OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER

Editor: R.M. Liuzza

Associate Editors: Daniel Donoghue
Thomas Hall

Subscriptions: The rate for institutions is $20 US per volume, current and past volumes, except for volumes 1 and 2, which are sold as one. The rate for individuals is $15 US per volume, 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 referreed 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.

The Year's Work in Old English Studies
2002

Frances Altvater	*University of Hartford*
Elizabeth Coatsworth	*Manchester Metropolitan University*
John David Cormican	*Utica College*
Craig R. Davis	*Smith College*
Nicole Guenther Discenza	*University of South Florida*
Genevieve Fisher	*Peabody Museum, Harvard University*
Mary Frances Giandrea	*George Mason University*
Kurt Gustav Goblirsch	*University of South Carolina*
David F. Johnson	*Florida State University*
Richard F. Johnson	*William Rainey Harper College*
Eileen A. Joy	*Coastal Carolina University*
Stefan Jurasinksi	*SUNY-Brockport*
Aaron Kleist	*Biola University*
Joseph P. McGowan	*University of San Diego*
Haruko Momma	*New York University*
Elisabeth Oliver	*Louisiana State University*
David W. Porter	*Southern University*
Mary K. Ramsey	*Georgia State University*
Elizabeth Rowe	*Somerville, MA*
Phillip G. Rusche	*University of Nevada, Las Vegas*
M. Jane Toswell	*University of Western Ontario*
Benjamin C. Withers	*Indiana University, South Bend*

Edited by

Daniel Donoghue	*Harvard University*
R. M. Liuzza	*University of Tennessee, Knoxville*

Contents

Preface

The annual compilations of the *Old English Bibliography* and *The Year's Work in Old English Studies* have grown in size in recent years, as even a casual comparison of page tallies will reveal. The *Bibliography* for 1992 filled up seventeen double-column pages (excluding book reviews); for 2002 it took twenty-nine pages, which is an increase of almost 60%. The size of *YWOES* over the same ten years has expanded at a similar rate. Surely this growth is a sign of vitality, especially in light of the ever-expanding number of countries represented in the two publications. In 2002, for example, there was an unprecedented number of studies from Russia in addition to the now-expected array from various non-Anglophone countries, some of which have been contributing, of course, since the earliest days of Anglo-Saxon studies. Recent years have also seen the publication of more reference tools, and if an editor's impression counts for anything there seems to be a jump in the number of festschriften and other kinds of collections.

While these increases have been a positive gain for the field in many ways, they have added to the workload for the contributors to *YWOES*. The editors would like to thank them, as always, for their professionalism in undertaking and finishing up such a daunting task—a task that begins anew as soon as one year's work is finished. To keep up with the expanding workload and to make up more of the gap between the year reviewed (2002 here) and the year of publication (2006), we have added more reviewers to the staff, whose names appear on the title page.

The turnover for this issue was not as great as for some others in recent years. We bid *au revoir* to Paul Kershaw from the History section and welcome in his place Stefan Jurasinski of SUNY College at Brockport. To the archaeology section we welcome Frances Altvater, who was at the College of William and Mary when she wrote her contribution but has since moved on to the University of Hartford. We are especially pleased that with the addition of Fran the Archaeology section is in such capable hands now, with three contributors. Unfortunately and through no fault of the current team, the items "Deferred until next year" in last year's Archaeology section will remain deferred indefinitely because of a previous contributor's inability to follow through.

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 on *The Year's Work in Old English Studies*, 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.

Readers may be interested to know that a searchable database containing the annual *OEN* Bibliographies from 1973 through 2002 is now available online at http://www.oenewsletter.org/OENDB/. More than 17,000 entries from the past thirty years of the *Bibliography* can now be browsed by subject heading, or searched by almost any combination of criteria such as author's name, title, journal, date of publication, language, type of item, keywords, and so on. Search results may be saved, printed, or emailed. Use of the database is free, but registration is required for access; please see the website itself for more information. Comments and suggestions regarding the *OEN Bibliography* database should be sent to editor@oenewsletter.org.

YWOES is set in Adobe's Minion Pro Medium 10/12, with headings in Myriad Pro 14/18 and special characters drawn from the Unicode font Gentium. It is produced on a Macintosh PowerBook G4 using Adobe InDesign CS2.

1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects

a. Language and Linguistics

In *Anglo-Saxon Audiences* Eugene Green grapples with the relation of Old English texts to their immediate audiences by applying modern semantic theory and rhetorical analysis to a select body of Old English texts (Berkeley Insights in Linguistics and Semiotics 44 [New York: Peter Lang, 2001]). Green's semiotic approach in chapter two, "Anglo-Saxon Royal Codes and Audiences," explores the extent to which the laws from Alfred to Cnut reflect a conscious rhetorical strategy designed to instill compliance and allegiance to royal authority. In chapter three, "Homiletic Speech Acts and Inculcation," Green applies the same approach to another body of admonitory texts designed to establish habits of devotional compliance and allegiance to ecclesiastical authority. Chapter four, "The Exploration of Mind in *Beowulf*," pursues three strategies for entering the "minds" of Anglo-Saxon audiences: a study of the poet's diction, an analysis of the flyting as a debate paradigm, and an examination of the poet's specultions about the "minds" of the monsters and the divine in the poem. Green extends this approach in chapter five, "Poems for Audiences in Crisis," to *The Battle of Maldon*, *Deor*, *The Seafarer*, and *The Wanderer*. Green's richly complex study of Old English texts as discursive acts yields a deeper understanding of Anglo-Saxon habits of mind.

Two essays commemorate the successful completion of the *Middle English Dictionary* (MED). Jane Roberts celebrates a new era of lexicographic cross-fertilization with "Some Thoughts on the Representation of Early Middle English in the Historical Thesaurus of English" (*Dictionaries* 23: 180–207). After a brief history of the genesis and development of the *Historical Thesaurus of English* (HTE) project, Roberts illustrates the organizational principles of HTE using the entries under the concept of 'peace'. A lexical-cartographer, Roberts charts the use, disuse, and transformation of words for 'peace' from Old English to Middle English through a comparison of entries in the *Thesaurus of Old English* (TOE), the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED), HTE, and MED. In so doing, she deftly demonstrates the immense value of these projects for anyone interested in any aspect of the recorded history of the English language. Marking the same occasion in the same journal, Antonette diPaolo Healey discusses another monumental lexicographic enterprise, the *Dictionary of Old English* (DOE) in "The Dictionary of Old English: From Manuscripts to Megabytes" (*Dictionaries* 23: 156–79). Healey's essay surveys the various forms in which the work of the DOE project is available (the DOE Corpus on the World-Wide Web, the DOE Corpus on CD-ROM, and the first seven letters of the DOE on CD-ROM) and cites concrete examples of just how each of these formats may be searched.

b. Teaching Old English Texts

John William Houghton reflects on his experience teaching an elective English class on medieval literature at the high school level in "'Twice-Told Tales': Teaching Medievalisms to High School Seniors" (*SMART* 9.2: 15–34). While it may seem at first blush that there is little for the college instructor to glean from this essay, it has much to teach us about the appropriation of medieval culture in the modern era. After all, there is but a summer of idle fancy separating the high school senior from the college freshman. The central questions of Houghton's class, aptly called "Twice-Told Tales," are outlined in his syllabus: "Why does a modern writer reuse a medieval story? What advantage does the modern writer gain by doing so? How does the modern writer change the medieval story in the process of retelling it?" (16). Reading assignments are organized around the juxtaposition of particular texts in four subject areas: Arthur, the Anglo-Saxons, Becket, and Henry V. Although the texts are largely what you might imagine them to be (e.g., White's *The Once and Future King* and Malory's *Le Morte d'Arthur*; *Beowulf* and John Gardner's *Grendel*), some of his selections reflect an idiosyncratic and nuanced perspective on the invocation of the medieval in the modern, such as Arlo Guthrie's "Alice's Restaurant Massacree," and Terry Gilliam's 1991 film *The Fisher King*. Houghton's essay reminds us that there are creative ways to make the Middle Ages come alive for our students without sacrificing rigor for the sake of enrollment.

In "Making Students do the Teaching: Problems of 'Brit Lit Survey I,'" Gregory Roper offers an intriguing alternative approach to teaching that staple of English department curricula, the early British Lit survey course (*SMART* 9.1: 39–57). Roper succinctly summarizes the inherent dilemmas faced by anyone assigned to teach such a course by invoking the allegorical figures of "Too Long," "Too Much," "Too Fast," and "Too Complex." Roper divides the class into six groups and assigns each group a period: Anglo-Saxon, Late Medieval, Sixteenth Century, Seventeenth Century (pre-Restoration), Restoration, and Eighteenth Century. For the first month of the course, students read the

assigned works in their periods, develop research questions about them, research possible answers, and create a study guide for the students in the other groups. Roper oversees much of this work, guiding, prodding, pointing the groups in the direction of critical and interpretive analysis of the texts. After this initial phase, the groups rotate among themselves, sharing introductory material and contextual information on the texts. A more intense period of study begins after this introductory phase during which the groups share the fruits of their own research labors and exchange the Study Guides. Roper also sets up an e-mail discussion forum so that discussion can continue outside of class. Since it is impossible to preserve a chronological approach to the texts through this method, Roper provides coherence through a series of lectures during the final two weeks of the semester. The brilliance of Roper's suggestion is that it intuitively embraces recent developments in cognitive science concerning student learning styles. Despite its stranglehold on our thinking, the prevailing notion that tailoring subject content to a student's best learning modality (visual, auditory, or kinesthetic) will improve his educational achievement is not supported by recent research. Instead, the research seems to indicate that most subject-content calls for presentation in more than one modality. Ultimately, the modality of instruction is more important than the students' modalities of learning. Roper's approach, having groups of students research, collect, and present a wide range of materials relating to the central texts of the course, requires students to participate in a variety of instructional and learning modalities, and it has the obvious benefit of challenging student expectations as consumers of education.

c. Research Resources, Print and Electronic

Emile Amt has produced an extremely useful anthology of primary sources from early English history in *Medieval England, 1000-1500: A Reader* (Readings in Medieval Civilizations and Cultures 6 [Orchard Park, NY: Broadview, 2001]). With eighty-five documents covering five centuries of English history, Amt's aim is "to convey some of the wonderful variety found in the written record and to supply pieces that will complement the textbooks and monographs that history students are likely to be reading in their courses" (ix). Chapter One, "The Eleventh Century," will be of particular interest to those of us who regularly teach courses which of necessity require some consideration of early English history and its sources. Chapter one includes, among other texts, translations of Ælfric's *Colloquy*, the Laws of Cnut, Wulfstan's *Laws for Northumbrian Priests*, a transcription of the text of the Bayeux Tapestry, and Lanfranc's *Constitutions*.

Another useful reference work is Jana K. Schulman's *The Rise of the Medieval World 500-1300: A Biographical Dictionary* (The Great Cultural Eras of the Western World [Westport, CT: Greenwood]), which includes numerous entries on Anglo-Saxon figures.

The year 2002 saw the publication of a "stand-alone" version of the *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici* database, developed by David Miles in collaboration with Rohini Jayatilaka and Malcolm Godden (*Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: A Register of Written Sources Used by Anglo-Saxon Authors*, CD-ROM Version 1.1. [Oxford: Fontes Anglo-Saxonici Project]). The database is available both as a CD-ROM by request directly from the project or as a free download through the Fontes project website (http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk). In "The Fontes Anglo-Saxonici Database: The Stand-Alone Version" (*OEN* 36.1: 17–23) the project director Malcolm Godden and database editor Rohini Jayatilaka offer a cogent rationale for the publication and distribution of a stand-alone CD-ROM version of the Fontes database, describes the stand-alone version and highlight new features such as the "Author Reference Summaries" page.

Matthew Heintzelman, Associate Director of the Hill Monastic Manuscript Library (HMML), housed at Saint John's University in Collegeville, Minnesota, invites Anglo-Saxon scholars to explore its microfilm holdings in his descriptive essay, "English Resources at the Hill Monastic Manuscript Library" (*OEN* 36.1: 24–31). After a brief overview of HMML's genesis, mission, and scope, Heintzelman provides a detailed account of how one might search the electronic manuscript catalog, which includes nearly all of the manuscripts filmed by HMML since 1965 (some 78,000 manuscripts). Heintzelman concludes his essay with a two-part list of holdings which will be of particular interest to Anglo-Saxonists. The first part includes English locations at which HMML has microfilmed manuscripts, including Durham Cathedral; Durham University; St. Hugh's Charterhouse, Parkminster; Ushaw College Library (St. Cuthbert's); and Syon Abbey, South Brent, Devon. Printouts and copies of many of the manuscripts on this list are available through the library. The second list describes purchased sets of English microfilms from several colleges at Cambridge University; Christ Church Cathedral, Canterbury; Lambeth Palace, London, and others. For reasons of copyright, printouts and copies of manuscripts from these purchased sets are not avaiable through HMML, but scholars working on-site in the library have access to all manuscript collections on microfilm.

In "Circolwyrde 2002: New Electronic Resources for Anglo-Saxon Studies" (*OEN* 36.1: 11–16), Martin K. Foys

provides an updated summary and review of new electronic resources on the internet or in the marketplace.

d. Bayeux Tapestry and the Conquest

With his digital edition of the Bayeux Tapestry, Martin Foys has revolutionized the field of Tapestry criticism by exploding the "discursive limits of the printed page" and providing the "reader" with a seamless, scrollable, and annotated reproduction of the textile. In "Hypertextile Scholarship: Digitally Editing the Bayeux Tapestry" (*Documentary Editing* 23 [2001]: 34–43), Foys outlines the theoretical premises which guided him in the construction of his digital edition of the Tapestry. The fluid elegance of Foys's presentation of the Tapestry affords the viewer unlimited interpretative pathways into the material object and its historical context. Indeed, as Foys points out, the hypermedia edition "recaptures, if only by analogy, a sense that the Tapestry itself was a multimedia document in which meaning was found through a shifting collusion of space, location, image, text, border, and perhaps even sound" (42).

In "Harold in Normandy: History and Romance" (*Studies in Medievalism* 12: 79–112) Carl I. Hammer examines six historical novels which take as their subject some aspect of the "fatal tale of William and Harald" (79). With the object of studying the use of historical sources by the novelists, Hammer creates two "matrices" that catalog comparable information on Harold's journey to Normandy: Matrix 1 presents information on the journey culled from selected early sources, and Matrix 2 depicts the treatment of this same episode by each of Hammer's six novelists. Since the tale of Harold's journey comprises a number of episodes, Hammer concentrates on "the background and the immediate initiative for Harold's journey" (89) as they are represented in both the historical sources and the novels. In the end, Hammer is disappointed with the novelists: "When they are not absurd, they are rather timid and conventional for my tastes" (93). Despite this criticism, Hammer comments that until a new novel about William and Harold using the excellent historical sources now available is written, "Hope Muntz's *The Golden Warrior* deserves to be read widely both for historical instruction and for pure pleasure" (93).

e. Anglo-Saxon Spirituality

Two books this year attempt to illustrate the robust honesty of Anglo-Saxon spirituality. Paul Cavill's *A Treasury of Anglo-Saxon England: Faith and Wisdom in the Lives of Men and Women, Saints and Kings* (London: HarperCollins, 2001) begins with three chapters on daily life in Anglo-Saxon England, which cull examples from Old English literature of how people thought about their lives, their families, and their world. The remainder of the book focuses on the spiritual lives of Anglo-Saxons, particularly those of monks, nuns, saints, and martyrs. There are also chapters on Bede, St. Cuthbert, and Ælfric and Wulfstan. At the end of each chapter, Cavill fleshes out his sketch with a translation of a prayer or a hymn followed by some commentary. While slight on scholarship, Cavill's book provides the reader, particularly the non-specialist, with a glimpse of the faith practiced by Anglo-Saxons. In *Christ the Golden-Blossom: A Treasury of Anglo-Saxon Prayer* (New York: Paulist, 2001), Douglas Dales sets out to answer a seemingly simple question: "How did English-speaking Christians pray a thousand years ago?" (1). His answer is an anthology of selections from Old English prayers, saints' lives, and homilies, many of which are translated here for the first time, from the Nunnaminster Codex, the Canterbury Benedictional, and the Portiforium of St. Wulfstan, and other sources. In his introduction, Dales provides a brief overview of Anglo-Saxon history and theology. The first section of the book comprises readings from the Temporale, the second from the Sanctorale, revolving mostly around the feasts of native Anglo-Saxon saints. The book closes with a section entitled "Peregrinatio: A Pilgrim's Guide to Sites of the Anglo-Saxon Church," which is an alphabetical list of locations of significance to the history of the Anglo-Saxon church. Dales's delightful volume is slight enough to be used for private devotion and slender enough to be carried on pilgrimage.

f. Essay Collections

Elaine Treharne and Greg Walker offer six excellent essays that apply a range of approaches and methodologies to a variety of medieval genres in *Writing Gender and Genre in Medieval Literature: Approaches to Old and Middle English Texts* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer). Each essay explores the ways in which literary genres conditioned notions of identity in individual texts. Hugh Magennis ("Gender and Heroism in the Old English *Judith*") examines the representation of the biblical heroine Judith in the Old English poem and the extent to which she disrupts the traditional gender expectations of the heroic genre, and Mary Swan ("Remembering Veronica in Anglo-Saxon England") uncovers evidence that devotion to St. Veronica and her brand of affective piety may have deeper roots in Anglo-Saxon England than previously thought. Both essays are reviewed elsewhere in *YWOES* 2002.

Timothy S. Jones and David S. Sprunger have edited a collection of essays, *Marvels, Monsters, and Miracles: Studies in*

Medieval and Early Modern Imaginations (Studies in Medieval Cutlure 42 [Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publ.]), which explores the responses of medieval and early modern people to the experience of the marvelous and the monstrous. A tribute to John Block Friedman and his scholarship (especially his book *Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought*), these essays explore representations of marvels and of monsters in a wide variety of contexts and examine their impact on the formation of ethnic, class, religious, and gender identities in the literature of the medieval and early modern eras. The essays focusing primarily on Anglo-Saxon subjects are reviewed elsewhere in *YWOES* 2002: these include Greta Austin's "Marvelous Peoples or Marvelous Races: Race and the Anglo-Saxon *Wonders of the East*"; Thomas Hall's "The Miracle of the Lengthened Beam in Apocryphal and Hagiographic Tradition"; and Joyce Tally Lionarons's "From Monster to Martyr: The Old English Legend of Saint Christopher."

In *Authors, Heroes and Lovers: Essays on Medieval English Literature and Language* (Sammlung/Collection Variations 2 [Bern: Peter Lang, 2001]), Thomas Honegger edits a collection of papers from the first two *Studientage zum englischen Mittelalter* held at Potsdam in 1999 and 2000. The collection of eight essays is preceded by a foreword by H.L.C. Tristram and introduction by Andreas Fischer, which offer an overview of medieval studies at universities in Germany and Switzerland. The essays themselves cover a range of topics from narratology, metrics, philology and etymology, and manuscript studies. Four of the essays are reviewed elsewhere in *YWOES* 2002.

A conference held at the Italian Center for the Study of the High Middle Ages in Spoleto from 19–24 April, 2001 has produced a two-volume collection of essays on the varying perspectives of Rome from east to west (*Roma fra oriente e occidente*, 2 vols. [Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro]). Essays of note to Anglo-Saxonists include Michael Lapidge's "Byzantium, Rome and England in the early Middle Ages," David Ganz's "Roman Manuscripts in Francia and Anglo-Saxon England," and Nicholas Brooks's "Canterbury and Rome: the limits and myth of romanitas" Both Lapidge and Ganz's essays are reviewed elsewhere in this volume.

Próinséas Ní Chatháin and Michael Richter have edited the proceedings of the fifth International Colloquium on Ireland and Europe in the early Middle Ages (*Ireland and Europe in the early Middle Ages: Texts and Transmissions* [Dublin: Four Courts]). The conference was held at Konstanz University on 16–20 March 1998, and the majority of the papers focused on the theme of texts and transmissions.

The proceedings volume comprises some twenty-six essays organized into seven sections: Contexts, Texts, Biblica, Manuscripts, Laws, Monastica, and Literature.

Erik Kooper has edited a collection of essays drawn from a conference on the medieval chronicle in which over a hundred papers were presented. The result, *The Medieval Chronicle II: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle Driebergen/Utrecht 16–21 July 1999* (Costerius n.s. 144 [Amsterdam: Rodopi]), includes twenty-one excellent contributions on the subject. The conference itself focused on four themes: chronicles as history and/or literature; the function of medieval chronicles; the reconstruction of the past in chronicles; and the use of text and image in chronicles. David Dumville's opening essay "What is a chronicle?" also the keynote address for the conference, attempts to answer his own question by surveying the multitude of terms used to describe the variety of historical writings which fall under the rubric "chronicle" from classical Antiquity through the Middle Ages. Anglo-Saxonists will find Jennifer Neville's essay, "Making their own Sweet Time: The Scribes of *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* A," of interest. Both Dumville and Neville's essays are reviewed in section 4c. below.

g. Tolkien

Three essays on Tolkien this year warrant a subheading dedicated to the Oxford scholar and his work. In "J.R.R. Tolkien and the OED" (*English Today* 18 [October 2002]: 53-54), Peter Gulliver, associate editor of the *Dictionary*, remarks that Tolkien's career was bookended by stints working on the *Oxford English Dictionary*. Between 1919 and 1920, at the beginning of his career, Tolkien worked as an assistant to Henry Bradley, second editor of the First Edition of the OED. During this period, Tolkien researched words at the beginning of the letter *W*, and Gulliver examines Tolkien's notes on the words *waggle*, *walrus*, *walnut*, *wampum*, *waistcoat*, *wake*, *wan*, and *want*. In 1969, long after he had established a name for himself as an Anglo-Saxonist, philologist, and creative writer, Tolkien again became involved with the OED. This time he was asked to provide a definition for a word of his own creation, *hobbit*. Tolkien's definition was, of course, adopted almost exactly as he had written it: "In the tales of J.R.R. Tolkien (1892-1973): one of an imaginary people, a small variety of the human race, that gave themselves this name (meaning 'hole-dweller') but were called by others *halflings*, since they were half the height of normal men" (54). Gulliver points out that many other "Middle-Earth coinages," such as *mathom*, *orc*, *mithril*, have found their way into subsequent editions of the OED, and that more will certainly follow (an entry for *orcish* has been

prepared, and examples of the word *balrog* have already been collected).

Edward Pettit explores the likelihood that Tolkien may have used an Old English charm in his imaginative fiction of Middle Earth ("J.R.R. Tolkien's use of an Old English charm," *Mallorn: The Jnl of the Tolkien Soc.* 40: 39–44). The charm Pettit believes Tolkien may have used is against a sudden pain, which includes a prose recipe for a remedy, incantatory verses, and a final declarative line of prose, found in the *Lacnunga* collection of medical texts. Pettit provides his own idiosyncratic translation and argues that the charm likely informed Tolkien's representation of the Black Riders and their attack on Weathertop, and Elrond's several cures of Frodo (40). Pettit's argument is largely persuasive, although, as he readily admits, instances of literary inspiration are of course notoriously difficult to prove.

In a charming little piece, "Wrong about almost everything: Editing J.R.R. Tolkien," (*Medieval Academy News* 142: 12), Michael Drout describes the "saga" of his project to edit an unpublished manuscript by J.R.R. Tolkien which fleshes out the scholar's thinking on the poem *Beowulf* and which, according to Drout, served as a quarry for his seminal statement on the subject, "*Beowulf*: The Monster and the Critics." In the end, Drout is pleased with the project and is working on an edition of Tolkien's unpublished translation of *Beowulf* with his commentaries on the poem.

h. Varia

In *The Real Middle-Earth: Magic and Mystery in the Dark Ages* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson), Brian Bates channels his early mentors, the scholar of Zen Buddhism Alan Watts and the psychiatrist R.D. Laing, to uncover what he calls "the magical world inhabited by people in the first millennium (AD 0-1000)" (4). While only a magician could conjure up the year A.D. 0, Bates musters a body of "historical, literary, psychological and archaeological research" to reveal the customs and beliefs of the people who inhabited "the Real Middle-earth" (5). The twenty-one chapters of the book are organized into seven sections: "Rediscovering the Real Middle-Earth"; "The Doom of Dragons"; "The Enchanted Earth"; "Magical Beasts"; "Wizards of Wyrd"; "Dwarves, Giants and Monsters"; and "Voyage to the Otherworld."

In "London Bridge and the Archaeology of Nursery Rhyme" (*London Archaeologist* 9: 338–40), John Clark sets about debunking a popular Victorian era misconception that the famous nursery rhyme refers to an account of Olaf Haroldson's attack on the London Bridge found in Snorri Sturluson's *Heimskringla*, where the Icelandic scholar attributes the verse to the skald Ottar the Black. Clark examines the various theories about the origin of the rhyme and of the identity of the "Fair Lady," and concludes that "far from Ottar the Black inspiring the nursery rhyme, the nursery rhyme inspired Ottar the Black" (340).

Inspired by the riddles of the Exeter Book, Carter Revard tries to "revive the riddle-form by looking at the mysterious inwardness of ordinary things here and now" in "Some Riddle in Old English Alliterative Verse" (*Florilegium* 18.2 [2001]: 1–9). Revard offers eight riddles in modern English, using a loose alliterative style to allow "some ordinary created beings speak to reveal some of their mysteries" (1). Each riddle is followed by a passage explaining its poetic genesis and, in some cases, its connection to the OE tradition. Some of Revard's riddles are "The Poet's Cottage," "Refrigerator," "Birch Canoe," and "The Swan's Song."

Elise Partridge offers her own translation of selected lines (about one-third of the original) from *Maxims II* in "Gnomic Verses from the Anglo-Saxon: Adapted and Selected" (*Notre Dame Rev.* 14: 169). As is often the case with translations of Old English verse the use of alliteration is heavy-handed: "hawks hunch on the glove, the huffing boar / wander the woods with the wretched wolf." Perhaps most disconcerting, however, is Partridge's rearrangement of half-lines in the service of the alliteration.

In "From *Beowulf* to *Blood Meridian*: Cormac McCarthy's Demystification of the Martial Code" (*Cormac McCarthy: New Directions*, ed. James D. Lilley [Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P], 199–214), Rick Wallach compares *Beowulf* and *Blood Meridian* for their representations of the martial code, by which he means the "structured social systems that justify and promulgate conflict, represent violence as craft, and conventionalize destructive activity in a craftsmanly way" (199). Although Wallach believes that McCarthy's novel surpasses the epic in its exposition of the psychological and cultural underpinnings of the martial code, he argues that much of the "narrative's aleatory value results from an implicit dialogue with its Anglo-Saxon antecedent" (200).

Works not seen

Alcaraz Sintes, Alejandro. "OE CAI: Computer-Assisted Instruction of Old English." *International Jnl of English Studies* (Murcia, Spain) 2: 205–50.

Burnley, David. *A Multimedia History of Old English*. London: British Library, 2000. CD-ROM.

Chernysheva, A.Z. ed. *Politiceskie konflikty v proshlom I nastoyashchem. Materialy vserossiyskoy nauchnoy konferentsii. Ivanono, 24-26 aprel'a 2001 g*. Ivanovo: Ivanovo State University, 2001.

Fernández Cuesta, Julia. "Teaching Historical Linguistics in the New Curriculum." *The Grove: Studies on Medieval English Language and Literature* 8 (2001): 81–93.

Salvato, Nick. "Louis Zukofsky's Old English Sources for 'A'-23." *N&Q* n.s. 49 (2002): 85–88.

Stanbury, Sarah. "Vernacular Nostalgia and The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 44 (2002): 92–107.

R.F.J.

2. Memorials, Tributes, History of the Discipline

a. History of the Discipline

In *Vital Signs: English in Medieval Studies in Twenty-First Century Higher Education* ([Leicester: English Assoc.]), the second volume of Leicester's series *Issues in English*, Elaine Treharne collects three essays that consider the status of English within the discipline of Medieval Studies and the status of Medieval Studies within the undergraduate curriculum. In her introduction "The Current State of Medieval Studies" (1–5) Treharne sets the tone for the volume by declaring that "Medieval Studies must continue to adapt and evolve in order to meet the needs of new generations of students, and to reach out to a wider audience" (1). Wendy Scase's contribution to this volume, "Medieval Studies and the Future of English" (7–15), sets out to "dispel some myths and shatter some stereotypes" (7) about the status of medieval studies in the English curriculum of the United Kingdom. Scase's essay answers Treharne's call for adaptation by demonstrating that, in fact, scholarship in medieval studies has been reinvigorated by postmodern methodologies. Scase surveys a broad range of resources, both print and electronic, available to medievalists and points to a bright future in which medieval studies "has a special part to play in contributing to the development of English as the discipline responds to and engages with intellectual, cultural and social change" (15). In "Medieval Studies at the Beginning of the New Millennium" (17–27) Richard K. Emmerson focuses his attention primarily on the state of medieval studies in North America. Emmerson opens his essay with a quick survey of major scholarly publications, new publication series, and specialist conferences in the field to buttress his claim that "Despite numerous predictions to the contrary, medieval studies have flourished over the past two decades, at least in North America" (17). Most striking of Emmerson's observations is his perception of the relationship between scholars and the purveyors of "popular medievalism." Emmerson argues that "medievalists should become involved in such popular representations of things 'medieval' [such as

"medieval" computer games and fairs, and even the movies of Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings* trilogy] and make use of them to direct the interest of students and the general public towards a more complex and sophisticated understanding of the Middle Ages" (27). Robert Bjork surveys the "health indicators" of the field of medieval studies by examining organizations, publications, and electronic resources in "The Portfolio for Medieval Studies" (29–34). Despite the strength these indicators would suggest, Bjork points to three problems which beset the field: the perceived lack of relevance of medieval studies within society in general; the devaluation and underfunding of medieval studies in departments in universities; and the marginalization of early periods of study, such as Old English, by scholars of later periods, such as Middle English. The balance of Bjork's essay suggests ways in which these obstacles might be overcome, particulary through concerted efforts at "outreach."

Michael Lapidge has compiled and edited a massive volume, *Interpreters of Early Medieval Britain* (Oxford: Oxford U P), which commemorates the pantheon of medievalists who "transformed our knowledge of all aspects of the culture—philological, historical, literary, palaeographical, archaeological, art-historical—of early Britain" from the fifth to twelfth centuries (vii). The volume consists of the obituaries and portraits of twenty-eight scholars, largely reprinted from *Proceedings of the British Academy*. Lapidge also contributes the volume's introduction, which itself is a history of our discipline; the biographies of two scholars (Walter Skeat and Henry Bradley) for whom obituaries were never prepared; and revised the published obituaries for Arthur Napier, Sir Frank Stenton, and Francis Wormald.

Joanne Parker examines the astonishing scale of the millennium celebrations of King Alfred's death in "The Day of a Thousand Years: Winchester's 1901 Commemoration of Alfred the Great" (*Studies in Medievalism* 12: 113–96). Although Parker focusses on Winchester's festivities, she acknowledges that such celebrations also occurred in

other cities, particularly London and Wantage. Parker's essay explores the causes and manifestations of a century of enthusiasm for Alfred from 1800 to 1901. Parker argues that antipathy toward the French throughout the nineteenth century led many in Britain to identify themselves with their Saxon past. In addition, the fact that Alfred lived and died one thousand years earlier provided the Victorians with a ready-made set of anniversaries to celebrate and a convenient exemplar with whom to compare their monarch. Furthermore, the availability of source materials, from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* to Asser's *Life of King Alfred*, allowed writers of all political walks of life to use the Saxon king as a spokesman and representative of their own beliefs. Parker also points to several apocryphal aspects of the king's life and reign that appealed to the political sensibilities of the Victorians. To them he was the initiator of legal, social, commercial, and political reforms that anticipated those of nineteenth century; he was the first admiral, founder of a proto-Royal Navy; promoter of education and founder of universities; and he was widely credited with creating the first parliament. Parker notes ironically that in the period following the millenary popular interest in the Saxon king waned while academic interest in the historical accomplishments of Alfred's reign grew.

In "Humfrey Wanley Borrows Books in Cambridge" (*Trans. of the Cambridge Bibliographical Soc.* 12 [2001]: 145–60), Helmut Gneuss identifies two of three books Wanley mentions in a letter dated 19 October 1699 and posted from Oxford to Arthur Charlett: "an antient Lat. Eng. Dictionary containing the words of the Eastern-English" and "one antient Volume of the Antient Christian Poets" (148). After reviewing earlier attempts at identification by Sir Henry Ellis in his edition of *Original Letters of eminent literary men* (London, 1843) and J.A.W. Bennett in his unpublished Oxford D.Phil. dissertation of 1938, Gneuss determines conclusively that the first manuscript to which Wanley refers must be King's College, Cambridge MS 8. Gneuss identifies the second manuscript as Cambridge, University Library, MS Gg.5.35.

b. Tributes

Carole Hough and Kathryn A. Lowe have edited a fine commemorative volume in honor of Christine Fell (*'Lastworda Betst': Essays in Memory of Christine E. Fell with Her Unpublished Writings*, with a foreword by R.I. Page [Donington: Shaun Tyas]). In addition to essays on lexicology and semantics, the history of editing Old English poetry, and the position of women in the Middle Ages, all topics of interest to Professor Fell, the volume includes eight of her essays that remained unpublished at her death. The

editors have helpfully added references to these pieces, which Fell wrote for oral delivery. Roberta Dewa's contribution to this volume, "Of Editors and the Old English Poetry of the Exeter Book: A Brief History of Progress" (18–40), reviews the history of editing the poetic texts of the Exeter Book in an attempt to determine whether any progress has been made in the last three hundred years. Dewa's useful survey of the work of editors of this corpus and their practices suggests a certain circularity in the evolution of modern editorial practices. Other essays from this volumen are reviewed elsewhere in this issue of *YWOES*.

The collected essays in *Via Crucis: Essays on Early Medieval Sources and Ideas in Memory of J.E. Cross* (Medieval European Studies 1 [Morgantown, WV: West Virginia Univ. Press]) honor the life and work of a prolific scholar of early Irish and Anglo-Saxon literature. The collection comprises eighteen essays, eleven of which are revisions of papers delivered in sessions honoring Professor Cross at the 30th International Congress of Medieval Studies in 1996 and seven especially commissioned for this publication. As Thomas N. Hall, who edited the volume with assistance from Thomas D. Hill and Charles D. Wright, points out in the Preface, Professor Cross's research was, in his own words, marked by "two strands: identification of the sources for the prose (where verbal echoes are discernible), and identification of poetic ideas leading on to explication of some poems (where detailed background is sometimes difficult to ascertain)" (xv). Hall's fine volume will surely find an enduring place on the shelves of all scholars interested in the intellectual history and textual scholarship of the literature of Anglo-Saxon England.

Hans-Jürgen Häßler has edited a collection of essays in memory of Dr. Albert Genrich, who died 20 June 1996 (*Die Altsachsen im Spiegel der nationalen und internationalen Sachsenforschung: Neue Forschungsergebnisse*, Studien zur Sachsenforschung 13 [Oldenburg: Isensee, 1999]). Three essays of interest to Anglo-Saxonists included in this volume are reviewed elsewhere in *YWOES* 2002: Bruce Eagles and Diana Briscoe, "Animal and Bird Stamps on Early Anglo-Saxon Pottery in England"; Helena Hamerow, "Angles, Saxons and Anglo-Saxons: Rural centres, trade and production"; and Nick Higham, "Bishop Wilfrid in southern England: a review of his political objectives."

In homage to another formidable scholar of Anglo-Saxon studies, Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser have edited *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg* (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 252 [Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies]). The twenty essays in this

volume are divided between two thematic sections, "Influences and Interpretations" and "The Editing and Transmission of Texts." The essays cover such subjects as the sources and transmission of prose and verse texts; the palaeography, lexicography, and semantics of Old English texts; the editing of manuscripts; and the use of Old English texts in the Post-Conquest period. For example, in "William L'Isle's Letters to Sir Robert Cotton" (353-79), Timothy Graham edits and prints for the first time seven letters that L'Isle wrote Cotton. In a useful commentary following each letter, Graham explains the circumstances and subject matter of each letter and identifies individuals and texts mentioned in each. Two figures illustrate L'Isle's italic and secretary hands. As Graham points out in his introduction, the letters elucidate not only L'Isle's methodology with regard to his Anglo-Saxon studies, but also the manner in which the Cotton library was used during the founder's lifetime. They also give us a glimpse of how Sir Robert Cotton acquired manuscripts and built the collection that bears his name. Other essays from Scragg's festschrift are reviewed elsewhere in this volume of *YWOES*.

In honor of Professor Matsuji Tajima's sixtieth birthday, Yoko Iyeiri and Margaret Connolly have collected and published fifteen essays in *And Gladly Wolde He Lerne and Gladly Teche: Essays on Medieval English Presented to Professor Matsuji Tajima on His Sixtieth Birthday* (Tokyo: Kaibunsha). A discussion of the scope and trajectory of Professor Tajima's scholarship is followed by a personal reflection of "More Than Thirty Years of Friendship with Professor Matsuji Tajima" by E.F.K. Koerner. The remaining fourteen essays are divided into two sections, "Essays on Medieval English Language" and "Essays on Medieval English Literature." Several of these essays are discussed elsewhere in *YWOES* 2002.

Richard P. Abels and Bernard S. Bachrach have edited ten essays in *The Normans and Their Adversaries at War: Essays in Memory of C. Warren Hollister* (Warfare in History [Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 2001]). The essays collected cover a range of subjects from the military organization of medieval cultures in England, France, or Denmark to the intersection of personality, politics, and military operations.

In recognition of Professor Akio Oizumi's contribution to the field of English linguistics, Jacek Fisiak has collected some thirty essays in Studies in *English Historical Linguistics and Philology: A Festschrift for Akio Oizumi* (Frankfort am Main: Peter Lang). Several of the essays dealing with aspects of Old English linguistics are reviewed in Section 3 of *YWOES* 2002.

Katja Lenz and Ruth Möhlig have edited *Of Dyuersite & Chaunge of Langage: Essays Presented to Manfred Görlach on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Anglistische Forschungen 308 [Heidelberg: Carl Winter]). The twenty-nine essays of this volume are divided between ten subheadings: "Phonology," "Morphology," "Syntax," "Lexis," "Historical Lexicography," "Historical Sociolinguistics," "Language Contact and Linguistic Variation," "Historical Text Types," "Langauge and Literature," and "Mediaeval Saints' Legends." Under the heading "Historical Lexicography," Peter J. Lucas's contribution to the Görlach festschrift, "John Minsheu, polymath and poseur: Old English in an early seventeenth-century dictionary" (144–56), appraises the etymological work of the seventeenth-century lexicographer in his polyglot dictionary *Guide into Tongues*. Minsheu purports to provide the etymology of English words in up to eleven languages. Lucas analyzes the sources of the Old English etymologies offered by Minsheu and deems them inaccurate. Nonetheless, Lucas notes that in his day Minsheu was well-regarded as a scholar of the language, pointing out that William Somner "clearly found [Minsheu's] etymological dictionary of English invaluable in planning his own dictionary" (153), although he wisely chose not to replicate Minsheu's Old English etymologies. Many of the essays in Görlach's festschrift are reviewed elsewhere in *YWOES* 2002.

In *Ogma: Essays in Celtic Studies in Honour of Próinséas Ní Chatháin* (Dublin: Four Courts Press), Michael Richter and Jean-Michel Picard have collected thirty-one essays on various aspects of Irish and insular culture and literature. One essay of interest to Anglo-Saxonists, D.P. Kirby's "Cuthbert, Boisil of Melrose and the Northumbrian priest Ecgberht: some historical and hagiographical connections" (48–53), is reviewed in Section 7 below.

Appreciations and memorials for Kenneth Cameron, Christine E. Fell, C. Warren Hollister, Vivien Anne Law, C.A. Raleigh Radford, Norman Scarfe, and Margaret Schlauch were published this year.

Works not seen

Delany, Sheila. "Medieval Marxists: A Tradition." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 38 (2002): 11–21.
Harper-Bill, Christopher, Carole Rawcliffe, and Richard G. Wilson, eds. *East Anglia's History: Studies in Honour of Norman Scarfe* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 2002).
Poole, Russell G. "Two Students of Boethius." *New Zealand Jnl of French Studies* 23.2 (2002): 15–21.

R.F.J.

3. Language

a. Lexicon, Glosses

Edited Collections

A Changing World of Words: Studies in English Historical Lexicography, Lexicology and Semantics, ed. Javier E. Díaz Vera; Costerus n.s. 141 (Amsterdam: Rodopi), is a large (610 pp.) collection of essays on dictionary-making, theoretical models, and considerations of the craft at a time when, as the editor asserts, "it has become almost topical to state that linguistics is going through a period of re-discovery of the lexicon" ([i]: Foreword is unpaginated). A number of essays from this collection will be considered in the "Lexicon, Glosses" section. Editor Díaz Vera's contribution, "The Semantic Architecture of the Old English Verbal Lexicon: A Historical-Lexicographical Proposal," 47–77, "addresses some aspects of the lexical organization of the subdimension of TOUCHING in OE" (47) and is part of a larger research project *Diccionario onomasiológico contrastive del léxico verbal de las lenguas germánicas antiguas* (see also the study by Faber and Vásquez González below). Díaz Vera begins with "the semantic architecture of the field of PHYSICAL PERCEPTION in OE" and offers criticism of the *TOE* entry for "Sense of touch" for omitting "a wide group of verbs of TOUCHING" (52); actually these "omitted" verbs—*andhrīnan*, *gehrīnan*, *āhrepian* and *ātillan*—all represent "prefixed forms" of verbs in the *TOE* entry (*Thesaurus of Old English*, ed. Jane Roberts, Christian Kay, and Lynne Grundy [London, 1995]); while it is quite reasonable to assert that they too should have been listed, it isn't quite a "wide group of verbs." Of interest is Díaz Vera's table of "lexical productivity" for verbs of "touching" such as *hrepian* and *hrīnan*, both of which were fairly productive in terms of prefixed verbs and deverbal nouns (56). Also of interest is his "semantic interpretation of OE [verbal] prefixes" (63–66). Díaz Vera concludes with a sample entry on the OE subdomain of TOUCHING organized by "intradomain" and "interdomain" analyses (71–73). Díaz Vera repeats much of this in his contribution to *Onomasiology Online* 2 (2001): 1–16, "Reconstructing the Onomasiological Structure of Old English Verbs: The Case of Touching, Tasting, and Smelling," though here Díaz Vera adds two more lexical dimensions (TASTING, SMELLING) and provides more examples so that the jargon-heavy argument is actually clearer in this treatment. An appendix plotting the "internal structure" of these three lexical dimensions follows at 12–14.

A proposal for a different sort of thesaurus of OE, at least of OE verbs, is outlined in Pamela Faber and Juan Gabriel Vázquez González's "Adapting Functional-Lexematic Methodology to the Structuring of Old English Verbs: A Programmatic Proposal" (*Changing World of Words*, 78–108). The authors note "the need for a decisive improvement in the lexicological and lexicographical analysis of Old English" (102) and the Functional-Lexematic Model (hereafter, following the authors, FLM) they feel to be the solution. They describe FLM as "an eclectic model that incorporates theoretical constructs from diverse linguistic schools" (79; cited frequently are the overviews on the subject by Leocadio Martín Mingorance) whereby meaning is to be understood as "internal knowledge representation" (80) and lexemes are arranged according to their centrality or "peripheralness." To understand the OE verbal lexicon one must have the theoretical underpinning that sees language as "a means for communicative competence, an instrument of social interaction, foregrounding the pragmatics of language" (81). At any rate, the reader can get a sense of how this verbal lexicon would differ from, say, the *Thesaurus of Old English* by their "prototypical schema" for OE *sellan*, which marks the subdomains: from-higher-to-lower social position, from-lower-to-higher social position, and irrelevant social position (91); verbs that in some way mean 'to give (something) to' are then arranged according to "favours"; thus the "aristocratic favour" (*geðegnian*); the "teleological favour" (*foresceawian*, *findan*, *gearwian*); the "nourishing favour" is further subdivided by what is provided: thus "solid" nourishment (*etan*), "liquid" nourishment (*wæterian*), "bedding" (*beddian*), and so forth (91–92). It is difficult to know whether the FLM will ever catch on to any significant extent outside of continental linguistic circles (there is often hesitancy in committing to a model one fears may be a fad—and postmodern linguistics is littered with burnt-out fads); and it is sometimes difficult to see how marked an improvement FLM offers over the *TOE* as it seems often a different way of arranging the same data. But is of interest to see linguistics generally preoccupied with MnE take note of OE.

Francisco J. Cortés Rodríguez and Ricardo Mairal Usón outline "A Preliminary Design for a Syntactic Dictionary of Old English on Semantic Principles" (*Changing World of Words*, 3–46), which project is entitled *Diccionario nuclear sintáctico de base semántica del léxico en ingles antiguo*. It is one of two major semantic thesauri projects

being undertaken in Spain, which has produced a recent flurry of activity in OE language study. This "syntagmatic dictionary of Old English" (3) is introduced with a section on the "Requirements for the construction of a historical dictionary," among which are observational, descriptive and explanatory adequacy, these being, in the case of information about a lexical unit, "conditioned by maximality" (4–5). Next follows a series of appraisals of the usefulness of contemporary lexica of OE in which the deck has been somewhat artificially stacked against them (6–13), as, for instance, the *DOE* is found wanting in that "the syntax of lexemes is again left in a secondary position, and in most cases reference is made only to attested recurrent collocation patterns" (13). The *FLOED*, the authors' acronym for the English title of their project (Functional Lexematic Old English Dictionary), will solve these problems, and "these methodological tenets are in themselves innovative proposals that can enrich the already existing lexicographic material" (13). Two difficulties present themselves in this article and a few others from the collection (such as those from fellow Spanish researchers working on the two proposed major FLM lexica of OE): one is the employment of "scientific prose," the pseudo-detached jargon-rich register of the "hard sciences" that is a hallmark of postmodern linguistics and if anything has further widened the gap between philologically-oriented approaches to the history of the English language and "linguistic" approaches. The second follows from the first: a number of articles from this collection can read like tedious grant proposals. At any rate, of interest after much methodological musing is a sample consideration in FLM mode of the semantic domain of CHANGE (20–36), in particular, of OE *smītan* and MnE *smite*.

Isabel de la Cruz Cabanillas and Cristina Tejedor Martínez in "The HORSE Family: On the Evolution of the Field and Its Metaphorization Process" (*Changing World of Words*, 229–54) consider the semantic field HORSE in Modern English, very briefly mentioning earlier forms in OE and ME (232–34). Along the way they note, with infelicitous phrasing, that "[t]hroughout the history of English language the situations of cultural and linguistic exchange have been numerous: in the Old English period with Romans and Scandinavians…" (236).

The vocabulary and semantic range of three emotions in OE are analyzed in Małgorzata Fabiszak's "A Semantic Analysis of FEAR, GRIEF and ANGER Words in Old English" (*Changing World of Words*, 255–74). Drawing on recent linguistic work on emotion (including that of Anna Wierzbicka, *Semantics: Primes and Universals* [Oxford, 1996]), Fabiszak, after a lengthy methodological preface

(256–63), turns to OE "fear" words: e.g., *wæteregesa* (cited in its oblique form only by Fabiszak), which may reflect the underlying metaphor FEAR IS A BOUNDED SPACE and other *eg(e)sa* forms (263–65). But fear is not all terror in Fabiszak's analysis as there can be good fear: *in godes ege wunian*. OE GRIEF words "all seem to refer to the underlying metaphor GRIEF IS AN OPPRESSOR" (266), which anger can be too, though it may also be "seen as a desirable quality in a warrior" (267).

Caroline Gevaert outlines "The Evolution of the Lexical and Conceptual Field of ANGER in Old and Middle English" (*Changing World of Words*, 275–99); the study is a good example of how much electronic corpora, such as that of the *DOE*, have accelerated the pace of semantic studies of individual words and semantic domains and subdomains. Here OE terms for ANGER are grouped by "source domains" such as "Strong Emotions," "Wrong Emotions," "Bodily Sensations," and "Bodily Behaviour" (277–83). These add up to produce a chart showing the overlap of semantic domains of ANGER in which one can locate *anda* or *ellenwōd* in a series of overlapping rectangular "rooms": the diagram looks like nothing so much as a drafting assignment in architecture or design school, and it does have visual appeal. Once one figures out its three-dimensional representation of *words*, one cannot help but feel some sense of emptiness: that postmodern linguists must represent graphically and pseudo-mathematically what the ancient and medieval users instinctually grasped (as do their modern counterparts). Linguistics is particularly guilty of trying to ape the language and affectations of the hard scientists, which no doubt helps with grants. But, for example, Gevaert continues with a diachronic analysis of OE ANGER terms based on the Toronto Corpus to yield period results for before A.D. 850, 850–950, 950–1050, to which are joined expressions of domains (the OE terms for "anger" themselves) and precise-seeming statistics for their frequency (35.71% for *irre* in the domain of "Wrong Emotion"). The datings, of course, are made no more secure by their having appeared in an electronic corpus; the Toronto *DOE* project has performed heroic service in assembling the corpus and moving the dictionary to CD-ROM format for letters A-F (issued July 2003, to be reviewed in next year's section), but one bears in mind nonetheless the (now) old dictum about using computers: "garbage in, garbage out." Gevaert's study is a careful and sane one, but after such impressive diagrams we come to rather unsurprising results: "The conceptual field of ANGER in Old English seems relatively stable. Hardly any new conceptual domains are introduced in this period.…Throughout the Old English period, the WRONG EMOTION-field is an absolute favourite. This is almost exclusively due to the

expression *irre* [*ierre*], which is the most neutral expression for ANGER" (293).

Christian J. Kay and Irené A.W. Wotherspoon discuss theoretical and pragmatic concerns for the *Historical Thesaurus of English* (HTE) in "Turning the Dictionary Inside Out: Some Issues in the Compilation of a Historical Thesaurus" (*Changing World of Words*, 109–35). Although much has been written about the project and many progress reports issued for this and other major lexical projects (such as the *TOE*)—understandable in an age of accountability to granting agencies—Kay and Wotherspoon write interestingly about the challenges present in the development of the *HTE* since the project's founding by M.L. Samuels, who spoke of a need for such a thesaurus some three decades ago. A number of methodological concerns (nature of definitions, collocation and context, limitations of the dataset: 113–21) are followed by a section on "Data from Old English" (121–23) and an appendix giving two data samples from the *HTE*: FURIOUS ANGER and OBSEQUIES (132–35).

Michiko Ogura's contribution "Words of EMOTION in Old and Middle English" (*Changing World of Words* 484–99) adds some much needed detail to an otherwise theory- and report-heavy collection. The article really should be entitled "Verbs of Emotion" because this is what Ogura covers, continuing her many recent contributions to the subject. Traced are verbs such as *lufian* and *hatian* (as used in the OE versions of the Gospels). In a table of frequency of such verbs in selected OE and ME texts, the OE *Apollonius of Tyre* not surprisingly presents the highest number of occurrences of words of EMOTION (Ogura puzzles over that text's *næs git yfel wif* crux, which this reviewer dealt with in "Apolloniana," *Proceedings of the PMR Conference* 12/13 [1987-88]: 179–95, at 184-87).

The lexical domain of FRIENDSHIP supplies a test example in Manuela Romano Pozo's "A Morphodynamic Interpretation of Synonymy and Polysemy in Old English" (*Changing World of Words*, 332–52). It's easiest to start with the appendix to this study listing the terms under consideration as part of the domain FRIENDSHIP, a category that doesn't seem satisfactory because of the many distinctions between friendship and kinship, or loyalty, fealty, obligation to one's lord, etc. The terms covered include *freond* of course, but also *þegn*, *mæg*, *gesīð*, *gefara*, *geneat*, and others which do not necessarily have much or anything to do with friendship (perhaps "association" would be a better term for the domain). The author draws on "Morphodynamic Theory" (also called, rather unpromisingly, "Catastrophe Theory") to show "the similarities between

the behaviour of natural complex or dynamic systems and meaning" and "how a better understanding of a semantic field like FRIENDSHIP in OE and of the different meanings of its members seems to rely, thus, on a combination of semantic, cognitive, and social factors interacting synergistically or in mutual interdependence" (347). There are problems here, as throughout the collection *A Changing World of Words*, with errors, misprints, and unidiomatic English ("Pscology" at 334; "Withing Morphodynamic or Synegetic theory" at 335) and of what seem to be theories in search of some evidence. The diagrams in this study, particularly those taking into account "catastrophe theory," are especially unilluminating (see Figure 2b for what looks like a chart of recent performance of stocks on Wall Street). Of course the largest problem here is the lumping together of genuine terms for friendship and many terms that refer to other types of association, especially of the duty-bound sort.

Janne Skaffari discusses an analysis of a subsection of the *Helsinki Corpus* for loanwords in "'Touched by an Alien Tongue': Studying Lexical Borrowings in the Earliest Middle English" (*Changing World of Words*, 500–21); the sampling found that "even the earliest ME vocabulary, recorded in texts from *ca.* 1200, had clearly been touched by French and Norse" (518). Along the way to this conclusion there is discussion of "working with retrieval software" (504–6; namely, WordCruncher) and the observation that "the lowest loanword frequencies are found in two homilies and the *History of the Holy Rood-tree*, all of which are copies of OE originals" (512).

Louise Sylvester and Jane Roberts describe plans for a *Thesaurus of Middle English* (*TME*) companion to the *TOE* for the earliest stage of the language's history in "Word Studies on Early English: Contexts for a Thesaurus of Middle English" (*Changing World of Words*, 136–59). Of interest here to OE specialists, besides the intrinsic value of the project (heightened by gratitude any user of the *TOE* feels for that completed project), is a note concerning "alternatives between *-i-* and *-y-* forms" (142; *cirice* beside *cyrice*) and sample proto-entries on "Gamekeeping" and "FARMLAND," "FARMER," "Teacher," and "UNIVERSITY" (149–53).

Juan Gabriel Vásquez González discusses "Using Diachrony to Predict and Arrange the Past: Giving and Transferring Landed Property in Anglo-Saxon Times" (*Changing World of Words*, 353–71), and employs, as do a number of studies in this collection, the Functional-Lexematic Model by which "We have proved in this contribution the FLM suitability for the macrostructural patterning of Old

English verbs. We have also demonstrated the need for a decisive improvement in traditional definitions, which still retain a pervasive nineteenth century bias" (366)—as one would expect, since the Bosworth-Toller lexicon is a nineteenth-century product and is the only comprehensive dictionary of OE until the *DOE* reaches completion. More promising in this study is the use of some actual data; Table 1 is "The delimitation of the macrostructure at subdomain level" for THE TRANSFER OF LANDED PROPERTY (354). Here at least one can see an attempt at describing a semantic class that includes the verbs *lendan* (and prefixal forms *gelendan* and *alendan*), *godian*, *bocian/becian*, *freolsian* (and *geedfreolsian*). Some of the conclusions drawn from so limited a data set are questionable; so too is the reliance on just the verbs and not derivatives. For example, *(ge)freolsian* can have to do with "endowing with land" and "freeing" as from taxes, but it also dealt not just with landed property but slaves: a *freols-gefa* was a "manumitter" while a *freols-man* was a "freedman," usages found in the laws.

"Speculations about *wife* and *wives*" (1–5) by Wolf-Dietrich Bald is the first of five papers reviewed here from the festschrift *Of Dyuersitie & Chaunge of Langage: Essays Presented to Manfred Görlach on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Katja Lenz and Ruth Möhlig, Anglistische Forschungen 308 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter). It centers on the voicing of the final consonant with the addition of the plural suffix /ɪz/ to such English words as *wife*, *knife*, *calf*, *half*, etc. The generally accepted explanation has been that a final voiceless fricative [f θ s] is voiced by the addition of /ɪz/ through assimilation. Bald, however, considering that MnE *calve* < OE *cealfian*, and *thieve* < *ðēofian*, wonders whether the direction of explanation has been reversed: "If the base form is classified as a verb…then the nouns would be conversions from the verbs, with the singular form undergoing final phoneme devoicing" (2-3; Bald offers for comparison *thieve* and *theft*). And one can compare OE **stæb* > *stæf* 'letter', or the older form *elvish* for *elfish*. And so Bald concludes that the "plural formation would be regular, and the singular form could be interpreted as the result of devoicing" (4).

