Field points out that field-names with personal names are often compounds with *feld*, *tye* (OE *teag*) in south-eastern England, *several*, *in-*

take, *assart* including the stages of creating an *asart*: *ryding* 'clearing (of trees)' and *brec* 'breaking' or plowing the new soil. The personal names associated with these elements may refer to owners or tenants of the land in question, but a few field-names are commemorative of scenes of battle or named for generals or admirals who fought in the hostilities such as *Monmouth Field* in Dorset or *Vincent Grove* named after Sir John Jervis who was given the title of Earl of St. Vincent in 1797. In "Tarleton and Related Problems" (135-36 in the same volume), J. Insley cautions against uncritical acceptance of place-name etymologies with personal names such as the first element in *Tarleton* in Lincolnshire from ON *Þaraldr* when it more likely comes from OE **tær-lād* 'stream, water-course at a cleft' or OE **tēar-lād* 'tear-stream'; on the other hand, *Warrington*, formerly in Lancashire but now in Cheshire, which has been posited as coming from OE **wæring*, **wering* 'weir, dam' actually is an *-ing* name with the sense of 'estate' associated with the personal name *Wēra*. Again in the same volume, in "Personal Name and Place Name Chronology" (329-30), J. Insley, despite the title, deals only with personal name chronology, but he does call for a comparative typology of both personal names and place-names formed from personal names. He does note that personal names in *-ing* such as *Dunning* became common only in late OE and that the element *God-* which was common in the personal names of the late Anglo-Saxon aristocracy became so only after 900, while elements like *Dryht-* and *Til-* were more common before that date. In "Personal Names in English Place-Names" (131-34), M. Gelling observes that over the first seventy years of the English Place-Name Society, there has been less of a tendency to identify qualifiers in compounds as unattested Old English monothematic personal names when topographical and animal names are possible sources. In those cases where the first element in the place-name is an Old English personal

name, it did not necessarily refer to the founder of the settlement since the Anglo-Saxons often infiltrated existing British settlements.

In "The Saints Come Marching In: Saints' Names in the Toponymy of Cornwall" (*Names* 48: 257-64), L. Ashley presents a somewhat rambling discussion of place-names in Cornwall derived from saints' names, which he says are better preserved there than in other parts of Britain. Ashley seems to find it ironic that Cornwall, which he describes as "dour Methodist country," would best preserve the names of Catholic saints in place-names. Besides some interesting stories, he does provide a list of sixty-five place-names in Cornwall from Cornish saints. T. James explores the history of the Trent Valley from Wychner to Great Wilne in "Place Names, Saints and the Saxon Landscape" (*East Midland Historian* 10: 23-30). The first half of the paper deals with settlements along the River Trent and the regular pattern of flooding which James attributes to meltwater from ice and snow from western Staffordshire coming into the River Trent and increasing where it meets the River Dove. However, the second half of the paper shows by the *-ton* and *-by* names that the valley was settled by both Saxons and Danes. Five family groups are reflected in this part of the valley: "Ecga's people" at *Egginton*; "Dunna's people" at *Castle Donington*; "Hemma's people" at *Hemington*; "Locc's people" at *Lockington*; and "Wifel's people" at *Willington*. James also identifies church dedications in the valley to St. Peter, St. Andrew, St. James, Mary (the mother of Jesus), St. Michael, and many other saints, but he then connects the awarding of trade fairs in medieval England and their dates to important feasts associated with the saints to which the local churches were dedicated.

In "Celtic Essex: A Reappraisal of Some Placename Evidence" (*Essex Jnl* 35: 19-22), J. Kemble acknowledges that most Celtic place-names failed to survive the Anglo-Saxon occupation of the British mainland but points out that many river names in Essex are Celtic in origin. However, he suggests that *Pant* was a generic term for "running water" and appears not only in the *River Pant* but also in *Pan Farm*, *Pantlings Lane*, *Pentlow*, and *Panfield*. Kemble also suggests that Celtic *corio* meaning "a trained fighting militia, and hence a rallying place" survives in *Dovercourt*, *Corringham*, and *Corringales*. Further, he proposes an alternative to *-magus* 'market' in favor of a Celtic word cognate with Welsh *magwyr* and Latin *maceria* and coming to mean "ancient walls, ruins" in *Caesaromagus*, the Romano-British name for Chelmsford.