Andreas Fischer's "Notes on Kinship Terminology in the History of English" (*Of Dyuersitie & Chaunge of Langage*, 115–28) offers preliminary observations on the subject by setting out first some methodological basics, namely the "four principal dimensions" of kinship terminologies: sex; generation; lineality; consanguinity/affinity (115–17). Fischer gives two schematics of OE kinship terms (120–21), those with EGO at the center and patrilineal and matrilineal branchings to the sides that remind one of a *tabula*

consanguinitatis one finds in some Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. From these it is clear to see the important multiple role played by OE *nefa* and Fischer turns to it: "This most striking aspect of Old English kinship terminology by comparison with the modern system is certainly that "father's brother" and "mother's brother" (*fædera* and *eam*) and "father's sister" and "mother's sister" (*faðu* and *modrige*) are terminologically distinct from each other" (122). After a survey of MnE kinship terms Fischer ends with the question of "To what extent does lexis mirror changes in the 'outside world' (here: changes in social organisation)?" (126). To some extent the borrowing of *uncle* and *aunt* after the demise of the Anglo-Saxon period may show such a mirroring, i.e., a movement away from those "retained aspects of tribal organisation" and the "replacement of the traditional four terms for parents' siblings" (126–27).

Hans Heinrich Meier's "Their *burh* Was Their Homestead: Or, an Old Sense Overlooked" (*Of Dyuersitie & Chaunge in Langage*, 129–43) begins with a warning against translators of OE rendering *burh* as "stronghold" (though this is understandable as a self-perpetuating epic convention, along with any other "antique-flavored" rendering); he notes that the Germanic word referred rather to an estate, with a rampart or fence, a main hall or house, and outbuildings—and so it should be noted in translations. Of translators of *Beowulf*, Meier sees only Seamus Heaney as taking this into account (135). He also reminds us that "typically the Old Germanic world was a timber world" (138). Meier then opens up the study to a wider range of interesting considerations: the meaning of *stapol* in *Beowulf* (which Meier connects to the *stappulum regis*; 139), or the "old sense" of the title that the *burh* may not just be the fenced enclosure but the fence itself; and, lastly, at precisely such a wall, or rampart, or boundary, or fence spirits could congregate—something not just known from Germanic literature but amply attested in Celtic literature.

Dieter Kastovsky employs the historical linguist's adoption of Sanskrit terms for types of compound formation in his "The 'Haves' and 'Have-Nots' in Germanic and English: From *bahuvrihi* Compounds to Affixal Derivation" (*Of Dyuersitie & Chaunge of Langage*, 33–46). In seeking to explain such compound formations in Germanic languages as *paleface*, *redbreast* (*readbreast* in the text at 33), *egghead/Eierkopf*, one faces the problem that the 'head' (the second element) cannot stand in for the whole: thus "a *paleface* is not normally understood as a kind of face … a paleface is a person characterised by having a pale face" (33). It is possible, however, to interpret the preceding example as metonymic extension, as a Native American term (such as in forms of AIPE, American Indian Pidgin

English) of *paleface* = 'white man' (in place of native terms for the same such as *wasichu*). Nonetheless, Kastovsky cites Hans Marchand's description of such compounds as 'compound exocentric substantives' (*The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation* [Wiesbaden, 1960]) and Kastovsky appeals to IE historical linguistics for help in understanding them; for one, Germanic settled on the order "modifier/head" for compounds (35). The appeal is then made to the great Sanskrit grammarian Pāṇini, and his "threefold division of Sanskrit compounds into *dvandva*, *puruṣa* and *bahuvrihi*" (35). To demonstrate the applicability of the Pāṇinian scheme Kastovsky gives examples from other IE languages: thus for *dvandva* (determinative) compounds OE *āþum-sweoran* ('son-in-law and father-in-law') and *suhtor-gefædran* (or *suhterge-fædran*, 'uncle and nephew'); *tatpuruṣa* compounds are ones in which "the relation between modifier and head is one of limitation or qualification, such as MnE *bathroom*; and *bahuvrihi*, where "the actual head of the compound is not contained overtly in its morphological structure" (36), such as the preceding *paleface* example. The grafting of one language's grammatical terminology onto another, even within language families, is always problematic despite its usefulness (and just plain necessity in some cases). So is the adoption of the Pāṇinian system, which is much more complex than given here: Pāṇini's Books IV and V of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* cover nominal composition (see *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, ed. Śrīśa Chandra Vasu, 2 vols. [Delhi, 1988]), the threefold system of possessives, determinatives and possessives is further divided by function and composition: the determinative *dvandva* compounds, generally N + N; the dependent determinative *tatpuruṣa* ('that man') where the former element is often an attribute or descriptor of the latter (a N or PRON) and descriptive determinative *karmadhāraya* compound whereby the first element serves as predicate to the latter; the possessive *bahuvrihi* ('having much rice') compound often in the form ADJ + N and very often functioning adjectivally and agreeing in number, case, and gender with the substantive it goes with; and the adverbial *avyayībhāva* compound (such as *yathec-cham*, *yathā* + *icchā* before sandhi with the adverbial *-(a)m* accusative singular neuter ending, 'according to one's wish'). Sanskrit, more so than Vedic, simply loved compound formations (*sam-āsa*) and Pāṇini devoted nearly a quarter of his grammatical treatise to them. Kastovsky's title refers to what he considers *bahuvrihi* compounds in OE of the type with positive or privative first elements: as in *gebyrd* (Kastovsky glosses "having a beard," though the form is as often *gebyrded* and being a p.ptc. wouldn't "bearded" do as well? And is *ge-* really a positive 'have' prefix?) Or the privative *æ-gilde* ('without compensation'; 38). As Kastovsky's list (38-40) shows, this was a highly productive type of

compound formation in OE: *bliþ-heort* ('happy of heart'), *gylden-feax* ('golden-haired'), *þri-hyrne* ('three-cornered'); Kastovsky observes, "the second part, which from a purely formal point of view might be regarded as the determinatum, is a noun, but the formation as a whole functions as an adjective" (40; Pāṇini said as much too). But the pattern, Kastovsky shows, did not last: the OE *bahuvrihi* formations gave way to "suffixal derivatives" (45), so we see in MnE *anti-ministerial* or *inter-zonal*, concerning which and other matters of compound formation Kastovsky ends with a promise of more to come.

Though Matti Rissanen's "'Without Except(ing) unless…': On the Grammaticalisation of Expressions Indicating Exception in English" (*Of Dyuersitie & Chaunge in Langage*, 77–87), focuses upon such expression in ME and eMnE, he begins with an analysis of OE *butan* (*be utan) in its sense "outside, without, except," noting that the meaning 'outside' is predominant in use as an adverbial, preposition, or subordinator (78–79). In tracing "the patterns and paths of grammaticalisation" of these indicators of exception (i.e., their shift from content words to function words or grammatical affixes) all have shown "in one form or another, the development from concrete to abstract sense" (e.g., "the highly functional load of *but* and *without*"; 86).

Knud Sørensen's examination of "Particle + Verb-Stem Nouns" (*Of Dyuersitie & Chaunge of Langage*, 47–54) touches briefly upon OE for compound nominal formations of the type *downturn*, *input*, *overpass*, as "there is a trickle of instances during the Old and Middle English periods. The linguistically exuberant sixteenth century marks the first flowering of the type, which culminates in the second half of the nineteenth century" (48). But, morphologically speaking, the pattern "particle + verb-stem noun" does derive from OE compound verb formation "prefix + verb" (such as *ofspringen* or *agiefan*; 49).

The collection *'Lastworda Betst': Essays in Memory of Christine Fell with Her Unpublished Writings*, ed. Carole Hough and Kathryn A. Lowe (Donington: Shaun Tyas), takes its title from the OE *Seafarer* 72–3:

> Forþon bið eorla gehwam   æftercweþendra
> lof lifgendra   lastworda betst

and serves, as R.I. Page notes in his Foreword, as a *Denkschrift* from friends and students for Christine Fell (Nottingham), who died in July 1998. Included in the collection are five unpublished studies from Fell, whom Page described as being interested in a "practical semantics, that is, evaluating the possible and probable meanings of early words

in their contexts" (vii). The first of these is "Crook-Neb'd Corslets and Other Impedimenta" (242–48), in which Fell seeks to define more accurately the *gēapneb* describing a mailcoat in *Waldere* 19a. Fell has been dissatisfied with translations such as "crook-nibbed" for the compound, which she found "meaningless as a Modern English compound describing an Anglo-Saxon mailcoat" (243). Fell suggests that "*geap* is an alternative to *hringed* and that the compound word if we keep it unemended referred to the ring-protected front of the mailcoat" (247; see also Styles' article from this collection below).

In "Mild and Bitter: A Problem of Semantics," ('*Lastworda Betst'*, 219–28), Fell's 1987 Toronto ISAS paper places OE *milde* and *biter* as words of a category "sometimes but not always translatable by their etymological derivatives" (222), which has cautionary literary critical implications—such as with interpreting the *bitre burgtunas* of *The Wife's Lament*, where the "adjective *biter* describes the *burgtunas*, not the woman's mood" (223). And, relevant to her previous study on *gēapneb*, there is too the problem "in which a fixed equation is set up in the reader's mind between an Old English word and a translator's equivalent" (224). Fell reminds us that *mildr* "in Old Norse is a standard complimentary word used of a ruler" (225), which leads, as one would expect, to a discussion of the last three lines of *Beowulf* (226–27). All of which reflects Fell's concern with "practical semantics," of understanding the words in context and exercising due caution with what the lexicographer settled on entering for them.

Fell's note "Old English *bearmteag*," ('*Lastworda Betst'* 216–18), remained incomplete at her death but its proposal that the word may be interpreted as "lap-box" ("a money box or a jewelry box that was carried about by the owner for safe-keeping"; 218), in place of the "yeast-box" of the lexica, has been incorporated into the *DOE* entry as an alternative explanation.

In "Wax Tablets of Stone," ('*Lastworda Betst'* 249–63), Fell applies her "practical semantics" to OE *wrītan* reminding the reader that the verb in the first instance means "to cut" (251; or, in Clark Hall/Meritt: 'to incise, engrave, "WRITE," draw'); thus she first turns to what surfaces or things could be so cut or incised, both animate (in the *Leechdoms* a horse's head, and in charms one's forehead or arms; 251) and inanimate (horn knife handle, sword hilt, hazel twig, stone). So too one should exercise caution with *awrītan* 'to write, write down, describe, compose; mark, inscribe, draw, carve, copy' (Clark Hall/Meritt). Fell warns against overly figurative readings of terms for such as *forscrīfan* (as in *Beowulf* and *Solomon and Saturn*; 255–56) before turning

to the sense of 'writing' as we now predominantly understand it with a consideration for terms for "writing implement," a sure sign of the move to a "literary" culture.

Fell's "Words and Women in Anglo-Saxon England," ('*Lastworda Betst'* 198–215), warns about "the way in which assumptions about the roles proper to women are still governing our reading of the Anglo-Saxon evidence" (214), and the titular subject was one Fell had written quite a bit about (*Women in Anglo-Saxon England and the Impact of 1066*, with C. Clark and E. Williams [Oxford, 1984]). Fell, reflecting upon reviews of this work, notes somewhat astringently (her word) that "If 'feminism' requires me to demonstrate that all Anglo-Saxon women were unhappy, oppressed, manipulated and exploited, then neither anything I have written nor anything I am going to say today fits that definition" (199). Rather Fell focuses more upon what could be called "great" women of the period (in rank or property, or both) and especially their appearance in the laws, which are "controlled by a whole range of assumptions concerning what laws are likely to say about women rather than what they actually do say" (200). Included here is a consideration of the semantic range of *mann* and *menn*, and "There is no doubt at all that for the Anglo-Saxons the primary meaning of the word *mann* was not 'person of the male sex' but 'member of the human race,' 'human being'" (202). For example, in the will of one of these 'great women,' Leofgifu, we see that she "asks that all her 'men' in the household and on her estates shall be set free. I naturally suppose the word *men* here (and indeed generally wherever this clause occurs in the wills) to mean slaves of both sexes" (210). Which broader definition of *mann* was good news for the slaves.

The word *viking* has received considerable attention recently, and Judith Jesch's "Old Norse *víkingr*: A Question of Contexts" ('*Lastworda Betst'*, 107–21) takes up the point made by Christine Fell that ON *víkingr* (masc.) and *víking* (fem.) are "in spite of the etymological link … different words" (107). Jesch picks up the matter to consider what the ON terms themselves meant and she examines two lines of evidence from the Viking Age: skaldic verse and runic inscriptions. Fifteen instances of the word are recorded from rune-stone inscriptions, where one finds forms such as **uikikir**, **uikikaR**, **uikikum**, all plural. While "many of the examples are ambiguous" in skaldic verse, "the unambiguous ones suggest that *víkingr* was a pejorative term applied to one's opponents and would not normally be used of one's own group" (113), though such instances are again all in the plural. Based on these two lines of evidence Jesch observes that while "the skaldic usage seems to be predominantly negative, used of opponents of the group to

whom the speaker and his patron belong … the runic evidence seems to be positive or at least neutral" (121). Jesch holds out the possibility that the pejorative use in skaldic verse may indicate that the poetry was produced later than the eleventh century to which it has been traditionally been assigned, or that "it may reflect synchronic semantic variation between East Norse and West Norse," or the "different registers of two very different types of texts" (121); or that the people of the Viking Age themselves had mixed opinions about the Vikings (or, as the lines of evidence suggest, Vikings themselves may have been responsible for a number of the rune-stones but that skaldic poets did not necessarily hold these wayfarers in the highest regard, despite the function of praise-verse).

A place-name and a salt-maker's implement come together in David N. Parsons' "Old English *lōt, Dialect loot, a Salt-Maker's Ladle" ('Lastworda Betst', 170–88). Following Eilert Ekwall's estimate (in Old English wīc in Place-Names [Uppsala, 1964]) that wīc in west Midlands place-names could refer to salt-production, and that the place-name element lōt (as in Lootwic in Worcestershire from an eighth-century charter) referred possibly to "a rake used in salt-making" (170), Parsons adds to Ekwall's musings the detail that OE *lōt left another trace: dialectal loot 'a skimmer or ladle used in salt-making' (171). Parsons then proceeds to trace the dialectal term, which made it to America but had been attributed to Dutch origin (174–75): nonetheless, OE *lōt may have arrived with the Germanic settlers in Britain and can "be regarded as cognate with the Dutch, Frisian and Low German terms" (175–76). Parsons then argues for the location of Lootwic, which had in the charter been described as being along the River Salwarpe in Worcestershire: Parsons, after highly detailed argumentation (180–88), offers that "two originally separate units either side of the river" Salwarpe, Lootwic and Coolbeorg, were "combined into a single estate named after the river (Salwarpe occurring in charters supposed to be for 813 and 817; 187–88).

Tania Styles follows on from the work of Christine Fell in "Crook-Neb'd Corslets and Other Impedimenta" (see above) and examines other occurrences of neb and neb-compounds in OE in "Crook-Neb'd Corslets and Barefaced Cheek" ('Lastworda Betst', 189–97). While neb(b) is glossed first as "bill, beak, beak-shaped thing," and secondarily as "face, countenance, complexion" (Clark Hall/Meritt), Fell had taken geapneb from Waldere as "faced with curves" referring to a coat of mail (Clark Hall/Meritt glosses '(epithet of corslet) meshed' and queries the emendation to geapweb 'wide-meshed') and Styles pursues use of neb to refer to "the face as a whole," even the metaphorical transfer

as found in current BrE of 'cheek' = 'impudence.' The first passage on the way toward this interpretation is from an "anonymous homily for the dedication of a church" (192; printed in Rudolf Brotanek, Texte und Untersuchungen zur altenglischen Literatur und Kirchengeschichte [Halle, 1913]) in which the relevant line begins: Hwylcun nebbe 7 mid hwylcere gederstinese derr he genealæcean to godes wiofude (193). Because "grammatically parallel" with (ge)dyrstignes here, Styles argues that 'face' could be used here "metaphorically in the same way as its Modern English counterpart" (193)—and it wouldn't be a bad translation to say "with what cheek and boldness." Two neb- compounds from the glosses to Aldhelm's De laude virginitatis provide some further support: nebwlatful glossing frontosa and nebwlatung to impudentia. The former OE form Clark Hall/Meritt glosses as "barefaced, shameless" and the three OE neb(-) forms (simplex, and two compounds) taken together argue strongly Styles's point.

Three articles are reviewed here from the collection Studies in English Historical Linguistics and Philology: A Festschrift for Akio Oizumi, ed. Jacek Fisiak (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang). Keiko Ikegami's "From ēhtan to persecuten" (103–20) discusses terms for persecution in OE and ME. In examining the OE equivalents to Latin persequor, persecutio, etc., Ikegami looks at ēht(i)an, ēhtend, ēhtnes, which do not always explicitly refer to religious contexts (e.g., Beowulf), though the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle uses the feminine abstract noun to refer to the persecution of Christians under the Romans (108). Ikegami does not venture to propose just why ēhtan disappears in the ME period and turns then to ME persecuten. Letizia Vezzosi's contribution to the Oizumi Festschrift is "Some Observation [sic] on agen: Towards a Semantic Interpretation" (Studies in English Historical Linguistics, 433–49). Vezzosi takes his selfes as essentially synonymous with agen though she argues that "OE agen cannot be exhaustively accounted for if it is regarded as a possessive adjective" (433), rather it and his selfes are taken as intensifiers. Vezzosi uses as a test sample how Ælfric employs the two "intensifiers" in his translation of Latin: e.g., the pairing of corpora sua with his agene lichaman and propria voluntate with agenum anwealde (435). Though agen derives from the p.ptc. of āgan and so originally has the sense 'owned, possessed,' "it occurs to emphasize possession and expresses something like 'his and nobody else's'" (437), and its use with its original meaning is "rare" (438). Thus agen, Vezzosi argues, underwent grammaticalization and came to replace his selfes (445). Ilse Wischer takes up a much debated subject in "On the Function of se/seo/þæt in Old English" (Studies in English Historical Linguistics, 451–68). Noting that "[t]oday it is widely accepted that definite articles develop

from demonstratives through a process of grammaticalization when other markers of definiteness lose their functional power" (451), Wischer takes a functional approach to the OE demonstrative/definite article; namely, they are for: "signalling nominalization; individualization with singular countable nouns; expression of limitation with plural and mass nouns; expression of uniqueness; expression of generic reference" (452). So how do *se, sēo, þæt* fall out in an analysis of their occurrence by function? Wischer supplies a tabulation which shows that: *se* occurs 930 times, 317 times as demonstrative/relative (or 34% of the time) and 623 times as definite article (or 66% of the time); for *sēo* the figures are 288 total, 30 demonstrative/relative (10%), 258 definite article (90%); for *þæt* 1108 occurrences (as it occurs as nominative and accusative) with 552 as demonstrative/relative and 556 definite article, a 50/50 split. The results are surprising and interesting, but here Wischer's study ends and so what this marked difference in use of *se* (masc.) and *sēo* (fem.) indicates will have to await further study.

The collection *Authors, Heroes and Lovers: Essays on Medieval English Literature and Language / Liebhaber, Helden und Autoren: Studien zur alt- und mittelenglischen Literatur und Sprache*, ed. Thomas Honegger (Bern: Peter Lang, 2001), as Hildegard H.C. Tristram explains in the foreword, is meant to celebrate "deutschsprachige Anglistik/anglistische Mediävistik" by its title and focus; Tristram, should anyone need reminding, calls attention to the work of German/Austrian/Swiss medievalists with medieval English studies, as by this list of luminaries (chronologically by birth): Eduard Sievers, Julius Zupitza, Max Förster, Helmut Gneuss (from Germany); Karl Luick, Karl Brunner, Herbert Koziol (from Austria); Adrien Bonjour (technically as a Swiss). For OE language studies it could be added that the German-speaking scholars have at times even dominated the field. In this collection Ruth Möhlig's "Zur Morphologie der altenglischen *-nes*-Ableitungen: Eine synchronische Wortbildungsanalyse," (199–250) offers a careful synchronic analysis of the *-nes* suffix in OE, which is based, as explained in the "Methodisches Vorgehen" (201–16, which is quite a methodological setup), on the structural approach, or "Wortbildungsmodell," of Hans Marchand (*The Catgories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation: A Synchronic-Diachronic Approach* [Munich, 1969]) and Dieter Kastovsky (*Wortbildung und Semantik* [Düsseldorf, 1982]). Möhlig first sets out to group the abstract nouns in *-nes* by morphological syntactic-semantic structure. Whereas MnE very often creates deadjectival abstract nouns with *-ness*, OE could derive denominal adjectives (such as the semantically clear *ānmōd-nes*) and deverbal nouns (such as the morphologically

more complex *weder-āwended-nes*). Möhlig offer the schematic **P** = **B**[PRÄDIKATIV] + **x**, where **P** is "die spezifische semantische Eigenschaft des Ableitungsproduktes," **B** "die spezifische semantische Eigenschaft des Ableitungsbasis," and **x** the "Abstraktum" (205): that is, in adding *-nes* to form abstract nouns one considers the semantic value of the base to which the suffix is added and the semantic value of the derivational "product" according to such themes as state/condition, quality, action, process, result. This is fairly basic semantic theory, and so, as an example of QUALITY, **hit is grēn > his grēnnes*, and so on. And much more on the *Wortbildung* model follows in this section of methodological preliminaries. Möhlig then turns to the corpus of *-nes* forms she is examining: some 1340 forms, of which the majority have a nominal base (729), a considerable number verbal (287 are classified as 'verbal,' 280 as 'participial'), while 135 are of 'uncertain classification' (216–17). Möhlig then discusses morphological, syntactic, semantic, and etymological restrictions on *-nes* formation (218–224): certain loans, for example, such as from Latin and continental and insular Celtic, do not generally form abstracts with *-nes* (thus *wealh* did not produce **wealhnes*: apparently "Welshness" would have to wait until the modern era). Möhlig very briefly touches upon dialectal issues (227) and chronology (227–28), about which one would have liked more (though this study already covers quite a lot) and an appendix gives a sense of just how productive morphologically *-nes* was: most plentiful are the denominal adjectives (233–39, from *ācumendlicnes* through *ymbhydignes*), and rare are those numeric (*ānnes, ðrīnes*) and pronominal (*swilcnes, hwilcnes*).

The Festschrift for Matsuji Tajima is prefaced by E.F.K. Koerner's "More than Thirty Years of Friendship with Professor Matsuji Tajima" (7–14) and, fittingly for one of Japan's great scholars of medieval English, a philological investigation by Eric G. Stanley, "Old English *þæt deofol*: *se deofol* or Just *deofol*," in *And Gladly Wolde He Lerne and Gladly Teche: Essays on Medieval English Presented to Professor Matsuji Tajima on His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Yoko Iyeiri and Margaret Connolly (Tokyo: Kaibunsha), 51–72. Stanley takes up the question of "[w]hether the Anglo-Saxons had fully developed the definite article from the demonstrative pronoun" (51), focusing on the occurrence of *deofol* in OE prose (where it occurs as neuter but more commonly as masc. *se deofol*) and poetry (where neut. *þæt deofol* is the norm), where the occurrence of *þæt deofol* is relatively quite high in b-verses (Stanley follows the statistics from B.R. Hutcheson's *Old English Poetic Metre* [Cambridge, 1995]) though also frequent is its occurrence without definite article, as in gentival phrases (e.g., *helle deofol*; 54). Stanley concludes with a question he raises but

says may be unanswerable: "how did it come about that the style shown by the writers of OE differed so greatly as regards the use of the definite article with *deofol*?" (61). Thus, Wulfstan "fairly systematically" did not use the definite article with *deofol*; perhaps an explanation at this point is to be found in the observation that "The name *deofol* of the Antichrist is, as proper names are, idiomatically used without definite article" (63). Stanley appends to this study a brief discussion of *helle deofol* and the existence and nature of "genitival compounds" in OE (63–65).

Individual Studies

In his major study *Runes and Germanic Linguistics* (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 140; Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2002), Elmer Antonsen reserves for his final chapter a consideration of "Old English Digraphic Spellings" (329–342), an earlier version of which had appeared as "The Origin of Old English Digraph Spellings," *Studies in Linguistics* 19 (1967): 5–16. Antonsen takes up again a matter that has been debated for quite some time: the value of OE digraphs *ea*, *eo*, *io*. Antonsen starts out with two basic principles: "The first is that all regular phonological changes have their origin in the rise of allophonic variants in an earlier stage of the language in question. The second is that changes in orthographic systems are practically always the result of historical accident rather than of premeditated reform" (330). Antonsen reminds us that the earliest recordings of Germanic spelling come from Runic inscriptions, some dating to before A.D. 450 in what may be termed "Northwest Germanic" (331). Antonsen proposes that "the orthographic system was entirely adequate" (332): OE *ea* was a reflex of Northwest Germanic (NwG) [ɒ]; *eo* a reflex of NwG [ɣ]; *io* of NwG [ɯ]; and West Saxon *ie* a reflex of NwG [ɯ]. The last OE digraph is more complex as NwG /I/ = [ɯ] and /a/ = [ə] "have coalesced, both appearing as *ie*" (338). The vowels that resulted from changes in pre-English "found very adequate representation in the Old English fuþorc" (339); the development of a new rune for /a/ based on that for /æ/ "seems to be a strong argument in favor of the view that the symbol was devised by a writer in runes and was not influenced by a Latin model" (339).

Alfred Bammesberger uses six "isolated cases" to discuss linguistic problems in early OE glosses with his contribution, "Sprachgeschichtliche Probleme der frühen altenglischen Glossen: Sechs Einzelbeispiele," to the glossology collection *Mittelalterliche volkssprachige Glossen*, ed. Rolf Bergmann, Elvira Glaser, and Claudine Moulin-Fankhänel (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 2001), 137–45. Bammesberger first places the early OE glossarial corpus in the chronological context of the records of English: though Runic inscriptions dating to the end of the fifth century are the very earliest records, glosses in the Épinal manuscript (Bibliothèque municipale MS 72) from the seventh century are particularly valuable because of the data provided by the lemmata. Both corpora, the Runic and glossarial, present significant problems in interpretation (137), and no corpus of OE glosses, of the scope or nature of that provided by Elias Steinmeyer and Eduard Sievers for OHG (*Die althochdeutschen Glossen*, 5 vols. [Berlin, 1879–1922]), has been produced to date. Though the OE glosses in the early Épinal and Erfurt manuscripts have been fortunate in their editor (J.D. Pheifer, *Old English Glosses in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary* [Oxford, 1974]), that more can still be said about individual glosses is of course clear, and Bammesberger examines six from the Épinal glossary: *gesuirgion* (Épinal 214, numbered according to Pheifer's edition; Erfurt reads *gisuirgian*, which Bammesberger discusses phonologically); *ciisnis* (Épinal 406); *sigdi* (Épinal 430); *fex* (Épinal 430a); *faedun* (Épinal 797); and the mellifluous *ifaenucae* (Épinal 997). As to the first gloss Bammesberger considers, the entry is *consubrinus*: *gesuirigion* (Erfurt *gisuirigian*) and the general sense of the OE is not mysterious: the form is plural, Pheifer thought perhaps as the lemma derived from Orosius where one finds it in the plural *consobrini* (Pheifer 72). As the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (ed. P.G.W. Glare [Oxford: Clarendon, 1982]; hereafter *OLD*) glosses *consobrinus* 'Properly, the son of one's maternal aunt; generally, a cousin-german,' a sense of 'nephew, cousin,' as Pheifer (citing PIE **giswirjō-* from Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [Bern: Francke, 1989]) or Bammesberger's 'Schwesterkind' (138), Bammesberger here offers an etymological clarification of *-suirigion* of the gloss. Some further etymological detail is offered also to *ciisnis* (Épinal 406; Erfurt *ciinis*, both glossing *fastidium*), which Bammesberger connects to the verbal-root **keus-* and thus OE *cēosan* (compare also *ciismel* from the Mortain coffer inscription). Based on the lemma *falces/falcis* the OE gloss *sigdi*—the full interpretation is *uuidubil sigdi riftr*—is interpreted as 'scythe' (thus OE *sīðe*); Bammesberger offers the pre-form **seg-aþ-ija-* and as its starting point PIE **sekotiyó-* (140-41). For the entry *fucus*: *fex* in Épinal (it is absent from the Erfurt manuscript) Bammesberger questions Pheifer's interpretation of the gloss; actually, the suggestion that OE *fex* = **fæhs* 'color' Pheifer credits to Joan Turville-Petre and he assigns the lemma to a Rufinus batch of lemmata. Bammesberger sees the key to the Épinal entry in the Corpus glossary entry F379 *fucus: faex taelg*, which he takes not as two OE glosses to one lemma but as a 'determinative compound' meaning "hair dye." Though not cited by Bammesberger, the Corpus entry's context offers support for this interpretation;

neighboring entries include: *fusum: spinel, fusarius: wananbeam*. And Ælfric's *Vocabulary* offers *fucus: waad*. But a Harley glossary entry for this lemma offers a challenge to the determinative compound thesis: *fucus: deag, uel telg*; so too does the Cleopatra glossary entry *fucus: telg, deag* (Thomas Wright and Richard Paul Wülcker, *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies* [Darmstadt, 1968], 244,30 and 405,30). And, though this is not the occasion to expand upon the matter, there is good evidence that the Épinal entry could be interpreted as "dregs." For the curious, *ifaenucae* is interpreted as "mud-turtle." Though Bammesberger is after etymological detail in these half-dozen word studies and moves quickly through the glossological detail, it is nonetheless refreshing to see work continue in the vein of H.D. Meritt.

The contribution mentioned in Bammesberger's title "Altenglisch *earð/eart* '(thou) art' und Johannes Schmidts Beitrag zur Erklärung des verbum substantivum in Germanischen," in *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz: Festband anläßlich des 125 jährigen Bestehens der Forschungsrichtung "Indogermanistik" an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz*, ed. Michaela Ofitsch and Christian Zinko, Arbeiten aus der Abteilung "Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft" Graz 15 (Graz: Leykam, 2000), 11–19, is Johannes Schmidt's 1881 study "Die germanische flexion des verbum substantivum und das hiatusfüllende *r* im hochdeutschen," *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 25: 592–600. Highly problematic in OE, as elsewhere in Gmc., has been the suppletive copula: Bammesberger here addresses in eleven steps (the twelfth a 'summary') the forms themselves, all of them in fact, and attempts at resolution: Schmidt is credited with analyzing the 2nd sg. copula form *earð/arð/eart/ art* as a preterite-present < **ar-*, with the further analysis of *-t* in *eart* (**ar-t*) as the signal for 2nd person. The paradigm would be filled out with a 2nd pl. *earun/arun* (**ar-un*; *earun* the Mercian form as found in the Vespasian Psalter). Bammesberger's pithy step-by-step etymological consideration of the suppletive copula may be compared with Tanaka's longer but more narrowly focused study of **es-* and **wes-* suppletion (below).

In "Althochdeutsch *tiurlîh* und altenglisch *dēorlic*," *Sprachwissenschaft* 27: 25–29, Bammesberger argues for the etymological separation of homophonous OE *dēorlic(e)* < *dēor(e)* ('dear, costly, expensive') and *dēorlic* < *dēor* ('brave,' 'tapfer'). He accepts a derivation for the latter, the sense of 'brave,' in the Celtic, namely Welsh *dewr*—offering additional Celtic evidence (OIr *dag-fher*, 'great man, trefflicher Mann,' and PCelt **dego-wiros*) of the same sense—as proposed by Andrew Breeze in 1997 ("A Celtic Etymology for Old English *deor* 'brave,'" in *Alfred the Wise: Studies*

in Honour of Janet Bately on the occasion of her sixty-fifth birthday [Woodbridge, 1997], 1–4). The distinction is not necessarily new, but covers ground not taken care of in Holthausen's *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch,* 3rd ed. (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1974).

In "*Irish*: An Antedating," *ANQ* 15: 45–47, Bammesberger notes that the *OED* and *ODEE* (Bammesberger regularly cites Terry Hoad's *Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology* [Oxford, 1986]) maintain Laȝamon as the earliest use in English of the adjective *Irish*; he offers as antedating the 1055 *Chronicle* entry (London, BL, MS Cotton Tiberius B.i) *mid ðam Yriscan mannan*. Bammesberger notes that this antedating is "philologically secure" (46), as it certainly is; one wonders whether it was missed simply because nobody remembered the highly common lOE and eME *y-* for *i-*. As in other studies reviewed this year, Bammesberger cites *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1987), which boasts the sound editorial scholarship of Stuart Berg Flexner; *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 4th ed. (Boston, 2000), boasts the etymological work of Calvert Watkins. Bammesberger notes that OE *irisc* is developed on nominal *īras*, which is borrowed from Old Irish *Ériu*, "although it is not immediately clear how *ī* in *īr-as* can be explained" (45). Recourse to Watkins' "Indo-European Roots" appendix to *AHD4* complicates things; he directs the reader to PIE **peiə*, 'to be fat, swell,' which in its suffixed form **pī-wer*, 'fat, fertile,' he connects to *Erse*, *Ériu, Irish, Īras*, all < **Īwer-iū*, as the PCelt. name for Ireland (*AHD4*, p. 2041). The reconstructed form is of some help, as is the citation in Pokorny (*Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*) and R. Thurneysen (*A Grammar of Old Irish* [Dublin, 1993]) of Welsh *Iwerddon*, 'Ireland' (Pokorny, *IEW*, s.v. *ueru-*; Thurneysen, p. 212 §320). *Irish* and *Īras* need more work; A. Campbell had noted in 1959 that "Borrowings of this type [i.e., from the Celtic] are often difficult in form, and the attempt to deal with them in a general grammar of OE would make excessive demands on space" (*Old English Grammar* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1959], §565). A look at the evidence assembled by Pokorny and Watkins helps with the philological difficulty and the sense assembled (Pokorny's discussion of the root revolves around forms meaning 'belt, protection, fortress, mound, island') points generally toward a fertile island (stronghold), the *Īras* the people of such a good land. For the moment an antedating, but an intriguing area for exploration remains.

Bammesberger's "On the Prehistory of Old English *hlæf-dige*," *Language Sciences* 24: 213–19, retraces earlier etymological debate over the OE form behind MnE *lady* and

reserves particular focus upon the length of the vowel in the second element of this 'determinative compound' (the label is applied without elaboration– one understands it as meaning that the first element is syntactically dependent on the second, of the *karmadhāraya* type in Sanskrit grammar). The compound *hlāf-dæge* ostensibly means what it has always been taken to mean, '(female) bread-kneader,' and the vowel of the second element was long and the Gmc. 'pre-form' was **hlaiba-daigijōn-*. The vowel of *-dæge* was weakened and came to be written *-dige*. This much takes us up to step 10 in Bammesberger's argument, which is laid out in traditional etymological step manner (there are 15 in all to the consideration of *hlæfdige* here). The vowel of the first element of the compound then underwent i-mutation. Bammesberger's retracing of the quantity of the vowel in the second element takes us back to consideration of the matter by Johannes Hoops in 1908 ("Zur Etymologie von ne. LADY," *Englische Studien* 39: 467), who had argued that the vowel of the second element was short (the upshot being therefore a different Gmc. preform); he then follows Eduard Sievers's rejection of Hoops's argument in studies 1909–1927: perhaps unintentionally, Bammesberger's recounting turns for the moment to an interesting if minor current in the history of philological scholarship, with Sievers sounding much less formal ("Seit ich vor fünfzehn jahren in den Beitr[äge] die bemerkungen niederschreib … habe ich mich oft gewundert …") and scientific than his modern peers. In the end, Bammesberger accepts as determinative itself Sievers's argument for the long vowel in *-dīge* as a matter *metri causa*: the compound occurs four times in E-verses (twice in *Elene*, once each in *Juliana* and *Genesis*) where one would not expect to find a "short middle syllable" in this position (215–16). In steps 10-15 Bammesberger considers the phonology of *hlæfdige*. While "in the unstressed medial syllable of the compound *-dæge* the vowel quality became indistinct, and we would perhaps expect the indistinct vowel to be represented by <e>" (216, step 10), the matter at hand is that we would but we don't: that is, we would expect *hlæfdege* but we get, consistently—at least as far as the second element of the compound is concerned—*hlæfdige*. Bammesberger posits the likely role of analogy, yet the one parallel offered in support may not help: OE *modig < mōdeg < mōdæg*, which while "taken over from formations in Gmc. **-iga-*" (216) involves largely adjectives with the historical development of the suffix *-æg > -eg > -ig* (*hālig, meahtig/mihtig, monig/menig, stānig*, etc.), excepting of course *hunig/huneg* (Holthausen's entry for this noun in his *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* is not particularly helpful; see Campbell, *Old English Grammar* §§204.7, 376); Bammesberger cites briefly here only Sievers's discussion of "vowels in unstressed syllables" (*Altsächsische Grammatik* [Halle, 1898]). Steps 11-14 of Bammesberger's

investigation focus on the problem of i-mutation in the first element of the compound, which only goes so far as "The development of the vowel in the first syllable of Gmc. **hlaiba-daigijōn* to OE /æ/ would require extensive discussion of the phenomenon of *i*-umlaut, which cannot be offered here" (217); and, unfortunately too, "The further development of OE *hlæfdige* to Modern English /leidi/ is not completely clear, but this question cannot be dealt with here" (217 n.19). The difficulty here is presented by Campbell's reminder that "It is essential to *i*-umlaut that the *i* or [*j*], which causes it, should be an unstressed syllable. Hence medium stressed second elements of compounds do not usually cause it" (*OEG* §204.2). This has traditionally, and here again by Bammesberger, been more or less neatly done away with by arguing for an originally long vocalism, then a reduction in quantity or weakening (to *-dige*). Another way around the problem for the moment is suggested: "It may therefore be advisable to assume a general rule according to which *i*-umlaut did not only operate in simplex words but could also be caused by *i/j* in the second elements of compounds. Obviously a rule of this kind would have a very high number of exceptions" (218). In support of the notion that "the second element of compounds could cause *i*-umlaut in the first element" (217) Bammesberger cites OE *ænlēpe* and *ænēge* (the first element from OE *ān- < Gmc. *aina-*); he notes too that "the main theory of *i*-umlaut may well be in need of considerable revision" (217, step 12). And one wishes Bammesberger had offered more in the way of just what sort of revision may be needed, and on the development of /æ/ in OE *hlæfdige* and MnE *lady*; step 15 reasserts the general premise of step 1, itself reasserting what Sievers had argued, as in recapitulation it should. But the circularity in argument in this case gives the feeling that we have haven't gone anywhere. Nonetheless, we have a preview of the detail to what may be the entry for the disputed etymology in Bammesberger's revision of Holthausen's *AEW*. Oddly for a journal of its specialty, *Language Sciences* has printed all macrons for the long vowels well over the pertinent vowels with extra-long macrons (or in the case of *i*, rather short): the effect being in italicized forms that is appears as if whole syllables have been marked long.

With "OE *bysegan* in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*, ii.440.20" (*N&Q* n.s. 49: 9–10), Bammesberger considers Ælfric's more literal parsing of Luke 10:38–42, the famous *Martha Martha sollicita es* passage. Whereas the OE versions of the gospels has for the passage *soþlice martha geornlice him þenode* (*The Old English Version of the Gospels*, ed. R.M. Liuzza [Oxford, 1994], 1:124), Ælfric follows the Vulgate less compactly: *Seo swuster hi wolde habban to hire bysegan. ac drihten wæs hire forespreca. and heo sæt*

orsorhgre (9). Bammesberger adduces that Morgan Call-away, Jr. (*The infinitive in Anglo-Saxon* [Washington, DC, 1913]) and Bruce Mitchell (*Old English Syntax*) both found the construction *wolde habban to hire bysegan* difficult; the difficulty seems odd in retrospect and Bammesberger reads *bysegan* not as a form of the infinitive *bysgian* (Callaway) or as a weak declension adjective (Mitchell) but as an oblique form of the noun *bisgo/bysgu*. There are other inflected forms of the noun in similar spelling attested (*bysega* and *bysegum*) and so Bammesberger's plumping for the nominal form seems patently correct: so correct, in fact, that it was anticipated by the *Dictionary of Old English*, which arrived at the same conclusion in its "B" fascicle in 1991. The *DOE* has, under the head-word *bysgu*, the form *bysegan* among the attested spellings and the Ælfric passage in question is among the first citations. Here the form *bysegan* is a natural enough rendering of the Vulgate's *ministerium* (Luke 10:40).

Bammesberger and his former student Joachim Grzega examine "MnE *girl* and Other Terms for 'Young Female Person' in English Language History" in *Onomasiology Online* 2 (2001): 1–8. *Girl* is treated first in the context of Fred C. Robinson's proposed origin of the term for 'young female' coming from OE *gierela*, 'dress, apparel (for either sex)'; the etymology has not been uncontroversial (see the studies by Diensberg, Moerdijk, and Terasawa in Bammesberger and Grzega's bibliography) and Robinson has returned to answer objections to the original 1967 proposal (most recently in *The Tomb of Beowulf and Other Essays on Old English* [Oxford, 1993]). The present authors do not rule out the proposal on semantic grounds because of the type of metonymic extension (article of clothing to the one wearing it) – in fact they note that MnE *brat*, of disputed etymology, may show the same semantic pattern (*American Heritage Dictionary* gives: 'Possibly from *brat*, coarse garment, from Middle English, from Old English *bratt*, of Celtic origin'). Bammesberger and Grzega then take up the more difficult problems faced by Robinson's proposal: the phonological details, especially the initial plosive (as the pattern of development of the PGmc. preform to OE would call for palatalization of *g-* to *ġ-*). There must be, on this count, some outside influence to explain the plosive: it can't be Scandinavian, they argue, because "in the Scandinavian languages no really suitable word is available that could have exerted influence" (3). But an intra-English influence they see as tenable, such as a northern dialect of OE. If the Gmc. preform to *girl* is taken as **garw-ilan-* it may be possible "to justify the initial consonant within the rules of the phonological development" (3); in fact, the consonant "is regularly to be expected in the *barn*-dialects" (4)—that is, those dialects (Northumbrian is meant) where

there occurs retraction of *æ* > *a* before *r* and a consonant in a labial environment (4). Bammesberger and Grzega then move on to other members of the word-class: *maiden*, *maid*; modern dialectal BrE *maw'r/mawther*, which they see as possibly the continuing of OE (rare and marked as poetic) *magotūdor*, 'descendant, offspring,' which also bears a phonological resemblance to *-r* kinship terms; *ides*, of highly disputed origin, they suggest connecting to a PIE root **eité(n)os* or **ité(n)os*, itself going back to PIE **ei-* 'to go,' the semantic explanation being a suffixed form of the root with the sense 'course [of the world]' = '[woman determining] one's fate' (6); and *scielcen*, 'female servant,' they propose tracing to PIE **(s)kel-* 'to bend; bent, crooked,' hence a semantic link as "A servant may metaphorically be seen as the one who bends to his master to demonstrate his inferior position' (6); or, perhaps, one of a crooked back, bent, paraphrasing V.S. Naipaul, from the misery of stoop labor. At any rate, all of these musings presume a pejorative sense for *scielcen*.

Carole P. Biggam's "*Grund* to *hrof*: Aspects of the Old English Semantics of Building and Architecture," *Architectural History* 45: 49–65, is a reprint of her study of this title in 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, 2000) reviewed in this section in *YWOES* 2000 (*OEN* 35.2 [2002]: 19–20).

"Un rapprochement lexical gréco-germanique: grec μιαίνω, μιαρός et germanique **smeit-* (got. *bi-smeitan*, etc.)," *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 96 (2001): 153–80, by Alain Blanc, examines the PIE roots **mi-/smi-* (zero grade **mey-/smey-*), perhaps ultimately having to do with 'stain, soil, coat, anoint,' or at least a core sense of *enduire* ('coat with, imbue') and a connection between the Greek root and the Gothic and Germanic forms which later take on a different sense (hence MnE 'to smite'). Despite Blanc's allusion to this later development, OE *smītan* is normally glossed 'to daub, smear, soil, pollute, defile' (Clark Hall/Meritt), fully in keeping with the PIE root. What Blanc focuses on is the parallel development in Greek and Germanic from an earlier sense of 'to smear' toward one of 'pollute, defile,' and his main focus is on the development in Hellenic (from Attic back to Mycenaean) and the development μιάω / μιαρός / μιαίνω with a brief discussion of IE deadjectival verb formation (174). Citations of OE *smītan* are made (164–65) in the discussion of "The Sense of the Forms of **smeid-* in Germanic" (163–67).

Václav Blažek's "The 'Beech'-Argument–State-of-the-Art," *Historische Sprachforschung* 115: 190–217, examines a

piece of the puzzle of the Indo-European *Urheimat*; here considered is the dendronym (tree-name) *bʰāg(ó)-*, 'beech.' In the relatively long scholarly history of the question (of serious concern at least since the eighteenth century) a number of lexical signposts have been sought for the original homeland of the Indo-European family of languages: did the homeland have snow, salmon, coniferous trees, contact with salt (sea) or only fresh (rivers, lakes) water? What sorts of lexical tests can be made from reconstructed forms of terms for the flora, fauna, and topography of the ancestral homeland? Figuring in these arguments has been the PIE form for 'beech' and its reflexes, the exclusion traditionally of 'beech' from reconstructions of the IE homeland, and the problem of the etymon being used for different trees in different branches of IE. The net of evidence concerning this dendronym has been cast wide as one also can consider toponomastic evidence (its occurrence in place-names; Blažek examines critically the work of Mikołaj Rudnicki who sought the 'beech' etymon in Slavic place-names [Bagow, Bagicz, Baginiec]) and terms for things made from beech or its parts (beech mast, chariot shafts, plough hooks, and so on). Most importantly for OE and other Germanic languages is the beech-book connection: "This term as a derivative from the 'beech'-name is attested in all Germanic languages" (195). The explanation to the connection between OE *bōc* (pl. *bēc*; 'beech,' German *Buche*) and *bōc* ('book,' German *Buch*) is the early use of beech for writing, whether on beech bark or the use of a beech staff for carving runes. Blažek begins the survey with a series of excerpts from studies of the question beginning with Hermann Hirt's 1892 article "Die Urheimat der Indogermanen" (*Indogermanische Forschungen* 1: 464–85). Blažek marshals evidence from a number of branches and individual languages of IE: Greek (where *φηγός* means 'oak'; in Homer wood from the tree was used as a chariot-axle [204]), Italic (Latin *fāgus*), Germanic (194–96, where the OE is mentioned), Celtic (as in Gallic place-names preserved by Caesar or in inscriptions), Albanian, Iranian (Indo-Iranian **van-* could just mean 'tree,' reflexes could denote 'willow' or 'oak'), Indo-Aryan, Baltic, Slavic, Armenian, Phrygian, Anatolian. Attempts at an etymological sense of the proto-form are surveyed ("tree with edible fruits/nuts and hard wood, of the family *Fagaceae*" is the synthesis of these [209]) and the matter of the 'beech line' (running from the Baltic to the Black Sea, or from Königsberg/Kaliningrad to Odessa) is taken up: the linguistic problem being that the spread of the tree from southern and central Europe *ca.* 6000 B.C. (northern Greece, the Balkans and Alps; 210) northward hasn't helped with the "homeland" question, though the proto-form for 'beech' "belonged to the core lexicon, and there is both internal and external evidence for it, it was used at

the territory occupied by Indo-Europeans before their disintegration" (211). As this is a "state of the art" article no new solutions are proposed by Blažek, but the wealth of supporting detail and methodological questions add to the already fascinating subject.

"Treasure Digging in the Old English Lexicon," *NOWELE* 40: 109–14, is a review by Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr., of the 2-volume *Thesaurus of Old English*, ed. Jane Roberts, Christian Kay, Lynne Grundy (Amsterdam and Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, 2000), now in its second impression. Bremmer offers high praise (though he queries the absence of dialectal "flagging" of terms where possible, as such flagging is indeed possible for a number of Anglian terms) and a few corrections: e.g., to the entry **A tent, pavilion** should be added *geteldung* (113). In the review itself, read *exciting* for *exiting* (110).

Ruth Carroll follows the fate of OE *weallan* (strong class 7; 'to be agitated, rage, toss, well, bubble, seethe, foam, be hot, boil') and the weak verb *willan* (or *wyllan*, 'to boil') in her "*Well, Well*: Exploring Middle English *wallen/wellen*," in *English in Zigs and Zags: A Festschrift for Marita Gustafsson*, ed. Risto Hiltunen, Keith Battarbee, Matti Peikola, and Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen; Anglicana Turkuensia No. 23 (Turku: University of Turku, 2001), 15–32. The former verb, OE *wyllan*, ME *wellen*, still survives when one speaks of tears "welling up," which in OE was a transitive verb. Carroll classifies *wellen* as a "Verb of Substance Emission," which can be connected to syntactic constructions such as "Locative Inversion, in which the prepositional phrase showing the direction or location may be moved to the beginning of the sentence" (22; Trevisa's *In þis citee welleþ up and springeþ hote baþes*). Carroll then considers *wellen* as a "Verb of Change of State," specifically here a verb of cooking.

OE nouns such as *drīhð*, *iermðu*, *(ge)synto* are the subject of Jan Čermák's "A Diachronic Perspective on Old English Deadjectival Nouns Ending in -ÞU/-TU," *Brno Studies in English* 28: 19–25. Čermák begins by noting that the examples under consideration are part of "a closed and unproductive word-formation set" (19); English no longer forms nouns from adjectives with this suffix form (except jokingly). From OE and ME we have words such as *length*, *mirth*, *warmth*, *sloth* (*slow* + *-th*), while *width* is a later formation. The OE abstract nouns of this class ended in *-þ(u)/-ð(u)* or, by assimilation (as after *d, h, s*), *-t(u)*. Čermák traces the "cumulative effect of i-mutation, syncopation and apocopation" (21)—e.g., *earm* > *iermð(u)*, **wargiþo* > *wyrgðu* (beside *wearg*)—such that "this cumulative effect helps to increase the opacity of the morpho-phonemic system of Old English" (21; this also presents a

challenge to optimality theory). Though the suffix seems to be an example of "lexical mortality" (and Čermák notes that many other factors requiring further research are at work), in "new coinages, phonological and morphological conditioning gives way to lexical/semantic motivation," with the example given of *depth* "modelled on *length* and *heighth*" (22). The latter derives from OE *hīehðu* and "from the 13th century onwards, the final *-th* varied with *-t*, with the latter prevailing in literary language after 1500 but the former abundant in writing in the south of England till the 18th century" (22 n. 8); actually the pronunciation and (nonstandard) written form *heighth* have never been uncommon in American English, though this pronunciation is now nonstandard and regional and restricted to older speakers (such as in Southern mountain and midland dialects). An appendix follows (23–25) of 56 deadjectival nouns of this type drawn from Clark Hall-Meritt, marred only by the appearance a number of times of *?* for *ð/þ*, and keyed to symbols for usage in poetry only or occasionally in prose.

"The Anglo-Saxon Vocabulary of Metalworking," from Elizabeth Coatsworth and Michael Pinder, *The Art of the Anglo-Saxon Goldsmith* (Woodbridge and Rochester, NY: Boydell), 247–57, serves as an appendix to a wide-ranging study of gold-smithing and metal-working in Anglo-Saxon England (covering "imagined" and real goldsmiths in the period, and manuscript depictions of smiths, as in the Utrecht and Harley Psalters). The list of terms (249–57) is divided into four groupings: materials and by-products; tools and equipment; techniques and processes; metalworkers. Coatsworth and Pinder note that: "There is in Old English a rich vocabulary for processes such as heating, melting, mixing, thinning and thickening" (247), though there seems to have been "no way of referring to [niello] directly in English" (249). Terms in the list in bold indicate use only in poetry, in italics glossary usage. Where they exist, Latin lemmata have been supplied, and as this involves a simple majority of the terms one senses again the importance of the glossarial corpus: *aurocalcum: grēne ār*; *auricalcum: goldmæstling*; *auri obriza: rēadgoldlæfer*; *gipsum/creta argentea: spærstān*—just a few of the more arcane-sounding items from this metallurgical vocabulary.

Michiel de Vaan offers two etymological studies this year, the first being "The Etymology of English *shower*," *Die Sprache* 41 (1999): 39–49. PGmc. **skūrō-* gave rise to Gothic *skura* ('storm'), ON *skúr* ('shower'), OE *scūr* ('shower, storm, tempest,' and 'shower'-metaphoric uses); a difficulty is in connecting the Germanic root to other IE branches (though Lat. *caurus*, for instance, has been suggested as cognate). De Vaan proposes an "inner-Germanic

etymology" (41): the Gmc. root **skur-* 'to break, tear' is the zero grade of **sker-* 'to cut, tear,' and connected with words in the dialects for 'rock, cliff, crag' (and so then also 'skerry'). The formation **skūrō-* on the basis of **skur-* is part of a "productive ablaut pattern in Germanic" for strong verbs (41; de Vaan cites OE *brūcan* and *būgan*); the nominal form **skūrō* 'shower' is connected to PGmc. **skūra* 'shelter'—as there was also a PGmc. **skūrō* meaning 'shelter' we are dealing with a homonym; de Vaan somewhat tenuously suggests the connection that "one of the characteristics of a shower is that the sky becomes 'covered,' overcast" (42).

In "The Etymology of English *to brag* and Old Icelandic *bragr*," de Vaan reasserts the position that MnE *brag* must be of Scandinavian origin, the monosyllabic form in *-ag* being determinative: OE *-ag-* would change to *-aw-* in ME and so words in *-ag* must have been borrowed from Scandinavian during the ME period. But a Scandinavian origin for *brag* has not been fully accepted. The chronology of *brag-* forms spans the fourteenth century: first the adjective *brag* ('ostentatious'), then the noun, then a verb, then the derived noun *bragger(e)*. De Vaan rejects Romance or Celtic sources for the loan because it was too late for such routes (and de Vaan would expect the Celtic form to have *-k-* or ME *-w-*; 47). The proposed Scandinavian origin has been seen as semantically weak, a contrast between ON sense of 'first, distinguished, brave' (De Vries, in *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [Leiden, 1977] glosses *bragr* as 'der erste, vornehmste,' the OE cognate being *brego*, 'ruler, chief, king, lord') and ME 'boastful.' This does present a problem, though de Vaan pleads that *brag* and *braggest* in William of Palerne ought be taken as 'bravest' and 'bravely' (48). As ON lacks the pejorative sense 'boastful' for *bragr*, de Vaan must argue that the original sense of *brag* in ME was 'brave'; de Vaan appeals to northern dialectal usages of *brag* as 'goblin' and 'to challenge, defy,' which he dexterously, if not convincingly, reinterprets positively: the 'goblin' = Scandinavian 'hero' as it "was banned to the dark side of folklore" (56), and 'to challenge, defy' is 'to act bravely.'

Whether a group of OE words for intervals of time (*tid, tima, hwil, stund, þrag, fæc, mæl, siþ, stefn, sæl, rum, fyrst*) can be said to have any more specific temporal denotation is the subject of Maria Rita Diglio's "Sulle denominazione del tempo nella poesia anglosassone," *Linguistica e filologia* 13 (2001): 39–65. Diglio begins with St. Augustine's famous dictum on the nature of time (*Si nemo ex me quaerat, scio, si quaerenti explicare velim, nescio*), which serves well thematically as Diglio's study deals with a matter that she admits presents a great difficulty to analysis (that of

mental attitudes, states of being, abstract concepts) and expression in linguistic terms (41). And the emphasis given to St. Augustine, and to explications of Greek καιρός (Liddell-Scott: 'exact or critical time, season, opportunity'; it was subject to all sorts of philosophical elaboration), sets the tone for a study that in the main is an object of literary criticism, with some parts philosophy and semantics (for one, Diglio draws on the work of Paul Zumthor, such as his *Essai de poétique médiévale* [Paris, 1972]). Diglio limits her study to the poetic corpus, noting how much of OE prose consist of translations from the Latin (though the Ælfrician corpus might have served). This, naturally, introduces constraints of its own—formulaic, metrical, lexical—that are in part glossed over. Nonetheless, Diglio aims mainly to determine, insofar as is possible, whether these OE lexemes have meaning that is "sense-structure" dependent. For example, Diglio examines *sæl*, noting that it generally has a positive sense when denoting time (glossing 'occasione propizia,' 'periodo favorevole'); of course, in addition to denoting 'time, season, opportunity, occasion,' *sæl* also denotes 'prosperity, happiness, joy' (Clark Hall/Meritt). Not taken up here, though of quite some interest, is the etymological explanation of this word. OE *þrag*, on the other hand, is seen as denoting (or should it really be *connoting*?) less favorable occasion ('un tempo infelice'), though with exceptions; meanwhile, *tid* seems to concern rather human life ('la vita, il tempo degli uomini' [45]; it also denotes 'feast-day, canonical hour or service') and *fyrst* seems the more narrow or circumscribed term ('una porzione temporale delimitata o ridotta' [50]). The last few pages of Diglio's study consider the influence of the syntactic, or morpho-syntactic, on the semantic, that expressions of time—nominal (subject or object), adverbial, prepositional—do not find their meaning wholly in the words themselves but the syntactic structure in which they are fixed. Here also Diglio takes up briefly the obvious difficulty in using poetic examples, a line of evidence no doubt influenced (if not skewed) by demands of alliteration and so forth. Not all of the dozen terms set out at the beginning of the study are given full treatment; naturally, as this is material really requiring a separate monograph and broader base of evidence to more fully examine the OE temporal vocabulary. Perhaps Diglio's study is the start of such an investigation.

Philip Durkin's "Medieval Material in the Third Edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary*," *MESN* n.s. 3 (2001): 8–13, is a progress report on OE and ME in the forthcoming *OED3* from its Principal Etymologist. After a brief survey of the *OED*'s history Durkin apprises the reader of the state of the current new edition ("approximately 8000 entries in alphabetic sequence between M and MESYLATION"; 8).

Durkin notes that a "thorough review" is being made of the medieval material, especially with the help of the *MED*'s etymological information. One difficulty at present is that the Toronto *Dictionary of Old English* is not up to letter *M*; a more sustained difficulty is that the *DOE* is not treating etymologies at all. Thus the "solution adopted reflects the restrictions in coverage of Old English material adopted by the first edition of the Dictionary: Old English material is included in the *OED* only where the item in question survives into the Middle English period" (9). Nonetheless, by use of the *DOE* and *TOE* (*Thesaurus of Old English*, ed. Jane Roberts, Christian Kay, and Lynne Grundy [London, 1995]) "more than thirty headwords have been antedated into the Old English period" (9).

The University of Kansas fragment related to the Harley Glossary is transcribed, after a fashion, in Evelyn Scherabon Firchow's "Harley 3376 und das Glossarfragment Pryce MS. P2 A:1 in der Spencer Bibliothek der Kansas Universität in Lawrence, Kansas: Das Beispiel eines lateinischen Glossars mit nennenswerten altenglischen Elementen," in *Mittelalterliche Volkssprachige Glossen*, ed. Rolf Bergmann, Elivira Glaser, and Claudine Moulin-Fankhänel (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 2001), 243–59. Firchow, editor (with Richard Hotchkiss) of a massive two-volume text of Notker der Deutsche's OHG version of Boethius's version of Aristotle's *Categoriae* (Berlin, 1996), gives a very brief overview of the Spencer Research Library fragment (one leaf, from a section of *In-* lemmata; this is the "untraced (formerly Libri and Phillipps)" leaf in N.R. Ker's *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* [Oxford, 1957], item 240), retailing, fairly tediously, the shortcomings of Robert Oliphant's edition of the Harley Glossary (*The Harley Latin-Old English Glossary* [The Hague, 1966])—a point already fully covered decades ago in reviews of the edition. Firchow then grouses about Jessica Cooke's dissertation edition of the same glossary (Cambridge, 1993), though she herself describes the glossary's contents rather unenlighteningly as "seltenen und schwerverständlichen lateinischen Wörtern" (243). The Kansas leaf, curiously, is larger than the Oxford leaf also mentioned in Ker (item 240; from Ker's information one can deduce an explanation); Firchow does relay some information from the Spencer Library that a Frank Glenn of Kansas City purchased the leaf in 1954 from an unknown source and sold it that same year to the library (247). Plates of the recto and verso of the leaf follow: the recto is perfectly clear, the verso darker but almost entirely legible. Curious then is the "diplomatic text" that follows (based on an *in situ* reading in 1986; the author gives herself the siglum ESF): after each of the sides is a nearly photographically-exact transcription of the manuscript text, which entailed some odd special characters

and, unfortunately, a good many drawn in by hand. The facsimile doesn't present any great difficulties except for a few spots on the verso, and the section of "Erklärungen zur Texttranskription von ESF" (258) decodes abbreviations that weren't expanded in the transcription but would present little difficulty to any reader of medieval manuscripts. The transcription itself is odd: the perfectly normal Anglo-Saxon *r* is rendered with an inexplicably slender character that looks like a tall *s* followed by the number 2. This is editorial conservatism taken to an extreme: the "cult of the codex" that admits no editions. One can be grateful for the plates, but this glossary fragment still awaits an editor.

Rather less a Lehnbildungen-style study than an investigation of the cultural distribution and expansion of a metaphoric scheme is Roberta Frank's "Old English 'anchor': transformation of a Latin loanword," in *Germanic Texts and Latin Models: Medieval Reconstructions*, ed. K.E. Olsen, A. Harbus, and T. Hostra (Leuven, 2001), 7–27. Part of a conference proceedings, the paper bears still the impress of an oral presentation, and only pp. 12–14 strictly involve the subject of this section. And here of interest, in Wörter-und-Sachen fashion, is the matter of 'anchor' itself, which may have been borrowed from Latin (with shift of gender from fem. to masc.) as "the Latin loanword seems to have driven out vernacular terms for stone anchor" (13). The etymology of 'anchor' is given in "biography" form (p. 12), but quite clear is that Sanskrit *añcati*, Greek ἄγκυρα, Latin *anc(h)ora* all have to do with the PIE root **ank-* 'to bend,' and so determinate in the word's history is the shape of the iron anchor (*ancora* could also be a 'grappling-iron or hook' and related *ancus/uncus* was the dreaded hook 'used for dragging the bodies of executed criminals' [*OLD*]). As Frank notes, the arrival of the Latin loan to OE cannot be dated (14), and we cannot be certain either of the route of transmission (brought from the continent, or as a result of "continuing contacts with the continent, or through Celtic transmission" [14]); a minor point, but in discussing the appearance of the Latin loan in Irish *ingor* the explanation by citation of Thurneysen (*A Grammar of Old Irish*, rev. ed. [Dublin, 1993]) "for *-ng-* replacing the *-nc-* of *ancora*" (14 n.25) isn't quite what is happening in the Old Irish (see Thurneysen pp. 126–27, 566–67). The great bulk of the article is preoccupied with "anchor" in literary use, as symbol and metaphoric commonplace. The survey is wide-ranging, though sometimes ranges so far afield as to seem adrift: at one point we go immediately from a parable from Rabbi Shimʿon ben Yohai to lyrics from an early album by Icelandic popstar Björk—if there were a rhetorical term for this it might be the "appeal to hipness"—though her use of a well-worn commonplace probably has little to do with the singer's "northernness" and makes for a rough transition

to the much more relevant ON "anchor-riddle" (20–21). The study moves on to consider *anchorite* but before doing so has assembled so many instances of the "anchor" theme as to make abundantly clear its enduring literary value.

In "Lexical Templates and Syntactic Variation: The Syntax-Semantics Interface of the Old English Speech Verb *secgan*" (*New Perspectives on Argument Structure in Functional Grammar*, ed. Ricardo Mairal-Usón and María Jesús Pérez Quintero; Functional Grammar Series 25 [Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter], 281–302) Marta María González Orta adopts the functional lexematic approach popular in Spanish linguistic circles (such as in the work of Pamela Faber and Ricardo Mairal Usó, e.g., *Constructing a Lexicon of English Verbs* [Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1999]). González Orta does provide a cogent, if not perfectly idiomatic, formulation of how she will apply it: "The hierarchical organization of the lexicon within (sub-)domains permits to capture linguistic regularities. In the first place, the repetition of similar complementation patterns within each subdomain, due to the fact that the syntactic behavior of predicates seems to be motivated by the subdomain in which they are integrated. In the second place, the general tendency of most prototypical lexemes in a subdomain to present a greater number of complementation patterns, whereas with the most specific lexemes the number of syntactic patterns decreases" (281–82). This entails a lexical entry that attempts to "reflect the interaction between the semantic and syntactic behavior of predicates" (283), which for OE *secgan* involves considering "verbs of saying" as *activity* verbs, for which complex logical structures are given, which essentially express that such a verb of saying has two external variables, "external argument positions," and three internal variables "which make reference to the content of the expression, to the addressee and to the language used" (290). All of which is a lot clearer without the schematics; and so OE *þa ongan se Hælynd secgan be Iohanne* from the West-Saxon Gospels shows that *secgan* can, like other verbs of speaking, "take a second argument realized by a prepositional construction" (290), something already known from traditional syntax—though, curiously, *secgan to* + dative is rare, whereas *to* + dative with other verbs of speaking is not (*cweþan*, *sprecan*, *cleopian*; see Bruce Mitchell, *Old English Syntax* [Oxford, 1985], §1210). This raises a few points: does the construction depend on the type of preposition employed—which would throw up some difficulty to generating general theories about such constructions in postmodern linguistic models—and is the application of functional lexematic model here being used to illuminate OE or is OE being used to prop up the theory? This is especially of concern here as González Orta's study by and large is theoretically oriented; while a table of

"Syntactic alternations of SECGAN" follows the conclusion (295–97), the OE evidence itself does not figure quite as prominently as one might expect in support of the conclusion that "the results obtained from the syntagmatic analysis of the Old English lexeme *SECGAN* have proved its prototypical nature within the Old English speech lexical domain" (294); except, perhaps, for the construction *secgan to* + dative.

Mechthild Gretsch's "Winchester Vocabulary and Standard Old English: The Vernacular in Late Anglo-Saxon England," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 83.1 (2001): 41–87, is the published version of her T. Northcote Toller Memorial Lecture delivered in March of 2000. While some of the material in the address is to be found also in her CSASE study *The Intellectual Foundations of the English Benedictine Reform* (Cambridge, 1999), which, despite the title, is really a book about glosses, and a very important one, Gretsch's analysis yet again of Æthelwold, Winchester, the Regius Psalter (London, BL, MS Royal 2.B.v; its traditional siglum is D, hence discussion of a "D-type" gloss) is this time in service of what might be called a bookend study: Gretsch's Toller lecture serves as a companion some three decades later to Helmut Gneuss's seminal "The Origin of Standard Old English and Æthelwold's School at Winchester," *Anglo-Saxon England* 1 (1972): 63–83, matching the earlier study's pith and detail and, eventually no doubt, its longevity. In a year that produced a number of important studies on Old English language, enough emphasis can probably not be given to the value of Gretsch's Toller lecture: it is simply something that should be read by all students of Old English language and literature. The lecture is an exercise in intellectual history with three main aims. The first serves as a framing device: Anglo-Saxon uses of and attitudes toward the vernacular in the period of the late Tenth through early Twelfth Centuries, which Gretsch sees as "without parallel in the early medieval West"; the second is an effort "to uncover possible links between Anglo-Latin culture and the work on the vernacular done by tenth-century scholars" (41; namely, Æthelwold); the third is a discussion of "conceptions and misconceptions" concerning the "Winchester Vocabulary" and Standard OE. It is this third concern that predominates (44–87). The "Winchester Vocabulary," following the formulation of the Munich school of which Gretsch is a part, "implies the preferential employment of a specific vocabulary in a number of texts which would appear to have some connection with Winchester in the late Tenth and in the early eleventh century" (41–42)—a tenuous definition, with plenty of "wiggle room," and necessarily so as "some connection with Winchester" has proven uncertain even elusive for some of the texts Gretsch discusses.

Nonetheless, the somewhat tentative formulation is in the service of, to some extent, defending and, to a greater extent, promulgating the "Winchester vocabulary" (and by extension "Winchester standard," at least as a basis for or significant contributor to the West Saxon standard behind Standard OE), in which the Munich school has much invested. While this desire for a *Schriftsprache* with a named progenitor is understandable, it has met with some questioning, and Gretsch addresses precisely most of these matters in great detail, as with the use (or, in her view, misconstruing) of the terms themselves: "on closer inspection it emerges that, irrespective of a presumed origin with Æthelwold, Winchester Vocabulary and Standard Old English are quite distinct in character and intention, and … they originated in different historical and cultural contexts" (44). Not covered here are objections to the whole "Winchester Vocabulary" thesis and its uses, such those made by non-Munich-school German scholars: their work one presumes is to be discounted by the force of the lecture's argument; this is highly problematic as the continued focus on lexis first and foremost in studying the rise of a *Schriftsprache* is foregrounded by this address, and it begs serious questions that cannot be glossed over much longer. Gretsch gives then a summary of Walter Hofstetter's findings on Winchester vocabulary items in thirteen semantic fields (*Winchester und der spätaltenglische Sprachgebrauch* [Munich, 1987]); for example, the Winchester term for Latin *ecclesia* as 'the Catholic Church' was *(ge)laþung* (Hoftstetter's A-group, "Winchester words"), while the non-Winchester synonym was *cirice* or *gesamnung* (Hofstetter's B-group, words avoided by Winchester writers), and the "neutral" term was *geferræden* (Hofstetter's C-group, words used by both Winchester and non-Winchester authors). Based on Hofstetter's "magisterial study," Gretsch notes that "[w]hile it is unmistakably clear from the thirteen semantic fields in which Winchester words have been established that, within these fields, an active forging and regularizing of the English language has taken place, it should, however, be no less apparent that Winchester vocabulary cannot plausibly be regarded as the lexical branch of Standard Old English" (44–46). And it might be noted, to be specific, the "forging and regularizing" observed here is with lexis: the phonology, morphology, and syntax of Winchester OE and standard late West Saxon are another matter altogether (and not the subject of this lecture). In then considering the "nature" of the Winchester vocabulary Gretsch offers by way of example two 'Fachsprachen,' or technical registers: liturgical terminology (49–52, including loanwords such as *capitul* and *cantic*, or the quasi-etymological rendering of *hymnus* as *lofsang*) and grammatical terminology (53; sadly this *Fachsprache* is given shorter shrift in Gretsch's discussion but the reader is

directed to 53 n. 57 for extensive references). On the basis of these two registers Gretsch opines that "it would appear that the creation of a comprehensive and precisely defined terminology in these *Fachsprachen* was an urgent concern of Æthelwold's circle" (54). Next considered is "the relationship with the Latin lemmata" (such as "Æthelwold's employment of some highly eccentric exegetical translations of Latin words such as *eardung* and *eardungstow* 'habitation' for *tabernaculum*" [55]); the sections "Winchester words and Benedictine monasticism" and following draw heavily from Gretsch's 1999 monograph, with emphasis upon the OE version of the *Regula Benedicti* (the subject of Gretsch's Munich dissertation; published Munich, 1973) and the Regius psalter gloss (see 62 n. 98 on use of *-lœcan* verbs in the Regius Psalter). In a section on the origin of the Winchester vocabulary Gretsch asserts that "We have seen that the beginnings of Winchester usage can be traced back to Æthelwold's Glastonbury years (ca. 939–ca. 954) while he was presumably working on his translation of the *Regula S. Benedicti*, and, perhaps in collaboration with some of his colleagues, on the Royal Psalter gloss" (63); Gretsch has of course written extensively and cogently about psalter-gloss interrelations, though this last point is still speculative. We come then to the return to vogue of the hermeneutic style in the late Anglo-Saxon period, traced to King Æthelstan's court, of which Æthelwold "was a fervent proponent" (66); borrowing Michael Lapidge's term we are told that the style is "glossematic," its "typical … vocabulary drawn from Greek-Latin glossaries" (66). As Gretsch bristles at oversimplifications by other scholars of the terms "Winchester vocabulary" and "Standard Old English," one wishes for a somewhat more expansive and less stereotypical explanation of "the hermeneutic style," especially as she goes on to argue that there is "the manifest possibility that these scholars, by their active interest in Latin vocabulary, by their training in searching glossaries and the works of specific authors for recherché and unusual words, and by their training in coining learned and flamboyant Latin terms, may well have been prompted to attempt to enrich and embellish the English language along similar lines by paying close attention to the components and structure of its vocabulary and the resources of its word-formation" (67). This is a major point: that an Anglo-Latin *style* influenced the lexis of late Old English—at least, that is as far as Gretsch takes the argument, as there is no consideration, for instance, of possible syntactic influence (how often does sustained linguistic contact affect only one component of the target language?). After so much carefully supported argument and sustained specificity of focus (Winchester, Æthelwold, the Benedictine *Rule*, the Regius Psalter gloss) the speculative leap that follows is surprising, especially from a scholar of the Munich school:

William of Malmesbury's assertion that Aldhelm was venerated by King Alfred as "the greatest of poets who had composed in the vernacular" (68) is conjoined with Michael Lapidge's suggestion of "Aldhelm's circle at Malmesbury as the place where *Beowulf* could have originated" (in his "*Beowulf*, Aldhelm, the *Liber Monstrorum* and Wessex," *Studi medievali* 3rd ser. 23 [1982]: 151–92) to produce the claim that "[t]here is a poem which may give us a glimpse of what Aldhelm's English poetry might have looked like: *Beowulf*" (68). What? Though we are told that "The *Beowulf* poet (as I need not demonstrate here) is distinguished by his stunning resourcefulness in coining new words, principally compound-nouns, often of a recherché quality" (68), a reader familiar with *Beowulf* criticism in the past half-century cannot help but feel blindsided by the last statement. Gretsch concedes in a footnote that "There is no question that *Beowulf* is firmly embedded in the traditional diction of heroic poetry; what is relevant here, however, is that (except for *Exodus*) no other Old English poem reveals a similar wealth in compound words, many of which have a recherché flavour and are seldom if ever attested elsewhere in Old English poetry" (68 n. 124). This is not the main point of Gretsch's chapter of intellectual history, and we are warned with the understatement that: "These observations take us into the realm of conjecture" (68); nonetheless, several considerations are worth making as Gretsch places this bit of "conjecture" right before her final section on "Standard Old English": a) hapax legomena are of course not necessarily recherché; b) the word choice, the frequency and nature of compound-formations are at times a matter *metri causa*; c) "no other Old English poem reveals a similar wealth in compound words" as no other OE poem consists of 3,182 lines and no other poem in OE (or English literature for that matter) is quite like *Beowulf*: it really does seem *sui generis*; d) the evidence of OE poetry is of a clearly different nature and kind than the Regius Psalter gloss, or the *Regula Sancti Benedicti*, or so on; e) Aldhelm may have been a vernacular poet (none of his OE verse survives), but was he an oral formulaic poet, a *scop*? would not his formal education in Latin and Latin verse-making preclude or at least make unlikely his composition of native verse of the kind of *Beowulf* and other "heroic verse"? (One assumes training in either kind began early—this is not a flippant point as the assertion flies in the face of a quarter-century of oral formulaic scholarship); f) in order to know whether the vocabulary of *Beowulf* is in any way comparably "hermeneutic" one would need to know a little more about date and place of composition, neither of which are in any way secure in the contemporary scholarship. The list could go on; while it is true that "the possible links between the vocabulary of Old English poetry, the hermeneutic style in Anglo-Latin, and

the Glastonbury-Winchester concern with refining the English language would merit close and careful attention"(68), such an investigation would need a stronger methodological basis for comparison. The concluding section of Gretsch's Toller lecture concerns "Standard Old English" (69–87), a subject rich enough for a separate address, and here its treatment is a model of careful assertion and clarity. Gretsch makes a contribution to defining "Standard OE" via lexis (she also calls attention to the phonological investigations in Willy Schlemilch's neglected *Beiträge zur Sprache und Orthographie spätaltenglischer Sprachdenkmäler der Übergangzeit* (1000-1150) [Halle, 1914]). This time, she asserts, evidence points not toward Æthelstan's court, but rather (as she has argued elsewhere) to the reign of Edward the Elder (899–924), which may have witnessed "England's first supradialectal language" (77—or *acrolect*?). And here Gretsch's argument comes full circle, in search of a reign in which the political stability might be found for "a political and intellectual ambience which with some plausibility might have nurtured the idea of Standard Old English": and this might be "the early 970s" (78), for which Gretsch marshals a variety of evidence, including numismatic (the reform of coinage in 973 under Edgar, who in turn brings us back to Æthelwold). Gretsch concludes by noting the challenge in "attempting to represent the uniqueness and the quality of the achievement of these scholars to the academic world and to an educated audience at large." Both these audiences would do well to read together Gneuss 1972 and Gretsch 2002.

Two studies from Mechthild Gretsch on the Junius Psalter gloss (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 27, traditionally given the siglum B) abridge her immensely valuable *ASE* study "The Junius Psalter Gloss: Its Historical and Cultural Context" (*Anglo-Saxon England* 29 [2000]: 85–121): "The Junius Psalter Gloss: Tradition and Innovation," in *Edward the Elder*, 899-924, ed. N.J. Higham and D.H. Hill (London: Routledge, 2001), 280–91; and "Die sprachliche und kulturelle Bedeutung der altenglischen Glossierung des Junius-Psalters," in *Mittelalterliche volkssprachige Glossen*, ed. Rolf Bergmann, Elvira Glaser, and Claudine Moulin-Fankhänel (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 2001), 171–74. And while Gretsch begs the reader's indulgence by having the work appear in triplicate, her *ASE* article and CSASE monograph (*The Intellectual Foundations of the English Benedictine Reform* [Cambridge, 1999]) are major contributions to psalter study. Gretsch builds in part in the *ASE* article on the work of Phillip Pulsiano ("The Originality of the Old English Gloss of the *Vespasian Psalter* and its Relation to the Gloss of the *Junius Psalter*," *Anglo-Saxon England* 25 [1996]: 37–62) and expands psalter-gloss-tradition interrelations to a consideration of the intellectual milieu

of the Junius and Regius psalters, in particular why Æthelwold "studiously ignored the Junius Psalter" (Gretsch, "The Junius Psalter Gloss," 2000: 120). Matters of psalter-gloss tradition interrelations will be taken up in next year's section with consideration of the foregoing recent work and a two-part study from Peter Kitson ("Topography, Dialect, and the Relation of Old English Psalter-Glosses (I-II)," *English Studies* 83 [2002]: 474–503, 84 [2003]: 9–32), as well as Michiko Ogura's "The Variety and Conformity of Old English Psalter Glosses," *English Studies* 84 (2003): 1–8.

At the outset of "Altenglisch *bisc(e)op* und seine germanischen Verwandten" (*Anglia* 120: 372–83), Joachim Grzega notes that much ink has flowed over the matter of the OE equivalent of Gk. ἐπίσκοπος (originally, 'ecclesiastical superintendant'), Lat. *episcopus*, its relatively high number of variant spellings (*bisceop*, *biscop*, *biscep*, *bisscop*) and precisely when the Church term was borrowed into the Germanic dialects. Grzega summarizes the alternative proposals for what winds up a central concern in his own study, the loan source for **biskop*: a) a loan from Vulgar Latin; b) a conveyance of the Greek original term through Gothic; c) a loan from ecclesiastical Latin; d) a loan from Romance. Grzega settles on the first of these after a detailed discussion of the phonology of early Latin loans to OE (drawing on Alfred Wollmann's *Untersuchungen zu den frühen lateinischen Lehnwörtern im Altenglischen: Phonologie und Datierung* [Munich, 1990]) and plumps for the late/Vulgar Latin route on account of phonological matters: the variation between -*b*- and -*p*- and the aphaeresis of *e*-.

Grzega's "On the Names for Wednesday in Germanic Dialects with Special Reference to west Germanic," *Onomasiology Online* 2 (2001), [1–14], considers terms for 'Wednesday' as "Woden's day' and 'Mittwoch' in terms not just of etyma but 'iconyms,' the 'motive' and "the origin, or motivation, of the names' motive" (1). Grzega's first 'iconym' is "Woden, name of the highest God" + "day" and the Germanic cognates for such: OE *Wōd(e)nesdæg*, ON *Óðinsdagr*, etc.; as a calque on *Mercurii dies* the motivation was that "Mercury was interpreted as Woden because they both share the feature of flying through the air and certain functions like the patronage for merchants and voyagers in the respective pantheons" (3). The notion of 'Wednesday' as 'mid-week' is the next iconym examined; interestingly, the first attestation of the expression in the Germanic languages is Notker's *mittewehha* (4); Grzega queries why this term for Wednesday should belong "to a numeral naming system." Though there are contemporary examples (Modern Icelandic *þriðjudagur* 'Tuesday' and *fimmtudagur* 'Thursday', with *miðvikudagur* for Wednesday), "the vast spread of a numeral term—*Mittwoch*—is unique" (5).

Unfortunately for this iconym, "the initial motivation for a coinage of the type 'mid-week' remains beyond our knowledge" (5), rather "a polycausal hypothesis … is most likely to be favored" (6). What follow are forms to be grouped under the broad and somewhat curious rubric "Unclear cases and cases worth discussing" (7–11); these include Old Frisian *Wērnisdei* and *Wērendei*, which may be connected to a tribal name; Dutch dialectal *wonseldach*, and others including MnE *Wednesday*. Among the dialectal forms Grzega records from the *Survey of English Dialects* (Harold Orton and Eugen Dieth [Leeds, 1964-71]) may be added AmE [ˈwɛnzdiː], such as heard in Philadelphia. Motivations for forms, and motivations for motivations, as one would imagine, are hard to discern for historical forms and Grzega's study does focus rather more on etyma than iconoyms. In doing so quite a bit of information is assembled, some of it presented seemingly in scattershot fashion, on a few occasions the English is not always clear ("a number of etymological problems still remains to be unsolved" [1] or "A number of forms cannot be the results of the regular sound processes" [3]) and some details are not always recorded perfectly accurately: for Russian '9' and '10' the diacritics are missing, read дѐвять and дѐсять. Nonetheless Grzega's study and the first few issues of *Onomasiology Online* bode well for the electronic journal.

Eminent Indo-Europeanist Eric P. Hamp with the note "Old English *heoru* > Germanic **heru-*" (*Historische Sprachforschung* 115: 117–18) adds cognates and proto-form information to Alfred Bammesberger's *Die Morphologie des urgermanischen Nomens* (Heidelberg, 1990). Bammesberger had listed OE *heoru* ('sword') as among the root *u*-stems, along with cognate Greek κεραΐζω ('to destroy, slaughter'); Hamp adds Irish *ara·chrin* ('withers, decays') and *do·cer* ('fell') and reconstructs the PIE root as **ḱ´reH$_e$-*. Hamp turns then to the Germanic form **heru-z* 'sword,' "which appears to be an ancient nomen agentis * 'destroyer, wounder' (117). The *u*-stems seem to be a "rare and recessive PIE formation … equally sparse in its attestation in Germanic" (117), though Hamp adds *brego* ('prince, king') and *feld* (< **felþ-u-* 'field, plain').

A comparative study of medieval psalters with interlinear gloss in OE, OHG, and Old Low German that seeks to restore the OE psalter gloss tradition to its Germanic context is Ernst Hellgardt's "Einige altenglische, althoch- und altniederdeutsche Interlinearversionen des Psalters im Vergleich," in *Mittelalterliche volkssprachige Glossen*, ed. Bergmann *et al.*, 261–96. Hellgardt bemoans not just neglect of glossed psalters and psalter-fragments with interpretations in other early Germanic languages but also the loss of the manuscript set-up in editions of the texts

(262). And it is salubrious to be reminded of the Psalter of Notker Labeo (Notker Teutonicus, *ca.* 950–1022), which survives in one twelfth-century copy in the monk's own abbey of St. Gallen (Stiftsbibliothek, MS 21), though some score of fragments also witness Notker's work; add to this the "altalemannischen Fragmente," the ninth-century bifolium of Reichenau provenance. That textual editions have not reproduced the manuscript layout is a point much belabored by so-called "New Philology," though editions of OE glossed psalters seem rather less guilty in this regard than those of other OE texts. At some point the argument becomes effete: of course editions do not fully reproduce every detail of the manuscript—that is what facsimiles are for. Hellgardt catalogues interlinear versions too in Old Low Franconian and Old Saxon, and for the latter provides plates of fols. 1-4 from s. ix/x Warsaw, Biblioteka Narodowa Rps. Akc. 6748. Those interested in comments on the OE version can turn to Hellgardt's section IV (269–271); the one complaint that can be raised here, besides the brevity of consideration for the most extensive tradition of glossing the Psalms in an elder Germanic tongue, is the reliance upon mainly one source, Mechthild Gretsch's *The Intellectual Foundations of the English Benedictine Reform* (Cambridge, 1999). Brief examples of the fruits of comparative study of Germanic interpretations of psalter lemmata follow, e.g., renderings of *ira* and *furor* at Ps 37:2 (272–73). Very briefly treated in section VI are test examples for case, tense (which is remarkably brief: in seven and one-half lines we learn that medieval German and English interpreters rendered Latin future verb forms in the present, 275), personal pronouns, and relative subordinate clauses. The pace of coverage and discursive presentation make for only an outline of a sketch of the subject. Though a somewhat lengthier treatment, Hellgardt's final section on the exegetical sources of the versions (277–81) can no more than scratch the surface of a vast subject. A helpful list of Psalters and psalter-fragments with Germanic interpretations other than in OE follows (282–83), arranged in the order: althochdeutsche und altniederdeutsche Psalterien; altsächsische Fragmente; rheinfränkische Cantica-Fragmente; altfriesische Psalmenübersetzung; parallele Psalmenverse innerhalb der deutschen Überlieferung (here the Lublin Old Saxon fragments and verses rendered in "Alemannic," Old Frisian, Old Low Franconian). Ten pages of plates follow, which at least make known the existence of the Warsaw leaves as there is not much discussion of them in the study itself. As with a number of studies in this valuable collection, Hellgardt's offering seems still rather more in the conference presentation stage of development. This is a shame as his emphasis on the OE psalter-versions as part of a larger Germanic tradition (of Eadwine and Notker) is instructive.

Carole Hough undertakes what seems an uphill battle in her "Onomastic Evidence for an Anglo-Saxon Animal Name: OE *pur 'Male Lamb'" (*ES* 83: 377–90), in that she proposes another origin for an OE place-name element that she admits etymologically "seems to be unexceptionable" (378). The place-names Purbeck in Dorset, Purleigh in Essex, and Purley in Berkshire have traditionally been viewed as having in common a first element deriving from OE *pūr*, 'bittern, snipe' (Clark Hall/Meritt adds 'sea gull?'). On the basis of the anonymous OE prose Exodus 12:5 occurrence of *anwintre purlamb* ('a yearling purlamb,' or for the compound itself 'lamb without blemish'), Hough moves toward a re-interpretation of these place-names as deriving from OE *pur = 'lamb'. Though the Exodus passage is tenuous evidence—does the *pur*- derive from Latin *purus*? (as the Lat. adj. was seemingly borrowed via OFr. during the ME period)—but Hough cites also Norwegian *pyr* 'calf' and so with the general sense of "a young male animal" comes to postulate "the existence of an OE *pur 'male lamb'" (381; Hough notes at 382 that a first mention of this alternate explanation of *pur*- was made by J.B. Johnston, *Place Names of England and Wales* [London, 1915], s.v. *Purbeck*). Hough adds what may be an overlooked piece of corroborating evidence from the Scots place-name *Pusk* (recorded as *Pureswic* [1209] and *Pureswjch* [1240]): the first element of this too has traditionally been associated with 'bittern,' though Hough argues that formations in -*wīc* are more likely to be paired with first elements referring to domestic animals than wild birds (385). The great difficulty this argument faces is not so much that it counters the received version as that it abstracts an otherwise unattested noun from a place-name requiring displacement of an attested noun, an argument which Hough has used before (see this section in *YWOES* 2001 for the review of Hough's "Place-Name Evidence for an Anglo-Saxon Animal Name: OE *pohha/*pocca 'Fallow Deer,'" *ASE* 30 [2001]: 1–14). Nonetheless, Hough's discussion of the *pur = 'male lamb' is surrounded by so much additional material of interest about place-names and place-name elements that one doesn't have to come away convinced to have profited from her work.

Christopher Jones's "Old English *fant* and its Compounds in the Anglo-Saxon Vocabulary of Baptism," *MS* 63 (2001): 143–92, gives not just the history of a lexical item but of a liturgical practice as well. Jones begins with the problem of tracing the history of Latin loans in OE, here those brought by the Latin ecclesiastical vocabulary. While Alfred Wollmann studied extensively the earliest Latin loans to OE (*Untersuchungen zu den frühen lateinischen Lehnwörtern im Altenglischen: Phonologie und Datierung* [Munich, 1990]), Jones restricts his focus to 'font' as "The

growth of a vernacular word-group around 'font' constitutes an index not only to the status of baptism generally but also to its specific forms and canonical regulation" (144). Thus Jones examines a narrow lexical grouping (*fant*, *fantbæð*, *fantbletsung*, and other *fant*- compounds) but goes about it methodically and with great detail, a sort of old-fashioned philological investigation one no longer sees very often—a shame as this is genuinely interdisciplinary work. Jones begins with the question of the origin of *fant*, going against Irish as the vector of transmission and asking whether it is a "mission-term." He settles on the *Missionsgebiet* argument: "A second and more promising trail leads to the Continent, where reflexes of Lat. *fons* (*baptismi*) appear in a number of early Germanic languages" (145). It's a necessary preliminary decision on his part, as the superstructure of the lengthy and detailed investigation that follows rests upon the possibility of this Germanic vector. And so in less than one paragraph the Irish explanation is dealt away with, probably too hastily as neither Ferdinand Holthausen (*Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3rd ed. [Heidelberg, 1974]) nor the *Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology* are particularly eager to assign a Celtic origin to any English word. Their caution suggests reason; details concerning the Celtic terms for 'font' and 'fount' have been collapsed together and dismissed too quickly since there's more to Irish *foinse* than has been briefly covered, not to mention *fuarán/uarán*, *cuisle*, *tobar*. At any rate, on to the Germanic path and the problem of dating: "not a single attestation in any Germanic language can be dated with certainty before the tenth century" (147). Though OE may bear the earliest datable occurrences, these are not quite as frequent as one might think for so elemental an ecclesiastic term: twenty-four as a simplex, and about the same number in compound formations, but none in early texts. Jones rightly questions assuming that an unglossed occurrence of Latin *fons* in texts such as the interlinear glossed psalters signals a naturalization of the loan; problematic, as he notes, is the partial glossing at Ps 35:10 *fons uitae*, which "is interpreted simply as *lif* in J [Arundel Psalter], but *lifes* in G [Vitellius Psalter] makes no sense in the absence of a gloss to *fons*" (147 n. 16). This takes psalter-glossing tradition a little too literally: the nominative form *lif* in Arundel for genitive *uitae* is unusual, though it indicates a lexical gloss, while the *lifes* in Vitellius makes good sense as an accurate rendering of *uitae*. The two manuscripts involved simply have gaps over *fons* (whereas the Eadwine Psalter has a misplaced gloss): it is tempting to take this as an indication that the Latin word did not need a vernacular rendering, and such a gap isn't unique: in Vitellius one can find unglossed *Sion* (Ps 125:1; and not simply a matter of proper names going unglossed: at Ps 147:19 *Israhel* is glossed *isr'*) and *Iacob* (58:14), though

more curious is the absence of a gloss to *ceperunt* (58:4). Other examples could be added (see Pulsiano, *Old English Glossed Psalters: Psalms 1-50* [Toronto, 2001]), but the interesting point to hand from the glossed psalters is how *fons uitae* is taken in this context in the (relatively) early (Vespasian: *waelle lifes*) to later psalters (*fons* glossed as *welle*, *wylle*, *wille*, *wyl*). The liturgical centrality of the text—the Book of Psalms—did not seem to trigger *fant* in this context (Jones thinks it "confirms the translator's sensitivity to literal meaning in the Latin" [162]). Jones moves on to the sense of the borrowed Latin form (it did have the meaning 'spring, fountain, water-source'; 148) and the vowel in *fant/ font* (which "remained an allophone of /ɑ/" [149 n. 25]), though Jones expresses doubt about the "popular" status of the loan (i.e., from Vulgar Latin or Proto-Romance; 150-51) and allows that it is likely a "learned" borrowing (though following this sense as a sociolinguistic marker, i.e., "learned" in the sense of path of transmission and diffusion and the likely users of the term [152]). Jones then turns to the baptismal font itself as thing, that is, the archaeological evidence. Baptism in the Catholic rite may be by immersion or pouring/infusion (canon 854: *baptismus conferatur sive per immersionem sive per infusionem*; *Codex Iuris Canonici* [Vatican City, 1983]); there must have been a good many examples of Anglo-Saxon fonts as infant baptism was "the norm by our period, except in mission territories" (154-55). But "[l]arge gaps remain in the archaeological record" (155)—where were they? As Jones notes, the translator of the OE Bede rendered *baptisteria* (medieval Latin *baptisterium*) "noncommittally" as *fulwihtstowe* (so too in the Cleopatra glossaries: Wright-Wülcker 359,28 *baptisterio: fulwiht stowe*; 494,12 *baptisterio: fulwihtstowe*, which entry occurs in a grouping with the rubric *De Clementi*). Anglo-Saxon baptism may have been "a function of large, regional minister churches, devolving upon smaller local churches only as a parish-system began to emerge in the tenth century" (155); OE *fulwihtstow* may simply also indicate those other "gathering places" where baptisms could occur (canon 857 states that *proprius baptismi locus est ecclesia aut oratorium*, though it allows for other sites *casum necessitatis*). Jones turns then to use of *fant* and *fant*-compounds, especially in Ælfrician usage (164–90); this brings up the matter of what *fant* in the sense 'baptismal font' refers to (standing font or merely a basin, such as when rendering *urceum* [167]). Glossary activity, especially that deriving from Isidore's *De vasis vinariis et aquariis* (XX.vi) and *De fluminibus* (XIII.xxi) in the *Etymologiae*, evidences knowledge of the polysemous nature of Latin *fons*, allowing Jones to conclude that: "A learned author knew very well where *fant* came from and how the etymon meant one thing in church, another outdoors and possibly another ('source') in metaphors from Scripture and

literature" (170). Of the seven known *fant*-compounds six occur in the N + N form, one in N + ADJ; of these, *fantfæt*, *fantstan*, and *fantwæter* "have finally dispelled the vagueness of both *fant* and its etymon by clearly distinguishing the receptacle from the water" (171). Interestingly, Ælfric in his OE version of the *Vita* of Irish monk St. Fursey misses the polysemy of *fons* by an over-ecclesiastic rendering of *fons* and *aqua viva* (181); doubly interesting in that Ælfric could make such an error and that one calls to mind that the continental *Missionsgebiet* and insular ecclesiastic culture was as Irish as Anglo-Saxon. Jones's discussion of these *fant*-compounds entails many interesting excurses into the liturgical history of the Anglo-Saxon period, though he returns in his concluding remarks to the crux that for so important a sacrament the relative paucity of occurrences of its terminology in OE leaves the "impression of a word-family without deep or far-spreading roots" (190). And, liturgically, the "impression of 'learnedness' about the term … weaken[s] the notion that it belonged to a core of elementary Christian vocabulary" (191). Clearly a great amount of work went into this study, and one would like to see Jones pursue not just "a thorough study of Old English baptismal terminology in all periods" (190), but of the OE liturgical vocabulary as a whole.

"More on the 'Instability' of Interdental Fricatives: Gothic *þliuhan* 'flee' and Old English *flēon* 'flee' Revisited" (*Word* 53: 1–8) by Mark J. Jones responds to an earlier article on the same subject in that journal by Göran Kjellmer ("Unstable Fricatives: On Gothic *þliuhan* and Old English *flēon*," *Word* 46 [1995]: 207–23). The argument is a phonological one and concerns the proto-form behind the Gothic and OE descendants, the crux being the initial consonant clusters *þl-* and *fl-*, for which Kjellmer 1995 had assembled a variety of data to shows a pattern in a number of IE languages for the development [θ] > [f] rather than [f] > [θ] (one thinks of English and American regional and social dialectal usage, which bears this out). Thus the Gothic cluster was seen as preserving the original Proto-Germanic initial cluster. Kjellmer had argued for an articulatory motivation for the shift, yet Jones notes that: "Although the physical distance between the places of articulation for [θ] and [f] may be relatively small when compared with the extent of the vocal tract, if articulatory distance is calculated to include muscular reorganisation as a factor, the gulf between these sounds appears much greater" (5). Jones adheres not to an argument of articulatory phonetics but to an "acoustic-auditory-perceptual" one (3). While noting that Kjellmer's observation regarding the change [θ] > [f] in Germanic languages holds true in general, Jones specifies the differing circumstances in the Gothic and OE forms for 'flee' as they involve consonant clusters, in which

sounds behave differently. Thus Jones, on the basis of the scarcity of the cluster [θl] and relatively high frequency of [fl], is "inclined to regard [fl-] as the original onset cluster, and to interpret the Gothic form as a hypercorrection" (6; Jones's evidence for hypercorrection here involves rare dialect forms, such as nineteenth-century Surrey pronunciation of 'flail' with initial [θr]). Jones expands upon the particular case under examination to the general observation that "despite what current phonological models would have us believe, articulation is only ever half the story (at most), and even though physical constraints on articulatory gestures play a role in sound change, acoustic-auditory evaluation of the output of vocal tract gymnastics will always have the last word in deciding what contrasts and what does not" (6–7).

Ursula Kalbhen's 2001 Munich dissertation *Kentische Glossen und Kentischer Dialekte im Altenglischen* has now been published as part of the Münchener Universitätsschriften series Texte und Untersuchungen zur Englischen Philologie (Band 28; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2003) and so will be reviewed in this section next year.

English Colour Terms: Etymology, Chronology, and Relative Basicness, Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 60 (Helsinki: Société Néophilologique) is the published form of Seija Kerttula's 2002 Helsinki dissertation. A diachronic study of color terms in English arranged largely by colors (93–241), of interest to Old English specialists will be the survey of "Previous Research in Old and Middle English colour terms" (45–79), which includes a brief but encouraging mention of work reevaluating Celtic influence on English color terminology (49–50), and Appendix A (350, of "English colour terms in chronological order by first occurrence"; eleven of these are placed in the OE period: white, *swart*, dark, red, yellow, hoary, dun, green, purple, grey). Interesting, curious too, is the section on "Marginal or obsolete English colour terms" (238–41), among whose number are *swart* (dated to OE and listed as a "brightness term"; not considered is its survival in topographic and onomastic evidence), *incarnadine* (dated to 1591; not mentioned is its survival as a "learned" poetic term), *verdigris* (dated to 1668; it is still a term in active use by numismatists), *bisquit* (1884) and *bisque* (1922). Some of the list's entrants are patently arguable, and an afternoon (should one choose) of programming on HGTV or any other design or home show currently in vogue would doubtless provide a few dozen or score more examples. The dissertation is fairly rigidly programmatic and very basic, and not only when it seeks to refine a sense of "relative basicness" of English color terminology: "Colours surround people wherever they live. They have been man's

companion since the very beginning" (18). So much for dogs.

A difficulty that has been around for some time is addressed in Marcin Krygier's "A Re-classification of Old English Nouns" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 38: 311–19), namely, that the traditional assignment of OE nouns to Germanic gender/declension classes does not work. Krygier draws on work on this matter in the 1990s by Roger Lass and Dieter Kastovsky; of interest is that thinking had been headed toward this direction—that of synchronic concerns over diachronic—even earlier (Krygier cites Alfred Reskiewicz's *Elementy gramatyki historycznej języka angielskiego: Język staroangielski* [Warsaw, 1961]; trans. as *Synchronic Essentials of Old English: West Saxon* [Warsaw, 1998]). The problem with the declensional arrangement in OE is that "gender indeterminancy for many nouns is so high that it is virtually impossible to say with any degree of certainty that such assignment is at all possible" (311). Thus, while in PGmc. the morphological structure is transparent for nouns, such as the proto-form for 'day' **dag-a-z* (root, stem, inflection), the "stem formatives were no longer distinguishable" (312) in OE. Objections are made to the artificiality, for instance, of "treating the *a*-stem masculines and neuters as belonging to different paradigms, while masculine and neuter *n*-stems are without exception collapsed into one inflectional type" (313). And, Krygier continues, "This leads to another aspect of the OE nominal morphology which urgently needs rethinking, namely the category of grammatical gender" (313). And so Krygier bars both the morphological structure of the noun and grammatical gender from a classification of OE nouns, which raises the question, what then is to be used? What is suggested in place of traditional Neogrammarian classification is derived from a "similarity matrix … of shared similarities among all the productive inflectional types" (315). By this system Krygier comes up with three declensions: I) traditional strong masculines and neuters; II) traditional strong feminines; III) traditional weak masculines, feminines, and neuters (316). The advantage here, Krygier maintains, is that this system is not only "much simpler" but "is truly synchronic" (316). It also has "retrodictive power … the ability to correctly predict and explain the subsequent developments as they really happened" (317). To be fair to the Neogrammarian system, it was always understood to be something of an imposition from Greek and Latin grammar (applied also to Sanskrit, for instance, which had its own highly developed linguistic vocabulary): it was a form of shorthand, a way to organize data in the IE dialects to allow for broad mass comparisons among the languages ensuring that the handbooks and grammars would be arranged in similar fashion. Krygier's reduction of the

declensional system into fewer paradigms makes sense for the grammar of English; the other purpose of such paradigms was to teach OE in the context of PGmc. Perhaps this is yet another rumbling of serious reworking of the writing and teaching of OE grammar to come.

Pil-Hwan Lee's "Relativization and Preposition Stranding in Old English: Morphological and Functional Approach," *Journal of English Language and Literature* (Seoul) 47 (2001): 643–68, approaches "preposition stranding" in English diachronically. The "stranding" referred to is the movement of a grammatical element from its other elements in the construction: here the "stranding" of the preposition from its PP (Lee employs a transformational approach), such as one sees in MnE "Where are you going **to?**" Additionally, Lee considers overt and covert objects, here of prepositional phrases, such as OE *on ðære ðe*.

In "Tradurre dall'anglosassone: il mare 'salato,'" in *Testo medievale e traduzione: Bergamo 27–28 ottobre 2000*, ed. Maria Grazia Cammarota and Maria Vittoria Molinari; Serie Traduzione Letteraria (Bergamo: Bergamo UP, 2001), 237–270, Patrizia Lendinara considers the OE collocation *sealt sæ* and near equivalents diachronically and understands the rendering as arising in the poetry as a 'stylistic element' that in this case is neither arcane nor dependent upon polysemy but wholly transparent ("lungi dall'essere posto davanti a un vocabulo polisemico o di difficile interpretazione … del tutto transparente dal punto di vista semantico" [238]—which does beg the question that if so transparent, why did it arise in OE and why do we still use it?). One finds also the collocations *sealt mere* and *sealte yðas*, and Lendinara catalogues other less frequent pairings (once each in poetry for *sealt* + *flod* and *mere*, twice in poetry and once in the glosses with *mersc*), and the discussion focuses at first upon these and other poetic pairings (*sealte streamas*, *sealt wæg*, *sealt wæter*, 239–254). In part, the co-occurrences are *metri causa*: some of them obviously alliterative, and Lendinara also notices an apparent constraint in the use of *sealt* + substantive: it can appear in the interior of a hemistich, in the second half (the examples cited by Lendinara all involve PPs), or it appears as a noun phrase where the /s/ of *sealt(e)* is the arsis (253); a few examples might make this clearer: *ofer sealtne sæ* (*Christ* 677a); *on sealtne sæ* (*Meters of Boethius*, metrum 19, 16a); *sealte flodas* (*Paris Psalter* Ps 68, 4b); *sealte yða* (*Paris Psalter* Ps 76:13, 2b; *Exodus* 442b). A pattern does seem to be present, a difficulty of course being the relative infrequency of occurrences of *sealt* + N in the poetry. Passages cited from the prose corpus cement the notion of the importance of collocative 'salt sea/water' in OE. More difficult is any explanation why: "Nella letteratura anglosasone

il sale ha un valore positivo" (262), the basic importance of salt given grounding by Lendinara in biblical phraseology (the 'salt of the earth,' *sal terrae* of Mt 5:13), as a nutritional or alimentary staple, as essential to life itself. A brief section on "the other Germanic languages" offers corroborative evidence for the collocative use (Old Frisian *salta se* in the Riustring Codex). Lendinara's conclusion mentions the continuity of the expression and its non-redundancy (as for translators); very quickly mentioned is 'sweet water'—and this brings up a very important matter. For as OE refers to 'mare salato' it does so with some sense of there being reciprocal terms—that is, the 'salt sea' and 'salt water' as opposed to 'sweet water' or 'fresh water' (*fersc, swete*); compare, from *Leechdoms*: *dulci aqua potata*: *ðæs swetan wætres and ðæs ferscan* or *fersc wæter and swete*. Or, more intriguingly, from Ælfric's translation of Bede's *De natura rerum* (appearing also in the *Leechdoms*): *7 gif hit sealt bið of ðære sæ, hit bið þurh þære sunnan hætan, 7 ðurh ðære lyfte bradnysse to ferscum wætan awend*. OE seems to evidence in opposition to 'salt water' that which is 'fresh and sweet'; one of the adjectives still applies in commonplace MnE 'freshwater.' An interesting subject that could no doubt be expanded upon.

René Lepelley adds to the literature on the etymology of *viking* with his "Considérations étymologiques sur le mot *viking*" (*Annales de Normandie* 52: 67–72). Lepelley begins with a first consideration of terms for the people *Viking* referred to: the *Northmanni* according to the western European medieval scribes, while the Anglo-Saxon scribes used the term for "leurs turbulents 'visiteurs'" (67). Etymological roots to *vīkingr* form the next consideration, and the usual suspects appear: ON *vík*, 'creek, cove, fjord,' Lat. *vicus*, as 'village' (in toponyms) or in sense of 'encampment,' ON *vig*, 'combat' (67–68). Lepelley adds his own suggestion, and it relies upon interpreting OE *wīcing* as deriving from *wicing* < **wig-kining* (69). DeVries reviews all but this most recent derivation and suggests plausibly a connection to *víkja* (thus 'Seeräuber,' 'sea-raider'; *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [Leiden, 1977]). A semantically attractive solution to the *Viking* problem, but the form, requiring a syncopated *cyning*, may be another matter and it will be interesting to see how this proposal fares with the Germanistik scholars. The venue of publication of course echoes an interest in the Northmen; of bibliographic interest to this question is another French study cited by Lepelley: Guy Nondier, "Aux origines du nom viking," *Études Normandes* (1998).

Anatoly Liberman's "Origin Unknown" in *Studies in the History of the English Language: A Millennial Perspective*, ed. Donka Minkova and Robert Stockwell; Topics in

English Linguistics 39 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter), 109–
23, deals by way of a number of examples with the titular
designation as it appears in dictionaries: whether it reflects
genuine lack of knowledge over a word's origin in the lan-
guage or is "relative," as Liberman sees with some entries
in the *Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology* (ed. C.T.
Onions; Oxford, 1966), which bears the influence of the
Oxford English Dictionary's James Murray—that, "when
in doubt, say nothing, for no etymology is better than a
wrong one" (110). Liberman is himself engaged in an "ana-
lytic" etymological dictionary of English to fill the gap he
finds with this Germanic language: its wanting a great ety-
mological lexicon based on the comparative method the
likes of a Feist (Sigmund Feist, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch
der gotischen Sprache* [Leiden, 1939]; Winfred P. Lehmann,
A Gothic Etymological Dictionary [Leiden, 1986]). Liber-
man begins with an example of reduction in certainty as
the comparative method bore fruit with the example of the
etymology of *stubborn*, once "known" to be Greek *στιβαρός*
(as asserted in Francis Junius's *Etymologicum Anglicanum*
[Oxford, 1743]). Such certainty has subsequently crum-
bled and a connection with OE *stybb* "cannot be proved"
(109). Liberman's investigation cites the *OED* and *ODEE*
in the main for the current state of the etymology of Eng-
lish words, naturally enough, though other sources have
worked either around or beyond the great Oxford lexicon;
thus for the example of *butterfly* Liberman cites the decla-
ration by the Oxford lexica that "the reason of the name is
unknown," though the *OED* goes on in its entry (updated
in the online version since September 2003, though noth-
ing new apparently to the word at hand), that on the basis
of comparison with Dutch *boterschijte* "the insect was so
called from the appearance of its excrement." The *Ameri-
can Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (4th ed.;
Boston, 2000) fleshes this out and also includes the folk
notion of a witch in insect form making off with the but-
ter. At any rate, the first record of the compound in Eng-
lish is from Ælfric's *Glossary*: *papilio*: *buttorfleoge*. The
curious reference to *plug-ugly* and *hot dog* as "amusing
monstrosities" (111) and as being too of "origin unknown"
doesn't take into account recent American work on such
terms: *hot dog* has been a subject of much conversation on
the American Dialect Society listserv and in that society's
organ of publication, *American Speech*, while *plug-ugly* the
American Heritage Dictionary attributes to the Plug Uglies
gangs "active in several East Coast cities in the 1850s"; it
isn't too much to see in the name of the famine-era Irish
street gang—if not from the "plug-hats" reputedly worn
by members—a fairly simple potential origin: from Brit-
ish dialectal *plug* for a punch, a knock to the head—some
members of the street gang no doubt had been punched
ugly. And while Liberman warns against the work of Eric

Partridge (*Origins*, *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconven-
tional English*), Partridge's recording of cant and "criminal
argot" and "low vocabulary" in general is still valuable for
its attestations and range: a breaking of the class barrier, so
to speak. The foregoing examples point to a disciplinary
divide, Liberman holding fast to a more "scientific" etymo-
logical practice (and concerned rather more with the earlier
stages of the language, and with proto-forms in Germanic
and IE), investigators of modern expressions (especially
those in American English) leaning toward a more "cul-
tural," or perhaps quasi-anthropological, approach. None-
theless, both approaches have produced results—and both
have frequently enough been wrong. Liberman suggests
that one can understand the perils of the "origin unknown"
catch-all better by looking at words of "known" etymology:
he gives, as likely the most secure, the case of onomato-
poeic words. Next may be words from proper names and
"disguised compounds" (e.g., *woman* < *wīfman*; the case of
lady is much more difficult: see the discussion of Bammes-
berger above). Liberman's last section of his study turns
to examples of such words of "unknown origin"; he gives
a list of 137 such forms (115–16) and selects a few for fur-
ther comment. In discussing *clover* (OE *clāfre*) Liberman
accepts the longstanding connection to *cleave* but is skep-
tical of the attempts by Dutch scholars to argue for sub-
strate influence; while acknowledging important work in
substrate influence in Romance, Liberman argues that "in
Germanic the situation is different, and extreme caution is
needed to prevent the substrate from becoming a respect-
able-looking dump for words of unascertained, and often
unascertainable, origin" (120). Liberman's study is valuable
not only for the specific detail of argument but for gen-
eral formulations that put things pithily right; the subject
of his study really involves "words that do not allow mod-
ern investigators to 'make one step back in history'" (115).
And the craft itself of finding a word's etymology "means
to break through the arbitrariness of the sign, to reach a
stage at which the sound complex before us stops being
absolutely conventional" (114).