In "Some Place-Name Distributions" (*Jnl of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 32: 53-72), V. Watts uses distribution maps extensively to show regional variations in toponymic usage in the three parts of England which Watts identifies as a central province of "open champagne country characterized by the classic great open field system bounded by two provinces of a more wooded character." He shows that place-names in *-wall*, *-will/-wool*, *-worthy*, and *-worthine/wardine* fall outside the central province as do names from certain other Old English place-name elements. M. Blake, in "Assessing the Evidence for the Earliest Anglo-Saxon Place-Names of Bedfordshire" (*Jnl of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 32: 5-20), concludes that the place-name elements used by the earliest Anglo-Saxon settlers in Bedfordshire included *hām*, *hamm*, *dūn* (along with *-inga -dūn*), *ēg*, and *burh* and perhaps *ford*, *burna*, *(ge)wæd*, and *feld*.

In "The Importance of Being Leofwine Horn" (*Words: Structure, Meaning, Function*, ed. Dalton-Puffer and Ritt, 7-17), J. Anderson and F. Colman continue the argument that "names lack lexical semantic content and show minimal grammatically relevant notional categorisation." While they make the case well that names do not necessarily reflect the semantic content that a homophonous noun would, their attempt to make semantic content of bynames go away is not very convincing. In "The Survival of Scandinavian Personal Names in Staffordshire Surnames" (*Staffordshire Stud.* 12: 1-16), E. Tooth includes a table of surnames derived from Scandinavian personal names in each of the five hundreds recorded in the 1666 Hearth Tax Returns and another table of the top ten surnames from personal names from all sources in the same Returns to show the relative survival of Scandinavian personal names in Staffordshire, which was divided almost equally by Watling Street into part of the Danelaw and part of the English territory by the Treaty of Wedmore. However, Tooth also provides specific examples and places for the occurrences of such surnames, and he identifies Staffordshire place-names that contain Scandinavian personal names from *Krökr*, *Brandr*, *Gunni*, etc.

In "Viking Age England as a Bilingual Society" (*Cultures in Contact*, ed. Hadley and Richards, 89-105), M. Townend suggests that, because Old English and Old Norse were "adequately intelligible" to speakers of each language, Viking Age England would be bilingual but made up primarily of monolingual speakers of two different languages. He raises questions of a sociolinguistic nature that need to be asked about the relationships between the "users of language in con-

tact" rather than focusing only upon the borrowing of an Old Norse word into English or the presence of an Old Norse element in a place-name. D. Tyson says, in "Place-Names in *Le Petit Bruit* by Rauf de Boun" (*N&Q* 47: 7–10), that the place-names in *Le Petit Bruit* may be of interest to scholars as an example of a late scribe copying material that is unfamiliar to him, but it remains to be seen how any of his specific place-name changes or substitutions would be relevant to scholarly study.

K. Bailey's "Buckinghamshire Parish Names" (*Records of Buckinghamshire* 40: 55–71) classifies the 201 parish names in Buckinghamshire into five groups: those with compounds of personal names and habitative elements, those with compounds of personal names and topographical elements, "group names" in which personal names are compounded with *-ingas*, those with non-personal qualifiers compounded with habitative elements, and those with non-personal qualifiers with topographical elements. After discussing them all thoroughly, Bailey ends with a three-page appendix listing each of the 201 parish names with its hundred, its first citation, the elements in it, and its meaning according to the five classifications made earlier. In "The Field-Names of Kingsbury (Middlesex)" (*Jnl of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 32: 41–46), W. Cunnington lists the field-names' earliest forms and Old English roots after the forms from the 1839 Tithe Apportionment of Kingsbury.

Several essays in this year's bibliography focus on particular place-name elements. In "Place-Name Evidence for Two Middle English Words" (*N&Q* 47: 6–7), C. Hough takes the editors of the *Middle English Dictionary* to task for not using recent onomastic studies in defining words beginning with <w> in the latest fascicle of the *MED*. Specifically, she objects to the discussion of *wāle* there not reflecting Cameron's demonstration that the OE *w(e)alh* in place-names refers to Britons rather than serfs and to the discussion of *wār-lōtes* there not reflecting Cameron's discussion of *warlot* as a "piece of land assessed to a specifically defined payment of geld." In "ON *Kill* in English Place-Names" (*SN* 72: 1–5), she suggests that the Old Norse place-name element *kill* occurring in the place-name *Kildale* in the North Riding of Yorkshire, in the parish-name *Kelham* in Nottinghamshire, and in *Lathkill* in Derbyshire comes about through the metaphorical transfer of the meaning of ON *kill* 'a wedge' to a topographical sense (as S. Fridell has shown occurring in the Swedish parish-name *Kila*). In "Place-Name Evidence for the History of Modern English *hut*" (*Neophil* 84: 627–28), she notes that the field-

name *Hutfall* in Derbyshire is first recorded in 1294 and while the *OED* does not record the occurrence of *hut* meaning "a dwelling of ruder or meaner construction ... than a house" until 1658, the *MED* has a citation with that meaning from around 1350. Therefore, the meaning of *hut* in *Hutfall* as well as in the Lancashire place-name *The Hutt* has a much longer history than Ekwall and Cameron knew.

In "Old English *merece* 'Wild Celery, Smallage' in Place-Names" (*Nomina* 23: 141–48), A. Cole, J. Cumber, and M. Gelling in three separately signed essays discuss the Old English place-name element *merece* in *Marchwood* in Hampshire, *Marcham* in Oxfordshire (formerly Berkshire), and *Marchington* in Staffordshire. Gelling points out that the phenomenon of wild celery growing in these places demonstrates the trustworthiness of place-names. In "Ersce: Distribution and Use of this Old English Place-Name Element" (*Jnl of Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 32: 27–39), A. Cole shows conclusively that the meaning of the place-name element OE *ersc* in southern England meant "ploughland" in areas where most of the land would be woodland, pasture, marsh, or moorland unsuitable for planning grain crops, and indeed the *ersc*-names refer to ploughed fields that were not terribly productive, either because of soil types or poor growing conditions.

In "Middle English *beck* in the Midlands: the Place-Name Evidence" (*Words: Structure, Meaning, Function*, ed. Dalton-Puffer and Ritt, 87–91), J. Fisiak examines the distribution of ON *bekkr* in place-names and by-names in the southern part of the Danelaw from *Doomsday* to 1500, with the greatest concentrations being in Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, and Derbyshire. He concludes that the southern boundary of Middle English *bec* has receded northward during the Modern English period. G. Fellows-Jensen concludes, in "Old English *sōcn* 'soke' and the Parish in Scandinavia" (*Namn och Bygd* 88: 89–106), that cognates OE *sōcn*, Old Danish and Swedish *sokr*, and Old Norwegian *sókr* may have developed separate meanings on their own or they may have influenced their cognates' meanings. For example, OE *sōcn* may have developed the meaning of 'territorial lordship' rather than 'seeking' in the Danelaw in the tenth century among Danish settlers and spread from there to other parts of England. Fellows-Jensen also thinks that the meaning 'parish' for the Scandinavian cognates probably developed there but may have been influenced by familiarity with English parishes whose boundaries seemed to reflect those of the soke and where tithes were paid to the church of the soke as

territorial dues. In "The West Sussex Topographical Toponym and Its Landscape Significance" (*West Sussex Hist.* 65: 22–32), A. Brook discusses possible origins of the place-name element *rife*, which is used now to describe "sluggish, slow-moving waterways wandering across a wide, gently-sloping, low-relief plain" and is unique to the West Sussex Coastal Plain, but he comes to no conclusion.

There are many articles this year dealing with individual place-names. In "A Lost Swaledale Vaccary and a Palimpsest of Place-Names" (*Northern Hist.* 36: 159–62), A. Fleming argues that the two vaccaries "in Grinton township," Swaledale in the North Riding of Yorkshire mentioned by J. McDonnell in "Upland Pennine hamlets" (*Northern Hist.* 26: 20–39) and identified as *Frithloc* which he said was lost and *Whallesheved* which he identified as Dyke House need further examination. Fleming suggests that *Whallesheved* went through alternative names for some time and is now known as *Low Whita* and that the missing *Frithloc* vaccary was west of *Whallesheved* but east of the next documented vaccary, *Crackpot*. He also suggests that *Frithloc* meaning 'enclosure in a wood' fits the area of *Hollins Farm* or perhaps *Feetham Holme*. In "Plardiwick" (*Jnl of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 32: 21–22), R. Coates proposes that the element before *wic* in *Plardiwick* in Staffordshire is a compound **Plegrādas* or *-*rādenn* from OE *plega* 'play' and *rādenn* with the specialized meaning of 'right' and thus means "a place where a right to conduct games exists." In "The Sinodun Hills, Little Wittenham, Berkshire" (*Jnl of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 32: 23–25), he speculates that the name *Sinodun*, although probably a scholarly creation (since Oxford is only nine miles away), derives from Latin *sinus* 'bosom' since the hills are "twin peaks" but nevertheless represents the true English name of the hills.