Bettelou Los seeks to make a functional explanation
for "The Loss of the Indefinite Pronoun *man*: Syntac-
tic Change and Information Structure," in *English His-
torical Syntax and Morphology: Selected Papers from 11
ICEHL, Santiago de Compostela, 7-11 September 2000*, ed.
Teresa Fanego, María José López-Couso, and Javier Pérez-
Guerra (Amsterdam: John Benjamins), 181–202. The ques-
tion is long-standing and the solution proposed here isn't
novel, though restated in functionalist terms: "We have
suggested two additional factors which almost completely
destroyed the niche occupied by *man* in Old English. The
first one was the loss of V2 [verb-second], which affected

the information structure of the clause, and promoted the use of various passive constructions over the use of an active construction with a *man* subject. The second one was the competition between *to*-infinitives and subjunctive clauses which resulted in *man* in these contexts being largely ousted by generic (or arbitrary) PRO [proform]" (197–98). As far as studies in this school go, Los' essay is relative sparing in the use of such jargon and focuses closely and quickly in on an important morphological matter (the loss of indefinite *man*, retained by some other Germanic languages [Swedish, German, Dutch the examples given], replaced by *one*) and its syntactic repercussions: "competition between subjunctive *that*-clauses and *to*-infinitives" (181) and its replacement by the impersonal passive. Los admits at the outset what amounts to a concession to optimality: "the demise of *man* may have been hastened by the fact that the form may have become too opaque because of the existence of similar forms with similar meanings" (182)—or, one form in particular, *man(n)*, which Clark Hall/Meritt notes came to be "used indefinitely, like Mod. Eng. *'one'*" (s.v. *mann*). Los selects Ælfric's prose as "a good representative of authentic Old English" (183), which is fair enough as long as one means "standard written Old English": in terms of optimality, quite important but almost entirely unrecoverable for OE is the role of spoken OE in the competition and loss of forms (e.g., the rise of *they/their/them* in the personal pronoun system). With the Ælfrician examples Los divides instances into *man* clause-initial and not clause-initial in main clauses, and in subclauses into those occurring in subjunctive *that*-clauses and a fourth 'other' category. The first of these groupings, *man* clause-initial, yields some interesting dividends: its use is in the topic, or thematic, position, its function often anaphoric, provising "a link with the previous sentence, to maximize textual cohesion" (184); Los notes 26 instances of *man* in such a position, noting that "they all occur at, or close to, the beginning of a new episode" (185). Not surprisingly, considering the modern descendant of the construction, "Eleven of the 26 clause-initial uses are precepts" (185); so, from the *Catholic Homilies: Hit is awriten: Man sceal hine gebiddan to his drihtne*. The use of *man* in not clause-initial position Los sees as more of an "empty element" as it is less prominent and its loss more readily explicable. Nonetheless it is of higher frequency, though its syntactic environment is somewhat more restrictive as it function in such constructions as a clitic following "the finite verb when the first constituent … is a *wh*-word, the negator *ne* or a member of a restricted group of adverbs, most prominently *þa* 'then'" (187); its use is a lot clearer in the OE itself: *ða gebrohte man him to*, *tomiddes þam folce*, *ænne dumne man*, or *Be ðisum lytlan man mæg understandan*. Los may load the deck slightly by not translating *man*

in these two examples, which a modern parser of the OE likely would, as would, one presumes, the native speaker of OE. The use of *man* in subjunctive *that*-clauses generally involves evaluative predicatives (e.g., *Nis na god þæt man nime his bearna hlaf*), verbs of commanding and permitting, or verbs of persuading and urging (194–96). Los actually focuses rather more on the syntax of *man* than its eventual loss, dated to the fifteenth century, but is able to suggest that the syntax played an important role: as OE *man* was "in competition with generic PRO" (namely, that *one* would assume its role) and was under the constraint of "the ban on appearing in object position (of verb or preposition)" it was already facing replacement; and as "the *to*-infinitive ousts such subjunctive clauses [OE *that*-clauses] … this use of *man* disappears with it" (196–97). Los notes one "niche" in which the construction of *man*'s successor *one* can function as subject in a finite clause, namely "after a verb of persuading and urging like *teach*," for which is provided the MnE example: "the British side of his character had taught him **one** should only appear in the press thrice in a lifetime—'when born, when dead and when receiving the Victoria Cross'" (197). Nonetheless, this seems rather a matter of a precept again, something always within the province of *man*/*one* anyway.

The title may seem a bit wild—"'Ingvaeonic' **ster(i)r*-'Star' and Astral Priests" (*NOWELE* 39 [2001]: 85–113)—but Tom Markey's study of proto-forms in IE and 'Ingvaeonic' dialects is a wildly interesting linguistic-cultural survey of "an archaic thematic nexus and cultural datum: **deity : power : star** + **(divine) power : star** (86). The examples range across all the branches of IE, from a Vedic hymn to Indra (*Rigveda* 6.49) to numismatic evidence of Gaulish. For the OE specialist there is Markey's discussion of the "failure to assimilate *-rn-* to *-rr-*" (88) in Ingvaeonic dialects (Markey discusses here OE and Old Frisian); the pre-form **sterrō(n)* maintained the geminate in OE and "induced breaking" (87), thus masc. *steorra*. The plural-looking *-n* Markey notes as historically 'singulative,' using the example of OE *hyll* ('hill') < **hulniyaz*, which ancestrally has the core sense 'that which has been raised' (92). Markey also provides a proto-paradigm of OE *steorra* (**sterras*, **sterra*, **sterrum*, etc.; 94). Though a bit further afield for OE specialists, Markey includes a fascinating section on recent work with the Negau site in Slovenia: a La Tène site, on the border between Pannonia and Noricum, and the find-site of a hoard of what are now called Negau helmets (twenty-six of them, including one preserving a famous runic inscription). Markey seems to indicate that the helmets by 300 B.C. or so had become sacral implements: all of which is tied into the "astral priests" of the title. Much food for thought here though OE is treated only briefly.

Margarita Mele Marrero adopts a functional-lexematic approach to examine "The Anglo-Saxon *Dreams*: The Semantic Space of *swefnian* and *mætan*," *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 43 (2001): 193–207. The pursuit here is the joining semantically and cognitively of the two sense of *dream*, 'joy' and, in the *OED* formulation, 'train of thoughts, images, or fancies passing through the mind during sleep; a vision during sleep; the state in which this occurs.' Two OE verbs of 'dreaming' are discussed: *swefnian* in its senses of 'to dream' and, with the accusative of person, 'to appear in a dream to a person'; and *mætan*, 'to dream,' with dative or accusative of person (thus *me mette*). The two verbs are placed "within the domain of COGNITION" (200), though the two senses of the verbs ('to dream, to appear in a dream') suggest that this is a verb of mental and physical perception. The joining together of the historical sense of the *dream* (OE *drēam* and MnE *dream*) seems somewhat pedestrian after some fairly technical linguistic analysis: "When the Anglo-Saxons dreamt, they were happy; when visions presented to then [*sic*] while asleep, they had premotions [*sic*; read 'premonitions'] of good or evil. Their legacy allowed us to have 'dreams of joy'" (205). Unless of course a *mare*.

Rafał Molencki traces "The Status of *dearr* and *þearf* in Old English" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 38: 363–80) preliminary to a forthcoming study of ME *durren* and *thurven* (and the replacement of the latter by *neden*: hence in MnE we are needing, but not thearfing). OE class III preterite-present verbs *durran* and *þearfan* had "semantic and syntactic properties [that] distinguished them from other preterite-present verbs," namely that they "tended to occur only in nonasertive (negative, interrogative and conditional) contexts" (363). A curiosity Molencki observes is "the absence of non-finite forms" (367; e.g., infinitives, participles) for the verbs: the occurrence of *þearfende* in the OE *Apollonius of Tyre* (*Hlaford Apolloni, ure ceaster is þearfende*, 378) "was only used as a nominal adjective corresponding to modern 'poor, needy'" (368).

Ruta Nagucka's "Determination and Interpretation of Semantic Lexical Underspecification in Old English Homilies" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 38: 381–92), despite its daunting title, is a brief and clear look at polysemous terms and their comprehension in OE homilies. Drawing on semantic theories of polysemy, namely the notions of 'underspecification' (Nagucka cites here R.L. Trask's *Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in English* [New York, 1993]) and the "unpacking" of the sense of a polysemous item. The discussion is limited to six OE terms: *leorningcniht*, *apostol*, *ærendraca*, *leornere*, *letanie*, *ele*, *þrowend*. Thus, in a discussion of Ælfric we learn that he was "one of the

greatest, if not *the* greatest, Old English homilists" (381)— condolences to Wulfstan, one supposes, as the other possible claimant—and that "the Old English homilist always made a conscious effort to give his audience and readers the meaning in a clear and digestible vernacular idiom" (382). It seems difficult to know whether loans from Greek and Latin, such as the Anglicized forms *apostol* and *discipul*, "can hardly be associated with any native sense and thus are completely incomprehensible puzzles to Old English uneducated people" (384). That Ælfric and other educated Anglo-Saxons at times sought to find maximally transparent renderings of Greek and Latin ecclesiastical terms, often in the form of highly literal compound formations (as did speakers of other early Germanic languages), seems clear enough. The discussion of "underspecified" terms follows then the fate of *litania* and *oleum* and *oliva*, ostensibly as OE *ele* meant 'oil' and could be "unpacked" to cover both of the foregoing forms of oil involved (helpful here would have been a consideration of OE *crisma* as 'chrism, holy oil'). Of course there were all sorts of new words coming into the language during the period from Greek and Latin: the glossaries provide evidence in abundance. Perhaps not given its due weight here is the ability of not just homilists to explain periphrastically "underspecified" terms rather than or in addition to struggling to find or invent near native equivalents.

The "semantic problem" of "How to Understand *understand*," *NM* 102 (2001): 185–99, is treated by John Newman who begins with the apparent gap in matching the transparent elements of the compound verb (OE *understandan*) with the sense 'understand, perceive' that "developed out of this formation" (185). Though the form has been treated before (Francis Wood in two studies 1899–1900, Shigeru Ono in two as well 1979–1984) Newman appeals to advances in Cognitive linguistics to better understand *understandan* with "an appreciation of central and peripheral meanings of morphemes … an appreciation of the role of metaphor in understanding semantic extension … and an appreciation of image schemas (e.g., of *stand*) and their relevance to semantic extensions" (185). By access to the electronic *DOE* corpus a schedule of occurrences of OE *understandan* is tabulated and the use is overwhelmingly late West Saxon (in fact there are no occurrences in Anglian whatsoever in the prose and glossarial corpora; 186). The hypothesis of a century's duration that *understand* is similar in semantic extension to forms such as Lat. *cernere* that have the sense 'separate, distinguish' and therefore 'discern, understand' is covered as is a more recent metaphorical analysis that reads 'stand among/under' > 'be physically close to' > 'understand' (188–190). Newman finds neither to be wholly satisfactory, and so the analysis turns to parts, and

first the prefix *under-*, which is to be found as a formative element in some thirty-nine OE verbs: a significant point, though Newman's list is drawn from Henry Sweet's *Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1896) (a check of Clark Hall/Meritt produces fifty, or forty-nine if *undergestandan* and *understandan* are taken as one). Although at first Newman's statement that "there is an element of secrecy immanent in the meanings of these *under-* verbs" seems odd, an appeal to senses of Lat. verbs with *sub-* and a sense of 'concealing' makes sense as an extended semantic scheme deriving from 'beneath, below' > 'secretly.' Making the picture more complex are OE *underniman* 'take in, comprehend, understand', *undergietan* 'understand, perceive', and *underþencan* 'consider'. The difficulty for the semanticist is the expected pattern of development from concrete to abstract; while one may say that "*undergietan* came into use as a more specifically abstract variant of *ongietan*" one finds that "There is no evidence that *undergietan* emerges gradually out of any immediately prior concrete sense" (193; of interest to the titular verb under consideration is the entry in Clark Hall/Meritt for *undergestandan*, 'to stand under': a concrete sense). Some help is found in that "a verbal 'stand' morpheme can easily be extended to abstract senses" (195), with Newman appealing to MnE *insist* and *persist* having their origin in Lat. *sistere* (helpful, but not cited, is Clark Hall/Meritt's gloss of *understandan* as *subsistere*). Though the IE evidence is cursorily treated in a paragraph (195–96), there is more to be made of *-sistere*. Needing more elaboration too is the suggestion that "*understandan* could be viewed as a variant" (197) of OE *forstandan*. Given the significant number of OE verbs with *under-*, four of them having to do with mental perception, there is plenty more evidence for study and no doubt more to be said about semantic extension with *under-* verbs.

Expressions denoting 'to go one's way' are examined in Michiko Ogura's "*On the way*, *on way*, and *away* in Old and Middle English," in *Middle English from Tongue to Text: Selected Papers from the Third International Conference on Middle English: Language and Text, Held at Dublin, Ireland, 1-4 July 1999*, ed. Peter J. Lucas and Angela M. Lucas (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang), 71–82. Ogura notes approximately seven types of constructions with *weg* that can mean "on one's way, on the way, away," including those with a verb of motion + *weg* (in adverbial accusative or genitive), or a verb of motion + *on þæm*/*þone weg*, or a verb of motion + *on wege* or *aweg* or related variant. Ogura sees a process or "weakening" at work, from the "idiomatisation" of constructions with variations of *on* (…) *weg(e)* to their grammaticalization in forms such as *onweg*, *anweg*, *aweg*. Ogura acknowledges that the matter is more complex than it may seem as "the morpho-phonological

weakening seems to have taken place in the prehistoric Old English period" (71). Add to this the influence of loan-formations deriving from OE renderings of Latin *uiam* and *in uia*; here Ogura has recourse to glossed psalters and the OE Gospels. She notes further complexity in the matter of translation as "*repellere* is rendered *on weg drifan* in the *Vespasian Psalter* (A), *aweg adrifan* in the *Cambridge Psalter* (C), but *anydan* in the early West Saxon *Regius Psalter* (D)" (72). With the help of Phillip Pulsiano's *Old English Glossed Psalters: Psalms 1-50* (Toronto, 2001) one sees that the matter is more complex still: *non reppuli* in Ps 17:23 is glossed *on weg ne adraf* in Vespasian (A) and Junius (B), *aweg ne adraf* in Cambridge (C), and simply *adraf* without a *weg* construction in Stowe (F), Vitellius (H), and Arundel (J). The collective edition of the OE glossed psalters should afford more data in the future for examinations of such translation strategies. The Gospel evidence points to renderings of *in uia* by prepositional/adverbial *on weg*, *on þæm wege*, or *on þone wege* (73–5). A common construction in OE prose is verbs of motion or taking with *aweg*, though it is not the only expression (75–8; in the *Blickling Homilies* one finds constructions such as *onweg anumen* while Ælfric frequently uses *aweg* or *on þone wege* and closely related variants). In examining early Middle English Ogura notes that while OE could use *onweg* and *aweg* to mean 'on the way' there is increasing replacement of *onweg* by *aweg* in ME. Ogura concludes that the two are "variants … chosen in stylistically and semantically distinct environments … with occasional overlapping by morphological confusion" (81).

Ogura's "Verbs of Motion in Laȝamon's *Brut*," in *Laȝamon: Contexts, Language, and Interpretation*, ed. Rosamund Allen, Lucy Perry, and Jane Roberts (London: King's College London), 211–25, makes use of the comparative data offered by the two manuscripts of Laȝamon/Lawman (and the preface to the collection, at p. xi, offers a helpful brief digression on the forms of the author's name). Ogura had earlier treated verbs of speaking in the *Brut*, namely variation in use of *queðen* (Caligula MS) and *cweðen* (Otho MS; Ogura, *The Syntactic and Semantic Rivalry of QUOTH, SAY, and TELL in Medieval English* [Tokyo, 1981]), and now treats verbs of motion in the texts with an eye toward either diachronic variation (if the manuscript copies are taken to be separated by about three-quarters of a century) or synchronic variation (if the two copies are approximately contemporaneous). Specifically with regard to Old English the reader can see Ogura's section §2 (p. 213) which draws on an illustrative example from the OE versions of Gregory's *Dialogues*: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 322 employing *gan* where Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud 636 usually has *faran*/*feran*. Ogura notes that "the merger of *faren*

(< OE *faran*) and *feren* (< OE *feran*) was still taking place (213) at the time of Laȝamon's *Brut* and so she tabulates their occurrence in the text separately, as at table 1 (214) where one notices that the Otho manuscript uses with quite some frequency (more than 200x) *wende* where the Caligula manuscript employs *ferde(n)*, *fare(n)*, *liðen/liðde*, *fusde(n)*, or *beh/buȝen*. Ogura develops her focus also to consider lexical replacement "in those prepositions and adverbs which accompany verbs of motion" (220) and the development in early ME of idiomatic verb of motion + *way* (e.g., *faren minne wæi*). On the basis of this study of verbs of motion in the *Brut* and her earlier study of verbs of speaking Ogura does not find the linguistic evidence "decisive about the chronological gap between the two versions" (225), suggesting nonetheless that the "mixed character of the two versions may possibly attest to their contemporaneity" with the Caligula manuscript displaying a "feature of variability" and the Otho manuscript "a feature of uniformity" with regard to lexical replacement (225).

Ogura offers more on *Verbs of Motion in Medieval English* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer) in her monograph drawing on more than two decades of her work on OE and ME verbs. The "Conclusion" (111–12) is as good a place as any to start with as it offers a summary overview: verbs of motion in OE/ME exhibit a "many-sidedness in their function," being used intransitively when denoting simple motions, but also transitively, "especially in the prefixed form (e.g. *gan* and *gegan*)" (111). Grammaticalization can be observed with a number of verbs of motion, such as the development of '*begin* + infinitve' or '*gan* + infinitive.' Verbs of motion deriving from OE can show rivalry (*gan* and *faran*), contrastive use (*gan* and *cuman*), or merger (*faran* and *feran*). Ogura begins in her introductory chapter with a schema designed to give a sense of "direction and means of a movement" of OE verbs of motions: in plain prose one has a sort of up/down axis with *astigan* (*up*) and (*a*)*stigan nyðer*; a sense of approach or drawing near with (*be*)*cuman* and *genealæcan*; a going forth with *gewitan*, *feran/siðian*, *gan*(*gan*)/*faran*, and a sort of going forth and about with (*ge*)*cyrran*, (*ge*)*hweorfan*, and (*ge*)*wendan* (1). The relative frequency of verbs of motions in OE and ME Ogura tabulates from a selective and heavily-OE corpus: OE poetry, Alfredian prose, *Blickling Homilies*, *Chronicle* A, Gregory's *Pastoral Care*, Ælfric, Wulfstan, *Chronicle* E the main OE texts, while ME is represented by the *Ormulum*, *Ancrene Wisse*, Laȝamon, and *Cursor Mundi*. The significance of the initial tabulation is in some ways difficult to gauge as one wonders about context of usage but in the poetry (certainly for the OE corpus and Laȝamon) *cuman* predominates. Two following tables provide "Cognates of Verbs of Motion in Germanic Languages" (4; namely

Gothic, OHG, OS, ON, Old Frisian), which is helpfully illustrated with following comparative examples from Gospel passages translated into older Germanic languages (thus Lk 2:15 *transeamus* is rendered by Gothic *þairhgaggaima* or OE *ofer-fære*), and "Lexical Correspondence between Latin, Old English and Old High German" (6–8); one wonders, with the relative frequency of translation from Latin into these languages and very high frequency of glossing Latin lemmata in these tongues, whether "correspondence" might be accompanied by "influence." Naturally, the evidence of glossed psalters is invaluable for the OE and OHG evidence assembled here. Lastly in this introductory first chapter Ogura notes where one encounters "verbs of motion unexpressed" (8–10), such as constructions in which (modal) auxiliaries "like *willan* and *sculan* often occupy the position of the finite verb and give readers a sign of unexpression" (8; e.g., OE *Ic to sæ wille* [*Beowulf* 318b]). Chapter II considers "The Rivalry among Synonyms" (11–31), as between the '*gan*-group' and '*faran*-group,' which is illustrated with examples from the OE Gospels and three glossed psalters (A, D, F: Vespasian, Regius, Stowe) and of interest is the observation that "Prefixed verbs and verb-adverb combinations do not show the one-to-one correspondence to their Latin counterparts" (16); also considered is the merger of OE strong verb *faran* and weak *feran*, described here as occurring "in late Old English" (18), verbs "denoting 'to turn'" (22–24; namely, (*ge*)*cyrran* and (*ge*)*wendan*), the '*come*-and-*go* contrast" (25–29), and further verbs "which show rivalry" (29–31): e.g., *siðian* and *liðan*, though Ogura notes that "Most verbs denoting 'to go' show semantic overlapping to some extent" (29). Chapter III surveys "The Reflexive Construction," for the purposes of this study of verbs of motion usages of such verbs intransitively with coreferential pronouns: e.g., *he* (*ge*)*wende him ham* or *he* (*ge*)*wende hine ham*. Particular consideration is given to such constructions with *gewitan*: for example, *Andreas* 118a *Gewat him þa se halga*. Though it considers what Ogura admits can be seen as "pleonastic," this chapter is particularly interesting for a construction likely overlooked because its translation provides little problem to the modern reader. Chapter IV considers "'Impersonal' Uses of Verbs of Motion" (45–48), with or without dative of person (the latter as in Ælfrician *and him eac swa geeode*), and Chapter V "Verbs with Preposed or Postposed Elements" (49–79): or both, such as the OE rendering of Gen 4:8 *egrediamur foras!* as *Vton gan ut!* (50). Sub-section 3 of this chapter analyzes "Bound Morphemes as Prefixes," which is to say compound verb formations such as *ofer-faran* and *be-cuman*, while sub-section 5 traces the development of constructions with the sense of "to go one's way," as from "taking/making one's way" (*weg niman*). Chapter VI concerns itself with "Verbs of Motion as

Auxiliaries" (80–93), as a "verb of motion as a finite verb may take either a present participle or an infinitive of another verb of motion" (80): namely, constructions such as *secean come* (*Beowulf* 1597b), *com ridan*, *com yrnan*, *com fleogan* (all Ælfrician). Given particular emphasis is the construction *onginnan* + infinitive, which serves as the departure point for larger linguistic matters of the development of auxiliary verbs in English; succinctly Ogura notes that "Today's auxiliaries are yesterday's full verbs" (88, an adaptation of Givón's "Today's morphology is yesterday's syntax"; see 88 n. 7). Here the larger matter that has been in one form or another under consideration all along is explicitly stated: aspect. Ogura leans toward modern linguistic terms such as 'grammaticalization' and 'auxiliation'—as of the development in use of OE *onginnan* from a 'full verb' with the sense 'to undertake' to an auxiliary verb—as she is "not yet sufficiently convinced to use the term 'inchoative' or 'ingressive' aspect in Old English syntax" (88). Succinctly again, Ogura explains that "Old English auxiliary verbs are not auxiliaries from the start; modal auxiliaries are preterite-present verbs and an anomalous verb (*willan*), passive auxiliaries are *beon/wesan* and (*ge*)*weorðan*, perfect auxiliaries are *beon/wesan* and *habban*" (88). A helpful diagram at chapter's end illustrates use of *gan*, *agan* (that is, *āgān*), and *bigan* in early ME to express the ingressive aspect (the sense "began") or as auxiliary (periphrastic use, with sense "did"). Chapter VII covers "Present and Past Participles of Verbs of Motion" (94–103) and, following Bruce Mitchell's *Old English Syntax* (2 vols.; Oxford, 1985), Ogura describes OE verbs not as categorically transitive/intransitive but as 'verbs used transitively' or 'verbs used intransitively' (94). Although Ogura moves on to verbs of motion in constructions '*habban* + past participle' and '*beon/wesan* + past/present participle' (e.g., *Beowulf* 893 *hæfde gegongen*), one wonders whether a semantic differentiation obtains with verbs of motion 'used transitively/intransitively': intransitively in the sense 'came/arrived' or 'went/went out' and so forth, but transitively with a concrete physical sense of movement: i.e., stepping/walking/pacing on or through or over something/where, which seems to be the sense of the example from *Beowulf* 3019b *elland tredan* while the Chronicle poem example *Her Eadmund cyning … Myrce geeode* seems to evidence clear (and semantically transparent) metaphoric extension. And Chapter VII treats "Loan Verbs of Motion" (104–110). While Ogura notes that in OE one generally sees "supersession of native verbs by native verbs" (104), as of *(a)stigan* by *gon up*, in the ME period one finds loan verbs *entren*, *passen*, *visiten*, *mouen* (and *makynge iourney*, whence *to journey*). Three appendices follow the conclusion: the first, "Examples of Minor Verbs" (113–117), catalogues lower-frequency verbs of motion (such as *edwendan*, *forðscacan*,

and *þurhscriðan*); the second, "Manuscript Variants" (118–138), gives fuller lists of textual variants used in the tabulation of results in the study; and the third, "Formulas, Formulaic Systems, Syntactic Structures, and Variations in Old English Poetry" (139–151), should be of interest to metrists in particular. Rather tersely introduced as "a list of expressions found rather frequently in verse lines, mostly in a half-line unit, in relation to the verbs of motion" (139), this appendix is rather a very valuable catalogue of OE poetic formulae; for example, one finds the inversely related groupings 'Aux + Inf' (*ongan … steppan*, *ongan … fysan*, *sculon æfter cuman*) and 'Inf + Aux' (*faran sceolde*, *hweorfan mostan*, *gongan wolde*); one wishes in this case for prolixity: a very interesting chapter could have been had of this material. In all, Ogura's study is brief as far as modern monographs go (112 pages to its body); but this apparent brevity belies the detail and scope of coverage—transitivity/intransitivity, aspect, development of the auxiliary, compound verb formations, poetic variation. Quite some work has gone into this study, and it is one that will bear repeated readings.

A caveat to the editors of the *OED* concerning the treatment of ME (and the article concerns later medieval English predominantly) is issued by William Rothwell in "*OED*, *MED*, *AND*: The Making of a New Dictionary of English," *Anglia* 119 (2001): 527–53. Rothwell questions the use by editors of the *OED* of work carried out by other lexica (the *Middle English Dictionary* in particular) for revision of its "etymological and historical apparatus" (527). Rothwell would no doubt be even more alarmed that use of the *DOE* in revising the *OED*'s OE component is hampered by the Toronto project's decision not to pursue the etymology of OE words. Rothwell uses as test examples the forms *abjuration* (ME *abjuracioun*), *acception* (the *OED* traces this to Wycliffe in 1382; Rothwell suggests that the Anglo-French and ME forms are derived not from continental French but from Anglo-Latin, 545), *aducer*, (*ap*)*pentice*, and *apprentice* and, seeing the dictionary's current work with medieval material as "derivative," concludes with the warning that "if the printed declarations of its senior editorial staff are put into effect, the new *OED* runs the risk of being less complete in its treatment of the the etymologies and historical development of its entries than would be the case were it to adopt a more research-orientated approach to its task" (553).

Hans Sauer examines "The Old English Suffix -*el*/-*il*/-*ol*/-*ul*/-*l* (> Mod E -*le*, cf. *beetle*, *girdle*, *thistle*) as Attested in the *Épinal-Erfurt Glossary*," in *Innovation and Continuity in English Studies: A Critical Jubilee*, ed. Herbert Grabes; Bamberger Beiträge zur Englischen Sprachwissenschaft 44

(Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2001), 289–314. Sauer begins his analysis of this "somewhat productive" (289) suffix in OE by introducing the scribes of the text he uses as the sample: whereas the German scribe of Erfurt did not understand the *wynn* and so wrote *p* in such instances, he sometimes got right spellings the Épinal scribe got wrong: e.g., Épinal *aesil* as against Erfurt *haesil* (for 'hazel'). As Sauer's title suggests, there were a number of spellings of this suffix and the question has arisen whether one is dealing with one suffix or several: Sauer settles on the suggestion "to group them together as a suffix family" (297). The spellings do indicate a number phonological processes at work, e.g., syncopation (*gebles* as against *gaebuli*, or *scybla* compared to OHG *scubil*) or *i*-mutation of the stem vowel indicating that the suffix must have been *-il* (*thyfel* < *ðuf-il*, 298). The derivational process at work seems mainly to be of deverbal concrete nouns, which Sauer groups into five classes: a) action nouns (*thuachl* 'soap' < *ðwēan* 'to wash'); b) agent nouns (*bitul* 'beetle' < *bītan*, thus "originally 'an insect that bites'" [301]); c) nouns expressing the result or object of the action (*uuindil* 'basket' < *windan* 'to wind'); d) instrument (*bridils* 'bridle' < *bregdan* 'to pull'); e. locative nouns (*smygil* 'retreat, burrow' < *smūgan* 'to creep'); there are also denominal nouns and diminutives formed with this suffix family (*coecil* 'little cake'). Sauer then classes the *-el/-il* formations by "word-classes": persons; animals; plants; minerals; things (such as instruments or parts of the body)—only the "persons" class is not attested by Épinal-Erfurt. In a concluding section "the material" (307–13) Sauer lists all the forms from the glossary "certainly or probably showing the OE suffix *-el/-il*" (307): of the more than four-score (including compounds) some twelve Sauer thinks were formed in OE; interestingly, he notes that "At least as far as I can see at the moment, these words have no related forms in other Gmc. or WGmc. languages" (307). No real attempt has been made here to capture the extent of the phonological and morphological detail Sauer uses to conduct his analysis of these forms: any future worker with the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary will be indebted to Sauer's analysis and all readers will come away with a sense of just how valuable the glossary is as a record of early OE.

"Some Fishy Etymologies: Eng. *Cod*, Norse *þorskr*, Du. *kabeljauw*, Sp. *bacalao*," *NOWELE* 41: 3–16, has Will Sayers tracing the words for 'cod' on the European Atlantic seaboard in two strands: the Germanic as represented by ON *þorskr* ('fish that is dried,' thus 'stockfish') and "found south and east of Scandinavia" (17), and those found south to north related to Spanish *bacalao*, Basque *bakallao*, and metathesized forms such as French *cabillaud*, Dutch *kabeljauw*, Swedish *kabeljo*. As Sayers notes, English *cod* is a ME form: no OE antecedent is known, though one would find

it odd that Anglo-Saxon fishermen did not bring in fish of the family *Gadidae*. Though not concerned with OE *per se*, Sayers' ichthyonymic divagations are fascinating, such as the passage of the Basque form into Atlantic Canadian trade pidgins (19) and the possibility that ME *cod* may have a Celtic origin (24).

Stefan Schaffner takes on "eine alte Crux" (see review of Schumacher below) of his own in "Altenglisch *nif(e)l*, althochdeutsch *firnibulit*, altisländisch *nifl-*, altfriesisch *niuen* und die Etymologie des Nibelungen-Namens," *Die Sprache* 40 (1998): 179–201. The matter begins with the etymology of OE *nif(e)l*, which Holthausen marked "origin unknown" (*Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3rd uncorrected ed. [Heidelberg, 1974]) but connected with other Germanic cognates with the senses "dark, darkness, fog" (*dunkel*, *Dunkelheit*, *Nebel*). Schaffner takes the case through seven steps, beginning with the "varying meanings" of the OE form; indeed Bosworth-Toller (*An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* [Oxford, 1898, rpt. 1989]) cross-referenced *nifol* with *neowol* (offering the attestations *nihol*, *nihold*, *neol*, *niwol*) and glossed with two primary senses: 'prostrate, prone' and 'deep down, low, profound.' The ultimate goal is an explanation of the name *Nibelung*, which too has been marked as of uncertain origin. Schaffner mentions the relatively recent suggestion from Frank Heidermanns that OE *nifol* and OHG *nibulnissi* derive from a Proto-Germanic adj. *neƀula-* ('dark'; *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen Primäradjektiva* [Berlin, 1993]); speculation has been running this way for some time, as entries in De Vries for ON *nifl-* and *Niflungar* show (*Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2nd ed. [Leiden, 1977]): the former is of disputed etymology and for the latter De Vries calls to mind the epithet *Nebulones* for the Franks (*Franci Nebulones*). The problem, Schaffner notes, is that the two instances of OE *nifol* do not evidence a connection to the sense 'dunkel'—though it is clear that Bosworth-Toller was attempting a tenuous link for *nifol/neowol/nihol* as 'prone' > 'deep down' to a circumlocution for 'hell' (or at least 'to that profound abyss': *in þone neowlan grund*). A number of uses in OE are biblical, and it is not a great leap from hell/abyss to Orcus/darkness (Clark Hall/Meritt simply cut to the chase and gloss *nifol* as 'dark, gloomy'). One small quibble with the first step of Schaffner's argument is classing the two OE occurrences of *nifol* as belonging to *Bibelepik*: the instance from *Andreas* (line 1305) certainly, but the *Paris Psalter* (Ps 148:10)? It is the *Paris Psalter* occurrence of the form that Schaffner queries closely: the 'creeping things' of Ps 148:10 appears in the OE context *do þæt sniome nifle nædran cynn*. As Schaffner notes, nothing in the Romanum or Gallicanum (or Hebraicum for that matter) versions of the Psalms would suggest the *Paris Psalter*'s

"freien altenglischen Paraphrase" having *nifle nædran cynn*. Schaffner floats the idea that *nifle* here is adverbial rather than adjectival, on the pattern of OE adverbs in *-e* such as *georne, neode, symble* and company; alliteration may have been an influence (not mentioned is that now we would have two adverbs in a row: *sniome nifle*). Or perhaps the influence of biblical commentary is to hand, Schaffner suggesting for the OE of the *Paris Psalter* an interpretation 'unten (sc<ilicet> auf der Erde) das Geschlecht der Schlangen' (50). Recalled here is the curse placed on the serpent-kin, and Schaffner sees no room for the sense 'dark' for *nifle*. Of course might not recollection of the ancestral banishment of the serpent-kin to crawl on its belly for all its days and other biblical serpent allusions call to mind 'dark, infernal' too? Schaffner turns then to OHG *firnibulit*, ON *Niflheimr* and *Niflhel*, and other forms in a consideration of other Germanic reflexes of the underlying Gmc. root meaning 'dunkel.' This leads to the form *niflfarinn* (here basically glossed as 'nach unten gefahren') in the ON *Atlakviða* and the steps of Schaffner's argument draw toward the *Nibelungenlied*. Schaffner in his concluding step 7 reasserts that OE *nifol* in the sense 'dunkel' is "philologisch nicht sichern" (65). Rather, he sees a complex of Gmc. forms with the senses 'headlong, downward, downward sloping' (*nifol/nif(e)l, firnibulit*) or 'underworldly' (the ON *nifl*-forms), behind which PGmc. *niƀla*- or, "mit Suffixtausch," *niƀula*-. For quite some time scholars have pondered what the name of the Nibelungs means, that of the king Nibelung (in the MHG text *Nibelunc*; Karl Bartsch and Helmut de Boor, *Das Nibelungenlied*, 22nd ed. [Mannheim, 1988]), his son Nibelung II, brother of Schilbung, of the followers of the Nibelungs (Siegfried with his 1000 Nibelungs; in the epic's second half the Burgundians come to be called Nibelungs), of the famous treasure of the Nibelungs; and, too, the matter of where on earth Nibelungland is. Perhaps not on this earth, Schaffner suggests, deriving MHG *Nibelunc* and ON *Niflungr < *niƀlunga*- 'der unten Befindliche, Unterirdische' (65). Schaffner's concluding paragraph condenses probably too rapidly much that is of interest: PIE *ni-mnó*- ('unten befindlich, nach unten gerichtet'), an allusion to the living on of the Germanic conception of the Underworld in *Niflhel* (and Old Frisian *thiu niuene hille*, though the reference is not complete); there is also a tantalizing possible re-interpretation of the OE phrase *on þone neowlan helle seað* (66) and a curious concluding allusion to Gaulish *antumnos* and Proto-Celtic *ande-dubno*- (a future study linking etymologically and culturally the two conceptions of the 'Unterwelt, Totenreich'?). Much of Schaffner's study is packed with dense phonological detail and reconstruction (especially in many of the 128 footnotes); more speculative leaps are teased out and sometimes hastily deployed, and naturally so, as the study is etymological rather than cultural-historical. As Schaffner's etymological pursuit takes us to underworldly realms, one is curious about the etymology of one of the modern forms brought up: MdG *Nebel*, 'fog, mist'; the entry in Kluge (*Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 23rd ed., ed. Elmar Seebold [Berlin, 1999]) cites OE *neowol* and *nifol* with the senses 'Nebel, Nacht' (citing also Heidermanns study [above]). A sort of circularity in etymological argumentation is present, and perhaps inevitable. Intriguing is the appearance again of an etymology headed in two directions: toward the underworld (as in Schaffner's study) and toward Himmel, Kluge citing Old Church Slavic *nebo* ('heaven'), Greek *νεφέλη* (Liddell-Scott glosses 'cloud, mass of clouds, mist, fog'), Sanskrit *nabhas* ('mist, cloud, vapour, sky, atmosphere; there is also the masc. *nabha* with these general senses). Cited too, naturally, is Latin *nebula*; Glare in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* glosses 'mist, fog, cloud, obscurity' and cites Welsh *nyfel* and OHG *nebul*. But a reading of the entry for Lat. *nebula* in Walde-Hofmann (*Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 5th ed. [Heidelberg, 1982], at II:151-52) in a sense brings us from heaven (the heavens and Heaven, as represented by cognates as far back as Hittite) to hell, or at least the Underworld, the world of shades (ON *nifl*- forms). One wishes for more elaboration at some points—the intriguing conclusion in particular—and would wish for Schaffner's study a wider readership than its appearance in a German linguistic journal might be expected to garner.

There is no way to do justice here to Florian Schleburg's *Altenglische* swa: *Syntax und Semantik einer polyfunktionalen Partikel*; Sprachwissenschaftliche Studienbücher (Heidelberg: Carl Winter), a massive undertaking that began life as an Augsburg thesis; now published as a book of 609 pages, it presents such a wealth of data that a reader is overwhelmed. Unfortunately, there is no index to either passages cited or types of constructions (or Satztypen). This is a serious disadvantage for comparison with, say, Bruce Mitchell's *Old English Syntax* (2 vols. [Oxford, 1985]), to which (while much broader in scope and coverage) Schleburg's study might be compared. Certainly, one cannot now complain of *swa* wanting attention. Offsetting the lack of indices is the Inhalt (5–11), which allows the reader to see the overall organizing structure of this grammatical and syntactic-semantic study and the consecutive numbering of sections (as in Mitchell or Campbell's *Old English Grammar*); a preliminary section of general obversations (25–64) is followed by the body of the analysis (§§55–860) of the uses of *swa*. The citations from the 'Textcorpus' essentially follow *DOE* practice and will be readily understandable to users of the *DOE Microfiche Corpus* or online corpus. We begin, naturally enough, with the 'Herkunft' of

swa, cognates of which are to be found across the branches of IE. Following the major grammars (e.g., Campbell §§128, 128, 335), Schleburg presents the relatively uncomplex pre-history of Gmc. *swa, unaccented in WGmc. and the vowel of which was either short of long in OE: generally, the lengthening is seen as a later process, which led also to *swæ* (West Saxon) and *swē* (non-West Saxon). The connection to PIE possessive root **s(e)u-ó-*, nominalized from *sue has always presented something of a crux: the root seems to lead to possessive pronouns, adjectives, particles in languages such as Sanskrit (*sva*), Greek (ἑός), and Latin (*suus*) but the OE adj. and conj. *swa*. Schleburg treats the "origin" matter briefly as it is outside his central focus, relying upon solid guides such as Manfred Mayrhofer's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* (Heidelberg, 1996), although for the citation of Oscan *svaí* there is now Jürgen Untermann's *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen* (Heidelberg, 2000), where it is glossed as equivalent to Lat. gen. *suae* and labelled as a conjunction (725–26). Stranger still, in some respects, is that Sanskrit *sva* could be a possessive/reflexive pronoun or adj. with the sense 'own, his, her, my own' but also had in nominalized form the sense of *ātman*, 'the self' (cf. J.S. Speijer, *Sanskrit Syntax* [Leiden, 1886; Delhi, 1988], 198–200). This is paralleled by Lat. *suus* meaning also 'one's relations, one's property' (an extension of 'one's own'); Skt. *sva* and Gothic *sves* could simply mean 'possessions, property.' What blocked such a development in OE (*swæs*)? A comparative syntactic study across IE of *sva*, *swa*, etc., would be desirable, but at any rate, Schleburg had enough to do just classifying the uses of OE *swa*. The matter of the word class of *swa* is problematic, and all the more so the further along in Schleburg's analysis one gets: labeled an adverb (a high frequency function of the form) or conjunction (also a frequent usage) or conjunctive adverb or interrogative adverb, Schleburg settles on 'particle,' a polyfunctional one (e.g., demonstrative, relative, and free-relative functionings; §§3 and 53). Early on in the preliminary section Schleburg cites Mitchell's observation that: "To a speaker or writer of MnE, many of these correlative adverbs and demonstratives and many of the anticipatory pronouns are tautologic. But they allowed the Anglo-Saxon to control his sentence by completing one syntactical unit before beginning another" (*Old English Syntax* §1893). Schleburg begins to explain (§11) the structure the body of the analysis of the function of *swa* will take: a) demonstrative *swa* without a relative correlate (§§55–255); b) demonstrative *swa* with a relative correlate (other than *swa*; §§256–304); c) demonstrative *swa* in correlation with relative *swa* (§§305–544); d) relative *swa* (or *swa swa*) with a demonstrative correlate (other than *swa*; §§545–588); e) free-relative *swa (swa)* without a demonstrative correlate (§§589–740). What is left is "relative combinations" (§§741–

860): these include the patterns *swa þeah þe*; *sona swa*; *swa þæt(te)*; *swa hw- swa*. This last construction gives an example of how Schleburg's work no doubt grew in the making: section §767 considers the pattern *swa* [*hwa/hwæt/hwilc/ hwæðer*, etc.] *swa*. Thus for *swa hwæðer swa* the corpus citation is from *Beowulf* 686: *ond siþðan witig god / on* **swa hwæþere** *hond, / halig dryhten / mærðo deme, /* **swa** *him gemet þince*. With many of the citations Schleburg will provide a German translation marking the relevant equivalent construction there; so with the *Beowulf* example: "…und dann möge der weise Gott **derjenigen** Seite Ruhm zuteilen, der heilige Herr, [daß er] **welcher** [Seite] auch immer [Ruhm zuteile,] ihm angebracht erscheint." As a good many prose texts Schleburg's corpus draws from are translations, comparison with the Latin obtains; thus from Ælfric's *Grammar* we have this helpful list: *Eft* quisquis *'swa hwa,'* quaequae *'swa hwilc,'* quodquod *'swa hwylc'* (§768). The comparisons thus sometimes wind up being trilingual, and the pairing of OE and German can be felicitous. But here too, in this section of "correlation with another demonstrative" (§§772–806), one feels the want of indices: we can abstract from the examples how OE translators rendered Lat. *quicumque—swa hwa swa*, *swa hwylce swa*—but one would like to be able to cross-reference these with other sections of Schleburg's mass-comparison of constructions. Similarly, one would like to compare treatment of, say, *swa* in *apo koinou* constructions in Mitchell (§§3789–3803) and Schleburg, but a difference in linguistic vocabulary also hinders such comparison. Of course the length of both works, Mitchell's *OE Syntax* (1985) and Schleburg's *Altenglische swa*, means that one has to do a lot of flipping around through sections or across whole chapters of the works. Part of the bulk of Schleburg's study comes from the citations: they account for perhaps half the bulk, and in some cases they overwhelm. For example, in a section treating *swa þæt(te)* with a "consecutive" function, here from the *Martyrology* (Christopher) the construction *þa…þa…swa þæt* (§759) is followed by six pages of citations, which of course tells one something about the utility of the construction but seems unwieldy—and yet what other way is there (other than an accompanying CD-ROM, always a cumbersome alternative) to give a sense of the "Syntax und Semantik" of *swa* at work? There is no way to do justice in this brief space to the work Schleburg has put into *Altenglisch swa*: it is a work whose value will grow with time as other studies build from it, and one which can serve as a model for future intensive study of the syntax of OE particles.

The suppletive preterite form of the verb 'to go' in Gothic and OE is the subject of Stefan Schumacher's highly detailed investigation of "Eine alte Crux, eine neue

Hypothese: gotisch *iddja*, altenglisch *ēode*," *Die Sprache* 40 (1998): 179–201. Schumacher notes that while both forms are the weak preterite, the morphological form of Gothic *iddja* is 'unique' (179). Schumacher follows the programmatic numbered-section format of German historical linguistic investigations; after his opening section, Schumacher turns in §2 to the continuing of PIE perfect endings in PGmc., and here of interest is the discussion in the footnotes of the nature of the perfect in PIE in contemporary historical linguistic argument as a category (180 nn. 3–4, citing the formulation of Helmut Rix in Rix *et al.*, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen* [Wiesbaden, 1998]). This is followed by a section on considerations of the derivation of the original form of the Gothic and OE preterite of 'to go,' which Schumacher sees as being closely related etymologically, in fact, as leading back to a 'uniform Proto-Germanic pre-form' (183). This is followed by a discussion of the preterite of PGmc. *et-e/a* 'to eat' (class 5 strong verb), necessary as there seems to be similarity in the underlying PGmc. root; in his discussion of the proto-forms to the Germanic verbs for 'to go' (< *h_1ei-, whence OE *ēode*) and 'to eat' (< *h_1ed-, whence OE *æt*) Schumacher points toward a 'Wurzelstruktur' *eC- < *h_1eC-, where for the verb 'to eat' the C (consonant) is a stop and for 'to go' a resonant (184). Following Schumacher's arguments concerning these Primärverben one sees how much has changed since Pokorny's *IEW* (Bern, 1959; see *ed-* [287–88] and *ei-* [293–97]); Schumacher elaborates upon a matter found in Alistair Campbell's contemporaneous *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959; see §736(g): "the source of the Gmc. past with long root vowel is an IE aorist of the type of Gr. *ἔβην*"). After a much more complex argument considering alternative explanations of the preterite of these two verbs Schumacher offers a reconstruction of the preterite paradigm for PGmc. *h_1ei-*, which for the 3rd sg. would be *$æje$ (with subsequent loss of glide; among other lines of evidence in discussing contract verbs Schumacher points to ON *sá* < *$sājan$, citing Guðrún Thórhallsdóttir's dissertation *The development of intervocalic *j in Proto-Germanic* [Cornell, 1993]). Schumacher turns then to East Germanic and the proto-forms to Gothic *iddja* (192–93), then back to preliminary considerations with West Germanic and Old English, and then to what one would expect: the development of the suffix to the preterite form in Primitive OE that led to *ēode*, an area Schumacher says has not been investigated enough; nevertheless, in brief, he proposes *ēode* < *$æ$ + *-ūd-/-ōd-* (contracted form *$æud$- > *eud-). Schumacher summarizes his findings by stating that Gothic *iddja* and OE *ēode* derive from a "specific Germanic strong long root vowel preterite" (198) from the root *h_1ei- 'to go,' and that 1st/3rd sg. *$æ$ had added to it the preterite suffix from class

II of the weak verbs, whence through contraction *ēode* followed (199).

J.B. Smith detects a false note in the recording of the Dorset dialect in John Eastwood's memoir *Life in a Dorset Village* (Bridport, 1982) in "A Note on Dorset *er* for 'He,'" (*Somerset and Dorset Notes & Queries* 35: 177–79). The autobiographer had made a connection between Dorset dialectal *er* and German *er* for the 3rd person singular masculine personal pronoun. While *he* is from OE *hē* and OHG *er* is the odd man out in not having initial *h-*, the form Eastwood records is a result of hypercorrection; as Thomas Hardy recorded *a* for *he* in Dorset speech, this form becomes the hyper-rhotic *er*. Smith's point for Dorset is a highly common feature too in American English: the hypercorrect *soder*, *idear*, *earl* (for *oil*), and so forth of Brooklynites and other regionally non-rhotic American English speakers.

A pleasing and very basic textbook comes in the form of *English Words: History and Structure* from UCLA professors Robert Stockwell and Donka Minkova (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001). The textbook is a solid if breezy survey of English morphology, loan formations, and etymology; sections are very brief and cover the usual chesnuts: *de novo* coinages/neologies, acronyms, eponyms, morphemes, affixation, the fate of loans (assimilated ~ nonassimilated); it tends to build toward a more sophisticated linguistic vocabulary, thus chapter 8 "Fossilized allomorphy." The text rounds things out with the basic basics of semantics (amelioration and pejoration and company) and a survey of dictionaries and dictionary types. Throughout, Stockwell and Minkova, both major figures in English historical linguistics, aim for a translucence amenable to freshman to sophomore level undergraduates (based here upon the American model, or that of Southern California). Of particular help is Appendix II, the "morpheme list" (193–204), whose 427 entries serve as a mini-thesaurus and give students a clear sense of the value of etymology. Clarity of formulation in textbooks inevitably runs the risk of oversimplification. Thus the discussion of the Indo-European family of languages (23–28) proceeds rather more gale force than breezily. Celtic, in particular, suffers: the Celtic languages "were once spread over most of western Europe" (and all along the Danube and well into Eastern Europe and Anatolia) while "the Celts who remained in southern England were responsible for inviting mercenary warriors from across the North Sea" (24); and so "the idea did not work out well for the Celts" (24). No, it didn't; but then again they had it coming. Or so it might seem to the unwary undergraduate reader; despite publisher demands for brevity, this could have been clearer. And in chapter

10 we are told that "English contains classical words and phrases of two types" (163), the assimilated and unassimilated. Of course some shades between exist, not to mention the current trend toward neo-Latin in the sciences and pseudo-Latin in advertising (Acura, Lexus, Integra, Allegra, Viagra, etc.). In what is an unusual treatment in such texts, what follows is a helpful discussion of the pronunciation of Latin loans in modern English. Drawing on articles by UCLA colleague Henry A. Kelly, Stockwell and Minkova mention five systems for pronouncing Latin in contemporary times: classical Ciceronian; Italian; Continental; British; American. The last category includes some of the risible butcherings of the "old language" by American lawyers (*ex officio* in their parlance is not only pronounced /ɛks oˈfišio/, as at Stockwell and Minkova p. 164, but /oˈfiːšio/). And the removal of the designation Church/ecclesiastical Latin, still taught and used by the Roman Church, elides centuries of the history and use of the language—in retrospect, a longer history than that of classical Latin itself. One could quibble here and there with other infelicities no doubt induced by the format, but overall undergraduates could learn much from their text.

An extraordinarily complex matter is the subject of Toshiya Tanaka's "The Origin and Development of the *es-* vs. *wes-* Suppletion in the Germanic Copula: From a Non-Brugmannian Standpoint," *NOWELE* 40: 3–27. Karl Brugmann's work on comparative IE grammar is of course referred to in the title, and, citing the equally revered *Comparative Germanic Grammar* of Eduard Prokosch (Philadelphia, 1939), Tanaka notes the PGmc. copula is a suppletive verb comprised of three to four PIE roots: *es-*, *wes-*, *bheu-*, *er-* (whence the forms of OE *bēon-wesan* and the MnE copula's panoply of forms: *be*, *was*, *is*, *am*, *are*, *were*). Tanaka starts from the "standard idea that *es-* and *wes-* are independent roots with different meanings' (4), and though there was likely an aspectual difference between the roots the "lexical aspect" of *wes-* is uncertain as is the mechanism for its inclusion in the preterite paradigm (*was*, *were*). Tanaka then reviews proposals by IE specialists Émile Benveniste, Kenneth Shields, and Thomas V. Gamkrelidze and Vyacheslav V. Ivanov before explaining his adoption of a "non-Brugmannian" approach—Brugmann had assumed that PIE reflected the full verbal system as present in Sanskrit in terms of tenses, moods, aspects, which presents a problem for suppletion in Germanic. Were forms of the copular preterite in Germanic that corresponded to those in Vedic, for instance, somehow lost? (Tanaka seems to rule displacement out of the question entirely.) Tanaka also accepts the view that in PIE markings of the verb such as tense and aspect were realized not by inflections but periphrastically by particles or adverbs

(8). Tanaka then presents (10–15) his own view of "how the Germanic copula developed from the roots *es-* and *wes-*" (10). Tanaka proposes that *es-* was "originally an active-durative verb" and that "the meaning 'sit and occupy (a place)' should be assigned to the PIE verb *es-mi/si/ti*" (11). Actually neither of these proposals is really new: Pokorny notes for *es-* (*IEW* 340) "bildet ursprünglich nur ein duratives Präsens" and this has been treated by others since; and the semantic link between 'be' and 'sit' is available in any grammar of Vedic (or see the *Kluge Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 23rd ed., ed. Elmar Seebold [Berlin, 1999], s.vv. *sein* and *sitzen*). Thus the examples of "existential uses" of *to sit* in MnE (*Her house sits at the foot of the hill*) are superfluous. For *wes-* Tanaka proposes that "this verb originally denoted a momentary or perfective action, 'stop one's journey or migration (for the night, for the hearth, etc.),' from which the meaning 'stay' or 'dwell,' attested in corresponding verbs in IE dialects, is readily derivable" (12). Again, nothing really new is proposed. What is interesting is Tanaka's use as a comparative example for suppletion the adjective *ghōdh-* 'good' (with *bhod-*, or *bhad-*, whence 'better, best'). Tanaka follows the controversial notion that during the early proto-Germanic phase (shortly after the break from PIE) "there was no verbal conjugation for tenses or aspects and different lexical items could be used to express the difference between the presential and the preterital nuance of a verbal meaning" (14), which was reinterpreted by "paradigmatisation" by which apparently the copular paradigm was filled out by suppletion. The "variety of radices in a WGmc. copular paradigm [as many as four] suggests that the category of the copula had not yet been firmly established in Proto-Germanic" (15). Not a truly new proposal here, but an interesting state-of-the-art study.

Based on her Universität Münster dissertation, Katrin Thier's *Altenglische Terminologie für Schiffe und Schiffsteile: Archäologie und Sprachgeschichte 500-1100*, BAR International Series 1036 (Oxford: Archaeopress) is a handsomely produced, well-illustrated, and richly detailed investigation of Anglo-Saxon ship-building and styles of craft and the vocabulary for such. Thier says from the outset that she has revived "das alte Prinzip der Wörter-und-Sachen-Forschung" (3) and, sure enough, there is a chapter "Wörter und Sachen" (28–114) that covers types of ships, the hull, sail, rigging and ropes, rudder and oar, and other items of equipage (under "Ausrüstungsgegenstände" Thier covers such items as anchor, gangplank, sounding-line). Despite the presence of glossaries and lists of terms, the study does seem orientated rather more toward the *Sachen* side, and it is for the archaeologists to review the chronologies and diagrams. The study is divided into a text section (10–119)

of double-columned long pages, just to give an idea of how much information is covered. This is followed by the "Katalogteil," which includes a nautical lexicon (124–53), a list of written sources (154-63), an archaeological catalog of diagrams of finds of vessels with descriptions (164–208: of various types, from rafts to ferry boats to longships [the Haithabu longship at 194]), and a "Bildquellenkatalog" (213–41), which features reproductions of period depictions of ships (manuscript illuminations, seals, stone carvings and reliefs, wood carvings, coins, the Broighter model boat made of gold, and, of course, the Bayeux Tapestry). The text section on "Schriftquellen" (14–16) shows yet again the value of the bilingual Latin-OE glossaries, while a historical background section (16–27) gives a fairly technical briefing on matters such as propulsion by punting, tow-rope position, and mid-stroke oar positions before coming to *Beowulf* and Sutton Hoo. The "Wörter und Sachen" section considers Anglo-Saxon, Viking, and Frisian ship-types, but also a Macedonian bireme and Greek trireme, ferry boats, and hide boats such as the Irish coracle (curragh; as in Máel Dúin's *imram*). All of the parts of ships are then turned to, types of hull-building and planking, even sea-chests. A helpful diagram inserts OE terms for sail, rigging, and tackle, allowing the reader to make visual sense of *hun* and *hunþyrel*, *segl*, *seglgyrd*, and *mæst*, *stæg*, *racca*, *stedingline* (84). Thier seems to track down every extant instance of each item she has set out to cover; thus for the motif of the "sail and cross" as found in medieval seals and manuscript drawings we are supplied with the logo of the World Council of Churches, which adopts the motif surmounted by the Greek motto *oikoumene* (96). The section of main interest to the student of OE language is Thier's 'Lexikon' (124–53), which presents each headword of the assembled nautical vocabulary with the meaning, attestation(s) and etymology—one is impressed at the detail and accuracy in the relaying of the last item of information: the standard sources, Pokorny et al., are drawn from, but, as throughout this monograph, Thier is very careful with philological detail, all the more impressive as this is genuinely an interdisciplinary study (archaeology, history, philology). One may wish for a little more detail here or there in the etymologies (as for *ancer*, Sanskrit *añcati* and other forms go back to a PIE sense of 'to bend,' which seems of some significance to the thing itself), but one is grateful overall for such detailed work with such a mass of information. As with Coatsworth and Pinder's *The Art of the Anglo-Saxon Goldsmith* (see above), a whole area of activity in the Anglo-Saxon world has been described, amply illustrated and historically traced, and its register delimited and defined.