C. Hough has a large number of articles dealing with individual place-names. In "The Place-Name Cabus (Lancashire)" (*N&Q* 47: 288–91), she rejects A. Breeze's derivation of *Cabus* from a Celtic term meaning 'ferry boats' and argues that the first element is OE *cæg* 'stone' and that *Cabus* means 'stony hillocks' from an OE **cæg-ball*. In "Sinkfall in Lancashire" (*N&Q* 47: 168–69), she suggests that the first element of *Sinkfall* in Lancashire as well as in other names means "a pit for sewage, cesspool." She observes in "The Field-Name *Flagdales*" (*N&Q* 47: 291–92) that plant nomenclature is well evidenced in toponyms and particularly in field-names as shown in *Flagdales* in the *Thurgarten Cartulary* from the fourteenth century referring to a meadow in Nottinghamshire and coming from ME

flagge 'the flag-iris; a reed or rush' even though plant names may be underrepresented in literary works. In "Carolside in Berwickshire and *Carelholpit* in Lincolnshire" (*Nomina* 23: 79–86), she proposes that the first element in both names in the title should be from an OE **carel*, an animal name for which she finds no cognates in other Indo-European languages. However, in "The Field-Name *Felterrode*" (*Jnl of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 32: 47–49), she argues persuasively that the first element of the lost field-name *Felterrode* in the West Riding of Yorkshire should be OE *feltere* 'centaury', a plant, rather than an OE antecedent of ME *feltere* 'felt-maker'. In "The Place-Name *Pitchcombe*" (*Jnl of the Eng. Place-Name Soc.* 32: 50–52), she suggests that the first element in the parish-name *Pitchcombe* in Gloucestershire comes from an unrecorded OE **piccen* attested in Middle English as *picchen* meaning "descend precipitously" so that *Pitchcombe* would derive from an OE **piccen-cumb* 'valley with sloping sides'. In "The Trumpeters of Bemersyde: A Scottish Place-name Reconsidered" (*Names* 47: 257–68), she presents a convincing argument that the first element in *Bemersyde* in Berwickshire from OE *bēmere* 'trumpeter' comes from the transference of the word to refer to a bird with a trumpet-like call, possibly the bittern which was indigenous to the area during medieval times. Thus, the name *Bemersyde* might best be interpreted to mean "hillside frequented by the bittern."

In "*Flooker's Brook* Again" (*N&Q* 47: 169–71), J. Inley rebuts C. Hough's suggestion that Dodgson's etymology for the Chesham stream-name was wrong when he said it meant "fluke-catcher" and that *Flooker* should come from an unrecorded ME **flokere* 'shepherd' rather than an unrecorded OE **flōcere* by using earlier spellings and phonological arguments.

A. Breeze has three articles this year on individual place-names. In "The Name of Doultling" (*Somerset and Dorset Notes & Queries* 34: 349–52), he proposes that the first element in *Doultling* in Somerset is a British element represented by medieval Welsh *dylad* 'flood, deluge' although there is evidence that the word was also a Welsh name-element for beautiful women. In "The Name of Cad Green, Ilton" (*Somerset and Dorset Notes & Queries* 34: 355–56) he argues that *Cad* in *Cad Green* (first recorded in 725 as *Caducburne*) comes from *Caduc*, a Celtic name meaning 'mist' and related to Welsh *caddug* 'mist, fog, murkiness, gloom, dimness, darkness' (also 'covering, armour, coat of mail'). In "The Name of Trunch, near North Walsham" (*Norfolk Archaeol.* 43: 483–84), he rejects both Ekwall's suggestion that the name of this village in northeast Suffolk might be connected to the

French monastery of Le Tronchet and his suggestion that it might be from Celtic form related Welsh *trwyn* 'nose, headland, promontory.' Breeze proposes instead that *Trunch* comes from a British form giving Welsh *drum*, *trum* 'back; upland' on both phonological and topographical grounds.