A stunningly unusual and interesting argument comes in Theo Vennemann's latest installment of "Germania

Semitica" (here he goes by Vennemann genannt Nierfeld), "Germania Semitica: *aþal- (OE *æðel-*, G *Adel*) 'Nobility': With an Appendix on Gk. Ἄτλας," *Sprachwissenschaft* 26 (2001): 189–204. As no satisfactory explanation has been made to date for the PGmc. (much less PIE) root to OE *æðel-*, ON *aðal*, and other forms (including MdG *Adel* 'nobility') Vennemann takes the step (a very, very big one) of positing superstrate influence (one usually sees arguments for substrate influence; e.g., of Celtic on OE, or non-IE Iberian forms on Spanish, etc.). Vennemann connects PGmc. *aþal- to a Semitic source, such as the root *'sl* (found in Arabic and Hebrew): there is a nice semantic parallel with the sense 'noble' but the reliance on older lexica for the Semitic (e.g., E.W. Lane's classic but dated *An Arabic-English Lexicon* [London, 1863]) is worrisome. But there are many problems in argumentation here: *aþal- is "well attested in Germanic but has no certain Indo-European etymology. It is therefore not unlikely that the word is a loan-word from a non-Indo-European language" (189): that is fine, but only true if one rejects the arguments of all the etymological sources to date. Pokorny's *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bern, 1959) connects the root to a *Lallwort* for 'Vater, Mutter,' though the discussion heads in the direction of a sense of *parentes*, i.e., one's ancestors, one's stock, good stock (all meanings connected in one way or another with all of the *aþal- forms). Words for 'father, fathers' outside of IE that evidence some closeness include Hungarian *atya*, Turkish *ata*, Basque *aita*, all neighboring more closely than Semitic the Germanic Urheimat range. But Vennemann argues that the Germanic root "has a close phonological and semantic match in the Semitic" root (189): actually it seems more a semantic parallel, and the phonological match is visual, not acoustic (and subject to methods of transcription of Hebrew and especially Arabic). One thinks of the new appendix of "Semitic Roots" in the fourth edition of the *American Heritage Dictionary* (Boston, 2000): it is meant to complement the highly regarded appendix by Calvert Watkins of Indo-European roots, but is clearly a matter of apples and oranges here. The IE roots are relevant to nearly all of the core English words in the dictionary (excluding loans from non-IE sources, such as Native American languages); the list of Semitic roots helps explains some loan words (from Hebrew directly or by way of Yiddish but even moreso from Arabic—a medieval legacy) but by and large helps explain modern loans of religious vocabulary and Biblical names (and in the etymological sense is a lot less relevant). Vennemann has taken a dramatic speculative leap here largely on the basis of circular reasoning: "According to my theory of the origin of Germanic, the language of the ruling class in prehistoric Germania was related to Semitic. We should therefore look into the

Semitic languages for a possible source" (191). Vennemann knocks down Nostratic-level arguments (192) since this would require contact at the stage of PIE and Proto-Hamito-Semitic, and he is thinking of the contact coming significantly closer to the historical era. The "related to Semitic" superstrate language of the Germanic elites becomes a little more definite later in the argument: "If we ask how it could happen that key concepts of Germanic society were expressed with Semitic loan-words, the only answer is that prehistoric Germanic developed under a Semitic superstratum. If the designation of the Germanic ruling class is a Semitic loan-word, it shows that this ruling class was of Semitic stock; at least this interpretation is natural if we take the English replacement of *æðel-* by *noble, nobility* after the Norman Conquest as a model" (198). That this is the "only answer" is leading, and the Norman supplanting argument is reaching: the OE term was supplanted by one from the same linguistic family, itself a loan from Latin, in a dialect of French spoken by the mixed descendants of the *Northmanni*. Moreover, the new term was transparent to the Anglo-Saxons, who would have recognized its root in *nobilitas* and needed no translation. And then we get the statement: "Thus my linguistic results further corroborate the more comprehensive thesis that the prehistoric Germania and its Palaeo-Germanic language developed under temporary colonial Semitic dominance. For this thesis we now possess a considerable amount of robust linguistic evidence, and in addition some independent support from a neighboring discipline, the study of religion and mythology" (198). Note that the corroborating evidence comes not from a field such as history, or archaeology, or genetics. And the circularity of reasoning is troubling, as Vennemann's "Germania Semitica" series of articles is pressed into service in proving the thesis of the "Germania Semitica" articles. Vennemann's appendix on Greek Ἄτλας is even more baffling: it would be unfairly reductive to say that it claims that Plato's Atlantis story is historically true, but it basically does, "to those who trust that Plato was interested in historical truth and not in invention or propagation of fairy-tales" (198). All of this is in pursuit of a proto-root *ʾaTl-* by which we may connect Atlas, the *ʾaþal-* root, and the Semitic-speaking "Atlantic nobility" who lived beyond the Pillars of Hercules. The odd genuine detail is pressed to fit the theory, and some of the details do fit: ancient Gades was a Punic colony, and Melqart was worshipped there, as numismatic evidence offers representations of a syncretic Melqart/Hercules (but not Atlas). But the numismatic inscriptions one encounters are Punic/Neo-Punic, then Greek, then Latin (as for Massilia/Massalia we go from Greek to Latin). All of this is fascinating, but highly speculative and tendentious from a well-known historical linguist: we are never offered what historical evidence there is for a "temporary" Semitic overlordship of ancient *Germania*: how did they get there? Where did they go? And how without leaving any archaeological trace? And all of this ignores the possibilities of substratum activity: the IE peoples in general did not move into unpopulated regions (the Basques being one example of a "pre-European" people). The fact that Vennemann ranges so far afield here bespeaks more a desire to find another root to add to his "Germania Semitica" and to solve an IE etymological crux by any available means, than anything more solid.

"Die altenglische Wortfamilie *prūt* und ihre Herkunft," by Ferdinand von Mengden, in *Authors, Heroes and Lovers*, ed. Honegger, 179–98, notes that the *prūt/prūd* "word-family" is generally associated with negative sense of "proud, arrogant" (Clark Hall/Meritt), such as the deadjectival *pryte*, "pride, haughtiness." The derivation of this feminine nominal form (Clark Hall/Meritt have for their headword *pryt(o), pryte*) is treated as von Mengden's "erstes Problem" (184–186): ostensibly the formation *prūt > pryte* involves the Proto-Germanic suffix *-iþō*, as with analogous *strang > strengþu* (< *strangiþu*); von Mengden cites Campbell, *Old English Grammar* §588 (at 588.6) on this, but doesn't follow through quite all the steps—the PGmc. suffix *-iþō* is syncopated in early OE, the final *-u* being what remains and the umlaut occurs when "both a middle and an end syllable contained either *i* or *u*, and both were in conditions demanding loss of that vowel, the middle syllable was the one affected" (§353). Nonetheless, as von Mengden observes, this was not a particularly productive suffix formation in later OE (for a study of a highly productive suffix, see from the same collection the study by Möhlig above). The "zweites Problem" is that of the final sound: *-t ~ -d* (though no chronology is given), for which recourse is made to citation of ON *prúðr*, which "repräsentierte dagegen den regulären galloromanischen Reibelaut" (187), itself not an entirely certain or clear assertion (von Mengden had earlier traced the origin to Lat. *prodesse* or a Vulgar Lat. adj. **prodis*; 181-82), but at any rate the *-d-* would be an intervocalic stop for the fricative. The third problem is the tonic vowel, the matter of /u:/ from the Lat. /o/ (189-90). And, fourthly, the matter of the meaning of *prūt*: as the modern reflex is *proud* one finds the OE so glossed inevitably, though the sense is often negative (as when associated with *superbia*) but not entirely so: von Mengden notes that it is attested also with the senses "grossherzig, tüchtig, mutig" (192-93), though this is to be set against the evidence of *prūt-* compounds such as *prūtscipe* and *prūtswongor* that have negative connotations.

The "lineage" of a clausal expression is traced diachronically by Hideki Watanabe in "The Lineage and Variations

of the Biblical Phrase *While the World Standeth*" (in *And Gladly Wolde He Lerne and Gladly Teche*, 239–56). The expression, which Samuel Johnson in the eighteenth century would find archaic and in need of explanation by Lat. *saeculum* and Grk. *αἰών* (255), Watanabe finds in OE *þenden worold standeð* (here from the *Paris Psalter*, it occurs also in the OE poems the *Phoenix* and *Genesis*) and in cognate Germanic languages (e.g., Swedish *så länge världen står*). Watanabe notes too that it is of a pattern with other expressions denoting the world's duration, such as the formula "world without end" found in prayers throughout the history of English.

Drawing on ME evidence, Jerzy Wełna traces the fate of OE *ēode* in "Suppletion for Suppletion, or the Replacement of *ēode* by *went* in English," *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 36 (2001): 95–110. Though regional forms of the OE preterite *ēode* seem to have persisted for quite some time (to the seventeenth century in Lincolnshire *yede*, *yode*), the decline of the form comes in the ME period. Wełna relays the "distribution of the preterites *yede* and *wente*" in the dialects of ME (99–106) and notes that the new preterite "need not be a northern form, since it is found in Late West-Saxon and Early Southern Middle English" (107), that it represented, by devoicing, a development of *wende* (the form common in Southern and Midland dialects), and that while a Northern *yode* did not last for long a period of coexistence of preterite forms occurred in Southern and Midlands ME as the diffusion of *wente* proceeded (107).

Irené Wotherspoon investigates the "Origin of *Thill*" (*N&Q* n.s. 49: 188–90), defined by the *OED* as 'The pole or shaft by which a wagon, cart, or other vehicle is attached to the animal drawing it' (and by *AHD4* as 'Either of the two long shafts between which an animal is fastened when pulling a wagon'). Wotherspoon notes the variant forms of *thill* in later English (*fill(s)*, *thrill*, *trill*, *sill*) and focuses on OE *þisl(e)* as the source for *thills* by metathesis (189), rather than the *þille* ('board, plank, flooring') posited by the *OED* and *MED*. If *þisl* metathesized to *thills* "it is likely that it would be reinterpreted as a plural, and give rise to a new singular without /s/" (189). While the connection in meaning makes this proposal attractive, Wotherspoon does note the difficulty that the metathesis of the sounds involved is rare in OE. But, lexically, the absence of other terms for this part of a cart beside *þisl* may support the development of variant forms.

J.P.M.

Not Seen

Čermák, Jan. "A Typological Note on the Category of Gender in Old English." *The Tongue Is an Eye: Studies Presented to Libuše Dušková*. Ed. Aleš Klégr and Jan Čermák. Prague: Dept. of English and American Studies, Charles Univ., 2000. 15–20.

Griffiths, Bill. *User-Friendly Dictionary of Old English*. 4th ed. Loughborough: Heart of Albion, 2002. 60 pp.*

Gvozdetskaya, N. Yu., and E. A. Shaposhnikova. "Semantiche-skoe tolkovaniye slova v glossariyah k sovre-mennym izdaniyam drevnih pamyatnikov (na materiale drevneangliyskoy poezii)" = "The Semantic Interpretation of Words in Glossaries in the Modern Editions of Ancient Texts (Based on Old English Poetry)." *Drevniye yazyki v sisteme universitetskogo obrazovaniya. Issledovaniye i prepodavaniye = Ancient Languages in the System of University Education: Research and Teaching*. Moscow: Izdateľstvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, 2001. 93–101.

Lendinara, Patrizia. "Il nome della folaga e altri vocaboli dalla radice ie. *bhel- in albanese e in germanico." *Studi in onore di Antonino Guzzetta*. Ed. Francesca Di Miceli e Matteo Mandalà. Cattedra di Lingua e Letteratura Albanese, Dipartimento di Scienze filologiche e linguistiche, Università degli Studi di Palermo. Palermo: Helix Media Editore, 2002. 223–34.

Pons Sanz, Sara. "Aldred's Glosses to Numismatic Terms in The Lindisfarne Gospels." *The Grove: Studies on Medieval English Language and Literature* 8 (2001), 111–20.

Roberts, Jane. "Mixing and Matching Meanings Makes a Thesaurus…" *The Grove: Studies on Medieval English Language and Literature* 8 (2001), 121–44.

Steinberg, N. A. "Compound Verb Forms in Old English: Pragmatics as a Bridge to the Paradigm." *Anglistika v XXI veke = English Studies in the 21st Century*. St. Petersburg: Univ. of St. Petersburg and the Linguistic Soc. of St Petersburg, 2002. 241–44.

Vishnevsky, A. V. "K probleme semasiologicheskogo analiza i perevodi-mosti drevnego slova" = "On the Problem of the Semasiological Analysis and Translatability of Ancient Words." *Vestnik Ivanovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Vyp. 1. Seriya "Filologiya" = Ivanovo State University Messenger. Issue 1. Philology Series* (2002): 85–91.

b. Syntax, phonology, other aspects

i. Phonology *et al.*

Edited Collections

New Insights in Germanic Linguistics II, edited by Irmengard Rauch and Gerald F. Carr, Berkeley Insights in Linguistics and Semiotics 38 (New York: Lang, [2001]) offers a selection of articles presented at the 1998 Berkeley Germanic Linguistics Roundtable. They address historical and contemporary problems. Three chapters are reviewed in this section: "The Third Obstruent Series in Old Germanic" by Kurt Goblirsch, "Compensatory Variation" by Yuri Kleiner, and "Apocope in Germanic, or an Ax(e) to Grind" by Anatoly Liberman. Two other articles are on English topics: "Semiotics of Compounds in Old English Riddles" by Eugene Green (reviewed in section 4b) and "The Prosody and Syntax of Light Elements in West Germanic Verse: With Special Reference to *Beowulf*" by Yasuko Suzuki (reviewed in section 4c).

In "The Third Obstruent Series in Old Germanic" (*New Insight*, 35–44) Kurt Goblirsch posits two types of obstruent system in Old Germanic. The Common Germanic system, having the following series: 1. voiceless stops, 2. voiceless spirants, 3. voiced obstruents, is found to be retained in Gothic and the Older Runes. Despite the arguments to the contrary, there is no evidence for a regular stop/spirant alternation in the third series, which was probably realized as spirants. In most of Northwest Germanic (Younger Runes, Old Norse, Old English, Old Saxon, Old Low Franconian) the obstruent system was reorganized in the seventh and eighth centuries so that the following series obtained: 1. voiceless stops, 2. voiced stops, 3. spirants. The transition from the old system to the new was brought about by the occlusion of voiced spirants initially, in gemination and after sonorants (with some dialectal variation) and the voicing of voiceless spirants medially in a voiced environment and final devoicing. In both cases, the third series, with only one distinctive correlation, was less tightly bound to the system than the first two, which participated in two correlations. In other words, voice is replaced by occlusion as the most important distinction.

In "Compensatory Variation" (*New Insights*, 57–78) Yuri Kleiner hypothesizes a prehistoric period of compensatory lengthening in English and the other Germanic languages. In this period, certain prosodic types became prominent in the different languages. Compensatory lengthening is not to be viewed as the automatic transfer of features from adjacent units. Compare **gans ~ *gan-ses* > OE *gō-ses*, OE *feorh ~ *feor-hes* > *fēo-res*, with elements lost in different positions in the sequence and different shifts in interconsonantal syllable boundaries. The author argues that all of the changes in the different languages he discusses constitute the rearrangement of elements within the same system, i.e., a kind of "quantity preservation rule" in the sense of Hickey (1986: 361), provided quantity is interpreted in terms of boundaries. They do not create new elements in the system (distinctive quantity already exists) and thus the variation in the different languages belongs to the sphere of synchrony.

In "Apocope in Germanic, or an Ax(e) to Grind" (*New Insights*, 79–93) Anatoly Liberman presents a "short apodictic position paper" in anticipation of his book *Stress and Quantity in West Germanic, in Partial Comparison with Scandinavian*. He conceives of apocope as an ax that kept chopping off endings, suffixes and all manner of connecting vowels for over two thousand years, from before the time of the earliest documents into the sixteenth or seventeenth century, when no endings were left to chop off. Apocope should not be ascribed to stress in Germanic, since no force can be identified with stress. Stress should, however be equated with phonological privilege: an accented syllable is one in which oppositions occur that are not allowed elsewhere. For the earliest times, Liberman posits only sentence stress, but sometime before the oldest Runic inscriptions from Scandinavia, however, the first radical syllable drew attention to itself and away from other syllables. This meant the crowding of information on the first radical syllable, which had been formerly spread evenly over the word, i.e., umlauts, breakings, and lengthenings set in and Germanic reacquired stress. Apocope was one of the consequences. The increasing role of the root and the replacement of voice by aspiration and other features are the two most decisive changes in the history of Germanic. The phase of apocope best known to modern researchers began around the year 1200. While some languages, English included, lost endings altogether, others like Danish weakened them, while still others like Icelandic and Swiss German have full endings. The degree to which voice is lost generally stands in inverse proportion to the loss of endings. The various stages of development in the modern languages are attributed to a period of free apocope, which could even result in the return to full endings. For Icelandic it seems influence of the literary tradition played a role in restoration.

Three of the ten articles from *Studies in English Historical Linguistics and Philology: A Festschrift for Akio Oizumi*, ed. Jacek Fisiak (Frankfurt am Main: Lang) appear in this section. "*Geworden wæron* in *Orosius* 1 5.24.10 (Bately)"

by Mitsu Ide (83–101) examines the collocation in Janet Bately's 1980 edition of the OE *Orosius*, based on London, BL, MS Add. 47967 (s.x[1] [Ker 1977: 133]), rather than BL, MS Cotton Tiberius B. i. (s. xi[1] [Ker 191, Art. 1]). She considers various possible readings and emendations of the sequence, a part of the phrase *þæt þa Godes wundor þe on hiora landum geworden wæron*. It is a rather loose translation of the original Latin phrase, so comparison with it will not help here. The author considers and rejects construing *geworden* as an absolute participle and the insertion of a second *wæron*, which would solve grammatical and semantic problems. Instead she interpets *geworden* as a variant of preterite plural *gewurden* as in other eleventh century manuscripts, refering to examples found in a MS of Bede from the same century.

"After Jones: Some Thoughts on the Final Collapse of the Grammatical Gender System in English" (*Studies in English Historical Linguistics and Philology*, 293–306), by Robert McColl Millar, contends that Charles Jones's subsystem cannot be understood as the only process at work in the collapse of the English grammatical gender system. While Jones posits that the grammatical gender associations of nouns, adjectives and pronouns are sacrificed in order to preserve the function marker purpose of the forms in question, the latter being considered more salient, Millar finds the most central expression of the relationships in the compound demonstrative pronouns. Jones' sub-system is understood as a transitional stage in late OE and early ME texts (see especially *Laȝamon's Brut* or *Peterborough Chronicle*) between the "classical" morphological system and one that does not mark gender distinction. In the texts in question, however, Millar finds evidence of retention of the original system and of a stystem which completely ignores the distinctions in question, along with evidence of Jones's sub-system. In an earlier article Millar (1997) hypothesized that the process of the loss of grammtical case and gender distinctions first developed in the *koinë* of English and Norse in Samuels's (1989, 1989) Great Scandinavian Belt and fanned out, being "mediated" into the surrounding dialets. He also posits different registers, including a formal one with a historical consciousness. The attempt to incorporate as much of the inherited system as possible, while reorganizing and simplifying in order to remove ambiguity is termed *conservative radicalism.*

"Old English Palatal Diphthongization: With Special Reference to the *West-Saxon Gospel of St. Matthew*" (*Studies in English Historical Linguistics and Philology*, 375–87), by Hirokazu Noguchi, tries to resolve the controversy over the phonetic value of OE short digraphs used in sequences with [j] and [ʃ], as in *geong, sceaða*. Contrary to the other

theories regarding the spellings, i.e., that <e> is a diacritic in all cases (Stockwell and Barritt 1951 and others), that <e> represents the first element of a diphthong (Campbell 1959: §§171, 176), and that <e> is sometimes real, sometimes a diacritic, although we cannot always be certain (Hogg 1992: §§5.59-70), the author proposes that palatal diphthongization is genuine after /j/, while after /ʃ/ <e> repesents a diacritic.

Studies in the History of the English Language: A Millennial Perspective (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter) presents selected papers from the SHEL-1 (Studies in the History of the English Language) conference held at UCLA in spring 2000. Like the ICEHL conferences in Europe, it is hoped that SHEL will reinvigorate the desicpline of English historical linguistics in North America. The emphasis of the papers in the current volume is on the history of the discipline: "how healthy was it at the end of the millenium and what if anything needed to be done to maintain its scholarly energy and relevance?" The collection is divided into three main sections: "Millennial perspectives," "Phonology and metrics," and "Morphosyntax/Semantics." The first section offers views on the history of different aspects of the discipline by experts in their fields: the concept grammaticalization (Traugott), mixed-language texts (Schendl), dialectology in historical linguistics (Kretzschmar), etymological studies (Liberman), prosody (Cable, Youmans and Li). The other two sections contain articles by wellknown and younger scholars. The chapters by Stockwell and White are summarized below. The book concludes with an envoi, "A Thousand Years of the History of English," by Richard Bailey.

Two articles concerning Old English appear in *Sounds, Words, Texts, and Change: Selected papers from 11 ICEHL Santiago de Compostela, 7-11 September 2000*, ed. Teresa Fanego *et al.* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins). "When Did English Begin?" (145–72) asks Angelika Lutz in a paper that posits a different periodization than the traditional ones that use a tripartite division. While the customary division between Old and Middle English is based on the levelling of inflections or the Norman Conquest, she suggests dividing the history of English into Anglo-Saxon and English, based on the great changes in vocabulary associated with the Norman invasion. The changes do not show up immediately, but only in the fourteenth century when the French ruling classes gradually took up the English language and imported large numbers of French words. Early Middle English texts like *Peterborough Chronicle, Proclamation of Henry III,* Laȝamon's *Brut, Proverbs of Alfred, The Owl and the Nightingale* show a decay of inflectional endings, but retain the largely native vocabulary. Late Middle

English texts, on the other hand, have replaced a high percentage of Anglo-Saxon words with French words. Words of French origin permeate all style levels in modern English, unlike the borrowings from other languages like Latin and Greek. Scheler's (1977) studies of *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* and *Advanced Learner's Dictionary* show in fact more words of French origian than from *Inselgermanisch*. A comparison of Tyndale's English and Luther's German Bibles from the early modern period show the greater extent to which English has taken up borrowings compared to German.

In "What's Afoot with Word-Final C? Metrical Coherence and the History of English" (*Sounds, Words, Texts, and Change*, 173–87) Chris McCully argues against an analysis of Germanic stress that uses extrametricality (in the sense of Lahiri *et al*. 1999), rules, and weight-sensitive iterative construction across a string parsed on a single derivational level, citing problems encountered in its application. Instead he proposes a solution drawn from Optimality Theory, which provides additional motivation for the "invisibility" of C# and makes the need for extrametricality and repair strategies redundant, at least for OE. He concludes with the following incomplete ranking of constraints for stress and syllabification in OE: Root >> Initial Prominence >> Non-Finality >> Foot Binarity >> Trochee >> Parse-C, Weak C. His approach captures all structures formerly adopted by the Germanic foot (which he proposes removing from analyses of Germanic phonology): the moraic trochee as an optimal product of Foot Binarity, acting in concert with Initial Prominence and Nonfinality.

Two of the nine papers from *Of Dyuersitie & Chaunge of Langage: Essays Presented to Manfred Görlach on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Katja Lenz and Ruth Möhlig (Heidelberg: Winter) are reviewed in this section. In "The Genesis of *h*-dropping Revisited: An Empirical Analysis" (6–26) Manfred Markus argues against the handbook view (Wyld 1936: 296, Luick 1940: 1093) that the loss of initial prevocalic *h* goes back only to the eighteenth century. Following James Milroy (1992: 198) this is instead taken as the date when *h*-less forms became stigmatized. Based on data collection from the *Oxford English Dictionary* on CD-ROM and *LALME*, Markus posits instability of initial *hV* beginning in the second half of the fourteenth century and spreading throughout England by 1500. Evidence comes in the form of *h*-dropping and hypercorrect *h*-insertion. Maps from *LALME* show it to be most common in the East (Essex to Norfolk) and West (Devonshire to Warwickshire, but it hardly affected London before 1500. Insertion of *h* predominates in the Danelaw and is attributable to Scandinavian influence. Since allophonization of

h- in French words is attested only in the first half of the fifteenth century, the author argues against French being the driving force in the change in Germanic vocabulary. Instead he agrees with Lutz (1998) and Milroy (1992) that loss of the universally weak consonant is for phonotactic reasons. Latin and Greek words, to the contrary, came into English in the Middle Ages without initial *h*, only to have it restored in the Humanist period.

Hans Sauer's "The English Kings and Queens and the English Language" (*Of Dyuersitie & Chaunge of Langage*, 180–98), is a survey of the influence English monarchs had on the development of English. The topic has three aspects: 1. the spoken and written language of the kings and queens; 2. the extent to which their language usage influenced contemporary and subsequent speakers and writers; 3. the use of royal authority to support developments of the language, including standardization. The following OE matters are included in the discussion: the laws of the Kentish kings; Alfred's educational program, translations, and poetry; and Cnut and his laws.

Two articles are reviewed here from the festschrift *And Gladly Wolde He Lerne and Gladly Teche: Essays on Medieval English Presented to Professor Matsuji Tajima on his Sixtieth Birthday,* ed. Yoko Iyeiri and Margaret Connolly (Tokyo: Kaibunsha). In "The Old English Sound System from a North-Sea Germanic Perspective" (17–38) Hans Frede Nielsen discusses in turn the vowel systems, the unaccented vowel systems, and the consonant systems of Old English, Old Frisian and Old Saxon with an eye to determining the extent to which features shared by OE and the continental languages developed on the continent before the settlement period. The following common features are considered to have developed before emigration: contrast between long and short *aV* and *aN*, the loss of nasals before fricatives, unified plural verb forms, loss of -*r* in the personal pronouns *he, we, me*, and addition of *h*- in *he*. The following were interpreted as independent innovations in OE: monophthongization of *ai*, the fronting of long and short *a*, palatalization and affrication of velar stops, *i*-umlaut, and breaking.

"The Origins of Old English Breaking" (*And Gladly Wolde He Lerne*, 39–50), by Jeremy L. Smith, offers a sociolinguistic approach to the problem. He hypothesizes that integration between the Anglian and Saxon sound-systems in England give rise to the phenomenon. Smith subscribes to the view that OE digraphs represent diphthongs in the breaking environments. While leaving aside *w*-breaking, he proposes that back realizations of *l, r, x* in Anglian, originating on the continent before emigration, spread to

West Saxon and were there responsible for the insertion of a back vowel to form the diphthongs, long and short *ea, eo, iu*. Back *l* in Anglian is attributed to the velarized *l*, which is still found in the present-day Danish of East Jutland. The Angles would in turn have taken up the back *l* through contact with Pre-Scandinavian in the Germanic homeland. In similar fashion, back *r* in Anglian is attributed to uvular *r*, which is currently used in Denmark and southern Sweden, being weakend to a velar *r* in non-Anglian varieties of English. Calling on modern Dutch as a parallel, it is further hypothesized that Anglian *x* came to have the velar realization not only following back vowels, but also following front ones. While cases of failed first fronting of Gmc. *a* > *æ* in northern English are ascribed to presence of the back varieties of *l* and *r*, back *x* came to dominate in Anglian only after the first fronting. Thus phonetic borrowings from Anglian are held to account for breaking in West Saxon, where it received its fullest expression.

Individual Studies

Elzbieta Adamczyck examines "Old English Reflexes of Sievers' Law" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 36 [2001]: 61–72). Although Germanic reflexes of Sievers's Law are generally assumed to be present only in Gothic alternations of the type *-ji-* vs. *-ei-* after light vs. heavy root syllables, cf. Go. *nasjis* (2nd pers. sing.) vs. *sokeiþ* (3rd pers. sing.), the author has identified obscured traces in Old English. They are present for example in the nominative and accusative singular and plural of masculine and neuter *ja*-stems, as in **andiian* > **andi* > **endi* > *ende* (masc. sing.) vs. **kunian* > **kunnjan* > **kynni* > *cynn* (neut. sing.), or in the *ja*- and *jo*-stem adjectives, primarily in the nominative and accusative singular, as in *clǣne* vs. *midd*. In OE, the alternation is presence vs. absence of vowels in heavy vs. light stems, as opposed to long vowel vs. semivowel + vowel sequences in Gothic. While gemination is present in the light stems, it is viewed as prevented by the prehistoric working of Sievers's law in the heavy stems. In addition Sievers's Law in OE is found to interact with high vowel deletion in that a vowel is preserved where deletion is expected according to HVD (cf. *mæru*, *ierfu*).

In another article, Adamczyk discusses "Reduplication and the Old English Strong Verbs Class VII" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 38: 23–34), following Mottausch's 1998 classification of the new types of verbs which replaced reduplication on the original Germanic pattern as attested in Gothic (see *YWOES* 1998). She treats type II and type IV, since these are best attested in Old English. Type II, whose origin the author dates to the late fifth century, is attested Anglian, in the *r*-preterites and the *r*-less preterites: cf.

rǣdan : reord, hātan : hēht. As an alternative to the traditional approach which holds these forms to be due to Anglian syncope, Adamczyk proposes that they are due to the original ablaut pattern. By analogy the new type developed on the model of the two verbs *leort* and *reord* from **lelōt/*lelt* and **rerōð/*rerd*. The root vowels reflect the original singular *o*-grade and the original non-singular reduced or zero grade, respectively. The *eo*-vocalism present in most of the forms is attributed to breaking in the *r*-type and velar umlaut in the *r*-less type, following d'Alquen (1997: 87). Type IV, which eventually replaced the other types, is posited as spreading within Northwest Germanic between 500 A.D. and the seventh century, originating in Frankish. In OE, these forms are traditionally referred to as *-ē*-preterites and *-eo*-preterites. Adamczyk analyzes the systematic new pattern in the vocalism as /e/ infix + root vowel, with the infix soon being interpreted as the preterite marker, as in *aikan : é-aik, aukan : é-auk*. The vowel-initial verbs were the source of the *e*-infix. Six verbs of the *aukan*-type were the model for analogical spread.

"Naturalness, Markedness and the Productivity of the Old English *a*-Declension" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 36 [2001]: 73–93) is an attempt by Antonio Bertacca to explain the spread of this declension other than by recourse to analogy alone. In so doing, he applies the tenets of Natural Morphology as propounded by Wurzel and Mayerthaler. Productivity is viewed not as merely reflecting the quantity of items belonging to a class of words, but as potentiality resulting from class-stability and system-congruity. The reasons the *a*-declension became productive at the expense of other declensions are the following: the high type-frequency, with over 50% of OE nouns belonging to this declension; its word-based inflection and accompanying morphosemantic and morphotactic transparency as opposed to stem-inflection; loan words accepted in the OE period usually joined the *a*-declension; there was no syncretism of the nominative/accusative plural with the other cases; it was the target of transfers from the other classes. Moreover, the *a*-declension was the least marked type and became even less marked and more "natural" as the other unstable classes were quantitatively reduced.

Juan Conde-Silvestre presents "The Code and Context of *Monasteriales Indicia*: A Semiotic Analysis of Late Anglo-Saxon Sign Language" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 36 [2001]: 145–69). This text, preserved in folios 97v–101v of London, BL, MS Cotton Tiberius A.iii (s. xi med.), lists the signs used in the Benedictine Community at Christ Church, Canterbury and possibly in other monastaries. Although the Rule of St. Benedict called for silence in the monastaries of the order, *MI* is the only list translated into

the vernacular. The 127 signs, mostly common nouns for the persons and objects encountered in everyday life at the monastary (e.g. *abbud, hunig, syx, stola)*, are examined syntactically and semantically by Conde-Silvestre. The main syntactic distinctions described are between simple and compound signs as well as free and bound gestures. In the semantic realm, the signs are found to make use of primary inconicity or derived iconicity, i.e., the signs connect their base and referent in direct imitative terms (deictically, kinetically, pictorially) or indirectly by means of synecdoche, metonymy, and metaphor.

S. Terrie Curran's *English from Cædmon to Chaucer: The Literary Development of English* (Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland) is a history of English for students with little or no previous knowledge of linguistics. The focus on the study of language in its cultural context, literary and linguistic, has the aim of attracting students back to studying the history of English. "As culture impacts language, the shape of language impacts literature" (ix). With this dictum in mind, the author examines the affect of major historical events, like invasions, on the English language and samples of the literature of the various periods. The texts are accompanied by word-for-word interlinear translations to encourage closer examination by students. Structural aspects of the language are not completely neglected but receive a simplified presentation, supplemented by exercises. The prehistory of English is ignored in favor of the documented stages of the language.

Jeannette Marshall Denton offers "Phonetic Insights into the Articulation of Early West Germanic /r/" (*Études & travaux* 4 [2001]: 159–72). Since a disproportionate number of changes are attributed to *r*, the author reasons it is worth considering its early articulation and acoustic features. It is posited that there was no single articulation of the consonant in the early Germanic languages. The changes examined, the Gothic lowering of high vowels, OE breaking, Upper German consonantal blocking of *i*-umlaut, monophthongization of Gmc. *ai, au*, and the Upper German development of *eu*, all involve the lowering and/or retraction of the preceding vowel. Following Howell (1991), it is hypothesized that *r*, as well as the other conditioning factors involved in these changes (/h/, /l/, /w/), was an approximant or had a vowel-like articulation rather than a strongly constricted one when it conditioned these changes in postvocalic position. On the basis of an instrumental study of American /r/ (a vowel-like approximant in certain varieties), which showed that *r* in the syllable rhyme rhotacized the entire syllable, i.e., lowered the 3rd formant of preceding vowels, Denton argues for the possibility of a similar pronunciation of early Germanic *r*.

A History of English: A Sociolinguistic Approach (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), by Barbara Fennell, is an overview of the development of English from the pre-history to the present day, including attention to the English language in the United States and world wide. The book is intended for beginners with a first chapter covering the periodization, English phonetics and general concepts of linguistics, especially language change. Each subsequent chapter covers a period in the history of English, treating the structure of the language at each stage of development and the social and political context (traditionally called "external history"), each chapter ends with a "sociolinguistic focus." The topics covered in this section introduce students to various aspects of sociolinguistics, especially in the historical setting: archaeological linguistics, language contact, multilingualism, creolization in Middle English, standardization in the modern period and social and regional dialects.

"Conditions for the Voicing of Old English Fricatives, II: Morphology and Syllable Structure" (*English Language and Linguistics* 6: 81–104), by R.D. Fulk, is the second of two articles on the topic. The first (*IJGLSA* 6 [2001]: 55–78) treats phonological aspects of the problem. There he argues, following Bammesberger (1988), that rather than the commonly assumed complementary distribution of voiced and voiceless fricatives in OE, an opposition voiced/voiceless was established medially following sonorants as in *weorðe, mǣrsian* vs. *iermþ(u), mǣrþu*. In the latter two examples voiceless fricatives (cf. Luick 1914-40: §639) came to stand in this position by syncope. The present article examines fricatives at points of morpheme juncture in compounds and quasi-compounds as evidenced especially by place-names, but also personal names and common nouns, and, to a lesser extent, inflectional suffixes (e. g. *heorðweorod, Wulfweard, stīðlīce)*. The author concludes that fricatives were voiced at the end of the first constituent of a compound when a voiced sound followed or before an inflection beginning with a voiced sound, but not a voiceless one. Thus OE did not generally devoice fricatives in syllable final position. Interchanges of <h> and <g> in this position are taken to be merely orthographic, as in other non-initial positions.

Richard Hogg's *An Introduction Old English* (Oxford: Oxford UP) is a text for a beginner's course. Instead of using the traditional approach for textbooks of old languages, which couples a free-standing account of the grammar with a selection of texts to be deciphered by reference to the grammar, the present book follows the model of William Bennett's (1980) introductory Gothic textbook. The book is divided into easily digestible chapters introducing

various points of the grammar and textual exercises, high-lighting the new material. The grammatical descriptions are of necessity not as full as as those in some textbooks and no extended discussion of phonology is included. The author finds that too great an emphasis on phonology in the beginning stages of study inhibits the understanding of other aspects of the structure of the language and even the reading of original texts. An OE glossary, a glossary of linguistic terms and a list of recommended reading are included.

In "How Primary was the OHG Primary Umlaut?" (*NOWELE* 14: 99–104), Bo Isakson discusses again the traditional hypothesis that Umlaut spread from north to south in West Germanic. In German scholarship, umlaut of short Gmc. *a* in Old High German is called 'primary' umlaut as opposed to the 'secondary' (later) umlaut of the remaining short and long accented vowels. Based on the attestation of primary umlaut in manuscripts, the author argues for spread in West Germanic from OE via Old Frisian (*ca.* 650) to the other continental dialects Old Saxon (*ca.* 700), Old Franconian (*ca.* 750), Old Alemannic, and Old Bavarian (both *ca.* 750-800). He posits spread through Franconian scriptoria along the lower Rhine to Alemannic scriptoria, which clustered on the Upper Rhine and finally to the Bavarian centers of literary activity along the Danube river system. The frequency of primary umlaut, declining from north to south also suggests this direction of spread.

"*Gēata lēod*: On the Partitive Genitive in Old English Poetry" (*Anglia* 119 [2001]: 596–605) by Göran Kjellmer compares the use of this construction in poetry to its use in prose, based on his collection of data from the following corpus: *Beowulf, Wanderer, Seafarer, Exodus, Battle of Maldon* (all poetry, approx. 23,320 words), and selections from King Alfred's version of *Cura Pastoralis, The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Ælfric's Life of St. Edmund* (all prose, approx. 26,000 words). The texts are mostly original Old English compositions, while those with Latin background appear to be minimally influenced by Latin. Although alternative constructions were available to writers of prose and poetry, the statistics show that use of the partitive genitive is six to seven times more common in the poetry than in the prose. Also clear from the assembled figures is the preference for the pre-head genitive in poetry and for the post-head genitive in the prose. The verse writers used pronouns (*monna gehwylc*), superlative adjectives (*corna caldast*) and quantifiers (*wintra worn*) as the head word, whereas prose writers used primarily numerals (*.xl. manna*) and quantifiers (*fela wundra*). Kjellmer points to the compact type of language and the exigencies of meter in the verse as well as the relative age of the poetry as compared to the prose (generally

speaking) to explain the preference for the rather succinct construction in the one genre as opposed to the other. As the one later poem, *Battle of Maldon* (after 991), stands out. While it still prefers the pre-head partitive genitive, it displays only about half as many tokens as the other poems. The development is also seen as part of the general trend from synthetic to analytic in the Germanic languages.

Lucia Kornexl's contribution "From *gold-gifa* to *Chimney Sweep*? Morphological (Un)Markedness of Modern English Agent Nouns in a Diachronic Perspective" (in *English Historical Syntax and Morphology: Selected papers from 11 ICEHL*, ed. María José López-Couso *et al.* [Amsterdam: John Benjamins], 111–29) questions whether there is continuity of the type, formally unmarked nouns, from OE to MnE. The affixless derivations in Old English, semantically action and agentive nouns, were very common. They belong to the *n*-declension and the author follows Kastovsky (1968: 13, 81–83; etc.) in viewing the masculine *-a* and feminine *-e* endings as merely declensional and not derivational in character, since derivational affixes can no longer be isolated in forms like *dēma, widuwe*. Based on the data in Sauer's (1992) study, Kornexl argues that this type died out after early Middle English. Derivationally unmarked agent nouns in MnE do not appear to represent a continous development: they are either loans (*cook, guide, judge*) or date back only to the sixteenth century. Furthermore, the derogatory nouns belonging to Marchand's *cheat* group (1963: 178f) are not protypical agents.

Although Marcin Krygier's "The Simplification of the Initial [wr-] Cluster in Middle English" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 36 [2001]: 51–59) finds the data supporting Stockwell's and Minkova's (1997) cautious dating of the change to the fourteenth century to be questionable, the article examines further data pointing in the same direction. Metatheses and epentheses confirm that <wr-> represented a phoneme sequence in OE, cf. OE *werna* (Corpus Glossary B, *ca.* 725) for *wrenna*, *wurað* (*Lindisfarne Gospels*, *ca.* 950) for *wrāð*. Alliteration of <wr-> with <w-> also points to the retention of [w] in the sequence in the OE period. Stockwell's and Minkova's arguments for a fourteenth-century dating include the following: <runkle>-spellings for MnE *wrinkle*, *Havelok*'s (13th century) <wrobberes> for *robberes* and Scandinvian borrowings with intial <r-> with inverse spellings: <wrang> ON *rangr* 'wrong'. Krygier counters: ME <runkle> is not from the same etymon as OE *gewrinclod*, but derived from a Norse borrowing, cognate with Danish *rynke* (noun and verb) 'wrinkle'. *Havelok*'s *wroberes* alliterates with *wreieres* and ME *wrobbe* (vb.) is attested in Thomas of Erceldoune and seems to alliterate with *wrye*. Norwegian and Danish dialects spoken in England had

[wr-]. The author, however, points to metathesis in texts up to the sixteenth century (<worng> for *wrong*, <wirten> for *written*), epentheses and metathesis in place names up to the fourteenth century (<Warslyngwrth> for Wresting-worth, <Warangebroc> for Wrangbook) to suggest a lack of stability of [wr-] beginning in the fourteenth century.

Ursula Lenker's review of *Verschriftung und Verschrift-lichung des Altenglischen: Eine methodisch-exemplarische Untersuchung* (Frankfurt: Lang, 1999), by Christine Ehler (*Word* 53: 238–43), criticizes the book on a number of accounts. Although she finds the study of the textualiza-tion of English to be a worthy topic, noting the distinction between *Verschriftung* (scripting the oral code of a given text) and *Verschriftlichung* (textualization of the language as a whole), she finds the work to suffer from "many grave mistakes, its methodological inconsistencies and, above all, its superficial and careless handling of medieval sources" (239). The numerous typographical errors seem to point to the haste in which the book was readied for publication. The author also questions the value of the conclusions reached. For example, Lenker notes that Ehler's analysis of the relative amount of Latin and English used in charters from the seventh to eleventh centuries results only in the conclusion that the percentage of English increased, which is already common knowledge.

Chris McCully's "Exaptation and English Stress" (*Lan-guage Sciences* 24: 323–44) examines three features of the English stress system: 1. the notion of "default" stress, 2. the longevity and productiveness of the primary-second-ary pattern on nouns, and 3. the stress patterning of Eng-lish verbs. While the first two survivals are found not to be exaptive, or opportunistically co-opting a feature whose origin is unrelated or only marginally related to its later use (Lass 1990: 80), the third is found to be redeployed and may be exaptation in progress. The author finds the direc-tion of change to be toward a mode of stress on English verbs which is not only 'right-strong', but an unambiguous indicator of their morphological class. Nouns, on the other hand, have a left-hand pattern and can be nothing other than nouns.

An-Nah Moon's study "Consonantal Changes in the Inventory of English: A Constraint-Based Analysis" (*Ohak Yonku* [*Language Research*] 38: 801–25) analyzes the con-sonant inventory structure of the three periods of Eng-lish within the dispersion theory formalized in terms of Optimality Theory. A primary assumption is that three basic factors are responsible for the composition of the inventory: maximization of the number of contrasts, maximization of distinctiveness, and minimization of

articulatory effort. The three factors are labelled Maintain nNF contrasts, Mindist, and LAZY. Most attention is paid to the fricative subsystem, since this is is where the more far-reaching changes in the documented history of Eng-lish have occurred. The dominance of "maintain 5NF con-trasts" is said to determine the five places of articulation of the fricatives. The proposed hierarchies of constraints attempt to explain why OE did not have voiced fricatives in the phoneme inventory and why only the front voiced fricatives became phonemes in English.

In a second article Moon discusses "The Pronunciation of <c> in Old English: Palatalization and Umlaut" (*Jnl of English Language and Literature* 47 [2001]: 1147–71). The author seeks to explain the seemingly contradictory pal-atalization of medial and final velar consonants by pre-ceding umlauted vowels and the lack of palatalization of initial velar consonants by umlauted vowels, cf. *sēcan, bēc* vs. *cynn*. The proposed explanation is that palatalization is caused by the adjaceny of the front segment which triggers umlaut rather than the umlauted vowel. The initial conso-nant, being separated from the trigger, is not palatalized. Additionally, the author tries to capture when palataliza-tion occurs and when it does not, by applying Optimality Theory. Although the proposed constraint ranking is not considered ideal, it can easily characterize the distribution of palatal and velar consonants and their interaction with umlauted vowels.

Karl-Heinz Mottausch attempts an interpretation of Umlaut and Unrounding in "Umlaut und Entrundung im Altenglischen: Versuch einer Deutung" (*NOWELE* 41: 3–16). While unrounding of long and short *ö* proceeds from south to north in the ninth and tenth centuries, unround-ing of long and short *ü* followed in the tenth and eleventh centuries, being retained in parts of Anglian into ME. A comparision with other languages, including German, shows that there is no phonetic reason that front rounded vowels should be done away with so quickly after their appearance. Instead the author seeks the cause in the struc-ture of the OE vowel system by drawing a parallel with the Rhine Franconian German dialect of Lorsch (Mottausch 1999). He argues that in both cases with disturbances to the pair of correlations, unrounded cardinal vowel : unrounded umlaut vowel, and rounded cardinal vowel : rounded umlaut vowel, this aspect of the system collapsed altogether. Two changes in OE, reasons the author, left *ö, ü* isolated and vulnerable to being reinterpreted within the system: First, *å* develops, but has no counterpart *æ*. Sec-ond, the umlauted diphthongs suffered great changes with dialectal variation: OE *äo > īe* remained in West Saxon, but became contracted to *ē* in Anglian and Kentish. OE *iü >*

īe remained in West Saxon, while the other dialects had unumlauted *īo, ēo*, which merge except in Northumbrian. Further attention is paid to the vowel systems of West Saxon, Kentish, Frisian, and Anglian. In the latter dialects, the longer rentention of the rounded front vowels may be due to Scandinavian influence.

Following in the tradition of the study of Germanic verse form, Geoffrey Russom's "A Bard's-Eye View of the Germanic Syllable" (*JEGP* 101: 305–28), makes use of evidence from meter, employing his word-foot theory (Russom 1998) to propose a new theory of the syllable in Germanic. He accepts Sievers's five verse types and resolution of two short syllables to count for one long stressed syllable, but would like to revise the notion that syllables always contain two morae. Three principles are proposed for the construction of the Germanic syllable, which, the author argues, are consistent with a realistic language-learning situation: 1. the minimal length requirement for a syllable is one mora; 2. the minimal length requirement for Germanic primary stress is two morae; 3. syllables that exceed minimal length are subject to shortening by a principle of least effort. The third principle explains shortening of ultralong stressed syllables and unstressed syllables longer than the minimum. Included in this process are degemination in monosyllables and in unstressed syllables (cf. OE *cyn* < *cynn, gyl.de.ne* < *gyl.den.ne*. Words like OE *bī*, but not like *be*, could be stressed. Subordinate stress, it is proposed, does not always require a domain of two morae.

In "How Much Shifting Actually Occurred in the Historical English Vowel Shift?" (*Studies in the History of the English Language: A Millennial Perspective* [Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter], 267–81), Robert Stockwell reviews ideas put forward in Stockwell and Minkova 1985 and 1988. It is proposed that the "great vowel shift" is not mainly, as is usually assumed, a chain shift. The most conspicuous part of the shift, it is argued is "center drift," which consists of the diphthongization, centralizing, and lowering of [iː] and [uː] to some variant of [aj] and [aw], rather than being part of a chain mechanism. The other main part of the "shift," termed "implosion," is interpreted as multiple mergers in the lower part of the vowel system. It is argued that the mergers are a from of optimization, avoiding overcrowding in the lower front and back regions. On the one hand the vowels of OE *brecan, ehta, mægden, great* and on the other the vowels of OE *nosu, growan, bāt, āgan* merged into [ej] and [ow], respectively. The only remaining "chains" would be the development of [eː] and [iː], [oː] and [uː], respectively. Disagreeing with Lass (1999: 91ff), who argues, based on the testimony of early modern orthoepist John Hart, that long monophthongs remain in

the ancestors of MnE *pray, know*, Stockwell instead follows Alexander Gil, whose testimony gives diphthongs for these words already in the early seventeenth century and calls the monophthongal pronunciations affected.

"Interpreting the Old and Middle English Close Vowels" (*Language Sciences* 24: 447–57) by Robert Stockwell and Donka Minkova offers an alternative explanation to the "lengthening and lowering" theory of Roger Lass (1999: 149, etc.). Based on John Hart's *Orthographie* (1569), Lass posits that /i/ and /u/ remained [i] and [u] until after 1650 and were lowered, in combination with open syllable lengthening to /eː/ and /oː/. The current authors, however, make a case for [ɪ] and [ʊ] already in the OE period, so that when they were lengthened it was natural for them to merge with the nearest long vowels, ME long close *e* and *o* (as opposed to long open *e* and *o*) which were types of *i* and *u*; i. e., <ee>, <oo> spellings represent [ɪː] and [ʊː]. The idea was first published in Stockwell 1961 and echoed, with slight variations, in Lieber 1979, Ritt 1994: 79–80, and Smith 1996: 103. Luick's (1899) view was close to that of Lass, but started out with short open *i* and *u*, as does Stockwell's. Hogg 1992: (199–202) writes of LOE "laxing" to account for the results of the lengthening of OE *i* and *u*. After the Great Vowel Shift, the vowels end up as *iː* and *uː*, which leaves the door open to the various speculations about their pre-shift values.

Matthew Townend's book *Language and History in Viking Age England: Linguistic Relations between Speakers of Old Norse and Old English* (Turnhout: Brepols) continues his discussion of the issues treated in his previous article "Viking Age England as a Bilingual Society" (reviewed in *YWOES* 2000). In applying the contemporary methods of testing intelligibility of two languages (1. Linguistic comparison, 2. Test the informant, 3. Ask the informant, 4. Analysis of social relations) to the period in question, the author makes the central conclusion that Old Norse and Old English were "adequately" or "pragmatically" mutually intelligible. The evidence examined includes: 1. the phonogical systems of Viking Age Old Norse and Old English; 2. the phonemic substitution in the Scandinavianization of English place names by Norse speakers and the Anglicization of Norse words and names by English speakers in "The Voyages of Ohthere and Wulfstan," the Old English *Orosius*, Æthelweard's *Chronicle*, and Ælfric's *De Falsis Diis*; 3. cultural contact and anecdotal evidence of literary sources (Icelandic sagas of a later date). The type of mutual intelligibility identified does not assume ability to understand utterances of high syntactic complexity, but the ability to understand individual words to permit face-to-face and day-to-day transactions, which precludes the need for

bilingualism of individuals or habitual use of interpreters. The final chapter expands on the central conclusion of mutual intelligibility to discuss: 1. the coexistence of Norse and English at the spoken level, 2. their contrastive distribution at the written level, 3. The consequences in terms of inflectional loss in both languages, 4. the entrance of Norse words into English.

In "Restoration of /a/ Revisited" (*Studies in the History of the English Language: A Millennial Perspective* [Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter], 283–300), David White calls for reconsideration of the unconditional status of the first fronting and doing away with /a/ restoration. In the case of OE *dagas*: /dagas/ > /dægas/ > /dagas/ the reversal of the first fronting is unmotivated and we are better off without it. In cases like OE *slean*, a complicated sequence of events is necessary: 1. Unconditioned first fronting, 2. Breaking, 3. Restoration of /a/, 4. Loss of former /x/, 5. Compensatory lengthening of short diphthongs (with loss of unstressed vowels in hiatus), i.e., /slaxan/ > /slæxan/ > /slæaxan/ > /slæəxan/ > /slæə.an/ > /slæən/. Instead, he proposes that the "Brosnahan Effect" (Brosnahan 1953) applied to such words. Brosnahan argued that for some reason, stress in OE was associated with frontness. In *slean,* the effect would have been dissimilation in hiatus: /slahan/ > /sla.an/ > /slæ.an/ > /slæ.ən/ > slæən/, the last step by reanalysis. Dissimilation is also posited in hiatus with a following front vowel as in *feos*: /fexes/ > /fe.es/ > fe.əs/ > /feəs/, rather than breaking with subsequent lengthening.

In a Discussion Note, "Negative Contraction, Dialect, and the AB Language: A Note on Levin 1958" (*Jnl of Germanic Linguistics* 14: 357–58), Johanna Wood does not question Levin's claim that preverbal negative incorporation is a Western and Southern dialect feature in OE and ME, but does question some of his data. There are only two uncontracted forms (as opposed to the 495 uncontracted) in eME texts of Southern and West Midland origin. The two forms in question, she notes occur the Nero MS of *Ancrene Wisse* and the Titus MS of *Hali Meiðhad*, but not in the other versions of these texts. She posits that the two uncontracted forms (*ne is* and *ne wute* as opposed to *nis* and *nute*) were Northern and Eastern scribal emendations in copying these two MSS.

K.G.

ii. Syntax *et al.*

Edited Collections

Sounds, Words, Texts, and Change: Selected Papers from 11 ICEHL, Santiago de Compostela, 7-11 September 2000, ed. Teresa Fanego, Belén Méndez-Naya, and Elena Seoane, Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 224 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins) is a collection of thirteen papers presented at the eleventh International Conference on English Historical Linguistics and, as such, constitutes a companion volume to *English Historical Syntax and Morphology* (ed. López-Couso *et al.*, reviewed below). Two of the articles in this collection are reviewed elsewhere in this section: Lutz's "When Did English Begin?" and McCully's "What's Afoot with Word-final C?" In addition, the volume includes two other essays that touch on OE. Christian Kay and Irené Wotherspoon's "Wreak, Wrack, Rack, and (W)ruin: The History of Some Confused Spellings" (129–43) examines the origins of words beginning with wr-. Those *wr-* words which have their origins prior to MnE— whether they came from OE (e.g. *wreak* from *wrecan*, and *wrack* from *wræc*) or from Anglo-Norman or Scandinavian (e.g. *wrack* 'rush', *wreck* 'item cast off from a ruined vessel')—had their initial w-sound fully pronounced until the loss of the consonant cluster /wr/ between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries. Kay and Wotherspoon point out that many of these *wr-* words gradually intensified their meaning pertaining to pain and suffering (as in vengeance, shipwreck, and danger). They postulate that it was the negative meanings associated with the *wr-* group that gave rise to unetymological spellings like *wruin* and *nerve-wracking* as well as words of MnE origin like *wrig* ('wanton woman') and *write* ('to be acutely embarrassed'). In "Historical Discourse Analysis: Scientific Language and Changing Thought-styles" (201–06), Irma Taavitsainen examines scientific writing in English from the perspective of "theoretical and methodological issues of historical discourse analysis." Taavitsainen traces the beginning of scientific language to astrological and computational treatises, herbals, and medical texts in OE. Of these, the most important are *Lacnunga*, *Leechdoms*, and Bald's *Leechbook*, all of which can be classified as remedy books since they consist mostly of recipes, charms, and rules of health. Taavitsainen argues that these texts, although skillfully combining native elements with classical knowledge, are not written "at the learned or theoretical level." After OE, there is a gap in scientific writing until the last quarter of the fourteenth century, when English witnessed an "emergence of the scientific register."

The companion volume, which includes twelve papers from the eleventh International Conference on English Historical Linguistics, is *English Historical Syntax and Morphology: Selected Papers from 11 ICEHL, Santiago De Compostela, 7-11 September 2000*, ed. María José López-Couso, Teresa Fanego, and Javier Pérez-Guerra, Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 223 (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins). As stated in the introductory essay by Fanego (1–7), the contributors to this volume often employ grammaticalization and other "current approaches" that would call into question "a number of the basic axioms of structural linguistics, such as the notion of the discreteness of categories or the autonomy of the domains of grammar." Two of the essays included in the collection are reviewed elsewhere in this issue: Kornexl's "From *Gold-gifa* to *Chimney Sweep*?" and Los's "The Loss of the Indefinite Pronoun *Man*." In addition, the volume offers three other essays that touch on OE. Cynthia Allen's "On the Development of a *Friend of Mine*" (23–41) looks into the history of the so-called double-genitive construction. While this construction is generally believed to have originated in the fourteenth century, Allen contends that its "prototype" can be found in early ME clauses, like *ʒif þu mare spenest of þine* ('if you spend more of your [money]'), where a partitive-denoting *of* governs a possessive pronoun referring to things or people associated with the referent (cf. OE *mid his* 'with his [people]). Allen adds that OE has examples that "look rather like double genitives": e.g. *sume of urum*. Since this construction is limited to close translation from the Latin (e.g. *quidam ex nostris*), it should probably be regarded not as a forerunner of double genitives but, rather, as a stretch of "the grammar beyond its normal limits." Ursula Lenker, in "Is it, Stylewise or Otherwise, Wise to Use -Wise?" (157–180), considers the origin of Present-Day English sentence adverbials containing the suffix -*wise* (e.g. *jobwise*, *agewise*). She rejects the common view that such adverb formation is archaism resulting from a faddish revival of the suffix, since its OE counterpart, *wise*, had very different meanings and usage: as a lexical noun, for example, it meant "fashion" or "way" (e.g. *ealde wisan*, *on oðre wisan*); as a manner adjunct, it appeared in phases like *on scipwisan* ('in the manner of a ship'). Lenker argues that Present-Day English -*wise* compounding should be seen as English and American innovations developed for a "functional reason," namely, "to form derivations … from non-Latin roots which do not allow the element -*(c)ally*." In "Morphology Recycled: The Principle of Rhythmic Alternation at Work in Early and Late Modern English Grammatical Variation" (255–81), Julia Schlüter conducts an empirical study of four sets of grammatical variables, which have their origins in OE: namely,

the suffix -*en* in *drunk* (from an OE participial ending); the suffix -*ly* in the adverb *scarce*; the preposition *to* for infinitives occurring with the passive *be made*; and the prefix *a-* occurring with -*ing* forms (from OE prepositions like *on* and *at*). Since these variables cannot be rendered "obligatory" or "unavailable" through grammatical requirements, they seem to be placed under the influence of the "Principle of Rhythmic Alteration." In other words, the grammatical variables in question are used as buffers to produce what Schlüter believes to be a "universal rhythmic ideal" which favors "a strict alternation of strong and weak beats" (e.g. *drúnk with ópium* but *drúnken wrétch*; *sét them góing* but *sét a-bléeding*). Dieter Kastovsky's "The Derivation of Ornative, Locative, Ablative, Privative and Reversative Verbs in English: A Historical Sketch" (99–109) considers the formation of causative-inchoative verbs in the five semantic categories stated in the title. Most of these categories are present in OE: ornative, e.g. *bedician* 'to surround with a dike'; locative, e.g. *husian* 'to house'; privative, e.g. *befotian* 'to cut off one's feet'; reversative, e.g. *onbindan* 'to untie'. Kastovsky points out, however, that OE has a "relatively weak representation of the locative type" and seems to demonstrate a "genuine gap" in the formation of ablative verbs (e.g. MnE *unsaddle*, *dislodge*, *deplane*). Like MnE, OE derived these verbs through prefixation (e.g. *besniwan* 'to cover with snow'), suffixation (e.g. *clænsian* 'to clean', from the adjective *clæne* + the affix -*s*- + the verbal ending -*ian*), zero-derivation (e.g. *munucian* 'to make into a monk', from the noun *munuc* + the verbal ending -*ian*), and a combination of these processes (e.g. *unclænsian* 'to soil'). Compared to OE, MnE has a greater variety of such adverb formation, thanks to French and Latin affixes like *de-*, *dis-*, *en-*, -*ate*, -*en*, and -*ize*. In "Detransitivization in the History of English from a Semantic Perspective" (231–54), Ruth Möhlig and Monika Klages argue that detransitivization apply to verbs that have certain semantic properties, such as BODY CARE (e.g. *wash*, *bathe*) and BODY-MOVEMENT (e.g. *move*). Möhlig and Klages provide four diachronic patterns of detransitivization of the verbs in question. First, a "co-referential intransitive pattern" pertains to a shift from transitive (e.g. *John washed the clothes*) to reflexive with a co-referential Goal-object (e.g. *John washed himself*) to co-referential intransitive with emphasis on the Agent (e.g. *John washed*; also, OE *heo baðian wolde*). Another pattern is called "generic use," because it pertains to an intransitive use of a transitive verb whose object is "implied by the cultural context": e.g. *he is wise who reads* (intransitive; also OE *seðe redes oncnawað*), as opposed to *Mary read a book* (transitive). The third pattern is "ergative," as it involves verbs that can take both a "transitive-causative" construction (e.g. *Mary opened the door*) and an "intransitive-inchoative" construction with a "non-Agentive participant" as

a subject (e.g. *the door opened*; also OE *sona hyt sceal ope-nian*). The fourth pattern, called "middle use," is characterized by an intransitive use of transitive verbs along with adverbs of manner like *well*, *easily*, and *better* (e.g. *this book reads well*). This last pattern did not develop until MnE. Möhlig and Klages believe that all of these detransitivized constructions, compared to their transitive counterparts, seem to "affect the agentivity of the state of affairs."

Several articles concerning Old English appear in *Studies in the History of the English Language: A Millennial Perspective*, ed. D. Minkova and R. Stockwell (Topics in English Linguistics 39. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter). In "Explaining the Creation of Reflexive Pronouns in English" (325–54) Edward L. Keenan introduces a number of semantic criteria to show that the history of reflexive pronouns in English (e.g. *herself*) is "far more complicated than a simple parameter resetting." In order to account for the transition from OE collocations like "*he self*" to -*self* compounds in early ME like *himself*, Keenan employs the concept of DECAY, a process through which "phonological reduction obscures morpheme boundaries." Keenan uses INERTIA, a concept that "explains the non-changes," to indicate why the earliest usage of -*self* compounds resembled that of OE *self*: namely, as a pronoun occurring either in apposition to the subject or independently in the predicate. Keenan introduces the concept ANTI-SYNONYMY, a semantic constraint on co-existence of "pure synonyms" in a given language, to account for the fact that -*self* compounds have never been used as "emphatic" or "contrastive" possessors (e.g. **he is using himself's pen*): such usage must have been checked by the existing "possessive + *own*" (e.g. *his own*), a collocation that was established in *ca.* 1000 (e.g. *his agen*) and has since been in use thanks to INERTIA. In the same volume Ans van Kemenade's "Word Order in Old English Prose and Poetry: The Position of Finite Verb and Adverbs" (355–71), uses *Beowulf* to argue that a certain "poetic word order pattern reflects an earlier stage of the language": namely, clauses introduced by a negation word with no preposed finite verb (e.g. *no ic fram him wolde*, as opposed to *nolde se Hælend*). Observing that such a construction accounts for 41% of the negative-initial clauses in *Beowulf* but cannot be attested in prose texts from the ninth and tenth centuries, Kemenade concludes that OE poetry contains "a good deal more verb-final word order" than OE prose. There seems to be, however, a "close similarity between the poetry and the prose" in other syntactic characteristics including the "positioning of sentence-internal subjects and adverbs." Also in the same volume, Jeong-Hoon Lee argues, in "The 'Have' Perfect in Old English: How Close Was it to the Modern English Perfect?" (373–97), that contrary to the common view, the OE "have"

perfect was not limited to a "resultative" meaning (that is, a description of past action with present results, as in *I have eaten lunch*) but was also able to express two other sub-categories found in the semantic domain of the MnE perfect. One sub-category, the "existential" perfect, pertains to a situation that "occurred once or more in the past within a span of time construed by the speaker as continuing up to the present": e.g., *I have read that novel*, OE *hæbbe ic mærþa fela ongunnen*. The other sub-category, the "universal" perfect, pertains to a situation that began in the past but has persisted until the present: e.g. *he has sung in the choir for years*; OE *nu hæbbe ic … þinne willan gelæst to ful monegum dæge*. Lee concludes that "as far as their possible semantic domains are concerned," there is "no significant difference" in the use of the "have" perfect between OE and MnE.

Several articles appear in *Studies in English Historical Linguistics and Philology: A Festschrift for Akio Oizumi*, ed. Jacek Fisiak (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang). In "Subordinate Clauses with VS Order in Old English" (175–89) Willem F. Koopman examines a number of major OE prose texts and confirms a well-known phenomenon: Verb–Subject order is frequent in main clauses (e.g. *ða gesawon hi ðær twegen englas*) but "not very common" in subordinate clauses. Koopman argues that conditions that cause VS in subordinate clauses—whatever they might be—are different from those which cause VS in main clauses, and further speculates that most examples of VS subordinate clauses have their subjects remaining in a "low position": e.g. *þæt him com of heofonum ongean mycel engla werod*. Exceptions to this category may be found in several constructions: e.g. relative clauses, whose status as subordinate clauses is often ambiguous; *forþan þe* clauses, which Koopman interprets as main clauses (an equivalent of MnE main clauses beginning with the sentence adverb *for*); and *swa swa* clauses, which he sees as an "idiomatic expression" (e.g. *swaswa us segð seo boc*). In "Contrasting Patterns of *s*-Plural Attachment to *n*-Stem Neuters in Middle English" (343–53), John G. Newman considers the expansion of the -*as* ending, originally a marker for nominative and accusative plural of strong *a*-stem masculine nouns in OE (e.g. *stanas* 'stones'), to weak (or *n*-stem) neuter nouns in the ME period. Newman examines this cross-paradigm extension by focusing on two ME nouns: *eaʒe* ('eye') and *eare* ('ear'). Despite the semantic and phonological similarities shared by the two words, *eare* adopted the -*s* ending (i.e. *eares*, as opposed to *earen*) already in the early fourteenth century, whereas *eaʒe* did not adopt the *s*-plural (i.e. *eaʒes*, as opposed to *eaʒen*) until the late fourteenth century. Newman speculates that the time lag in the adoption of the *s*-ending was caused by the higher frequency of

occurrence for *eaʒe*, at least in the plural. In "An Explanation of *to*(-) Compounding in Old English Based on the Cumulative Tendency" (355–74), Yoshinobu Niwa examines *to*-compounds and recognizes a "cumulative" or emphatic tendency in their semantic features, regardless of their syntactic functions. When used as a verbal prefix, for example, *to-* may increase the meaning related to separation or movement in the verbs: e.g. in the compound *todælan* ('to sunder'), its elements share DIVIDE as a "common semantic feature," but the prefix *to-* strengthens this meaning in *dælan* ('to part') by adding a "resultative force." When used as a prepositional prefix, *to-* seems to have a cumulative effect on the elements with which it shares such common semantic features as DISTANCE (e.g. *togeanes* 'towards', from *-gean-* 'against', with added "direction" meaning), and MOVEMENT (e.g. *tosomne* 'together', from *samnian* 'to gather' with added "resultate" meaning). The collocation *to ðon æt* functions as a conjunction meaning 'until', in which the semantic feature EXTENT in *ðon þæt* ('as much as') is strengthened by *to*. Masayuki Ohkado's essay, "On Object Fronting in Old English" (239–53), examines Object-Verb-Subject order in Ælfric and argues that, in addition to the types of object fronting still found in Present-Day English, OE has at least two more unique types. One is called THREAD-CLARIFYING TOPICALIZATION, because it moves objects in sentences that "summarize the preceding discourse after … digression." For instance, the sentence "*Ðreora manna gebyrd-tide freolsað seo halige gelaðung*" ('the holy church celebrates the birth-tide of three persons') is used to resume the homily's topic, John the Baptist's birthday, after a digression into miracles occasioned by the saint's birth. The other type of object fronting is VAGUELY LINKED TOPICALIZATION, in which the reference to the fronted object "is not overtly given" and must therefore be inferred "from the context." In the sentence "*mycel yfel deð seðe leas writ*" ('he does great evil who writes false'), for example, the reference to the fronted object *mycel yfel* is not directly linked to the previous sentence, where Ælfric admonishes scribes to correct their transcribed texts "lest we be blamed through careless writers" (*þylæs þe we þurh gymeleas writeras geleahtrode beon*).

Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change, ed. David W. Lightfoot (Oxford: Oxford UP), is a collection of twenty-one essays on changes in grammars drawn from presentations at the sixth meeting of the Diachronic Generative Syntax series in 2000. In the introduction (1–19) editor Lightfoot defines grammars as "formal characterizations of an individual's capacity, conforming to … the tools provided by a universal initial stage … and developing as a person is exposed to his or her childhood linguistic experience." In addition to the seven essays reviewed in the next

paragraph, the volume offers two others that touch on Old English. Thórhallur Eythórsson's "Changes in Subject Case-Marking in Icelandic" (196–212) uses examples from OE and several Scandinavian languages to consider grammar changes related to impersonal constructions in Icelandic. Thomas McFadden's "The Rise of the *To*-Dative in Middle English" (107–123) considers how OE dative constructions can be studied "in terms of current theories," and what relation they bear to their MnE counterparts. McFadden argues that the OE order Indirect Object-Direct Object has survived as the MnE double-object construction, whereas the OE order Direct Object-Indirect Object has changed into the MnE *to*-dative construction. In order to explain the latter process, McFadden speculates that, when overt case marking was lost from the dative in the Direct Object-Indirect Object construction in early ME, the learner was able to retain this element order by reanalyzing the obliqueness of the indirect object as a prepositional phrase.

Cynthia L. Allen's "Case and Middle English Genitive Noun Phrases" (*Syntactic Effects*, 57–80) considers an ME appositional construction that contains a discontinuous possessive without overt case agreement, as in *þe kinges moder henri* ("King Henry's mother"). According to Allen, such "non-agreeing possessive appositives" arose in early ME and continued to be used "at least into the early seventeenth century." This construction is a departure from OE, in which "both parts of the appositive" had genitive marking: e.g. *on æþelredes dæge cyninges*. Allen argues that OE would have rejected the construction like *þe kinges moder henri* through "Morphological Blocking," a principle which prevents morphologically unspecified forms, like *henri* here, from "being used when a more specific form is available." Morphological Blocking became relaxed through the gradual disappearance of case marking in ME until agreement had become "optional in appositives." Željko Bošković's "Split Constituents within NP in the History of English: Commentary on Allen" (81–87) is a response to Allen's discussion (above) on discontinuous possessive constructions like *Inwæres broþur ond Healfdenes* ("Possessive 1-Noun-Possessive 2"). Bošković argues that the key to a successful analysis of split elements rests in capturing their properties, such as their "discontinuous constituency," "semantic unity," and the fact that the second split element can occur outside the noun phrase (cf. *com se cyning to him Godrum*). Bošković ascribes the genitive split construction to "scrambling" and presents its Logical Form ("LF") as "Poss1-Poss2-N" (e.g. *Inwæres ond Healfdenes broþur*). He argues that this analysis not only satisfies the properties of the split elements but also allows the morphology of the second possessive here to be "licensed through agreement after LF Movement." Susan Bejar's "Movement,

Morphology, and Learnability" (307–25) postulates a two-step reanalysis of OE impersonal constructions occurring with "dyadic psych-predicates" by later generations. Her example is *ac him na ofhreow ne þæs deofles hryre*, where the experiencer (*him*) is dative and the theme (*hryre*) is nominative. According to Bejar, the first step was a reanalysis of the nominative theme as accusative, a process that took place after the "loss of the nominative-accusative contrast" on full noun-phrases in early ME. The second step was a reanalysis of the dative experiencer as nominative, a process which Bejar believes to have been triggered by the first reanalysis. She argues that this two-part process gave rise to "A-movement," thus implying that the emergence of A-movement for experiencers in this construction is not "the *cause* of reanalysis, but a *result* of reanalysis." Bejar concludes that "case morphology and A-movement must be acquired independently of one another," as there is "no implicational relation" between the two. In "Inflectional Morphology and the Loss of Verb-Second in English" (88–106) Eric Haeberli considers why English has virtually lost the Verb-Second construction even though it was not uncommon in OE and early ME (e.g. *on his dagum sende Gregorius us fulluht*). After comparing English with other modern Germanic languages, Haeberli associates the loss of V2 with the loss of "empty expletives." Since empty expletives (marked as "*pro*" below) were allowed in OE sentences like "*and eft* pro *is awriten þæt…*" and "*and scandlic* pro *is to specenne þæt…*," they made it possible for full subjects to "remain in a lower subject position." Pointing out that OE already has a Verb-Third construction (e.g. *from Offan kyninge Hygebryht wæs gecoren*), Haeberli postulates co-existence of "two distinct numerations, one containing an empty expletive and the other lacking an empty expletive" for the V2 and V3 constructions, respectively. Since "expletive *pro*" is found in languages "with a relatively rich agreement paradigm," Haeberli speculates that the eventual loss of V2 in English is ultimately a consequence "of a change in the verbal morphology." Chiara Polo's "Double Objects and Morphological Triggers for Syntactic Case" (124–42) challenges the traditional view that "historical changes in syntactic structures are straightforward, functionally related effects of changes in inflectional systems." Polo's claim is based on her analysis of the so-called double-object construction where the verb occurs with a direct object (DO) and an indirect object (IO). After demonstrating a co-existence of IO + DO and DO + IO orders during the transitional period, 1100–1200, Polo concludes that there is "no corroborative evidence for a direct correspondence" between the loss of case distinction between dative and accusative in noun-phrases and the development of fixed ordering between IO and DO. Since ME later developed two fixed word orders for the

double-object construction (namely, IO + DO and DO + *to* + IO), Polo speculates that this twin development was triggered by the "breakdown of overt morphological case distinction on pronoun paradigms," rather than on noun paradigms. Susan Pintzuk's "Verb-Object Order in Old English: Variation as Grammatical Competition" (276–99) argues that "overt morphological case plays no role at all in determining verb-object order" in OE. Her claim is based on her discovery that OE objects show a fixed tendency to occur in a post-verbal position regardless of whether their case-marking is ambiguous or unambiguous. This observation has two ramifications: first, "there is no link during the OE period between case ambiguity and word order"; second, the loss of the case system, despite the accepted view, cannot be the cause of the loss of Object-Verb order, since "the latter started well before the former." Pintzuk further argues that the distribution of objects in pre-verbal and post-verbal positions in OE should not be explained through Kayne's leftward movement of objects from "post-verbal position in uniform head-initial structure." Rather, it should be seen as "grammatical competition in the headedness of underlying structure, head-initial vs. head-final." Jairo Nunes responds to Pintzuk's essay with "VO or OV? That's the Underlying Question: Commentary on Pintzuk" (300–06). While Nunes agrees with Pintzuk that the word order shift from Object-Verb to Verb-Object in OE cannot be linked to the loss of case morphology, he nonetheless believes that this particular observation "cannot be taken as a counterargument" to an approach based on Kayne's universal hypothesis. He adds that, contrary to Pintzuk's claim, the lack of adjacency between a verb and its object in OE may not "in itself present problems" for a Kaynean approach. Nunes concludes that Kayne's hypothesis "fares (at least) as well" to analyze OE as does the directionality parameter, which Pintzuk prefers.

Individual Studies

Susan Pintzuk returns to the Verb-Object topic of her paper in *Syntactic Effects* (see above) to make a similar argument in "Morphological Case and Word Order in Old English" (*Language Sciences* 24: 381–95), which proposes that morphological case marking cannot be used either to explain OE variation between two surface orders, Object-Verb and Verb-Object, or to account for the gradual increase in VO within the OE period. Through her quantitative analysis of OE clauses containing non-finite main verbs and noun-phrase objects, Pintzuk demonstrates that "overt case-marking, whether ambiguous or unambiguous, has no effect on the position of the object with respect to the verb": the frequency of the occurrence of VO is 29.5% in clauses with unambiguously marked objects and 31.0% in

clauses with ambiguously marked objects. Pintzuk further argues that the loss of morphological case cannot explain the change from OV to VO in ME, because the ratio of the latter order increased even during the OE period when morphological case marking had remained overt: 24.3% among prose texts composed before 950; 44.8% among those composed after 950.

Concha Castillo's "On the Non-Expressed Object of Old English Infinitives" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 36: 111–29) investigates OE infinitival "transitive" constructions with a gap in the object position: e.g. *rice men sendon heora dohtor þider to læranne* ("rich men sent their daughters there to be taught"). Castillo postulates that the base-generated object position of this construction is occupied by the null pronominal category (whose existence is independently attested in OE), and that the null pronominal category here can be interpreted as being "identical to the head antecedent through coindexation with the empty complementizer" (hence, *rice men sendon* [*heora dohtor*$_i$] *þider* [$_{CP}$ Θ_i [$_{IP}$ PRO $_{arb}$ pro$_i$ *to læranne*]]$_i$). Castillo argues that this structure can explain infinitive constructions with various functions including adverb of purpose (as above), relative construction (e.g. *ic hæbbe mete to etenne*), *tough*-sequence (e.g. *he sæde þæt he unieþe wære to gehealdenne*), and *be-to*-construction (e.g. *þas þing sint to donne*).

Graeme Davis and Karl A. Bernhardt collaborate on a comparative study of OE and Old High German in *Syntax of West Germanic: The Syntax of Old English and Old High German*, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik 697 (Göppingen: Kümmerle). Using Ælfric's homilies and the Tatian as sources, this monograph provides a description of word order based on such traditional categories of grammar as subject, verb, object, and complement. Davis and Bernhardt believe it "meaningful" to describe the syntax of the two languages in terms of a "common syntax of West Germanic," since OE and OHG seem to be governed by identical conventions and rules. To take word-order patterns for an example, Subject-Verb order is found in 95% of OE and OHG clauses containing simple verbs that do not begin with an adverbial: e.g. *seo cwacigende swuster eode of ðam stæpum*; *einlif iungoron giengun in Galileam*. As for clauses containing simple verbs that begin with an adverbial, Verb-Subject order is found in 71% of the OE instances and 75% of the OHG instances: e.g. *þa on sumere nihte hlosnode sum oðer munuc*; *in themo tage giengun zi imo Sadducei*. In direct questions, the subject almost always follows the finite verb: e.g. *gelyfst þu þis Martha?*; *bist thu Helias?* Virtually all subordinate clauses of place have Subject-Verb order: e.g. *þær heo lytle ær cwaciende stod*; *thar thaz magatin lag*. Even when word order seems to deviate from such

standard patterns, the apparent syntactic freedom "lies within a precisely defined area," such as inversion due to fronting of objects, theme-rheme constraint, stylistic fronting, and Latin influence. In addition, lighter elements tend to precede verbs, whereas heavier elements—particularly heavy objects or complements—tend to follow verbs. Davis and Bernhardt conclude that, as far as syntax is concerned, OE and OHG should be regarded as "two dialects of one Old West Germanic language."

Pamela Faber and Juan Gabriel Vázquez Gonzáles's "Adapting Functional-Lexematic Methodology to the Structuring of Old English Verbs: A Programmatic Proposal" (*A Changing World of Words: Studies in English Historical Lexicography, Lexicology and Semantics*, ed. Javier E. Díaz Vera, Costerus n.s. 141 [Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi], 78–108) undertakes to develop a "macrostructural patterning" for the OE verbal lexicon. Their starting point is drawing of a "Stepwise Lexical Decomposition" for each verb by searching through its citations in the *DOE* corpus for co-occurring verbal lexemes: for example, the semantically specific verb *geedfreolsian* ('to restore to *someone* totally enfranchised land by charter') is synonymous with the slightly less specific verb *freolsian* ('to endow *someone* with totally enfranchised land by charter'), which in turn is synonymous with *bocian* ('to accord *something* by means of a legal document'), all the way down to *sellan* ('to give'), a "semantic near primitive" which is "the richest item in semantic terms … and also the most complex one syntactically speaking." In addition, Faber and Vázquez Gonzáles propose to develop "prototypical schemas" for semantic near primitives. For instance, SELLAN prototypically concerns a semantic subdomain that specifies a "from-higher-to-lower social position" (*geedfreolsian* among many other examples), rather than two related subdomains that specify a "from-lower-to-higher" social position (e.g. *offrian* 'to sacrifice') and an "irrelevant" social position (e.g. *wrixlan* 'to exchange'), respectively.

In "A Tale of Two English Perfects: A Case of Competition between Grammars?" (*Of Dyuersitie & Chaunge of Langage: Essays Presented to Manfred Görlach on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Katja Lenz and Ruth Möhlig, Anglistische Forschungen 308 [Heidelberg: Carl Winter], 66–76), Markku Filppula uses the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts* to give "a descriptive and explanatory account" of the history of two types of perfects: namely, the "medial-object perfect," with the object falling between the auxiliary *have* and the past participle (e.g. *I have my work done*); and the "final-object perfect," with the object appearing after the past participle (e.g. *I have done my work*). Of these two "rival constructions," the medial-object perfect

was the "prevailing" form in OE, but the final-object perfect developed rapidly during the transitional period with a "snow-ball effect" and, by 1250, had established itself "as the preferred choice at just over 60 per cent." Filppula adds that the decline of the medial-object perfect was "in line with the general decline" in the use of Object-Verb order in English. Its defeat in the competition notwithstanding, the medial-object perfect has managed to survive by specializing its meaning to become a "marker of stative and/or resultative meanings."

Raymond Hickey, in "Internal and External Forces Again: Changes in Word Order in Old English and Old Irish" (*Language Sciences* 24: 261–83), considers typological reorientations undergone by Irish and English in their early stages. While the two languages share their typological origin in the IE Subject-Object-Verb, they subsequently developed "quite different" patterns: namely, SVO for English and VSO for (Old) Irish. Hickey argues that there are two "significant factors" responsible for the typological development of English. First, Wackernagel's Law, according to which elements with low stress occur as clitics in the second position of the clause. When applied to English, Wackernagel's Law "shifted auxiliary verbs to clause-second position," hence changing the typological pattern from Subject-Object-Lexical Verb-Auxiliary to Subject-Auxiliary-Object-Lexical Verb. The second factor is fronting, which moves topicalized elements to clause-front position: e.g. *her rad se here ofer Mierce*. Hickey contends that this construction might have triggered the shift to SVO in English, because the clause-initial adverb (like *her* above) might have been reinterpreted by later generations as an element occupying pre-verbal position that "could also be occupied by a subject." Hickey believes that both Wackernagel's Law and fronting played an important, but very different, role in the typological realignment of Irish.

In "Event-related Adjuncts and the OV/VO Distinction" (*Proc. of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* 20: 276–89), Roland Hinterhölzl examines adverbs of time, place, and manner as an evaluation tool for OE syntax, because these "event-related" adverbs usually precede the verb in Object-Verb languages but follow the verb in Verb-Object languages. The existence of postverbal event-related adverbs in OE clauses (e.g. *up* in *þa ahof Paulus up his heafod*) seems to question the classification of OE as an OV language. Hinterhölzl proposes to derive clauses from a "basic OV-structure" (e.g. [$_{CP}$ *þa* [$_{IP}$ *Paulus his heafod up ahof*]]) by "licensing movement of arguments and V[erb-]P[hrase]-internal predicates to designated positions in the middle field" (e.g. [$_{CP}$ *þa ahof*$_i$ [$_{IP}$ *Paulus* [$_{VP}$ *up* t$_i$] *his heafod*]]]). Hinterhölzl believes that such "a stylistic rule

of light predicate raising" might have been a "crucial factor" for the change from OV order to VO order in OE and early ME.

Michio Hosaka's "Competing Grammars in Old English" (*English Linguistics* 19: 433–60) offers a useful summary of Susan Pintzuk's *Phrase Structures in Competition: Variation and Change in Old English Word Order* (New York and London, 1999). Hosaka commends Pintzuk's book on a number of accounts: e.g. its rejection of an abrupt reanalysis of the underlying structure of OE; its attestation of "the existence of V[erb]-movement in subordinate clauses on the basis of the distribution of particles"; and its resolute fight "against ambiguity and optionality in diachronic studies." Hosaka, however, gives a more cautious response to Pintzuk's "double base hypothesis," according to which "V-movement is symmetric between verb-medial main clauses and subordinate clauses." While admitting that this hypothesis can explain some of the typical OE word order patterns in a simpler way than the standard theory, Hosaka nonetheless argues that double base hypothesis is open to criticism especially concerning its probabilistic approach, its handling of clitics, its placement of restriction on topic elements, and its recommendation of optionality for the direction of head parameters.

Marcin Krygier's "Reconsidering the History of the English Verbal System" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 36: 51–59) questions the standard classification of OE strong verbs into seven major classes on the ground that "it is not based on OE, but on an earlier stage" of the Germanic language family. Krygier's alternative hypothesis is provocative: "OE did not have a strong verb system at all, and no classification is possible as there is nothing to be classified." Krygier postulates a history of English strong verbs in three stages. First, Proto-Germanic had a "fully working strong verb system," which was "categorised on the basis of the consonantal structure of the stem": e.g. "*-i* + an obstruent consonant" for class 1 (hence **reið-* 'to ride') and "*-u* + an obstruent consonant" for class 2 (hence **beuð-* 'to offer'). Second, the "collapse of the Proto-Germanic system" in OE forced it to rearrange "the existing linguistic material into new categories" by using the vocalic structure of stems as a new criterion: e.g. subsequent to the loss of the obstruent consonant, *teon*, *þeon*, and *wreon* were each re-classified from class 1 to class 2. Third, ME saw an emergence of a new system "characterised by unambiguous stem vocalism," in which "only a few distinctive strong classes" had survived from the previous stage.

In "Corpus-Provoked Questions about Negation in Early Middle English" (*Language Sciences* 24: 297–321), Margaret

Laing uses methods of corpus linguistics to demonstrate how the development of clausal negation is more complex than a step-by-step progress prescribed in "Jespersen's cycle," advancing from the OE negative particle *ne* (e.g. *ic ne secge*) to the ME collocation *ne … not* (*I ne seye not*), to late ME *not* (*I say not*). As a counter-example to Jespersen's cycle, Laing points to G. Jack's observation on eME negative sentences, namely, that "*ne … not*" is "not normally used in clauses containing a further negative form" (e.g. *he ne gad naut to scrifte*), whereas *ne* can occur in conjunction with multiple negation (e.g. *he nalde nefre nan oðer god don*). Since the eME negation "*ne … not*" can occur only in a specific syntactic environment, it should not be regarded as a "separate and intermediate 'stage' in the progression" as stated in Jespersen's cycle. Laing confirms the "basic claim of Jack's Law" by analyzing "tagged" texts assembled for the corpus towards *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English* (*LAEME*). The article includes an appendix with a technical note on tagging for *LAEME*.

Bruce Mitchell and Susan Irvine's "Critical Bibliography of Old English Syntax" is a third and latest supplement to Mitchell's 1990 book under the same title, this time covering publications from 1993 to 1996 (*NM* 103: 3–32, 179–204, and 275–304, for Parts I, II, and III, respectively). In the Foreword, Mitchell and Irvine deplore the proliferation of publications in recent years: scholars would produce, presumably under increasing pressure to publish, multiple pieces of work by using the same material but giving "different slants and different titles"; conference proceedings would include dialogues, in the form of short articles, between presenters and their critics. In the eyes of the bibliographers, however, none of such publications "offers much to advance our knowledge." The main body of this "Supplement" provides summaries of 193 items arranged in the subject order employed in Mitchell's *Old English Syntax*. It ends with a subject index and an index of authors and reviewers. This annotated bibliography is useful for anyone interested in the subject, especially since many of the items included here are published outside England and the United States and/or written in languages other than English.

Norihiko Otsu's "On the Presence or Absence of the Conjunction *Þæt* in Old English, with Special Reference to Dependent Sentences Containing a *gif*-Clause" (*English Language and Linguistics* 6: 225–38) conducts a corpus-based study of complex dependent clauses containing a *gif* clause. Like MnE, OE often places the *gif*-clause at the end of the sentence (e.g. *hi secgað þæt hi mægen þe yð hiora wisdome fulgan … gif hiora anwald bið fullice ofer þæt folc*). Almost common in OE, however, is a "peculiar" construction where the *gif*-clause precedes the *þæt* clause and behaves somewhat like direct speech (e.g. *he wenð, gif he hit ær geseo, ðæt he hit wille forsacan*). In another OE construction, which is less common than either of the other two, the whole of the dependent clause looks "as if it were borrowed from direct speech": *hwi ne meaht ðu geþencan, gif nanwuht full nære, þonne nære nan wuht wana…?* (The sample passage quoted, however, is direct speech from the OE *Boethius*.) Otsu argues that such a construction might have been used to avoid problems arising from the structural complexities of the dependent clause, while distinguishing itself from a similar construction functioning unambiguously as direct speech: e.g. *Se hælend cwæð. Gif ge forgyfað þam mannum þe wið eow agyltað þonne forgyfð eow eower heofonlica fæder eowere synna.*

In "Some Meanings of the Adnominal Genitive in Old English" (*Language Function, Structure, and Change: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Thomasz P. Krzeszowski*, ed. Wiesław Oleksy [Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang], 91–105), Adam Pasicki describes genitive constructions in *Beowulf* by using "just a few categories." One such category is the "subjective" genitive construction, in which the genitive has a subjective meaning in relation to the head noun: e.g. *æfter deoflan hryre*. In another category, the "objective" genitive construction, the genitive is semantically the object of the head: e.g. *wuldres Waldend*. In the "relational" and "identifying" genitive constructions, genitives occur with "either kinship terms or terms identifying social roles": e.g. *æðelinga bearn*, *cwen Hroðgares*. One type of the "part-of-whole construction" concerns head nouns "denoting (parts of) the human body" (e.g. *to banan folmum*); another type occurs with partitive genitives (e.g. *eower sum*). Pasicki notes that "the representation of undisputed possessive genitives in *Beowulf* is an extremely modest one" and therefore challenges the common practice of deriving various functional meanings of the genitive from possession. Rather, the genitive should be regarded as a case having a "network of four or five major meaning categories with interconnections between them."

Amanda Pounder's "Adverb-marking in German and English: System and Standardization" (*Diachronica* 18: 301–58) examines historical development of adverb formation in English and German. The starting point for these two languages was "very similar." Just as OE used the suffix *-e* to derive adverbs from adjectives (e.g. *rihte* 'rightly' from *riht* 'right'), Old High German employed the suffix *-o* for the same purpose (e.g. *blinto* 'blindly' from *blint* 'blind'). OE had many adverbs ending with *-lice* (the adjectival suffix *-lic* + *-e*), whereas OHG frequently used the adverbial suffix *-licho* (the adjectival ending *-lich* + *-o*); e.g. *fiantlihho* ('inimically'). Just as the weakening of unstressed

vowels in late OE and ME led to the loss of the adverbial suffix -*e* and the rise of -*lic*/-*ly* as an adverbial suffix, the levelling of -*o* to -*e* in late OHG and Middle High German led to the ambiguation of adverbial and adjectival endings, while -*lich* developed as a principal suffix in several lexical conditions. The parallel development, however, ended in the early modern period when English continued to privilege adverb formation with -*ly*, whereas German used conversion (that is, zero formation) as a dominant system of adverb formation. Pounder believes that the divergent development was accelerated by the growth of written language and authorized through linguistic standardization during this period.

Tomoyuki Tanaka's "Synchronic and Diachronic Aspects of Overt Subject Raising in English" (*Lingua* 112: 619–46) takes a minimalist approach to historical variations in the presence and absence of overt subject raising. In order to explain why Present-Day English allows subjects to remain overtly in their base position only in *there*-sentences (e.g. *there will arrive three students*), Tanaka proposes that "expletive *there*" in this construction satisfies the Extended Projection Principle ("EPP") feature of Topic ("T"): hence, $[_{TP}$ *there* $[_{T'}$ T $[_{VP}$ V Subj]]]. In OE and ME, subjects can also remain overtly in their base position in passive clauses, impersonal clauses, and clauses with mutative verbs (e.g. *þæt him ne belimpe se egeslica cwyde*), because the EPP feature of T could be satisfied by, Tanaka maintains, the "rich" verbal agreement of this language and therefore leave the initial position available for other topic elements: hence, $[_{TP}$ XP $[_{T'}$ V-T $[_{VP}$ T$_v$ Subj]]]. Tanaka adds that OE, unlike Greek or Spanish, does not have a rich enough verbal agreement to allow subjects to remain overtly in their base position in transitive and un-ergative constructions.

Carola Trips's monograph *From OV to VO in Early Middle English* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 60 [Amsterdam: John Benjamins]) argues that the word-order shift from Object-Verb to Verb-Object in early ME was triggered by "the language contact situation with Scandinavian between the eighth and eleventh centuries," interpreting this well-known typological change as a replacement of the West-Germanic type (OV) with the North Germanic type (VO) through external pressure. According to Trips, early ME texts exhibit traces of Scandinavian syntax including "stylistic fronting," which concerns movement of past participles, adverbs, adjectives, and verb particles. Stylistic fronting is typically found in the "older stages of the Scandinavian languages," but it also seems to occur in early ME: e.g. *þatt lac þatt offredd wass*; *þatt wif þatt usell wass & wædle*. Trips argues that eME had two different Verb-Second patterns: first, the Scandinavian Verb-Second pattern,

typically found in northern texts, seems to be based on a grammar that produces Verb-Second constructions "in all contexts"; second, the OE Verb-Second pattern, found in southern texts, seems to be based on a grammar that can also produce Verb-Third constructions when the subject is a pronoun (e.g. *on alle wise he fandeð hu…*; cf. OE *þa hie gefengon micle herehyð*). The co-existence of competing grammars would imply that early ME was "a mixed system no matter how the underlying orders are derived." In so doing, Trips challenges Kayne's theory, since "there is no real motivation for [his] leftward object movement rules."

Margaret E. Winters's "On Choosing a Theory: A Diachronic Case Study" (*Language and Communication* 22: 113–29) highlights the virtual divide between the formalist and the functionalist schools of linguistics by considering the way each of the two schools deals with the loss of impersonal verbs occurring with a dative experiencer (e.g. *þæt his fæder licode*). After rehearsing formalist and cognitive approaches to this widely studied subject, Winter admits that each school is capable of not only cohesively interpreting the data at hand but also offering an "internally consistent" model while making strong claims for "psychological reality." And yet, Winters argues, neither school is invulnerable to "criticism from the outside, that is, from the point of view of other theories."

H.M.

[Lópes-Cousa and Méndez-Naya, "On the History of If- and Though- Links with Declarative Complement Clauses," and Ohkado, Old English Constructions with Multiple Predicates, were reviewed last year.]

Works not seen

Fabiszak, Małgorzata. *The Concept of 'Joy' in Old and Middle English: A Semantic Analysis*. Pila: Wyzsza Szkola Biznesu, 2001.

Falileyev, Alexander. "Beyond Historical Linguistics: A Case for Multilinguialism in Early Wales." *Ireland and Europe*. Ed. Ní Chatháin and Richter. 6–13.

Fuss, Eric, and Carola Trips. "Variation and Change in Old and Middle English—On the Validity of the Double Base Hypothesis." *Jnl of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 4 (2002 for 2001): 171–224.

Minkova, Donka. "Ablaut Reduplication in English: The Criss-Crossing Prosody and Verbal Art." *English Language and Linguistics* 6: 293–306.

Yoon, Hee-Cheol. "Economy Considerations and the Derivation of DP in Old English." *The History of English* 13 (2002): 201–26.

4. Literature

a. General and Miscellaneous

Meter and Style, Prosody and Poetics

After a lean year, a plenitude of riches in the field of stylistics: the boots of content generally trample the delicate flower of form, so just this once I will start with prosody. First, Geoffrey Russom addresses a favorite topic, "Dating criteria for Old English poems" in *Studies in the History of the English Language*, ed. Minkova and Stockwell, 245–65. The chapter addresses whether type frequencies (referring to Sievers's five verse types) vary over historical time, beginning with both the methodological problems of assessing poetic compounds and with the absence of metrical rules in Sievers's approach (which makes distinguishing complex but acceptable variants from the unacceptable difficult). He advocates his own word-foot theory as a useful way to develop accurate and agreed-upon verse counts and to identify deviations from the norm. Demonstrating in passing both that *The Battle of Maldon* and *Paris Psalter* are late (Russom describes their relevance to "metrical death") and that quality of composition is as important as date (using type A3 verses and the best scholarly assessment of the quality of individual OE poems), Russom concentrates on variants of types C, D, and E which have a long simplex word with a heavy medial syllable (*slæpendne rinc* is a type E example). He provides a table of the evidence for simplex C, D, and E verses, along with the date and "merit" criteria for each poem. Among other conclusions, Cynewulf unexpectedly demonstrates a higher frequency for simplex E verses. "Best" poems have frequencies of the metrically superior simplex D of over 40%, but here Cynewulf is just below 20%. Russom returns for further evidence to two-word A1 variants, finding that here too Cynewulf would place among the "best" and also late poems by this measure. Russom posits that if *Andreas* were shifted to the earlier part of its range, to about 850, Cynewulf would then be chronologically adjacent to the late "best" poets, and placed even later than 850. This differs from the assessments of Fulk and Conner, though not spectacularly. Interestingly, this evidence may also support Fulk's placement of *Beowulf* among the early poems, because that poem has a splendidly high percentage of simplex D in relation to simplex E. Even the small OE poems demonstrate a gratifying degree of conformity in these respects to the usual assessment of their quality and date, which suggests that OE poems and poets do adhere to metrical norms and distribute complex variants carefully in their texts so as to keep scansion intuitive. Despite the density of the argument, Russom manages here to introduce OE meter and draw new conclusions about its application for the dating of OE poems and for the history of the English language, and to do so in a short and elegant article.

Rachel Mines addresses a different aspect of OE meter in "An examination of Kuhn's Second Law and its Validity as a Metrical-Syntactical Rule" (*SP* 99: 337–55). Since Kuhn's Second Law can only be defined by reference to meter, Mines notes that it is not inherently a syntactic rule for early Germanic poets. She reviews the problems with definition, especially with "initial dip" and "phrase-particle," and with determining clause-boundaries, the syntactic categories that Kuhn exempts from the operation of this law, and also explains the two major categories of violations. She notes that recently there has developed a consensus (Momma, Russom, Orton) that the second law has neither descriptive nor explanatory force. Her project is to determine the second law violations in Old English poetry and to adduce other explanations for the observations that gave rise to Kuhn's conclusions. Her corpus is eighteen poems, 3501 lines, including sections of long poems and complete texts of many shorter poems, but not including *Beowulf*. There are sixty-three second law violations (taking the broadest definition of what a violation might be), thirty-three of them involving anacrusis (and thereby precluded from consideration by Hutcheson). The narrowest possible interpretation of the law yields fourteen violations. Mines concludes that "there is at least a strong tendency for main clauses in Old English poetry not to open with unstressed prefixes, demonstrative adjectives, possessive adjectives, prepositions, or proclitic adverbs as sole occupants of an initial dip or upbeat (however defined)" (349). The conclusion is sound. She then turns to considering the implications for this of clausal upbeats with a single particle, of which there are few, as opposed to those with two or more unstressed constituents in the upbeat. The "law" depends on uncertain definitions, modern editorial punctuation, and the effects of the Old English lexicon itself on syntax. It is therefore simply a feature of word-order effects of the production of Old English poetry, not a rule adhered to by the poets.

R.D. Fulk and Kari Ellen Gade publish a second corrected and updated version of the bibliography earlier published as volume 28 of the *Old English Newsletter Subsidia*. This version is "A Bibliography of Germanic Alliterative Meters: Comparative and Prehistoric Old Norse-Old

English-Middle English-Old Saxon-Old High German," *Jahrbuch für internationale Germanistik* 34: 87–186. Close comparison of the two versions suggests that this version includes one or two recent articles in each section, and some corrections to other entries. Fulk also engages in the very analysis he wants to include in the bibliography in "Early Middle English Evidence for Old English Meter: Resolution in *Poema morale*," *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 14.4: 331–55. He starts his defense of Sievers's analysis with a review of approaches to resolution, supporting Suzuki and Obst, and also positing a "creditable rationale for the assumption that resolution applies only variably under some conditions" (335), conditions which for resolution under secondary stress develop from Kaluza's law. If resolution is suspended in *Beowulf*, an etymologically long inflectional ending occurs, whereas if resolution does apply under secondary stress, an etymologically short ending occurs. Moreover, if Sievers's assumptions about resolution are correct, then the larger framework of his five types or templates also holds, and it is not possible to add or rearrange the types. As mid-level abstractions, they reflect the possible verse contours. Resolution enables this system to function since it is, Fulk argues, a policing action which regulates the number of positions per verse. Evidence that there is a principle of resolution at work is therefore evidence of the accuracy of Sievers's approach. Resolution itself is not just a metrical principle but the result of an early Germanic phonotactic constraint, working to remove the anomaly of a stressed syllable ending in a short vowel (which would violate Prokosch's law). Fulk adduces from Icelandic *rímur* evidence for the existence of this constraint in Germanic, with examples from *Olafs ríma Haraldssonar* and *Skíða ríma*, and somewhat vaguer evidence in Snorri Sturluson's description of verse construction in his *Háttatal*. In the last eight pages of the paper, Fulk addresses the early Middle English *Poema morale*, written in a regular isometric, rhyming non-alliterative form. Generally about four hundred lines long, it survives in seven copies in six different manuscripts. The meter is the *septenarius*, based on Latin models. Elision is quite common, and Fulk analyses its occurrence here and elsewhere. Resolution, however, also seems to occur, especially at the end of the first hemistich. Some cases are ambiguous, and Fulk collects all the relevant patterns from the first hundred lines. More than a third have a short syllable in the penult of the first hemistich; although some counterexamples do occur, Fulk concludes the survival of the property of resolution. The possibility does exist that the device is a Middle English innovation rather than an OE survival, but it remains improbable. Aside from its proof of resolution in OE verse, the article is an elegant explanation of OE metrical structure and the issues it raises for scholars.

Also drawing conclusions by comparing stylistic features of Old English with Old Norse is Karin Olsen's "Metaphorical Density in Old English and Old Norse Poetry" (*Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 117: 171–95). Olsen examines the structure of the metaphorical statement, starting with Roman Jakobson's definition of the poetic principle and Jan Mukařovský's process of semantic accumulation. Meaning is the "product of the interaction among the elements of all retentional columns" (173); the interaction, in these terms, between metaphor and textual markers for metaphors occurring exclusively in poetry (and therefore being more likely not to be conventional) is Olsen's focus. The major part of the article addresses Old Norse poetry to establish the parameters against which Old English poetry is compared in the last pages. Word order is very flexible for kennings in skaldic poetry, such that both a lack of linear movement and a lack of contiguity can be characteristic. Olsen analyzes several examples in detail, and concludes that audiences must have had some knowledge of the literary conventions at play. During the transition period to Christianity and afterwards, metaphorical kennings continued, though techniques focusing on the language were less prevalent as skaldic poets chose less complex word orders for greater clarity. Eddic verse uses a paratactic and contiguous style and does not reach the intensity or the diversity possible in skaldic verse. Nonetheless, kennings can be well elaborated and integrated into the narrative, despite their simpler structures. Old English poetry does not achieve the high complexity of skaldic poetry, nor does it have pre-Christian differences. Olsen analyses lines 1–6 of *Andreas* and 50–58 of *Maxims I* to demonstrate the literal and metaphorical meanings possible in Old English. Apposition makes metaphors transparent, and keeps the metaphoricity low; variation allowed metaphoricity to be both complex and unusual in *Exodus*, for example, especially in the description of the Israelites' voyage across the desert. Here variation combines with metaphor as the poet creates an elaborate metaphorical narrative structure. Similarly, in *Elene* 243–246a, the textual markers combine with the appositional structure to increase the metaphorical density of the text. In Norse poetry the appositional style was never fully developed, whereas in Old English the versification was less defensive of the native tradition and more willing to assimilate new modes. The great strength of the article is its detailed study of the intricacies of meaning and metaphor in the texts analysed.

Two papers address alliterative poetry. In "Die europäische Stabreimdichtung 'European Alliterative Poetry'" (*Jahrbuch für internationale Germanistik* 34: 59–74), Piergiuseppe Scardigli starts with the terminology of Snorri Sturluson concerning metrics, reviews metrical and

rhyme structures including those of Dante and Homer, and establishes the corpus of Germanic secular and Christian alliterative poetry. *Beowulf* is set to one side as a work of art. European alliterative poetry from 1350–1400 in the North and in England divides into three groups: the *Alexander*-group, *Gawain*-group, and moral satire. Scardigli quotes Wagner on alliteration, considers the *Poetic Edda*, and closes by introducing the "Internationale Forschungsstelle 'Europäische Stabreimdichtung'" based at Frankfurt. He lists the scholars involved, the texts for which commentary has so far been developed, and the future plans of the project. The next paper in the journal is Ulrich Groenke, "Stabreim und Endreim—ein Zwiespalt?" (75–86). Groenke elucidates this conflict between alliteration and end-rhyme with examples from Old Norse and translations into modern Icelandic of post-medieval texts.

John Ford, in "A New Conception of Poetic Formulae Based on Prototype Theory and the Mental Template" (*NM* 103: 205–26), proposes a new way to define formulae based on his studies of *Amis and Amiloun*. He argues for the utility of prototype theory, which identifies essential features, and edits out attributes which are, in fact, accidentals. Once the prototype core is identified, variations upon it and related constructions become mental templates. This approach accounts for the fuzziness of the structure. The essential features are: a formula is made of words, it has a particularly useful metrical structure, it has meaning and expresses a given idea, and it is repeatable. The variations and alterations include lexical alterations for rhyme and/or meter, and structural alterations for grammatical and/or metrical cohesion. Ford concludes, then, that identifying formulae will require identifying the mental templates utilized by versifiers. None of this will surprise those who have been reading the work of John Miles Foley for the past two decades; Ford, however, does not number among them, to judge from his bibliography. He does, nonetheless, work out a sensible approach, and one that might provide some food for thought for formula studies.

N.U. Gvozdetskaia published two papers in Russian on the study of OE poetry (summarized for me and explained by Grzegorz Danowski, Department of Modern Languages, UWO). The first of these, "The Birth of the Poetic Word in OE (Concerning the Solving of the Conflict of Cultures in Anglo-Saxon Poetry)" (*Norn by the Well of Destiny: Studies in Honor of Elena Aleksandrovna Melnikova*, ed. T.N. Jackson [Moscow: Indrik], 44–52), starts with a historiography of OE studies in Russia, mentioning the central role of E.A. Melnikova's book *The Sword and the Lyre: The Anglo-Saxon Society in History and Epos* from 1987. She continues with the question of whether Bede's account of Cædmon

(and the channeling of Germanic poetry into the current of the new religion) can be seen as motivated by purely utilitarian, propagandist concerns. Her answer is that no, the Cædmon miracle testifies to a natural rebirth of traditional epic poetry in an entirely new cultural context. The emergence of OE poetry is tied in with the emergence of an environment capable of appreciating Cædmon's gift; that is, the monastery at Whitby, a center in which Cædmon's talent could flower. *Beowulf* was itself only possible after the revolution of Cædmon, although after Bede's death the conflict between the 'heroic' and the 'Christian' in English poetry appears to have deepened. In a similarly traditional vein is "Man in Old English Lyric Poetry: Toward the Problematic of Conflicting Worldviews" (*Personality-Idea-Text in Medieval and Renaissance Culture* [Ivanovo: Ivanovo State University], 65–84). Gvozdetskaia here argues that "OE lyric poetry can only express universal human feelings, and—despite all its depth—it is incapable of exploring the inner world of a human as an individual." She addresses the unity of personality of the hero-teller, the pagan Germanic themes, and the Christian worldview as it demonstrates itself in compositional structures and narrative devices. Thus in *Deor* the poetic "I" is not strictly lyrical since it is only one of the possible illustrations of human destiny. Different moods of the same verb also demonstrate a move from the personal to the universal, so that the "I" of Anglo-Saxon poetry is non-lyrical because illustrative. In *The Seafarer*, the move is from the lyrical to the didactic, and the narrator's image or "I" is part of an intricate system of designations in the text, both of the narrator and of temporal layers of narration. At the end of the poem, the unhappy seafarer and the happy land-dweller unite into an image of the human in general.

Catalogues, Surveys, Essay Collections, and Editions for the General Reader and Student

From a rich collection of writings by and for the late Christine Fell, a *denkschrift* according to Ray Page in the Foreword, comes Fell's own "Introduction to Anglo-Saxon Letters and Letter-Writers" ('*Lastworda Betst*', 278–98). This was Fell's major project at the time of her death, but unfortunately she had completed only a draft of the introduction and some sample translations. The translations include Bede's letter to Ceolwulf written as preface to his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, excerpts from Bede's letter to Ecgbert Archbishop of York, a letter from the Bishop of Winchester to Boniface, excerpts from three of Alcuin's letters to Charlemagne, excerpts from letters by Alcuin to Offa and to the monastic community at Monkwearmouth and Jarrow, and a letter to Aldhelm from an anonymous Irish student. The draft introduction notes that evidence for

or correspondence by Anglo-Saxon letter- writers begins in the late seventh century, but refers to the Norwegian archaeological evidence of runic writing on pieces of wood as analogical evidence for a possible earlier tradition. Nonetheless, the surviving letters place the Anglo-Saxon family in a European, and, initially at least, a Latin tradition. Fell proposes to prepare a corpus reflecting social as well as political interests, sex, century, region, sender as opposed to scribe, language, genre, purpose: in short, the planned book would acknowledge that Æthelweard's entire chronicle was couched as a letter to Matilda, abbess of Essen. Fell considers, as she did elsewhere, the words for writing, the verb *writan* and noun *writ*, and for letters, *stæf*, and she addresses why certain correspondences survive and others don't. Even God communicates with letters, *ærendgewritu*, in Old English, and a homily on Sunday observance describes God as sender and an angel as scribe. The book would have had a thematic approach, and Fell planned to edit the letters ruthlessly, and to translate so as to retain the differences of style among the letter-writers. Though Fell's own rigor and wit are unavailable, it is to be hoped that someone will complete this project with Fell's sense of how letters "voice the most urgent personal and professional concerns of the writers" (287) in a given historical period, Fell's scholarship, and Fell's profound humanity.

Roy Liuzza collects a selection of modern essays, the earliest from 1974, in *Old English Literature* (New Haven: Yale UP). The collection is a large one, with twenty-one essays by English-speaking scholars. Some choices are traditional, some are not. Liuzza in the introduction starts with the gulf between modern scholars and OE texts, and proposes that contemporary literary criticism assists immeasurably in the mapping of OE literature. These articles recognize textual instability as a given, and focus on texts often encountered in introductory OE classes in order to provoke thought and discussion. Liuzza analyses each of his choices in these terms, asking readers to "chart their own course through this rich and strange country" (xxxiii).

Liuzza's second collection of the year is *The Poems of MS Junius 11: Basic Readings*, Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England 8 (New York: Routledge), the first of this well-known series to address a specific manuscript. The collection has fourteen essays, which range (as Liuzza points out in his "Introduction," ix–xviii) from Roberta Frank's classic paper on paronomasia in 1972 through scholarship slightly earlier (James Earl on *Exodus* from 1970) to more recent gems both on the other poems in the manuscript and on religious and biblical poetry in general. Liuzza correctly suggests in the introduction that reading these poems in connection with each other could provide

new insights, and that the Old Testament pervades Anglo-Saxon culture. One paper in the collection falls under the purview of this section: J.R. Hall revisits his 1976 article on the theological unity of the manuscript with "'The Old English Epic of Redemption': Twenty-Five-Year Retrospective" (53–68). He does so in order to engage with arguments raised against his article, starting with the proponents of the Easter liturgy as the organizing principle for the manuscript. Marjorie Sue Allen, he contends, attempts to prove too much, such as arguing that the manuscript is informed by monastic spirituality and that the three poems *Genesis*, *Exodus*, and *Daniel* correspond to the three sections of *Christ and Satan*. Secondly, Phyllis Portnoy argues for temporal compression and temporal disjunction in the Junius manuscript and in the Holy Saturday readings, but mistakenly uses an argument for unity in the single poem *Exodus* to apply to the whole manuscript. Furthermore, the temporal disjunction of the Holy Saturday readings, a set of high points in salvation history, does not map onto the Old Testament material in the Junius manuscript and matches poorly against the texts there. Where Portnoy finds a symbolic relationship between the readings and the text, both of them having a central figure or holy remnant, Hall argues that an argument which is so inclusive that it explains everything probably lacks explanatory power. Thirdly, Paul Remley suggests that the twelve-lection system for Holy Saturday, and its predecessor the six-lection system (which corresponds more closely to the Junius manuscript), has a pivotal triad of readings that correspond to the manuscript. Hall argues, however, that the triad is not demonstrated as fundamental to Anglo-Saxon perceptions of the Holy Saturday readings. Hall concludes with the argument that although the attraction of the Holy Saturday lections as explanatory for the Junius manuscript is a natural one, the compiler of the manuscript did not necessarily think of the liturgy while assembling the poems. On the other hand, the linkage to the tradition of salvation history in *De catechizandis rudibus* and Wulfstan's *Sermo 6*, because less complex an explanation, is the more likely one for Hall. The last part of the article addresses those who have disagreed with Hall as to whether *Christ and Satan* was part of the compiler's original plan for the manuscript. Here Hall disagrees in short order with Peter Lucas on the pricking and ruling and with Barbara Raw, who disproves Lucas but agrees that *Christ and Satan* was an afterthought in the manuscript on the basis of the designs in the manuscript before the poem. Hall recapitulates his argument elsewhere that the designs were later additions to the manuscript, and his further conclusions on the codicology of the manuscript. Finally, Hall proposes that the common conclusion that *Christ and Satan* is an addition or afterthought may perhaps be reconciled with the contradictory

but equally common conclusion that the manuscript reca-pitulates salvation history: perhaps the compiler arranged the first three poems, and found the fourth at a later date, only then copying it into the codex, and binding the man-uscript. Given the trenchant views expressed throughout the article, the conclusion seems a somewhat unexpected compromise.