G. Kristensson also has three essays this year on individual place-names. In "The Hundred-Name Desborough" (*N&Q* 47: 402-03), Kristensson derives the name *Desborough* from an OE **dystels* meaning 'something thrown (up)' and OE *beorg* so that OE **dystels-beorg* would mean "hill with (or consisting of) a mound or earth work," which is what Desborough Castle was. In "The Place-Name Owermoigne (Dorset)," (*N&Q* 47: 5-6), Kristensson proposes a compound of OE *ōga* 'terror' and OE *ōra* 'ridge', resulting in **ōgōra* meaning "terror ridge," as the first element of the place-name *Owermoigne* whereas the second element is that of the Moigne family which held the property beginning in the thirteenth century. In "The Place-Name Yarnfield (Wiltshire)" (*N&Q* 47: 4-5), Kristensson proposes that the first element is *Yarnfield* in Wiltshire but formerly in Somerset comes from OE *yearn* 'yarn', but its Proto-Germanic meaning was "guts" which seems to have been extended metaphorically as a topographical term meaning "something extended in length" or "something long and narrow."

In "*Cerne, Cirencester, Diss*: Die mittelalterliche Schreibung <ch> und der anglofranzösische Einfluss auf die phonologische Entwicklung englischer Ortsnamen" (*BN* 35: 171-223), K. Dietz shows that /č/ being replaced by /s/ in English place-names like *Cerne*, *Cirencester*, and *Diss* was not the result of a sound change but of a spelling pronunciation because both <ch> and <c> were used in Anglo-French for /č/ but <c> also was used for /s/.

D. Parsons and T. Styles, in *The Vocabulary of English Place-Names (Brace-Cæster)* (Nottingham: U of Nottingham), present the second volume of this continuing project. The only changes in format from the first volume, *Á-Box*, are that they now indicate, when a term is combined with a personal name, whether that personal name is monothematic or dithematic and that they now identify the language from which it came.

J.D.C.

Work not seen

Reid, Bill. "A Post-Roman Frontier in the Stroud Valley? The Evidence from Place-names." *Glevensis* 33: 9-16.

8. Archaeology, Numismatics, Sculpture

Reviewing of works in this section will resume with *YWOES* 2001.

How to reach the Old English Newsletter

For all business correspondence, including publication information, subscriptions, back orders, *Subsidia* information, or to notify *OEN* of a change of address, please contact:

Publisher, *Old English Newsletter*
Medieval Institute
Western Michigan University
1903 W. Michigan Avenue
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-3801
phone: 269-387-8832 / fax: 269-387-8750
e-mail: mdvl_news@wmich.edu
website: <http://www.wmich.edu/medieval/research/oen/index.html>

As of volume 37, the editorial operations of *OEN* have moved to the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. All correspondence regarding the editing of *OEN*, including submissions, should be sent to:

R. M. Liuzza
Editor, *Old English Newsletter*
Department of English, University of Tennessee
301 McClung Tower
Knoxville TN 37996-0430
phone: 865-974-6970 / fax: 865-974-6926
e-mail: rliuzza@utk.edu

Communications about the *Year's Work in Old English Studies* should be sent to the *YWOES* editor:

Daniel Donoghue
Department of English
Barker Center, Harvard University
Cambridge MA 02138
phone: 617-495-2505 / fax 617 496-8737
email dgd@wjh.harvard.edu

Communications about the *Old English Bibliography*, including citations and offprints, should be sent to:

Thomas N. Hall
Department of English (M/C 162)
University of Illinois at Chicago
601 S. Morgan Street
Chicago, IL 60607-7120
e-mail: tomhall@uic.edu

To submit abstracts of papers given at conferences for the annual appendix in the spring issue write to:

Robert M. Butler
Dept. of English and Foreign Languages
1000 ASU Drive #120
Alcorn State University
Alcorn State, MS 39096-7500
phone: 601-877-6401
email: rmbutler@lorman.alcorn.edu

Send *Research in Progress* information (current research, work completed, and forthcoming publications) to:

Heide Estes
Department of English
Monmouth University
West Long Branch, NJ 07764
fax: 732-263-5242
email: hestes@monmouth.edu

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER
MEDIEVAL INSTITUTE
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
1903 W. MICHIGAN AVE.
KALAMAZOO, MI 49008-5432

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT 478
KALAMAZOO, MI