   Michael Swanton's *English Poetry before Chaucer* (Exeter: U of Exeter P) is a revised and updated edition of his *English Literature Before Chaucer* published by Longman in 1987. There were many good things in the original work, not least a genuine effort to consider literature from Cædmon through to the lyrics and debate poems of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. However, this remains a light revision only, characterized by a new layer in the footnotes, the "see generally" reference. Thus, Swanton includes text and footnotes from the previous version and, to preclude making any changes recent scholarship might require to the text, appends a further reference which implies no detailed importance or no major change in approach, with the introductory locution "see generally." Sometimes there is variation on this formula, or the work of other scholars is a "valuable survey" or a "useful summary." But, clearly, Swanton seems to suggest that nothing has really changed since the late 1980s. As a result, the utility of the book lies in its being an available and relatively inexpensive (in Eng-land, anyway) reprint of Swanton's previous book, with some new references.

   Although he might describe himself as first a poet and translator, others might suggest that Michael Schmidt has made a career out of introducing poets, mostly mod-ern poets but with a substantial sprinkling of earlier ones, to a popular audience. His *The Story of Poetry* volume 1, subtitled "English Poets and Poetry from Cædmon to Caxton" (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2001) is yet another product of this evidently fertile endeavor. Old English, however, appears only at the beginning of "An Informal History," pages 7–38 of the first 143 pages, fol-lowed by the unlovely title "It begins again" as a reference to the standard idea that Old English faded out, going to black, while Middle English paused prettily for a cen-tury or more before setting a delicate toe onstage. In the ensuing "Anthology" (147–474), amidst a generous help-ing of Hoccleve, Lydgate, Dunbar, Gavin Douglas and even Stephen Howes, Old English is represented by twenty-five pages, most of them the translations of Edwin Mor-gan ("The Seafarer," short version, "The Wanderer," "The Ruin," seven Riddles, and three fragments from *Beowulf*, ll. 1–193, 702b–824, 1397–1650). Morgan does not, how-ever, make an appearance in the acknowledgments or the

bibliography. What does appear is gratitude to Charles Schmidt, who "is responsible for the inclusion of Old Eng-lish poetry, though not for any errors or omissions in my account" (475), and who also provides a very interesting translation of "Dream of the Rood." If Charles Schmidt is A.V.C. Schmidt (more often called Carl), then the transla-tion of a vision poem by an expert in that genre is worth a few minutes of anyone's time. However, Michael Schmidt himself cheerfully defines Old English poetry as the prov-ince of "the dwindling crew of specialists in Anglo-Saxon, a discipline which was compulsory in gaining an English degree in many British universities until quite recently" (147). The introductory material, described by the author as taken from his *Lives of the Poets* (1998), seems unlikely to proffer an original interpretation. And yet Schmidt tries. Writing is a re-enaction of a runic discipline, a secret world closed to all but initiates. In the ninth and tenth centuries, runic writing was "decisively displaced … by the Roman alphabet brought in by Irish missionaries" (4). An origi-nal approach. For general readers, not specialists, Schmidt advocates reading with C.H. Sisson's "techniques of igno-rance" and to indulge in our reading as a necessary vice. *Beowulf* is a "favourite scholarly playground" (33), epic and elegy the chief OE modes (32), and the teaching of OE as a "national" poetry never "more than a political device" (27). Perhaps the general readers of this introductory text will never encounter an Anglo-Saxon scholar; for the sake of the scholar's blood pressure, let us hope so.

   Likely to be of more use to scholars is the second edi-tion of *Medieval English Literature*, ed. J.B. Trapp, Doug-las Gray, and Julia Boffey as part of the Oxford Anthology of English Literature (New York: Oxford UP). Old English poetry (no prose) gets 110 of 594 pages, the whole being a third longer than the first version of the text. The OE starts with a West Saxon and Northumbrian version of "Cæd-mon's Hymn," then the complete Edwin Morgan transla-tion of *Beowulf*, followed by a representative sampling of OE texts, with most translations by Michael Alexander. The introductions are judicious and informative, the foot-notes helpful without being excessive (though the editors find themselves having to annotate Morgan's translation of *Beowulf* when he refers to the *krakens* which "gally the mariners' thoroughfare" ("gally" means "to make terrify-ing, dangerous").

   Duncan Wu edits *Old and Middle English Poetry*, a Black-well's Essential Literature volume based on Elaine Tre-harne's *Old and Middle English: An Anthology*, published in 2000. Treharne provides a brief introduction and the facing translations for the OE texts. The collection splits very evenly between Old and Middle English, including

four elegies, *Dream of the Rood*, *Battle of Maldon*, *Beowulf* 662–1250, and *Judith*. The Middle English texts (a selection of lyrics, *Owl and the Nightingale*, *Sir Orfeo*, and *Wynnere and Wastoure*) have individual words glossed in footnotes. There is no other apparatus.

E.G. Stanley addresses a well-known classic in his "An Anthology of 572 lines of Old English Short Poems plus *The Battle of Maldon*" (*N&Q* n.s. 49: 2–3) in assessing the revision by R.D. Fulk of Pope's anthology, now entitled *Eight Old English Poems*. Stanley argues that where Pope was judicious, Fulk is pedantic and overburdens the young scholar with commentary and explanation. More specifically, Stanley objects to details in the annotation of the opening poem, "Cædmon's Hymn," paradoxically requiring more references and analogues.

Editions, Manuscript Issues, and General Studies

Edward Pettit here publishes his 1996 thesis at the University of London in two volumes as *Anglo-Saxon Remedies, Charms, and Prayers from British Library MS Harley 585: 'The Lacnunga'* (Lewiston: Mellen). The bibliography at the end of the collection takes up the last thirty-four pages of the second volume, with the preceding 366 providing a somewhat leisurely commentary to the *Lacnunga* arranged in 190 entries. Like most theses, a large part of the commentary provides references to what other scholars think about the details of the text. Pettit also evinces an unsurprising urge to defend the compiler of the text. The most useful entries concern the metrical charms, which receive detailed study including stylistic and metrical analysis (with Bliss-type scansions provided verse by verse). Other intriguing entries offer consideration of pagan backgrounds, some good philological analysis of difficult words, and analogous remedies in later English and other cultures. Volume I is less clear in its construction. Perhaps the Mellen editors hoped for a bestseller; this is the only explanation for the displacement of the manuscript description to Appendix 1 in favor of some very general introductory material. Appendix 2 usefully provides a list of variant versions, sources and analogues, both from other surviving insular manuscripts and from transcriptions, and from the Latin tradition. Pettit also provides a useful table of variant versions. Appendix 3 is a detailed and careful consideration of the language of the *Lacnunga*, including all the usual elements of such analysis in some thirty-five pages of text. Appendix 4 provides an Old English glossary, 5 an Old Irish one, and 6 a list of plant names in the text. The text itself, including the careful and intelligent translation facing it, takes up 125 pages. A brief introduction to Anglo-Saxon notions of disease causation and the preparation of

remedies, including a table of major editions of the *Lacnunga* (arranged entry by entry) and a very useful table of entry headings, completes the work. This is a scrupulous and useful edition.

Also concerned with editing is Peter Baker in "How to Cheat at Editing: The Domitian Bilingual Chronicle, *Anno* 679" (*ANQ* 15: 8–13). Baker describes the difficulties of reading a passage on fol. 43r of manuscript F of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and proposes that, after investigating the text's sources and the scribe's copying practices (especially for additions to the text), the editor must investigate plausible other sources in order to work through possible interpretations. The result, in this case already published in Baker's edition of the Domitian chronicle, is an inductive process of research, hypothesis, and testing of hypothesis.

David N. Dumville in "A Twelfth-Century English Translation of a Tenth-Century Latin Official Document?" (*Fedorov Readings: University Translation Studies* [St. Petersburg] 3 [2001]: 194–215) looks at the odd subgroup of royal diplomata from the tenth century known as the alliterative diplomata. Specifically, he considers a grant dated 955 in the name of King Eadred to the thane Æfsige Hunlafing conveying land at Alwalton, and now found in London, Society of Antiquaries MS 60. Largely in OE, the document translates a Latin original, presumably having been accomplished in about 1130. Following an earlier suggestion of his own, Dumville in this article re-translates the text into Latin as an exercise in textual criticism. He is most struck by the way in which odd phrases or segments in Latin interrupt the OE, the royal style itself, the order of the bishops' titles in the witness-list, the pairing of witnesses after the signature of the queen-mother, and the closing *anathema* and *pax*. He concludes that the theory of translation is cast into doubt, for the document appears to have been thought out and executed in English, with occasional Latin usages. The alliterative diplomata as a group were more bilingual than their mainstream counterparts, but this document appears more vernacular than Latin. Dumville closes by noting the creative originality of the author of this series of diplomata, and suggests that one of the King's chancellors may have been the drafter of this series. Two appendices include this text (S.566) and a list of the alliterative diplomata and their comparanda.

The potent editorial combination of Laura Cooner Lambdin and Robert Thomas Lambdin brought another project to fruition this year with *A Companion to Old and Middle English Literature* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press). The book divides medieval literature by genre, and includes nineteen articles, of which nine will be briefly

considered here. In an introduction the editors argue for genre as something "encouraging and relishing categorical interpretations of extant, primarily canonized, medieval works" (ix). They argue that medieval writers tried to follow established rules of categories. The first article in the companion is the editors' survey of "Old English and Anglo-Norman Literature" (1–25). They divide the field into epic, lyric, charms and riddles, didactic prose, and chronicles. Their survey is somewhat romanticized and rather more certain about the original orality of Old English texts than might seem accepted today. The authors review Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* with "Cædmon's Hymn," and provide the news that Cædmon conceivably composed *Exodus*, though that is not certain. Treatment of the surviving prose occupies a few paragraphs, in which the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* leads forward to the reign of William, OE now being delegated to "the language of the artisans and the oppressed" (17). The last few pages address Anglo-Norman literature. The article ends with a selected bibliography, closely resembling that in the 2000 Lambdin Encyclopedia (except that many articles from that work appear in the references). Gwendolyn Morgan addresses "Religious and Allegorical Verse" (26–36), noting first the massive range of this section and focusing for Old English on the riddles and metrical charms as the true Anglo-Saxon wisdom literature. The parallel texts from Middle English are *Piers Plowman* and *Pearl* and romances that also reflect a riddling approach. Some might quibble with the title of this section. Next, Scott Lightsey considers "Alliterative Poetry in Old and Middle English" (37–49) with a metrical and thematic review from the Gallehus Horn onwards, a neat tap-dance over the question of "transition" from OE to ME alliterative verse, a brief review of scholarship and discography, and a briefer word on medievalist reconstructions. Passing by balladry, the beast fable (in which Brian Gastle, "Beast Fable," introduces the subject and offers five good paragraphs on the OE *Physiologus* and *The Phoenix*, before moving happily onward to ME [69–85]), the Breton lai (and the incidental discovery that the book is organized alphabetically by genre), we pause for Emma B. Hawkins' article entitled "Chronicle" (98–117). This is a more traditional approach, with paragraphs for each chronicle, an opening definition of the genre, a careful introduction of the surviving vernacular manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, their scope, the selection of entries, the approach to history, mistakes in matching events to years, literary merit, the occasional advent of emotion, legend and myth, and the surprising survival of vernacular chronicles in later generations. She turns to the Latin chronicles with judicious analysis, before returning to later medieval vernacular chronicles and finishing with a review of scholarship on these texts. This is a useful article.

After much longer pieces on debate poetry, drama, and dream vision (a massive piece ignoring *Dream of the Rood* but giving Chaucer seven pages of bibliography on top of analysis), we arrive at John Michael Crafton's "Epic and Heroic Poetry" (210–29). He defines his terms, then briefly discusses various OE poems, including those under the Christ-as-hero subject heading, before turning to *Beowulf* for its depiction of the heroic code. Though he does refer unhappily to the "binaryism" (218) in the poem, Crafton makes good points before jumping to ME texts, and a critical history of scholarship which focuses on Ker, Tillyard, Southern, Auerbach, Frye, and the structuralists. Strangely, the next chapter covers largely the same material, as Richard McDonald considers "The Epic Genre and Medieval Epics" (230–54). The chapter is rambling and discursive, starting with the definition of the epic, a long list of its conventions (somewhat useful), an excruciatingly simplistic and detailed presentation of each of those conventions, a long list of medieval poems with epic qualities (divided by century), and a brief analysis of six medieval epics (*Beowulf* is the first of these), each of which gets one paragraph of description. Ignoring the analysis of the fabliau, we move on to a rather catch-all category—"Hagiographic, Homiletic, and Didactic Literature" by John H. Brinegar (277–98). Brinegar tackles this topic holistically by considering definitions and background before providing some representative examples—saints' lives such as those of Oswald and Guthlac, the theme of the Day of Judgment in various sermons, biblical translation, penitentials—and providing a good critical survey of the field. Sigrid King next focuses on "Lyric Poetry" (299–314), starting with the two linguistic classes of Germanic and Celtic, and finishing her discussion of the OE lyric in one paragraph. The volume finishes with considerations of the ME parody or burlesque, riddles (again), romance, and visions of the afterlife. This book does not greatly aid the scholar, nor the general reader, but a graduate student looking for a survey of medieval literature which reflects ideas from fifteen to twenty years ago would find useful material here, and would also find the certainty reflected in many places in the volume somewhat entertaining.

Analyses of Individual Figures in Anglo-Saxon Contexts

From 2001 are two articles in the collection *La Figura di San Pietro nelle Fonti del Medioevo*, ed. Loredana Lazzari and Anna Maria Valente Bacci (Louvain-la-Neuve: Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'Études Médiévales, 2001). Alberto Ferreiro and Patrizia Lendinara both address St. Peter in insular materials, the former in "Simon Magus and Simon Peter in medieval Irish and English Legends" (112–132 and one plate at the end of the book with three

figures on the page). Ferreiro synthesizes the available research on Simon Magus, recapitulating his appearances in Ælfric's sermon on the passion of the apostles Peter and Paul, the Blickling Homilies, *Leabhar Breac*, Muirchú's *Life of St. Patrick* (in which the Druid Lochru takes on the Simon Magus role), an anonymous Irish poem (surviving in three seventeenth-century manuscripts and entitled *An invocation of Saints Peter and Paul*), and Irish crosses at Kells, Monasterboice and Castledermot. The texts vary in their depiction of Peter's primacy over Paul but all enjoy the discomfiture (variously presented, though on some of the crosses he is naked to demonstrate his falsity) and death of Simon Magus. Secondly, Ferreiro considers the legend of the Druid Mog Raith for its involvement in the Simon Magus story. Thirdly, he turns to the question of monastic tonsures in the correspondence of Ceolfrid, who describes the tonsures of both Simon Peter and Simon Magus, and indicates his success in advising Adamnan to give up the tonsure of Simon Magus (though Adamnan believes it to be the tonsure of John the Beloved). Thus the primacy of Peter and his pontifical successors is judiciously established using a gentle pastoral approach.

Patrizia Lendinara, in a more ambitious article, tackles "Pietro, Apostolo, Vescovo e santo nella letteratura anglo-sassone" (649–84). She too starts with the *Passio Sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli*, noting that Peter's importance as the apostle with the greatest rapport with Jesus accords him a special place in the Anglo-Saxon church. Ælfric's homily on Peter and Paul, quoting from Matthew's gospel, establishes the importance of Peter, as does Blickling Homily XV based on the *Passio*. Simon Magus, however, appears as an antecedent for Christ in Wulfstan's "De temporibus Antichristi." Lendinara returns rapidly to Ælfric, and to the homily "De auguriis" in the *Lives of Saints*, which, with his second homily on Peter in the second series of the *Catholic Homilies*, provides a sense both of the importance of Peter and of the relevance of the *Passio* for Anglo-Saxon thinking about him. Lendinara canvasses Ælfric's other references to Peter's humanity and his significance, before turning to the possible apocryphal tradition of Peter. Lendinara works carefully through the appearances in several homilies (mostly late) of Peter as intercessor, suggesting that there might have been a precocious circulation in England of the apocryphal material behind this interpretation. Briefly, she considers the Rogation days, an important liturgical moment in Anglo-Saxon England connected in the relevant homilies to Peter's insistence on their importance; Peter's role in the Gospel as it was so often repeated in OE translations and adaptations; Peter's role as a fisherman, as noted by Ælfric in *Catholic Homilies* 2.16; the question of whether Peter had an earthly family, as elucidated

in the OE *Martyrology* and by Ælfric in the Preface to *Genesis*; his holding the keys in the *Catholic Homilies* 1.26; his disciples and his appearance in *Christ and Satan* as first of the disciples; his role as bishop and pontifex in martyrologies and texts which mention them; his appearance in letters and iconography as first of the apostles, in the New Minster charter of 966, the *Liber Vitae* of the New Minster of c. 1030, the Bury Psalter, the Athelstan Psalter, and other texts in which he is on a par with the Virgin Mary; and church dedications. Other representations of Peter include his appearance first in the incantations against theft which appear in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 41, and in London, BL, MS Harley 585, where he is concerned to work against toothache. Lendinara concludes that Peter is a significant figure, broadly present in Anglo-Saxon England. This article refers to all of the well-known material about Peter and some of the less well-known; still to be addressed is the more complex evidence of prayer-books and liturgical works.

Mary Swan addresses Veronica, an original choice, in "Remembering Veronica in Anglo-Saxon England" in *Writing Gender and Genre in Medieval Literature: Approaches to Old and Middle English Texts*, ed. Elaine Treharne (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer), 19–39. In this important article, Swan chases the elusive textual references in Anglo-Saxon England to Veronica, a saint popular in the later Middle Ages because of the rise of affective piety and her association with the Instruments of the Passion. Arising from the *Gospel of Nichodemus*, the legend of Veronica herself developed into the *Vindicta Salvatoris*, and its principal component is the story of the image of Christ's face. Veronica herself is named in two OE narrative texts, both copies of the *Vindicta Salvatoris* and both in manuscripts of the third quarter of the eleventh century written at Exeter: Cambridge, University Library, MS Ii.2.11 and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 196. The Latin manuscript which is now Saint-Omer, BM 202 was in England, perhaps at Exeter, during the eleventh-century episcopate of Leofric, and its version of the text is very close to the narrative content of the two OE copies. Swan works through three examples of differences in detail between the two texts, and proposes that the Corpus text was copied from the dictation of an OE translation, possibly that in the CUL text but possibly another one now lost. Three examples of details in the two OE texts as against the Latin in the Saint-Omer version demonstrate that in Anglo-Saxon England there was a strong connection between the image of Christ in Veronica's possession and a piece of his clothing; that is, it is possible that the much later tradition which associates the cloth with the wiping of his face on the way to Calvary (the story of Veronica's veil previously seen as

having its earliest appearance in the fourteenth century) might have Anglo-Saxon origins. Should this be the case, it would mark a very early appearance indeed of affective piety. Swan turns to a third OE version of the *Vindicta Salvatoris* in London, BL, MS Cotton Vespasian D.xiv, written in the mid-twelfth century in Rochester or at Christ Church, Canterbury. The version here omits all mention of Veronica and her legend, but Swan finds that there are indeed links among the OE versions which might point to an intermediate version or versions of the story, whether in Latin or OE. However, there are also links between the Vespasian and Saint-Omer versions. Veronica's absence from the Vespasian text is odd, since her popularity was growing and the manuscript has many hagiographical texts; Swan suggests therefore, not wholly convincingly, that the original intended audience for the manuscript was not female. Other places in which Veronica did appear in Anglo-Saxon England include charms and recipes (as *Bronice* in the recipe for *lencten adle* or tertian fever in London, BL, MS Royal 12 D xvii and as *Beronice* in London, BL, MS Royal 2 A xx in two charms to stop bleeding), a possible figuring of Veronica with Martha in a single figure on the Rothbury Cross Shaft, and hints in relic-lists from Exeter which refer to a piece of Christ's garment and other Instruments of the Passion. Swan concludes that a particular interest in Veronica existed at Exeter in the eleventh century, and that later versions of her legend were not new developments but a reintroduction of her story.

Saint Christopher is the concern of Joyce Tally Lionarons in "From Monster to Martyr: The Old English Legend of Saint Christopher" in *Marvels, Monsters, and Miracles: Studies in the Medieval and Early Modern Imaginations*, ed. Timothy S. Jones and David A. Sprunger, Studies in Medieval Culture 42 (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publ.), 167–82. Anglo-Saxon texts and the Old Irish version of Christopher's life in the *Leabhar Breacc* all agree that he was a cynocephalus, a man with the head of a dog (by implication in the fragmentary *passio* found in the *Beowulf* manuscript, and explicitly in all the other texts). Lionarons reviews the cynocephali in other texts available in Anglo-Saxon England, suggesting that the ultimate source was Ktesias' *Indika* from 398–97 B.C., which locates these beings in the mountains of India. In medieval European texts these and other monstrous races function as a collective Other for Christian culture, although by breaking down the borderline between the human and the monstrous the cynocephali create a category crisis. The resulting horror of the Other means that these hybrids are particularly popular in Western cultural imaginings of the East, according to Edward Said, John Friedman, and Jeffrey Jerome Cohen. Either the bestiality or the humanity

(especially the possibility of having a soul) becomes the focus in literary portrayals, so that in the OE *Wonders of the East* the hostility to human beings and animal natures of the cynocephali are prominent. The Christopher story, however, more closely resembles the conversion narrative of a cannibalistic cynocephalus in the Ethiopian *Gadla Hawâryât*. In the OE versions the category crisis in identity is resolved when Christopher learns to speak and becomes fully human; in the *Martyrology* this attainment of speech is figured as a divine gift. His linguistic and ontological transformation permits the narrative, having distinguished the human from the monstrous, to address the problem of discerning the divine. In the Latin and Irish versions the saint preaches, which brings him to martyrdom. The OE *passio* has the emperor, a typical hagiographic villain, mistaking Christopher for a monster and failing to discern the reality beneath the surface. The monstrous saint miraculously survives torture unharmed for three days, while the human emperor refuses to acknowledge the power of the Christian god even after he is literally blinded by arrows (and healed after Christopher's death with a mixture made from the blood of the saint and the earth on which he was killed). Nonetheless, Lionarons suggests in closing that the category crisis is never fully resolved, the anxiety never fully dissipated, as the monsters demonstrate the horrific potential of the monstrous in humanity.

John Edward Damon addresses the role of Byrhtnoth in the *Battle of Maldon* in "Sanctifying Anglo-Saxon Ealdormen: Lay Sainthood and the Rise of the Crusading Ideal" (*Via Crucis*, ed. Hall, 185–209). He assesses five tenth- and eleventh-century ealdormen whose lives were touched by lay sanctity and the literary traces they left behind for the "sanctifying urge" (186). These men demonstrate a growing sense of lay piety which, Damon suggests, is related to the crusading ideal of ensuing years. On the other hand, insular conditions in the years around the Conquest were not conducive to the call to crusade, since power had consolidated firmly in the hands of a central authority and energy was focused on dealing with external invasion. Whereas France's semi-anarchy and internal violence led to individual decision-making and the desire to reject local conditions in favor of an ideal endorsed by the Pope, England provides a control group for the examination of the rise of lay piety without the call to crusade. Damon argues that insular lay sanctity aligns itself with the holy confessors, rather than with the call to martyrdom, and suggests that although Byrhtnoth was not a saint, he was the model of a layman devoted to religion in life. However, despite his saintly death, he did not have the royal rank that would have proclaimed him a martyr, nor did he abandon secular life wholly to devote himself to God. As neither clergy nor

royalty, the lay Anglo-Saxon faced, according to Damon, a potential crisis of faith. Though this seems an extreme conclusion, Damon argues (following Patrick Wormald in a classic article) that Bede had been concerned about Anglo-Saxon warriors abandoning the military for the religious life and although the concern had diminished in ensuing centuries, developing an ideal of lay sanctity nonetheless provided an acceptable outlet for those tempted to renounce their warrior status. Thus, Æthelwine, ealdorman of East Anglia, remembered as *Dei amicus*, was a second pious and powerful layman who fought both invading enemies and impious Anglo-Saxons. Dying in a monastery, he achieved a level of reverence in texts such as Byrhtferth's *Vita s. Oswaldi* not allotted to Byrhtnoth. Æthelweard of Wessex, not a warrior but a politician, promoted peace policies and accomplished scholarly work. Leofric of Mercia, whose sanctity appears to be posited by the *Visio Leofrici*, seems to pass easily across the bridge to heaven in that text; however, the pietistic aspirations of that work on Leofric's behalf do not seem to have borne fruit. Finally, after the Conquest, Waltheof of Northumbria exemplifies this ideal of lay piety, even in his death (beheaded in 1075 by the Normans) suffering the passion of a martyr and thereby coming closer than any of his compatriots to achieving a cult and sainthood. In this context, then, Damon proposes that although Byrhtnoth might not have been a saint, his actions partook of this Anglo-Saxon ideal of lay sanctity.

Another saintly figure known principally through a poem is Helena, the central figure of the *Inventio* legends. In *Helena of Britain in Medieval Legend* (Cambridge: Brewer), Antonina Harbus considers Helena from late antiquity to late medieval saints' legendaries and beyond the Middle Ages (finishing with Evelyn Waugh). Relevant here is chapter 2 on the legend in Anglo-Saxon England and Francia (28-51), which starts with the Northumbrian cult of the Cross and the York connection to Constantine. Harbus delineates Anglo-Saxon interest in the Cross in poetry, liturgy, and in material examples of reliquaries, nails from the Cross, and sculpture. By the eighth and ninth centuries claims of Helena's western origin, either in Britain or Trier in Gaul, began to appear, as her name appeared more and more in litanies and calendars. The chapter turns to vernacular texts, including the two homilies concerning the finding of the true Cross (one of them by Ælfric), many other references to the Cross in OE which do not include reference to Helena, and the two poems focused on the Cross: *Dream of the Rood* and *Elene*. Helena also appears in Aldhelm's prose version of the *De Virginitate*, now with a local connection that may perhaps be Aldhelm's misreading of his source. Bede is not interested in possible insular origins for either Constantine or Helena, although the OE

translation of the *Historia ecclesiastica* does incorporate that claim, and makes it a prominent feature. The chronicle texts may have depended on the OE rendition of Bede, since the entries for 380/81 do have Magnus Maximus as having been born in Britain. The OE translation of Orosius, however, does not fall into that error. Claims of Helena in Trier and Hautvilliers appear to reflect her growing reputation as a venerable figure, although new legendary Helenas were constructed in Wales, and later in Anglo-Norman England and beyond. Harbus provides here a useful conspectus of Helena in Anglo-Saxon England.

Themes and Motifs

Nicholas Howe picks up some of the ideas from his Toller lecture in his "The Landscape of Anglo-Saxon England: Inherited, Invented, Imagined" in *Inventing Medieval Landscapes: Senses of Place in Western Europe*, ed. John Howe and Michael Wolfe (Gainesville: UP of Florida), 91–112. The Anglo-Saxons, he suggests, embraced a binary opposition between the uncertainty of this fleeting life on earth and the permanence of the expected home in heaven, which affected the ways in which they imagined landscape. The inherited landscape was alluring and fertile, though not uninhabited or edenic, but later Anglo-Saxons did construct their ancestors as having made an exodus to a new Canaan. Nonetheless, they inherited both earthen mounds and Roman ruins, though they did not refer to the former. *The Ruin*, perhaps the most static poem in OE, includes very precise description and builds with layers of history absent from most other OE poems. Howe notes that the monuments themselves would have been particularly striking in an agricultural landscape, and the poem itself evokes a lost people, the creators of the enduring stonework. The Roman ruins exist in the here and now, yet mark a time behind time, an elsewhere which is "the past of its landscape" (97). Invented landscapes include the human creation of the land recorded in over 1800 extant land charters. Generally in Latin to establish both authority and eternity, and in Old English to identify and map the land and its current features with precision, the charters mark the ways in which the Anglo-Saxons constructed the landscape. Howe suggests that repeated oral delivery would fix the boundaries given in the charter into the minds of the listeners, thereby making the landscapes into a series of signs to be walked. Howe notes that the landscape is not a vista; he does not, however, here focus on the utility of the landscape, on its importance for the sheer continued existence of the individual. The third theme of the chapter, the imagined landscape, develops the link between emotional struggle and the harsh landscape in *The Wanderer* and *The Wife's Lament*. In the former, Howe argues that the acute

suffering and efforts to express the exile's interiority leads to a seascape which is far beyond the bounds of the realistic—conventional, and yet vivid. The power of *The Wife's Lament* develops through the description of the landscape. Similarly, Beowulf moves through the wasteland and the underworld to fight Grendel's Mother, and the poet here provides a vision of the hero's mind as he moves farther from the human realm into the dehumanizing landscape of the mere. Howe concludes that figures of OE poetry are perhaps the most alone in the landscape of English poetry: poor, bare, forked creatures.

Considerations of the fantastic are gathering strength in the field. Two recent theses address the fantastic either directly or indirectly. Kathryn E. Powell in "The Anglo-Saxon imaginary of the East: A psychoanalytic exploration of the image of the East in Old English literature" (Diss. University of Notre Dame, *DAI* 62A: 3386) refers to the East in the tenth and eleventh centuries as a foreign realm beyond the liminal boundaries of the Anglo-Saxons. Using Kristeva, Zizek, and Lacan, she considers the texts of the *Beowulf* manuscript to examine the symbolic identity of the Anglo-Saxons. Lawrence Patrick Thomas Morris in his wide-ranging thesis addresses "*Veritas* and literary fiction in the hagiography of the pre-Norman British Isles (Ireland, England)" (Diss. Harvard University, *DAI* 63A: 1331). His concern is the way in which the saints' lives are so frequently dismissed as fantastic, yet medieval writers clearly saw spiritual truth, typological truth, and divine truth. A saint's life could thereby parallel the Bible, folklore, and vernacular story, all in the service of finding new theological formations. Some analysis of alliterative pairs and a series of case studies provide evidence for the argument.

Even formulaic analyses are addressing the fantastic: Michael Swisher, in "Beyond the Hoar Stone" (*Neophilologus* 86: 133–36), comments on the stone as a boundary-marker in charters but insists on its more important use as a marker of the threshold between the natural and the supernatural world. He compares the usages in *Beowulf* 887 and 2744 to Blickling Homily 17, in which St. Paul sees the boundary of the place where the waters flow beneath as being *under sumne harne stan*, and to *Andreas* 841, the point beyond which the hero must do battle in Mermedonia. The occurrences of the formula in *The Ruin* and Riddle 40 do not partake of this fantastic reference.

Jordi Sánchez Martí, in "From Youth to Age Through Old English Poetry (With Old Norse Parallels)," *Miscelánea: A Journal of English and American Studies* 23: 111–126, rightly takes issue with John Burrows's idea that the only age of man privileged among the Anglo-Saxons was *senectus*. Basing his conclusions solely on literary texts, Sánchez Martí starts with *Maxims I* and *II* with their references to youthful strength and wildness, turns to *Precepts* for a father's advice to his son, considers the education through traveling provided in *The Seafarer*, *Hávamál*, and *Widsith*, and concludes that a young man at the end of texts such as *The Wanderer* will have attained social principles of behavior and learned wisdom, the latter in solitude. Many temptations interfere in the finding of a wise man to be instructor, and texts such as *Guthlac A* provide relevant examples, although it is also possible rapidly to achieve wisdom, to be a *puer senex*, in *Andreas* when God is a youthful but expert sailor. Leaping to his conclusion (remarkably without a single reference to *Beowulf* as sagacious young man), Sánchez Martí cites *The Fortunes of Men* and Ælfric in the Parable of the Vineyard on the *fulfremeda wæstm* which is the completed growth and culmination of man's potential. He concludes that true well-being comes at the transition point between youth and old age, at *gravitas*, not senectitude and decrepitude. References from *Egils saga* suggest that the privileged age, the prime age, comes after the learning stages of youthful folly but before the warrior loses respect. Interestingly, the article refers only to the ages of men; perhaps women have a different trajectory.

Susanne Kries takes up a theme that is enjoying its fifteen minutes of fame in her "Laughter and Social Stability in Anglo-Saxon and Old Norse Literature" in *A History of English Laughter: Laughter from Beowulf to Beckett and Beyond*, ed. Manfred Pfister (Amsterdam: Rodopi), 1–15. This history of "risology," as Pfister puts it, starts with Kries's investigation of the literary representation of laughter in these texts. Laughter, according to the *Thesaurus of Old English*, includes terms which indicate mockery and derision as well as joy and mirth. Kries begins with the Christian and classical heritage, with its warnings against excessive laughter, against laughter as vanity, and against laughter as a pleasure that will be lost on Judgment Day (in *Judgment Day II* 232–7). However, angels and saints do indeed laugh in Anglo-Saxon texts (*Christ* 739ff). In what Kries simplistically terms the pre-Christian tradition, laughter does occur in halls such as those in *Beowulf*, where it separates human from nonhuman, culture from nature. Kries briefly reviews many occurrences of laughter in communal contexts in OE poetry, taking it as reflecting universally positive conditions in most texts, even *The Seafarer*. Even the binding of the Fenriswolf invokes the laughter of triumph among the gods. However, isolated laughter has negative or menacing overtones, as in Riddle 33, in which the laughter of the iceberg is *gryrelic*, *egesful* 'horrible, awful'. This is the laughter of Grendel or of Holofernes,

laughter without the *dream* of the hall, and with overtones of reversal and future destruction implied by the narrators. Excessive laughter has similar overtones, even for Byrht-noth. Thirdly, Kries considers laughter *lacunae*, including Beowulf's death, the lack of a reason to laugh for the Scots and Vikings in *Brunanburh* 47, and the ironic occurrence of *hleahtorsmið* in *Exodus* 43, when there is explicitly no laughter as the Egyptian first-born children are slaughtered. Kries links *hleahtorsmið* with *worulddream* to suggest that the Egyptian way of life is the former life of the Anglo-Sax-ons. Finally, Kries briefly considers the ON mythological story of Skaði, in which Loki must make the giantess laugh in a suitor test, which is a wooing scene reflecting a diffu-sion of gender difference. Her laughter restores the order between the giants and the gods and reestablishes gender roles. Laughter, therefore, is ritualistic and symbolic, a ges-ture which reflects the communal nature of the hall, of life in this world.

A far cry indeed from laughter is the moment at which the individual stands alone in front of the Supreme Judge unable to call upon kin for aid; Patrizia Lendinara inves-tigates the Anglo-Saxon treatment of this moment in "'*frater non redimit, redimet homo…*': A Homiletic Motif and its Variants in Old English" in *Early Medieval Eng-lish Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, ed. Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies), 67–80. Lendinara demonstrates the use of this motif "no aid from kin" in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 201 pp. 222–30 (HomU 55), the Macarius Homily; in Ver-celli Homily 4, where the motif is more fully articulated; in Napier XXX (HomU 27) from Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 113, fols. 73–80v, which borrows from the Ver-celli text; in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 162 pp. 422–31 (HomS 44), which has an elaborate version of the motif; in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ii.1.33, fols. 207r–211r (HomM 8), which seems independent from the other instances in that the motif moves from the Last Judg-ment to Hell; and in Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi*. The motif also combines with the *ubi sunt* motif to emphasize the con-trast between things and people relevant during one's life and the loneliness of the soul at Judgment Day. Lendinara proposes that the motif is similar to lines 97–102 of *The Seafarer*, to the Old High German eschatological poem *Muspilli*, which refers to the way no relative can help, and to Otfrid's *Evangelienbuch*, book five. She then considers the source, the *De paenitentia*, a metrical homily attributed to Ephrem the Syrian, which was available in Latin in Eng-land. The motif, however, occurs elsewhere in source mate-rials, including the homily *De exitu animi, et de secundo adventu*, attributed to Cyril of Alexandria. Most likely as a

source for this material is Ps 48: 8–9, beginning *frater non redimit, redimet homo*. The motif offers a sense of equality for all, and a parallel between members of the society and members of the family: yet another motif was reshaped and strengthened by Anglo-Saxons as they used it.

Antonina Harbus's second book of the year was probably first in conception since it reworks and reconfigures her 1994 Toronto thesis on dreams in Old English literature. *The Life of the Mind in Old English Poetry* (Amsterdam: Rodopi) begins with consideration of the role of psychol-ogy in literary criticism, especially criticism of Old Eng-lish; the second chapter addresses the vocabulary of the mind; she then turns to a somewhat traditional analysis by genre, moving in ensuing chapters through wisdom poetry, hagiography, elegy, and—saving the best for last—*Beowulf*. The introduction is a careful and lucid introduction to psychology and the difficulties of applying it to Old Eng-lish poetry, Anglo-Saxon beliefs about the mind, problems with the evidence and our modern conception of how the mind works, and the conclusion that the subjective psy-chological positions adopted by the speakers in OE verse and its reminiscent quality allow for this approach. The chapter concludes with a very brief review of the ecclesias-tical context of OE poetry and the mind (though without Jean Leclercq). The second chapter, in the classic Toronto tradition, is a detailed study of the words for "mind," start-ing with *mod*, in Old English. Harbus concludes that the Anglo-Saxons needed "a range of terms for the cogni-tive, emotional and spiritual centre of human beings" (32). Those terms were both simplices and compounds, used in pairs with a range of overlapping meanings, or alone. The sheer number of terms reflects the centrality of the mind and the mental world in the surviving discourse. Wisdom poetry is the subject of the third chapter, which notes that the gnomic literature "valorizes" the mental world and analyzes the texts with respect to four sets of ideas: that wisdom is necessary for a full and happy life, that wisdom reflects the need for mental restraint and control, that con-trol of the mind leads to understanding of good and evil or moral arbitration, and that common sense and wis-dom reflect social mores and cultural constructions. Saints' legends provide Harbus with the opportunity to examine the psychology of temptation, and to argue that hagiog-raphy was the medium for exploring the ideal Christian mind. She works through *Juliana*, *Elene*, *Guthlac A* and *B*, and *Andreas* to conclude that all these texts use discourse, argument, and debate to demonstrate the sanctity of the saint's mind. Although all these texts have Latin sources or analogues, and all but one have prose equivalents, the emphasis on "mind" vocabulary demonstrates that the texts are interested in the nexus between individual will

and conscience. Harbus then turns to the poems that dwell explicitly on the "life of the mind," the elegies. She argues that they are psychological first on a linguistic level in their use of mental vocabulary, and second on the thematic level, given the placement and weight carried by these concepts. The elegists understand that psychological distress and sadness correlate with physical pain, and that the mind itself carries the narrative. Thus the elegies are emotional complaints as much as they are dramatic monologues; moreover, they enact spiritual change over time and encode a process of change. This is the strongest chapter of the book, demonstrating that the physical circumstances of the elegies are only a vehicle for the mind and its alterations. The mind, however, is distinct from the self and the will; Harbus develops this cultural construction from Stock, Godden, and Clemoes. Finally, Harbus turns to *Beowulf* and its focus on psychology (though oddly without reference to James Earl's book on the topic). She argues that the poem is wholly the product of memory, a retrospective analysis of a constructed reality, looking backward and remembering heroic fame. Memory itself can spark heroic action in the poem, and many episodes of the poem are wholly memory (e.g., the Finn episode, the flyting between Beowulf and Unferth). The mind is even present in the names of some of the major characters: Hygd, Heremod and others. In her conclusion Harbus argues for a cognitive focus of OE verse, for a concentration on the cultural focus of the mind.

Historical Studies

Several scholars this year analyze how particular features of the classical, early Christian, or Germanic world arrived in Anglo-Saxon England and developed there. Aaron Kleist, for example, considers "The Division of the Ten Commandments in Anglo-Saxon England" (*NM* 103: 227–40). Five texts carefully order the Decalogue, although a number of others explicate it in various ways: the prose *Solomon and Saturn* appears to be based solely on the Exodus account in the Vulgate; Wulfstan's Latin homily *De cristianitate* (Bethurum Xb) demonstrates that Wulfstan thought the tenth commandment had two parts treating lust and greed separately; Ælfric's Second Old English Letter for Wulfstan (Brief III) and the anonymous *Decalogus Moysi* are quite similar, the latter closely linked to Ælfric; and finally Ælfric treats the question in both parts of the *Catholic Homilies* in the homilies for Mid-Lent Sunday although he cancels the passage in the first version and presents it more carefully in greater detail in the second. With the possible exception of the first text, all the other versions reflect the work of Ælfric and the divisions of the commandments follow a patristic tradition originating with Augustine. Kleist reviews Augustine's *Quaestiones in*

Heptateuchum, written around 419 A.D., starting with the Judaic systems of cantillation (marking the text for public recitation) which divided the commandments differently. Augustine argues for taking the final verse as two distinct commands, against coveting another's wife and coveting his possessions (lust, then greed). He gives various reasons, many of which were taken up by Isidore of Seville in his *Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum*, which tries to associate the first commandments more firmly with the Godhead. His exegesis was picked up by Bede, Alcuin, and Hrabanus Maurus, but Ælfric seems to have used more than one source. Isidore, as previously demonstrated by Malcolm Godden, is a clear source for one passage (explicated in one of three appendices). In the *Catholic Homilies* sermon, however, Ælfric uniquely changes the numbering of the fifth and sixth commandments, perhaps revealing knowledge of Augustine's teaching (if not the text itself), which uses this order and is followed by the three exegetes listed above. Kleist concludes that, of the three, Bede is the most likely source because of a note he interjects concerning the commandment to honor parents. Ælfric saw the first tablet as having three commandments relating to God, and his exegesis reflected this tradition, decisively influencing the Anglo-Saxon division of the commandments. If nothing else, this article obliged me to dig out a Bible in order to follow its argument—surely a good thing.

"The Anglo-Saxons and the Goths: rewriting the sack of Rome," by M.R. Godden (*ASE* 31: 47–68) reviews Anglo-Saxon treatments of the pillage of Rome by Alaric and the Goths in 410 and notes that although the event had little contemporary prominence it had a distinctive significance in the Alfredian period of Anglo-Saxon England. Augustine and Orosius constructed the sack as a Christian-pagan conflict but with little long-term effect; the Anglo-Saxons knew that the empire had fallen and imbued the sack with steadily more significance. Bede in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* saw its importance as critical in the history of Britain by tying it to the end of Roman rule in England and using Gildas's account of the Roman departure from England. He effects a neat chronological shift to imply that the two events are close in time, and Godden reviews the archaeological and historical evidence for this juxtaposition, concluding that the link is Bede's own. Whether the link is causal is uncertain, but Godden adduces a rhetorical connection. Similarly, Alcuin's poem on York reflects this implication, as does the Old English translation of Bede. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* further highlights this connection, even adding reference to Roman burial of treasure before leaving, a clear sign of the end of the era. Moreover, a later entry refers to the end of Roman bishops and the beginning of English prelates in England. Later yet, when

Æthelweard wrote his Chronicle he emphasizes the pathos of the situation at some length. The Alfredian translator of Orosius also focuses on this linkage (Godden here disagrees with Whitelock and Bately), mentioning the sack at least six times, twice in addition to the source text, and making it the final episode of his version. Godden argues that as a result the text is a kind of monument to a fallen world, giving rise to several kinds of irony. Alfred himself, in his translation of Boethius, begins with the fullest Anglo-Saxon version of the sack of Rome, using Orosius and this Anglo-Saxon tradition. This complicates the examination of providence in the text, both in the prose and metrical versions. There are errors in the details, which Godden discusses; the paper closes with discussion of the ambivalent view of the Goths and Romans in the Alfredian world.

James H. Forse considers the Easter trope as elaborated in the *Regularis Concordia* and early drama such as that of Hroswitha of Gandersheim in his "Religious Drama and Ecclesiastical Reform in the Tenth Century," *Early Theatre* 5.2: 47–70. He proposes that the Easter tropes are playlets resulting from the educational and ecclesiastical reforms propagated by Lotharingian and German clerics and their colleagues in tenth- and eleventh-century England and France. Charting (literally) the links of kinship and education among the Ottonian royal chancery, the chapel, and its greatest patron, Archbishop Bruno of Cologne, Forse notes Athelstan's links across the Channel, which may include this nexus of reform. Contacts also existed between these reformers and the monasteries of Fleury and Ghent, so that overlapping contacts might explain the widespread dissemination of the *Quem quaeritis* by the end of the tenth century. Forse argues that performative elements in liturgies of the time also developed from these policies of reform, such that the Easter and the later Christmas tropes show the reformers putting their religious and educational ideas and policies into practice— especially the use of "living pictures" for visual representations in a society with little literacy. These playlets turned pleasure in profane performances and games to Christian purposes; the most influential of the reformers, Bruno of Cologne, enjoyed drama and mime. Versions of the trope are found in the monasteries of St. Gall and St. Martial in manuscripts between 920 and 950, but the most elaborate version is the *Visitatio* in the *Regularis Concordia*, from 950–975. Forse describes the playlet, compares it to the gospels (especially the account of John), and notes that although intimate knowledge of scripture is evident, there are many differences for dramatic purposes. The ecclesiastics who wrote these materials created dramatic liturgical elements within the church to fix the essentials of the faith in the minds of the congregations, both ecclesiastical

and lay. Forse turns to the dramatic works of Hroswitha of Gandersheim as further evidence of the work of these reformers, connecting the two earliest extant manuscripts of her plays to the German reformers, and suggesting that she herself might have been a pupil of Bruno of Cologne. The article is the work of an historian, filled with facts and historical linkages; it is less convincing when it turns to the details connecting Hroswitha's plays to the Easter tropes.

Unusually, feminist approaches to OE literature are poorly represented in this year: one article and one book. The book is *Medieval Woman's Song: Cross-Cultural Approaches*, ed. Anne L. Klinck and Ann Marie Rasmussen (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P). The volume ranges from Sappho to the sixteenth century, and across Europe from Spain to Walther von der Vogelweide. The first chapter, by Klinck, "Sappho and Her Daughters: some parallels between ancient and medieval woman's song" (15–28), defines woman's song as "simple love-lyric in the female voice" and argues for it as an underlying mode in poetry from early Greece onward. She traces the links between the personal and the ritual or communal in Greek and biblical texts including Sappho and the Song of Songs, and their parallels to the Mozarabic *kharjas* of Andalusia. Motifs and contexts, seductress's songs and albas, erotic songs performed by women and dance songs, a dialogue between the lady in her lover's arms and the castle watchman and ballades by Christine de Pisan: all these texts take the apparent simplicity, naiveté, and open sensuousness of woman's song and alter the conventions for their own particular purposes. Pat Belanoff provides the second chapter: "*Ides … geomrode giddum*: The Old English Female Lament" (29–46). She starts, unusually but correctly, with the differences between *The Wife's Lament* and *Wulf and Eadwacer* rather than their similarities or ways to read them together, beginning with the traditional definitions of elegy in OE verse and concluding that *The Wife's Lament* does not have geographical movement but otherwise exhibits several traits of the elegy whereas *Wulf and Eadwacer* has far fewer correspondences with the genre, including no movement (whether mental or physical) at all. The poem, she suggests, is at the margins of heroic poetry. Belanoff then engages in a detailed study of each poem: for *The Wife's Lament* this includes the use of deictics, shifts between the present and past, the varying sense of presentness in *The Wife's Lament*, *The Seafarer* and *The Wanderer*, the ways in which *The Husband's Message* is a foil which encapsulates gender differences in the voice, and the strong sense of particulars in the poem, formalized and not generalized so that the anguish and confinement of the narrator are clearly spoken. For *Wulf and Eadwacer* the detailed analysis focuses on the language and the ways it relies on and

alters the available linguistic resources, and works through the well-known tricky words of the poem for their possible senses. Belanoff compares the poem to *Maxims I*, lines 146–51, and notes the wolf's existence outside the boundaries of civilization, but argues that the narrator constructs her own view of Wulf and presages violent activity in the near future. The article does not add greatly to the sum of scholarly knowledge of these poems, but it does turn the focus to questions of space and time, and it rightly distinguishes between the two poems on several grounds. Belanoff concludes with the argument that the specificity of the poems, their "hereness" and "nowness," and the marginalization of the narrator so that the outsider's viewpoint is the focus of the text might all result from the concerns of the women narrators.

Wiesje Nijenhuis surveys the field of female Anglo-Saxon saints in "In a Class of their own, Anglo-Saxon Female Saints," *Mediaevistik* 14 (2001): 125–48. Of the total of 86 names, 48 female saints have Anglo-Saxon data, 38 have post-Conquest references. Nijenhuis produces tables showing the popularity of these saints according to their mentions in extant pre- and post-1066 service-books and calendars, and analyzes the reasons for the relative popularity of many of the saints. Other texts are canvassed, both for evidence available and for lack of evidence, to consider how popular given cults were. After 1066, the established cults continued, and in late medieval *legendae* there remains a core of thirty Anglo-Saxon women saints. The prevalence of saints from the seventh and eighth centuries may have several explanations: Viking activity, a drop in fervor after the first frantic conversion period, or even the changed role of women in later centuries. Most of the saints are upper-class, as was the church itself. Nijenhuis also constructs tables and collects information to reflect the role of future saints in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, male vs female saints, the appeal of the eremetic ideal, degrees of popularity, family relationships and sainthood, possible pre-Christian charisma through genealogy, reasons for choosing the monastic life, and the economic power of the potential saint. The conclusions are wide-ranging and interesting.

An important interdisciplinary study is Daniel Anlezark's "Sceaf, Japheth and the origins of the Anglo-Saxons," *ASE* 31: 13–46. He starts with the Anglo-Saxon interest in origins and genealogy, linked to representations of Biblical genealogy in such texts as *Exodus* 353b–79. There the genealogies key into the pattern of God's covenant as promised and then fulfilled, with Noah at the apex of this thinking. He and his sons are the faithful remnant saved by God, and the Hebrew elders in the poem link their identity to their national past. A similar symbolic and genetic link is elucidated by Alfred when, in his rendition of Boethius, he links Nimrod's folly to his genealogy. Anlezark reads Alfred's addition of Germanic figures to the genealogy of the house of Wessex elsewhere in the Boethius translation as bridging a gap between the north and the immediate post-diluvial world. Sceaf is at the core of this linkage, and Anlezark proposes that he was incorporated into the genealogy during Alfred's reign, and also transformed into the ark-born son of Noah. Working through the scholarship on the genealogies and the different genealogies themselves, Anlezark addresses the ark-born son and suggests that the manuscripts with the longer genealogy naming Sceaf as that son are the older tradition. The Anglian and West-Saxon genealogies in the *Textus Roffensis* appear to differ with respect to Sceaf's parentage, but Anlezark concludes it was a mutated borrowing from the West-Saxon royal genealogies. Similarly, Asser's *Life of King Alfred* traces a pedigree, but one that does not include the son as ark-born, and names that figure as Seth. Despite the confusion in the record, the ark-born son seems originally to have been named Sceaf; where he came from is the next issue, and Anlezark addresses the scholarship on this question, especially Thomas Hill on the figure of Jonitus in the Latin translation of pseudo-Methodius. Not convinced by Jonitus as the source of the ark-born son, Anlezark argues that his "significance has to be more immediately accessible to contemporary readers" (29) and that pseudo-Methodius also places the birth after the flood, not during it. Noah's fourth son is also a problem in Rabbinic texts, including the Syriac *Book of the Cave of Treasures*, which Anlezark posits as possibly having been known through the biblical commentaries associated with the Canterbury School. Theodore certainly knew Syriac biblical traditions, including this one, which provides a way for the fourth son of Noah to have been reborn as Sceaf. That figure was both a royal ancestor for the West-Saxon kings and a son of Noah, a double personality which Anlezark associates not with conversion but with the ideological program of the reign of Alfred. The ark-born son marks the significance of shared communal descent from Noah, rather than the separate and distinct pedigree of kings. The link to the mythological Sceaf of Æthelweard's *Chronicon* and *Beowulf* may be relevant as fusing the heroic Germanic past to the patriarchs, but Anlezark proposes that the unique link to Noah provided by the ark-born fourth son—whatever his name—is the more significant connection. The West-Saxon genealogists wanted a unique relationship between Noah, the second father of the human race, and their kings. Anlezark argues that after this idea was developed it received wide circulation in England, in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* at least. However, Ælfric chooses to emphasize the number

of people saved in the ark in several texts, providing in several homilies his own enumeration of Noah's family—especially his three sons. In his treatise on the six ages of the world he refers at length to the three sons: Shem, Ham, and Japheth. Only eight people were saved in the ark, a point Ælfric makes again and again following orthodox church doctrine. In his later texts he expands the point to emphasize that the northern peoples were descended from Japheth. This orthodox position, by contrast to the apocryphal tradition of the ark-born son and descent from Noah through him, suggests an order of the three sons which is reflected in several short notes in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. The confusion created by the notion of the ark-born son meant that later scribes and authors such as William of Malmesbury were skeptical and cautious at the least. The conception of Alfred's circle, made to establish his power and ancestry extending back through Noah to Christ, was overtaken by theological orthodoxy and biblical authority.

Finally, a significant work in this year is Robert Stanton's *The Culture of Translation in Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer). Astounding as it may seem to the thoughtful that we had to wait until 2002 for the first consideration of translation in Anglo-Saxon culture, there is at least some solace that the first sustained study in the field is such a good and solid piece of work. Stanton narrows his focus to four things: glosses and pedagogy, the Alfredian circle, bible translation, and Ælfric. These are unfortunately the most frequently mentioned translation features of Anglo-Saxon England, and a broader approach might have been desired, but the study started as a thesis and license must be allowed—as to any translator. The monograph begins with a brief nod in the direction of translation studies and the argument that translation is an overarching concept which explains Anglo-Saxon literary culture (a worthy start). It continues in the first chapter with a fine introduction to glosses, methods of glossing, Martin Irvine's dense argument about textuality, taxonomies of gloss production, and commentaries. Three moments in glossing are canvassed: the "Leiden family" of glosses in the Canterbury school as a political and ideological process; the hermeneutic style and the third book of Abbo's *Bella parisiacae urbis* as a compulsive interpretive process; and continuous interlinear glosses in Old English used for instructional purposes—especially psalters. Eight plates illustrate the last section, which argues that semantic equivalence and the development of a gloss lexis were in the service of education; the glosses taught morphology, syntax, and semantics. The gloss lexis itself affected Byrhtferth of Ramsey such that he used a hermeneutic style both in Latin and OE. Stanton finishes the chapter with

an analysis of the gloss in the Lindisfarne Gospels, which blurs the distinction between the canonical Latin text and the act of interpretation which the gloss leads toward. The second chapter, on the Alfredian circle, is perhaps the closest to the 1994 Toronto thesis which lies behind the text. It starts with the argument that Alfred's work exemplifies the tensions basic to the idea of translation, and reviews the context of Alfred's work (largely his *Pastoral Letter* which Stanton analyzes in terms of Babel and linguistic redemption starting with Gregory, Isidore, and Bede), then turns to a history of classical and patristic translation which closely resembles that of Rita Copeland. Alfred's own acknowledgment of the "originary and recreative force of interpretation" (79) is next, and Stanton considers the vocabulary Alfred uses about his own role (mediator translated by *wealhstod*), and his combination of the traditional mix of fidelity to the original as against the context of the target language (though Stanton does not use this terminology). Stanton suggests that Alfred is developing a rhetorical force for English, and that his concern is to preserve the authority of the texts he is translating, despite their transition into a new language of lower status which does not yet have authority. He uses the primal scene of literacy from Asser in which Alfred plays out his education in his "mother tongue" to obtain a book in that tongue from his mother. Stanton's next major example is appropriately the classic statement of Alfred's working method in his introduction to Augustine's *Soliloquies*, and Stanton notes his communal enterprise as he learns the words from several helpers and explicators, then his decision to *areccan* with which several processes converge. Others explain the Latin texts to him, and he renders them into English. He thereby claims for himself a role as both interpreter and translator, the eloquent and enlightened king who persuades and leads his subjects. The final examples are from the *Pastoral Care*, as Stanton demonstrates the development of a vernacular culture from the top down, from the king to the people, creating a new authority. Stanton then turns to Bible translation and the trite but nonetheless true argument about the anxiety of authority. His concerns are: first, the obvious demonstration that English is here given value as a legitimate religious language, and second, the argument that Bible translation may serve as a paradigm for translation generally. He briefly reviews Anglo-Saxon Bible translation before turning again to an historical approach, here engaging in a detailed consideration of Jerome. Next, he notes Cædmon's status as a prophetic and originary figure, then returns to glossing and particularly to the vernacular psalter glosses. Stanton argues that continuous biblical glosses embody both the paradigm of the translation as prophecy and that of the translation as a pragmatic way to improve style and rhetoric. The glosses are both an "abasement of

the commentary language before the power of the original Latin" (119) and more than simply an aid to reading the Latin text. The glosses, however, do not get much time in the sun as Stanton returns to Alfred, this time to the prose psalter. This is a crucial text, in which Alfred is both prophetic translator and stylistic or rhetorical translator. The Old English gospels flash by, as Stanton arrives, not unexpectedly, at Ælfric on the Old Testament. Stanton works carefully through Ælfric's claims in the Preface to *Genesis*, and especially addresses his caution about exposing the vernacular Bible to laypeople. Nonetheless, several Anglo-Saxon thinkers served both as transparent reproducers of the presence of God and as interpreters of English. The last chapter in the book considers the rhetoric of translation as developed by Ælfric; it examines the homilist's prefaces, and his insistence that his language was both *consuetus* or customary and *usitatus*, usual. Here Stanton invokes Cassiodorus and Augustine, and considers the balance between literal and spiritual exegesis, and literal or simple translation as against artifice. Ælfric's choice is for plainness, purity, and clarity, and the *sermo humilis* of Augustine inflects his anxiety. Nonetheless his writing develops rhetorical approaches, and Stanton considers examples of some of these as demonstrating Ælfric's mix of oral and textual elements (in the *Life of St. Edmund*, for example). Despite his anxiety, he preserves the truth by embracing linguistic intervention, and by invoking the divine power of the vernacular. The great strength of this book is its linking together of historical approaches to translation with a proposed new paradigm for thinking about OE translation.

M.J.T.

Works not seen

Dumville, David N. "A Bilingual English/Latin Chronicle Written about A.D. 1100." *Fedorov Readings: University Translations Studies* [St. Petersburg] 2 (2000): 121–34.

Fernández Martínez, Dolores. "The Study of Old English Literary Texts from the Perspective of Discourse Analysis: An Overview." *The Grove* 8 (2001): 69–79.

Risden, Edward L. "Some Thematic Implications of Humor in Anglo-Saxon Poetry." *In Geardagum* 22 (2001): 77–90.

Robinson, Fred C. "Retrospection in Old English and Other Early Germanic Literatures." *The Grove* 8 (2001): 255–76.

Smirnov, A.A. "Features of the Rhythmic Organization of Lines in Old English Epic Poetry." *The Linguistic Society of St. Petersburg 2001 Conference*, 124–33.

b. Individual Poems

Andreas

Roberta Frank traces the influence of skaldic poetry on Old English authors in "North Sea Soundings in *Andreas*" (*Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations*, ed. Treharne and Rosser, 1–11). Her discussion begins with a few choice examples from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which demonstrate that "in certain circumstances the Anglo-Saxons were able to reach out and 'quote' from the North's poetic register, plucking for their own purposes both the cornflowers of eulogy and the violas of perfect pitch" (4). Many of the *Andreas* poet's images gain relief when viewed through the lens of the skaldic tradition. The association between weather and battle is a prominent feature of skaldic imagery and one that Frank convincingly demonstrates was shared by the *Andreas* poet. For example, the "sky-as-helmet" metaphor used at ll. 1305–1306, has clear skaldic parallels and evinces a "northern aura" (6). So too the poet's link between atmospheric conditions and warfare at 1255b–1262, a link not found in the Latin source (7). Even a much-maligned image in the poem—the comparison of "mead-pouring" (l. 1526b) to a "bitter beer-drinking" (l. 1533a)—emerges as a metaphor less muddled than previous critics may have thought when viewed from the skaldic perspective (9). Frank's brief elucidation of the Scandinavian influences in *Andreas* effectively shows what is to be gained from such an approach: "Sometimes light is shed on the meaning of an individual Old English compound or on the interpretation of a puzzling passage; sometimes the local effects the poet sought become a little clearer" (11).

D.F.J.

Works not seen

Stiles, Laura Shevaun. "*Hapax legomena* as Poetic Devices in Old English *Andreas*." Diss. Univ. of Georgia, 2002.

The Battle of Maldon

Not all pearls are found in the sea. Carol Hough serves up another gem of a note in "Wistan's Parentage" (*N&Q* n.s. 49: 175–76). The name recorded at l. 300 of Casley's transcript has been contested (and defended) by a number of the poet's editors and critics. Sedgefield was the first to suggest emending *Wigelines bearn* to *Wigel[m]es bearn* on the grounds that no such name is on record elsewhere and, moreover, the etymology of the second element is unclear and suspect (175). Fred C. Robinson has defended the transcript reading, a defense which is bolstered here most convincingly. Hough lists a number of examples where an

Anglo-Saxon man's name combines the first element of his mother's name and the second element of his father's. "Given that Wistan's name is a reduction of *Wigstan*, it would be fully in accordance with this practice for him to be the son of parents called Þur*stan* and *Wig*eline" (176). Hough's solution effectively dispels the confusion concerning Wistan's parentage in the poem, where at l. 298a his father is identified as Þurstan, but at 300a he is apparently (at least according to some editors) the son of *Wighelm*.

In "A War of Containment: The Heroic Image in *The Battle of Maldon*" (*SN* 74: 60–75), Michael Matto takes as his point of departure Jack Niles's interpretation of the poem's ideological position, i.e "that, read in its historical context, the poem works as propaganda not for continued military resistence to the vikings, as is generally assumed, but instead for acceptance of Æthelred's later policy of paying them tribute" (61). Whereas Niles marshals external evidence to build his argument, Matto explores "the network of epistemological concepts which the poem both relies on and shapes as it expresses this ideology" (61). He does so mainly by means of a discussion of a previously overlooked motif of "containment." "The logic of the poem is informed by images of containers and their contents, which in turn have their basis in a cognitive pattern, or image-schema, of containment" (61). These "images of containment" are present from the very outset of the poem, where the young man releases his hawk before the impending battle. The hawk flies to the forest, a space or "container" distinct from the field of battle, another "container." These containers function not, according to Matto, as symbols or static images, but rather "as elements in a meaningful heroic *process* as these early attempts at containment are thwarted by the contrary forces of disorder and transgression we find later in the poem" (62). The process of constantly disrupted "bounded space" constitutes a repeating motif which, Matto claims, "serves to schematize the central ethical concern of the poem,—namely, an ethic of heroism that specifically involves maintaining order in the world through containment" (62). At issue here is the efficacy of military containment, shown to be ultimately ineffective against the vikings in the poem and contrary to Æthelred's policy of "monetary containment." Matto looks closely at three scenes which, in his view, offer a critique of the effectivenss of military containment: Byrhtnoth's *ofermod*, Godric's flight, and the speeches of the "loyal" retainers (66). Most intriguing is Matto's treatment of the *ofermod* question as seen from the perspective of containment. It is not his intent to settle this long-standing critical question, nor does he do so, but if we "look for other uses of this *conception* of mental activity" (67) rather than other instances of the term and its cognates in other languages,

Matto believes we can position ourselves to better understand the poem's "interest in Byrhnoth's defining mental moment" (68).

D.F.J.

Works not seen

"Anglo-Skandinavskiy konflikt v drevneangliiyskom poeticheskom soznanii: *Bitva pri Meldone*" ["Anglo-Saxon Conflict in the Old English Poetic Conciousness: *The Battle of Maldon*"] *Politicheskiye konflikty v proshlom i nastoyashchem*, ed. Chernysheva, 62–63.

Christ and Satan

Included in *The Poems of MS Junius 11* (ed. R.M. Liuzza), Janet Schrunk Ericksen's essay "The Wisdom Poem at the end of MS Junius 11" (302–26) attempts to account for the marked differences between *Christ and Satan* and the other poetic material in the manuscript and suggests that the poem may best be understood as wisdom literature. Ericksen begins her argument by showing a distinct affinity between *Christ and Satan* and the wisdom literature of apocryphal books such as Ezra, Baruch, Enoch, Ecclesiasticus, and Job, and describes wisdom literature as less a genre than "a content-based category" (306). She continues by showing the links between *Christ and Satan* and other OE texts such as *Solomon and Saturn*, as well as Latin didactic literature, that include a list of "revealed things," which "was found particularly effective in contemplating the bounds and extent of human and divine wisdom, and in encouraging the pursuit of wisdom" (309). Ericksen discusses at some length the connections between divine wisdom and revealed knowledge in the poem and suggests that, while *Christ and Satan* has generally been read as part of the sequence that begins with the *Genesis* section, it may be better understood as a discrete text (314). Ericksen mentions both Peter Lucas's arguments that *Christ and Satan* shows evidence of having been circulated separately before being bound with the rest of Junius 11 and Barbara Raw's suggestion that *Christ and Satan* was instead copied specifically for inclusion in the manuscript, rather than for independent circulation. After describing the physical state of this last gathering of the manuscript, Ericksen concludes that "*Christ and Satan* … shows material evidence of both being part of and distinct from the rest of the manuscript" (317). Throughout her article Ericksen develops this ambivalence, both generically as wisdom literature and as a separate manuscript gathering that "indicates at worst wear associated with devaluation and at best an audience interested in updating, improving, and reading *Christ and Satan*" (318). She ends by suggesting that the wear inflicted

on the pages of the poem may have resulted from the poem being read separately rather than in sequence with those that precede it in the manuscript. Anyone who has a favorite chapter in a novel or poem in a collection—or who studied a foreign language from a text with a glossary at the end—will easily understand how one section of a book may become far more worn than others.

Carole Hough focuses her inquiry much more narrowly in "*Christ and Satan* line 406b" (*N&Q* n.s. 49: 6–8). She notes that the Tironian nota <7> normally used to denote *and* or *ond* begins line 406b and is usually emended to *ac* "but" to preserve the adversative sense of the line. She describes Finnegan's argument for the retention of *and* on theological grounds, but concludes that his comparison of Eve with the Virgin Mary notwithstanding, "the impression remains that the relationship between 405–6a and 406b–7 is one of contrast, with Adam and his kin being released from purgatory while Eve is not" (7). Hough adds that this is also the understanding of G. Shepherd in *Continuations and Beginnings: Studies in Old English Literature*, ed. E.G. Stanley (London, 1966), 1–36, at 34. Her purpose is not only to support Shepherd's interpretation, but to demonstrate that emendation of the text is unnecessary because Old English *and/ond* may itself carry an adversative meaning, citing M. Ogura's " 7 /*and*/*ond* in some Old English manuscripts," *Jimbun Kenkyu* [*The Journal of the Humanities*] 29 (2000): 327–44 at 337, wherein Ogura cites examples from a variety of sources to demonstrate that Old English *and* or *ond*, whether spelled out or represented by the Tironian nota, was used in both poetry and prose with a clearly adversative meaning. Thus, there is no reason to emend *Christ and Satan* 406b to *ac*: "[t]his solution is fully in accordance with recorded uses of Old English *and*, and has the advantage of avoiding emendation while retaining the interpretation preferred by a majority of commentators on the poem."

M.K.R.

Christ III

In "Visualizing Judgment: Illumination in the Old English *Christ III*" (*Via Crucis*, ed. Hall, 27–49), Sachi Shimomura examines the metaphor of light as a literal and figurative indicator of the presence of Christ. Shimomura connects the metaphor to Christian Latin tradition, demonstrating that light is allegorically associated with "divine clarity of vision" (28). While most studies of *Christ III* have examined the poem in the context of the other *Christ* poems or in relation to analogues and sources, this essay, "propose[s] to examine the imagery of light and illumination in the

poem against the cultural and rhetorical framework—biblical, patristic, and homiletic, as well as secular Anglo-Saxon—within which the poem must have been written, and upon which the *Christ III* poet presumably drew" (29). Further, the introduction promises to reveal a "Germanic twist" to the Christian Latin imagery, but the Germanic connection is less clear than one might wish; further, the essay treats only the first three of the five major sections Shimomura identifies in the poem, ll. 867–1335. Shimomura says that the figure of Christ shining like the sun is "so formulaic as to appear to be bereft of true metaphorical status," but claims that the Old English usage here redeems the metaphor and extends it beyond the original formulaic comparison (30). Old English homilies and other texts are adduced to demonstrate that such concrete metaphors "straddle the line between literal and figurative imagery," especially the figure of brightness, which "represents both a literal and a figurative nearness to divine presence" (33). Because the righteous shine in a hierarchy of brightness determined by their good deeds, Shimomura contends that "the carefully sketched details of the brightness/blessedness comparison … systematize the metaphor to an extent that gives it a vivid functionality well beyond that of a figure of speech" (38). "*Christ III*, balancing between figurative and literal poles of imagery, achieves its forays into literalized imagery by adopting standard homiletic metaphors in concretely visual versions that seem, at their very inception, susceptible to a vivid literalization" (39). As no thorough discussion of metaphor and allegory is complete without Augustine, Shimomura suggests that Augustine's explanation of the perception of righteousness "implicitly metaphorizes divine knowledge in terms of vision" (41); divine knowledge as a type of sight, however, is neither specifically Christian nor Western, as most religions refer to divine knowledge in terms of "seeing." The argument, however, does suggest that *Christ III* is innovative because the knowledge or sight mentioned is not just the figurative knowledge shared by the divine and the righteous human souls, but there is also a literal reciprocal sight between the blessed and the damned, focusing on the damned, who see the righteous shining with the brightness of their good deeds, a literal brightness perceived with literal eyes. The reason this literal sight is important, Shimomura suggests, is that the Anglo-Saxons placed great significance on the concept of shame and the notion of being seen to be damned would therefore carry enormous cultural weight. "Shame and praise are opposite sides of the same coin, and Germanic heroic culture heavily emphasizes the importance of praiseworthy action and its concomitant glory" (42). A potential problem Shimomura mentions but dismisses, is the ambiguity of the word *dom*, which can connote either "judgment" or "glory." The

author mentions the similarities between the Germanic praise ethos and the Christian emphasis on right action, but relegates the discussion to a footnote (44 n.45). Shimomura may overburden the distinction between the literal and figurative dimensions of the visual imagery, especially images of light and brightness, in *Christ III*; however, the essay does pose a number of important questions about the function of metaphor in the poem and the challenge of accurate interpretation.

Daniel

Paul G. Remley's "*Daniel*, the *Three Youths* fragment and the transmission of Old English verse" (*ASE* 31: 81–140) examines the possible relationships between *Daniel* and *The Canticles of the Three* Youths (or *Azarias*) by offering a stemma that shows a possible chain of transmission that would account for both the similarities and differences between the two texts (126, 128). The essay begins with a brief discussion of oral formulaic theory, asking consequent questions such as whether literate Anglo-Saxons continued to compose extemporaneous verse, whether they continued to develop the mnemonic skills of oral poets, and whether there might also have been a "literary-formulaic" idiom (81). Remley uses the variants in parallel passages of these two texts to identify points of scribal intervention and revision. Where possible, he has identified the work of "a literate Christian who was steeped in the Latin diction of the liturgy," an anonymous redactor he calls "the Canticle-Poet," drawing the name from his supposed use of the liturgical *Canticum trium puerorum* (84). The parallel passages display what Remley calls a "progressive divergence" (87), his analysis of which involves variation in lexis, morphology, syntax, phonology, and meter; by tracking the divergences, he makes a convincing case for the relative chronology of the texts and, indeed, some of their emendations. He explains that many circumstances might have caused the divergences, including increasing carelessness on the part of a scribe, worsening defects in a materially damaged exemplar, fading light, or failing memory on the one hand, and increasing accuracy with the Latin source material or improved confidence on the part of a reviser who was "a capable alliterative poet" on the other; perhaps the best explanation of the textual divergences may include elements of several of these (88–9). Remley details the use of the Old Latin canticle in the texts in a useful annotated list of the passages, then turns to possible Vulgate influence. He then describes the contributions of the Canticle-Poet in careful detail, with distinctive imagery and diction to make his case in identifying this poetic voice in the *Three Youths* passages. Further, he contends that the parallels he later shows between the two

texts "leave no reason to doubt that a poet contributing to the closing lines of *The Three Youths* was familiar with several sections of *Daniel*" (114) and that the parallels even suggest direct borrowing from *Daniel* rather than "from the formulaic word-hoard as a whole" (115). Remley then focuses on the manuscripts themselves, especially excision of a strip of parchment from folio 53 and the loss of at least one quire from Exeter 3501; without those lacunae, Remley contends that "the extant copy of *The Three Youths* … will have comprised verse corresponding in scope to the matter of Daniel III" (117). He continues, explaining the increasingly sporadic parallels as evidence of scribal revision that may have resulted in the *appearance* of divergence, reflecting "the deployment of formulaic diction by a poet (or reviser) attempting to reconstitute the substance of remembered or fragmentary verse" (118), which might be evidence of the devices of oral formulaic composition in the hands of a literate scribe faced with an incomplete or damaged text. Remley suggests that the series of errors in one short section of the texts (*Three Youths* 44–76 / *Daniel* 327–67) are attributable to a single careless scribe (135), and concludes his discussion by claiming that these texts, far from providing evidence for the standard practices of Anglo-Saxon scribes, suggest an extraordinary turn of events in the production of the *Three Youths* fragment that required "a thoroughgoing attempt at textual restoration on the part of an ambitious redactor" (136). Like all such reconstructions, the stemma is necessarily hypothetical, but it does neatly answer the questions Remley asks, and his identification of the redactor he calls the Canticle-Poet is persuasive. Finally, his analysis has implications for the dating of the Exeter Book and for the Junius MS, given that he assigns the work of the Canticle-Poet to the time of the Benedictine reforms (*ca.* 960 x *ca.* 980), which agrees with the dating proposed by Scragg and Gameson, though he regards the common antecedent text of *Daniel* and *The Three Youths* as having been produced "before the period of vigorous Benedictine reform marked by (say) Æthelwold's consecration as bishop of Winchester in 963. The transmitted text of *The Three Youths*, by contrast, is most easily viewed as a product of the reform years" (140).

M.K.R.

Dream of the Rood (see also *Ruthwell Cross Inscription*)

Works not seen

Seeta Chaganti, "Memorial and Metamorphosis: The Image of the Reliquary in the Poetry of Medieval England and France." Diss. Yale Univ., 2001. *DAI* 62A (2002): 3384.

Elene

Samantha Zacher's "Cynewulf at the Interface of Literacy and Orality: The Evidence of the Puns in *Elene*" (*Oral Tradition* 17: 346–87) provides a wide-ranging and thorough examination of the interface between orality and literacy as evidenced by wordplay in Cynewulf's *Elene*. At the outset of her study Zacher expresses some surprise that, despite Cynewulf's status as the accepted author of a significant body of Old English poetry and an important influence on other Anglo-Saxon poets, "so little scholarly attention has been focused on the extent to which Cynewulf managed to combine inherited elements of an ultimately oral poetic tradition with aspects of an imported (and ultimately Latin-derived) literate tradition of poetic compostion" (346). In what follows, Zacher may fairly be said to have almost single-handedly made up for this lack of scholarly attention. This is a study rich in detail, and Zacher reveals a keen eye (and ear) for what she terms "special linguistic features such as rhyme, echo-words, paronomasia and onomastic puns" in the poem (350). Her purpose in studying what are "held to be primarily aural phenomena" is to "illuminate the rich oral and visual texture of Cynewulf's poetry and call attention to Cynewulf's use of predominantly vernacular aural/oral elements within a narrative conspicuously derived from literate, Latinate sources" (350). The ensuing thirty pages take up each one of the features mentioned above and constitute a *tour de force* of analytical detail, which no brief summary can do justice to. The sum effect of Zacher's study lends significant weight to her concluding claim that "in the poetry of Cynewulf we witness the extent to which even a literature and Latinate Anglo-Saxon could choose to compose poetry using elements that can have been most effective only in oral performance" (380).

D.F.J.

Exodus

Damian Love's "The Old English *Exodus*. A Verse Translation" (*Neophilologus* 86: 621–39) is the first verse translation of the poem ever published, with the exception of the first 275 lines rendered in verse by S.B. Greenfield (*OEN* 21 [1987]: 15–20). Love's translation is based on P.J. Lucas's single poem edition (2nd ed. Exeter, 1994). Love notes that the only other modern edition of the poem with full apparatus is E.B. Irving, Jr.'s *The Old English Exodus* (New Haven, 1953), with supplementary materials published in "New Notes on the Old English *Exodus*" (*Anglia* 90 [1972]: 289–324) and "*Exodus* retraced" (*Old English Studies in Honour of John C. Pope*, ed. R.B. Burlin and E.B. Irving, Jr. [Toronto, 1974]); he suggests that Irving's version, while somewhat

superseded by Lucas, is especially useful "given Irving's contrasting and more skeptical attitude to allergorical readings of the poem" (621). Love acknowledges the compromises required in translating Old English alliterative verse into Modern English, and he makes transparent his aims: he approximates the four main-stress line, though he makes no attempt to conform to Sievers's categories of half-lines, and he attempts to preserve alliteration, though he admits that his adherence to the rules of Old English is relatively relaxed. "These expedients have been adopted on the grounds that an intermittent slackening of form is less detrimental than awkward articulation contrived to preserve it" (622). The poetic text is printed with the notes at the end; while this placement conforms to the usage of the journal, it makes the translation somewhat less easy to use in a classroom setting, but a Modern English translation of the entire poem is valuable indeed.

M.K.R.

Finnsburh Fragment

Jonathan Watson detects mythological kennings and other skaldic influences in the *Finnsburh* fragment ("The *Finnsburh* Skald: Kennings and Cruces in the Anglo-Saxon Fragment" [*JEGP* 101: 497–519]), a poem that has not enjoyed the same scrutiny for such features as others in the corpus. Watson first challenges the poem's widely accepted early dating, noting how "scholars have long noticed late features and a decidedly Northern edge to the poem" (498). Watson next makes the case that a later date cannot be precluded by current evidence, and posits a date of composition for the poem in the range 870–950, with a provenance of Viking-Age Northumbria. Other scholars have accepted the notion of Scandinavian coloring in the poem, but no one has entertained the possibility of the presence of mythological kennings. Following a discussion of mythological kennings in skaldic verse in general, by way of background, Watson turns first to the crux *Celæs borð* (l. 29a). The first element he takes to be an OE cognate of the Óðinn-name *Kjalarr*, while the second is to be seen as a Scandinavianism for *bord*, thus rendering the mythological kenning "Cele's board" [the shield] (506). Five lines on in the poem we encounter the second crux, Hickes's much-emended *Hwearflacra hraer* (34a). Offering compelling parallels from both ON and OE texts, Watson repunctuates the relevant lines (34a-36) and provides his own emendation (*hrær* to *hræs*):

> *Hwearf (H)lacra hræs: hræfen wandrode,*
> *sweart and sealobrun, swurdleoma stod,*
> *swylce eal Finnsburuh fyrenu wære.*

("Hlacor's storm [battle] turned: the raven wan-
dered, black and sleek-feathered; sword-gleam
shone, as if all Finnsburh were aflame.)

Watson's case for a valkyrie-name battle-kenning here
seems convincing. What does the appearance of these
two mythological kennings mean for our assessment of
the poem as a whole? The issue deserves a longer study,
but Watson tentatively concludes that we should assume
"late influence and a mixed Anglo-Norse audience" for the
poem, and that "the more agreeable scenario—materially,
linguistically, and artistically—lies in the Scandinavian set-
tlements centered around ninth- and tenth-century York,
rather than the earlier pre-Viking kingdoms of Bernicia
and Deira" (519).

D.F.J.

Genesis B

Glenn M. Davis's "Changing Senses in *Genesis B*" (*PQ*
80.2: 113–131) reads the temptation of Eve as fundamentally
involving human perception: vision, of course, but other
senses as well. Davis argues that the narrator of the poem
does not follow the three usual formulae scholars have
come to expect, given their knowledge of patristic, espe-
cially Augustinian, interpretations of the Fall: first, the cast-
ing of Adam, Eve, and the Tempter as allegories of Reason,
Sense, and Desire, respectively; second, the belief that Eve
was corrupt prior to the temptation; and third, that the Fall
is to be understood as a "crisis of linguistic interpretation"
(117). Davis associates each of these interpretations with
specific critics of *Genesis B*, explaining why their views are
both limited and limiting, as they obscure the crucial role
of the corporeal senses in the Tempter's seduction of Eve
and in Eve's subsequent seduction of Adam. The expla-
nation of Eve's altered senses is nuanced and takes into
account the deviation of *Genesis B* from the biblical nar-
rative. Where the scriptural version has two temptations—
the serpent and Eve, then Eve and Adam—the poem has
three: the two we expect preceded by the Tempter try-
ing his wiles on Adam, who refuses to eat the fruit with-
out a physical token to authenticate God's word. Having
failed with Adam, the Tempter then tries his luck with
Eve, promising her altered perception if she will eat. What
makes the poem so compelling for Davis is the fact that the
poet assumes that two changes take place simultaneously
in Eve's perception: Eve's original senses are lost, replaced
by two sets of new senses, one superimposed over the
other. "The tempter hides the perceptual change brought
on by the apple behind senses of his own making," senses
designed to deceive her as to the nature of the change (120).

The Tempter does not simply delude Eve: he literally cor-
rupts her existing senses, "and thus robs her of the ability
to interpret accurately the stimuli around her" (120). Her
altered senses cause her to see the false vision of heaven,
which will serve as the token that Adam demanded and
will be the undoing of them both; once he eats, Eve loses
the false sight the Tempter had given her, for it has served
its purpose in deceiving Adam. "For the Tempter and for
the poet, the deception must not occur outside of Eve's fac-
ulty of perception, but fundamentally within it" (121). In
this reading, the temptation faced by both Eve and Adam
is the same: "the promise of senses capable of perceiving
the transcendent and the divine" (125).

In "Pilate's Visionary Wife and the Innocence of Eve: An
Old Saxon Source for the Old English *Genesis B*" (*JEGP*
101: 170–84), Thomas D. Hill also strives to rehabilitate
Eve's reputation by suggesting that she is in fact "subjec-
tively innocent" and that the poet comments that she acted
in good faith when she persuaded Adam to eat the fruit
(170). Like Davis, Hill notes that the Tempter promises Eve
enhanced sight, including the ability to see God, which is
traditionally the supreme reward of the blessed (171). Also
like Davis, Hill concludes that the reason Eve did not per-
ceive her fallen state after she ate the fruit but before she
tempted Adam was because she "is still affected by the
vision the tempter has deceptively granted her" (173);
she tries to persuade Adam to follow what she genuinely
believes is her good example. Hill suggests that this decep-
tive vision may have been inspired by the strikingly similar
vision of Pilate's wife in the Old Saxon *Heliand* (175). The
parallels Hill notes are as follows: "in both narratives a true
spiritual vision is granted to a woman, but this vision is not
from God, but ultimately from Satan"; the woman in each
narrative is morally innocent of ill intent or actual trans-
gression; "while both Procla [Pilate's wife] and Eve see
spiritual truths that otherwise would be hidden from them,
the spiritual being who grants the vision is hostile and is
attempting to frustrate the will of God" (177–78). Further,
both visions are waking visions and both poets "adapt a
resonant Germanic motif to the context of diabolic tempta-
tion" (178); in *Genesis B*, this is the scene where the Tempter
arms himself and dons a *hæleðhelm*, a helmet of conceal-
ment similar to magical devices and clothing mentioned in
Germanic lore, though the poet does not make clear how
the Tempter uses this helm (178–79). Further, Hill argues
that it is more likely that the *Heliand* was the model for
Genesis B than vice versa: Procla's vision is attested in the
gospel source, whereas Eve's is not founded on scriptural
or exegetical material (179–80). Because the poet wished
to establish the innocence of Eve, he used another vision as
his model, one in which the dreamer also has a vision true

in substance, but sent by a demon in order to thwart the plans of God. Hill continues by demonstrating the deeply Germanic nature of the additions to the *Genesis B* account: Satan "depicted as a Germanic lord rebelling against his rightful king" (182); the variation and repetition involved in the stories of Satan's fall and that of Adam and Eve; the subversion of appropriate hierarchy; Satan is "clearly a man and a warrior and the story of his fall is a man's story of heroic pride, warfare, and eventual defeat" (183). Further, Eve is a Germanic woman who serves as an adviser to her husband; in this way, Eve is "in a sense fulfilling a quite traditional role in counseling her husband. It is simply that Eve is unlike the traditional Germanic heroine in that the advice she offers happens to be wrong" (183). In this way, the *Genesis B* poet almost creates a new myth, according to Hill, "a specifically Saxon account of the fall in which Eve quite innocently ensnares her husband and occasions the 'fyrenearfeða' (the enormous hardships) of her descendants" (184).

M.K.R.

The Grave

Jennifer Ramsay's note suggests that the verses generally considered to be additions to *The Grave*, appearing on fol. 170r of Oxford, Bodl. Lib. MS Bodley 343, were written by the scribe known as "the tremulous hand of Worcester" (*N&Q* n.s. 49: 178–80). Ramsay argues that the date of the lines and the early career of the tremulous hand may coincide in the first quarter of the thirteenth century, and that paleographical and contextual elements are consistent with the early work of the tremulous hand, such as Worcester Cathedral MS F.174, which contains, among other texts, *The Soul's Address to the Body*. Ramsay details the letter shapes that provide her paleographical evidence, then points to parallels between the *Soul's Address* and *The Grave* that suggest that the *Soul's Address* could have been the exemplar for *The Grave*, especially since "the tremulous hand is known to have copied the *Soul's Address* in Worcester Cathedral MS F.174 and he may have been compelled to add verses to *The Grave* with its already borrowed verses" (180).

M.K.R.

Guthlac A

The structure of the poem known as *Guthlac A* has long been a source of critical debate, particularly the opening lines. As Manish Sharma notes in "A Reconsideration of the Structure of *Guthlac A*: The Extremes of Saintliness," (*JEGP* 101: 185–200), these lines have been variously identified as an accretion or the conclusion of *Christ III*.

Scholars have excluded some or all of the initial ninety-three lines in their editions of the text, but recent examination suggests that the lines serve an important function within the poem (185). Sharma argues that these initial lines are integral to the poem and that the poem is best understood as tripartite in structure, with the first twenty-nine lines describing the first of the "three thresholds of primary significance" around which the poem is organized: the gates of heaven (ll. 1–29); the brink of hell (ll. 557–683); and the gates of heaven again (ll. 781–818) (186). Sharma notes that the notion of movement to and across these thresholds, both physical and spiritual, is central to the poet's concept of saintliness, and he examines the verbal echoes in each of the "threshold passages" to demonstrate the connections between them, especially *-gong*, *-fara*, *lædan*, *beorg*. One way Sharma contrasts the movement of demons and Guthlac's movements is to point out that the demons' motion in the poem is circular—they rise only to fall again—whereas Guthlac's trajectory is linear: he rises and gains admittance into heaven. Not only are their trajectories different, their ability to cross or be made to cross these thresholds sets them apart: the demons cannot cross the threshold into heaven, nor can the saintly Guthlac be cast into hell; instead, he rises to heaven. This ascension is central to the eremitic model of saintliness that Sharma believes the poem advocates. "[T]he imagery of the three critical episodes of *Guthlac A* depicts an approach to a threshold and … the potential for crossing those thresholds is first delayed, then averted, then realized. The tripartite structure of the poem permits the poet to traverse the whole of the Christian cosmos, bestowing both universal scope and considerable cohesiveness upon his work. This structural cohesiveness is only augmented by the unifying motif of physical and spiritual 'ascension' that runs through the poem and sharpens the presentation of the struggle between the saintly and the demonic" (200). In this way, a saint exists always in liminal spaces: "it is by moving to the extremes demanded of him by his faith that he separates himself from the rest of humankind and is assured of movement across the final threshold of existence separating him from God" (200).

M.K.R.

Judith

One of the challenges faced by readers of the poetic *Judith* is reconciling seemingly contradictory views of Judith as both a holy virgin and experienced widow, both an Anglo-Saxon noblewoman, with the emphasis squarely on her feminine nature, and a woman intruding upon the realm of masculinity, albeit for a good cause. In "Gender and

Heroism in the Old English *Judith*" (in *Writing Gender and Genre in Medieval Literature: Approaches to Old and Middle English Texts*, ed. Elaine Treharne [Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer], 5–18), Hugh Magennis suggests ways in which to reconcile the contradiction implied by a figure whose role as a woman should lead her to be a wise counselor and peaceweaver, but who instead beheads the general of the opposing army. Magennis begins by describing the generally accepted view of female virtue in Anglo-Saxon tradition as "epitomized in the dutiful and courteous figures of Wealhtheow, Freawaru, Hildeburh and Hygd in *Beowulf*" (7). The situation in the poem is such, however, that the traditional gender roles cannot stand because the world of the poem does not present the usual situation to be resolved by masculine heroism or feminine peaceweaving; it is "an exception to the norm" (8). Although Judith is not male, some of the epithets used of heroic figures are employed to describe her, making her position in the action even more ambiguous; indeed, "[i]n killing Holofernes and inspiring her people, Judith takes on the role of the male hero of traditional poetry" (9). Because the situation is unusual, Judith does not lose her female qualities by taking on a man's job, and Magennis points out that the poet does not overcompensate for her heroic action by stressing her sexual allure; in fact, the poet edits out the original sense of the biblical text, that Judith applies her sexual wiles in order to seduce Holofernes into a vulnerable position. Rather, he is responsible for his downfall because of his drunkenness and lechery. For Magennis "[h]er qualities of radiance and wisdom, along with her courage, are what are most emphasised in her portrayal in the poem" (10). Judith is far less a beautiful Christian virgin and martyr than a widowed Germanic noblewoman; indeed, her chastity is not insisted upon by the poet at all. Magennis argues that the vocabulary used to describe Judith has far less to do with her physical beauty than with the "radiance of personality or inner spirit" (13). Perhaps this is the reason the poet omits Judith from the feasting scene: "[t]here is no place for a gracious noblewoman at the disordered feast of Holofernes" (13). This highly feminine character is masculinized to the extent that she has courage and gains victory by physically defeating her opponent, but Magennis points out that "[t]he heroic epithets attached applied to her are invariably accompanied by a feminizing noun" (14). Even what seems to be terribly masculine behavior—the beheading of Holofernes—is actually feminine, given that no self-respecting Germanic warrior would attack a helplessly drunken opponent, drag that opponent about by the hair, or require two blows to sever the head from the body (17). Judith is heroic but not masculine in this view; rather, she is a Germanic noblewoman rising to an unusual challenge, using her virtues of courage, resolution, and faith

to accomplish a task for which she is essentially unsuited, thereby underscoring the depth of those virtues.

Also interested in troubling cruces in the poem, Fred C. Robinson offers "Five Textual Notes on the Old English *Judith*" (*ANQ* 15.2: 47–51). The first concerns ll. 34–7, wherein Holofernes orders Judith be brought to him arrayed in finery. Robinson suggests that while Holofernes so commands her adornment, we have no evidence that she appears as he wishes; second, Robinson locates a motive for the poet's ambivalence to her appearance in Aldhelm's *De Virginitate*, which awkwardly condemns ostentatious dress while praising Judith's use thereof. By ignoring the issue of her dress, save to suggest that Holofernes wished her to be ornamented, the poet avoids the awkward contradiction with which Aldhelm grapples. The second passage, ll. 46b–54, describes the net hung round Holofernes's bed. Robinson restores the *ond* deleted by E.V.K. Dobbie (restored in Griffith's edition) and removes an editorial comma to achieve a smoother reading: "A beautiful curtain was there, all of gold and hung round the commander's bed so that the evil prince of warriors could look through [it]." As Robinson notes, "[p]revious commentators have spoken of the curtain as some kind of mysterious two-way mirror, but the poet seems in fact to be saying that it was simply a matter of how the folds of the curtain were arranged" (48). The third note deals with ll. 92–4 and 97–8, in which modifiers often translated as adjectives are construed by Robinson as adverbs instead, with Modern English quotations of the lines. In lines 267–9, the question of how Holofernes's soldiers can be both "emboldened" and "gloomy" is answered by Robinson's suggestion that *gebylde* be construed as the past participle of *bylgan* rather than *byldan*, rendering the sense "The warriors stood around their prince's tent greatly vexed, gloomy." Robinson ends with the warriors trying discreetly to rouse Holofernes, not realizing that he lies dead. Past interpretations of *cohhetan*, a *hapax legomenon*, have had the soldiers "lament," "bluster," "cry out," and "shout." Robinson agrees with Griffith, Timmer, and Hall, making quick work of the problem by demonstrating that Holofernes's men announce their presence by coughing, with this the earliest attested form of that verb.

                                                                                                                                                M.K.R.

Meters of Boethius

Paul E. Szarmach's note "*Meter 20*: Context Bereft" (*ANQ* 15: 28–34) emphasizes the need to return to the manuscript contexts of the Old English texts and highlights in particular editorial choices made by Walter Sedgfield in his editon of the Old English translation of Boethius's *De*

Consolatione Philosophiae "in the face of fundamental textual difficulties with Otho A. vi that have not stood the test of time" (28). Sedgefield obscured the role of the damaged text that appears in London, BL, MS Cotton Otho A.vi, and Szarmach's discussion demonstrates how this "loss of manuscript context skews interpretation" (29). Sedgefield's insertion of the prose version of *Meter 20* found in Oxford, Bodl. Lib. MS Bodley 180 reflects a contemporary bias in privileging the poetry by separating *metra* from *prosae*. Szarmach shows, by means of the Otho version of *Meter 20*, that we stand to miss out on valuable insights concerning the genesis and central function of the two versions when, as Sedgefield did, we separate the prose from the poetry and remove them from their context in the manuscript. "The consensus sees the issue as a question of authorial or compositional stages where presumably the prose *Boethius* that Bodley 180 represents was a necessary draft that became a verse text. The audience or cultural function of a text suggests a potentially different possibility. It is this function that the long shadow of Bodley 180 obscures in Sedgefield's edition" (32).

D.F.J.

Works not seen

Sato, Kiriko, "Case-forms and *mid*-Phrases in the Old English *Metres of Boethius*: A Comparison with the Prose Version," *Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature* 17: 41–58.

Phoenix

Bruce Mitchell once again questions the application of modern punctuation (English or German) to Old English texts in "*Phoenix* 71-84 and 424-42: Two Syntactical Cruces Involving Punctuation" (*ANQ* 15: 38–46). It is a point worth making again and again. After all, if modern editorial practice dictates a greater respect for manuscript context (see Szarmach, above), why does this respect not extend to the punctuation, as well? Mitchell poses the question with regard to *Phoenix* 71–84: "Do we need such heavy stopping to make the meaning clear? Can we not give these fourteen lines a fairer wind? Further discussion is necessary before we can answer this question" (39). In the course of that discussion Mitchell surveys the punctuation of this passage by four editors, unravels difficult syntactical knots, and repunctuates the passage according to the Mitchell-Irvine system. The result uses five marks of punctuation instead of the much heavier twelve to sixteen of the other editors, produces an Old English text that is elegantly and comprehensibly punctuated, and a Modern

English translation that makes sense. Mitchell does the same with lines 424–42, and it emerges from his treatment of these passages that they should be considered continuous verse paragraphs. In the course of his study Mitchell refuses to take part in the "series of recurring exhumation ceremonies in which old explanations are dug up, reexamined, rejected and reinterred" (39), with one exception: Otto Schlotterose's 1909 editon reveals that he alone of the older editors understood the syntax of *Phoenix* 424–42. Mitchell's repunctuated interpretations of these difficult passages in the *Phoenix* should be consulted by every student of the poem.

D.F.J.

Riddles

Although the overall number of articles, essays, and notes on Old English poetry (not counting *Beowulf*) published in 2002 is somewhat lower than in previous years, Riddle scholarship continues at a prodigious rate and even goes as far afield as the University of Silesia, from where we have Rafał Borysławski's "The Elements of Anglo-Saxon Wisdom Poetry in the *Exeter Book* Riddles" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 38: 35–47). Borysławski's argument is twofold, one part of which is very smart and accords well with much recent scholarship in Old English poetry that seeks to reconfigure how we understand "genre" in Old English poetry. The other side of the argument, that the Anglo-Saxon Riddles, regardless of their solemn or "shameful" subject matter, have as "their main feature … the contemplation of the divine creation" (39), is perhaps a too-narrow conception of the Riddles' social and cultural functions, as well as their richly ambiguous complexities, a subject that has been explored in depth in recent years by various scholars (see, especially, Michelle Igarashi's 1999 dissertation "A Contextual Study of the *Exeter Book* Riddles" [Diss. SUNY at Stony Brook, *DAI* 60A: 2914], Robert DiNapoli, "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 [2000]: 422–55, and Nina Rulon-Miller, "Sexual Humor and Fettered Desire in Exeter Book Riddle 12," *Humour in Anglo-Saxon Literature*, ed. Jonathon Wilcox [Cambridge, 2000], 99–126; all reviewed in *OEN* 35.2). Borysławski's primary and most important argument is that we need to recognize that many of the Anglo-Saxon Riddles are actually a form of wisdom literature, and further, wisdom literature, such as the *Maxims*, are themselves "riddlic," and therefore we should not insist on a too-rigid discrimination between the two genres. Although his essay is fairly short and does not include footnotes (only a short list of works cited),

Borysławski covers a wide range of Old English literary texts, including references to and selections from *Maxims*, *The Soul and Body*, *Christ II*, *Seafarer*, *Solomon and Saturn*, *The Fortunes of Men*, and Riddles 26, 30a, 31, 32, 39, 40, 47, 55, and 94 (following Bernard Muir's 1994 edition). According to Borysławski, all writing in Old English was concerned with learning and is therefore essentially didactic in nature, but also allegorical—always pointing to hidden and "sublime" meanings. In terms of function, idiom, and form, Borysławski sees the Riddles and gnomic verses, when read together, as texts that interweave parallel themes of didacticism and esotericism. After pointing out riddlic elements in gnomic texts such as *Solomon and Saturn* and *The Fortunes of Men*, Borysławski turns his primary attention to the Riddles. Riddle 43, commonly solved as "soul," is explained as an exemplification of the moral lesson conveyed in the poetic text that precedes it in the Exeter Book, *The Soul and Body*. Riddle 39, notoriously resistant to an agreed-upon solution ("moon," "day," "time," and "creature death" are some of the answers that have been proposed), is seen by Borysławski as sharing elements commonly found in the more elegiac wisdom verses, such as those found in *Maxims*. Some Riddles, according to Borysławski, are even "meta-riddlic"—they ask questions concerning their own nature and they are, as it were, their own solutions" (44). Examples of this type analyzed by Borysławski are Riddles 47 ("book-moth") and 94, which "seems to refer to the question of wisdom in terms open to various conjectures" (45), and which Borysławski solves as *giedd*, or "song/lay/poem/speech/tale/sermon/proverb/riddle" (others have proposed "a wandering singer," "prostitute," "riddle," "moon," "soul," "spirit," and "book"). For Borysławski, the term *giedd* ultimately denotes a "textual composition aimed at facilitating intellectual insight, and not necessarily excluding the spheres of play and entertainment" (46). It is the term *giedd*, finally, that "conjoins the riddles with the gnomic poetry by implying active intellectual participation of their audience, forced to search for solutions, just as other didactic texts imply the search for self-improvement and self-understanding" (46).

In "Runes and Riddles in Anglo-Saxon England" ('*Lastworda Betst*', ed. Hough and Lowe, 264–77), an essay that remained unpublished at the time of her death, Christine Fell takes on the assumptions of two scholars in particular, Margaret Schlauch and Eric Moltke, who Fell believes have overlooked the "wealth of tradition for prosopopoeia in vernacular Anglo-Saxon, whether in terms of epigraphy or vernacular riddle" (264; as regards Schlauch's work, Fell is referring to Schlauch's essay "The 'Dream of the Rood' as Prosopopoeia," *Essays and Studies in Honor of Carleton Brown* [New York, 1940], 23–34). Further, Fell

wants to argue against Moltke's assertion in his major 1976 work, *Runerne i Danmark og deres oprindelse* (translated into English in 1985 by Peter Foote as *Runes and Their Origins: Denmark and Elsewhere*), that "a prosopopoeic runic inscription can only be late" (264). Moltke's mistake, in Fell's opinion, is in assuming that the Scandinavian runic world is the whole runic world or the whole Germanic epigraphic world, and also in stating, as he does in his book, that objects themselves do not speak, because when looking at inscriptions on objects where a text "ends in a verb, whether it be a verb of writing, making, owning or painting, that is to say a two-word statement of which the first word is a proper name, the second a verb and the object taken for granted, Moltke invariably completes the text with a common noun—bracketed of course" (265). In other words, Moltke "does not envisage the possibility that the original composer of the text might have completed the sentence differently, 'X made me,' because of course he has already decided that the formula could not have existed" (265–66). Fell also wants to quibble with Moltke's assertion, based on the corpus of inscriptions he analyzed, that the verb *wurkian* cannot have the material thing that is crafted, such as a buckle, as its object, but is instead referring to the runes themselves which have been "worked" into the buckle. Fell disagrees and asserts that "in both Gothic and Old English there is a compelling range of examples of *wyrcan/waurkjan* denoting the creation of artefacts, in Gothic of course only in manuscript, in English in both manuscript and epigraphy, roman and runic alike" (266). Moltke's fault, in Fell's view, is in overlooking Anglo-Saxon England entirely, while Schlauch, although analyzing an Old English poem in relation to the classical tradition of prosopopoeia, "paid no attention whatsoever to the epigraphical material" (266). But Anglo-Saxon literary culture contains a rich corpus of vernacular poetry and runic game-playing, as well as an epigraphical tradition that includes runic and roman inscription and even poetry, and all of these "can be cross-referenced to make a much fuller picture of how people wrote and what formulae they had at their disposal than can be derived from early Scandinavian runic material, which exists in isolation from either parallel epigraphic traditions or alternate forms of surviving text" (267). Fell first looks at some examples of inscribed objects from the Anglo-Saxon tradition that use the verb *wyrcan*, such as the ninth- or tenth-century Alfred jewel and the eighth-century Mortain casket, where the verb *wyrcan* clearly denotes the object itself and not its inscription. Fell also looks at the tenth- or eleventh-century Brussels Cross, which is an interesting example of two forms of reference being utilized—"i.e., one in which the object is the purported speaker and refers to itself as 'me,' and another in which the human controller

of the action is the speaker and the artefact defined by common noun, exist side by side on the same object" (267). Fell also argues here that Moltke's restriction of the semantic range of the verb *wurkian*, to include only the creation of runes, elides the fact that in Old English, the verb *wyrcan* denotes a wide range of made objects, from writing to books to ships to medicinal salves to weapons and beyond. Fell also looks at two verbs that are closely related to *wyrcan*, *writan* "write," (but also to "incise" or "cut") and *agrafan* "engrave," commenting on their use in the Derbyshire bone plate, the Old English *Orosius*, the ninth-century Lancashire ring, and *The Husband's Message*. Fell next turns to the Anglo-Saxon vernacular riddle tradition to further supplement her case that "[t]he tradition of objects naming or describing themselves has a long-standing history in the Anglo-Saxon poetic tradition" (269). In order to establish an early date for the Anglo-Saxon riddlic mode of writing, Fell first poses the provocative idea that vernacular versions of riddles may have preceded rather than followed from the Anglo-Latin tradition, while also pointing out that prosopopoeia was a common device in the Latin riddles. Fell confesses that she has "long been puzzled" by the arrangement of the poems in the Exeter Book, and she believes it is "important to remember that though we have the occasional riddle and the 'elegaic' motif in vernacular poems outside the Exeter Book, it is only this particular codex collection that gives us any feel for the range. We would barely know of the existence of either genre without its survival" (272). Fell also feels that it is "also extremely odd that the elegies are so totally without personal and place-name information" (272), which is in stark contrast to poems such as *Beowulf* and *The Battle at Maldon*. Could it be, then, that Exeter Book poems such as *The Wife's Lament* and *The Ruin* are also riddles of a type, and the author of the Exeter Book simply moved, without "hang-ups," from the voices of inanimate objects to the voices of human personas, interchanging at the same time the devices of prosopopoeia and ethopoeia? Ultimately, in Fell's mind, the rich cross-referencing that appears to (or might) exist between, say, the Franks Casket and *The Wife's Lament*, and between *The Dream of the Rood* and the Ruthwell Cross, between poetry and runic inscription, as well as the abundance of casual graffiti and trivial inscription on Norse and Anglo-Saxon objects, such as combs and the bones of animals, suggests that we have underestimated "the extent to which prosopopoeia was for the Anglo-Saxons a way of thinking, and that once we have seen this we can see links between runic and riddling traditions that have been insufficiently considered" (276). Fell concludes her essay with a brief look at Cynewulf's problematic runic signature in *Juliana*, to demonstrate that even a learned and religious writer such as Cynewulf was not averse to game-

playing to make a didactic point, and she suggests a rewriting of R.I. Page's solution to this runic signature (from *An Introduction to English Runes*), while also indicating that her suggested rewrite "requires to be defended at greater length" (277). The essay ends somewhat abruptly—though this does not detract at all from its obvious salience—and the editors of '*Lastworda Betst*' indicate in their headnote that Fell had "intended to add, as appendices, comprehensive lists of inscriptions using forms of the verbs *wyrcan* or *facere*" (264).

Eugene Green undertakes a semiotic analysis of compounds and *hapax legomena* in the Exeter Book Riddles and *Beowulf* ("Semiotics of compounds in Old English riddles" [*New Insights in Germanic Linguistics II*, ed. Rauch and Carr, 45–55]), in order to demonstrate that the Riddles, "as a whole, have a proportionately greater incidence of hapax legomena compounds, of which a significant number center on craftsmanship. Further, although in 'Beowulf' rhetorical variation is rich, its frequency for compounds, whether hapax legomena or not, is proportionately less than in the riddles" (52–53). Regardless of their affinities to "putative" sources, Green would like to argue for the Riddles' "singularity," which he believes can best be explained in relation to the particular circumstances of the lives and labors of the scribes who produced them, and therefore, the Riddles "speak to the circumstances and intellectual engagements of their producers" (54). Basing his analysis on Krapp and Dobbie's edition of the Exeter Book and on Klaeber's edition of *Beowulf*, and using chi-square tests, Green first points out that, "of the 315 compound words in the collection of riddles, 152 are hapax legomena, nearly one half," which is "substantial, inasmuch as it compares closely with the rich incidence of compounds in 'Beowulf', 1149, of which 578 are hapax legomena, a little more than half" (45). Green then spends some time discussing the differences between compounds that have transparent meanings and those that are more figurative in nature. For the former, he provides the example of *hygecræftig* from Riddle 1, which "has a meaning 'wise' transparently derived from the gloss for each member in the compound: 'thought' for *hyge* and 'skillful' for *cræftig*" (46). As an example of the latter, Green provides Riddle 3's *brimgiesta* 'of the sailors', which is "figuratively derived from the gloss for its members: 'sea' for *brim* and 'guest' for *giest*" (46). Following the work in semantics of Gennaro Chierchia and Sally McConnell-Ginet (*Meaning and Grammar* [Cambridge, MA, 1990]), Green asserts that, "in regard to figurative language, a speaker's utterance, although 'conventionally informative', may have a purpose 'quite secondary' or unrelated to 'straightforward communication'," and it is not "the essential quality of riddles that

they be uniquely analyzable for all in the manner of a 'good' sentence. They are MEANT to be difficult or impossible. Their essential characteristic is that they should be rescannable in terms of the correct solution when it is offered" (47). Green then looks at forty-seven instances of figurative compounds in the Riddles, which are both *hapax legomena* and kennings, and "the ratio of 47 kennings among 152 hapax legomena in the riddles exceeds the ratio found in 'Beowulf', 79 kennings in a total of 578 hapax legomena," which supports a conclusion that "the 'Beowulf' poet's inventiveness in devising compounds differs from that of the riddlers" (48). At the same time, the fact that both the riddlers and the *Beowulf* poet "do not differ significantly in relying on small ratios of traditional kennings speaks to their commitment to a freshness of language" (49). Green is next interested in looking at compounds for artisanry and rhetoric in the Riddles and *Beowulf*, because his survey of compounds in the Riddles "underscores convincingly enough an attention to forms concerned with crafted objects" (50). Of the *hapax legomena* in the Riddles, "twenty-one compounds imply at least some connection with handicraft," and *Beowulf* "exemplifies fifty-seven [of this type of] hapax legomena, many of them descriptive of weapons" (50). As to compounds related to speech, song, and writing, in regard to both rhetorical and scribal practices, he finds twelve *hapax legomena* in the Riddles, and *Beowulf* has ten such compounds. Once again, the Riddles are found to be richer in the frequency of *hapax legomena* compounds for crafted objects and forms of expression. Green also analyzes the technique of variation—"renaming in different ways"—in both the Riddles and *Beowulf*, and he finds that "the incidence of variation in the riddles that conjoins hapax legomena compounds to other words constitutes a significantly higher ratio than what is true of 'Beowulf,' and the "disparity in variation for compounds in the riddles and in 'Beowulf' that are not hapax legomena is even greater" (52). Obviously, rhetorical variation in *Beowulf* is rich, but the frequency of compounds overall is less than in the Riddles, and what all of this ultimately means, in Green's view, is that the variation and higher number of compounds in the Riddles attests to a manuscript context in which "scribes continually attended to texts and their meanings as elucidated by the apparatus of annotation" (53), and further, in their struggles to locate Old English equivalents for infrequently occurring Latin terms, they might often have resorted to the inventiveness of compounds and plausible *hapax legomena*. Finally, the subject matter of Green's analysis—"hapax legomena compounds, a superordinate category for forms of craftsmanship, and variation—have their semiotic complements in the work of scribes" (53). But what if the scribes began, as Fell suggests in her essay reviewed above, not with the

Latin tradition, but with their own vernacular tradition of riddling, which might have preceded the Anglo-Latin tradition? Food for thought.

What if the Old English "Dough" Riddle (K-D 45) has less to do with sex, as many have imagined it does, and more to do with a specific women's magic ritual (albeit one which appears to possess a somewhat threatening sexual component)? Such is the provocative argument of Thomas D. Hill's short essay, "The Old English Dough Riddle and the Power of Women's Magic: The Traditional Context of Exeter Book Riddle 45" (*Via Crucis*, ed. Hall, 50–60). Hill begins by asking us to consider how difficult the original text actually is (the poem contains two *hapax legomena*, one very rare noun, one emendation, and two relatively rare verbs), and how the supposedly simple "double-entendre" meaning of Riddle 45 is mainly based on scholarly conjecture—a scholarly conjecture, moreover, that is primarily rooted in modern assumptions about supposedly positive folk attitudes toward sexuality in Anglo-Saxon England, and therefore, Hill believes it would be fruitful to explore some of the *later* "literary and folkloric analogues of the Old English Dough Riddle because these analogues have not been recognized, because the texts are of very real interest in their own right, and because these texts allow us to speculate about the 'literary history' of the Old English poem with much more assurance" (52). In other words, considering the possible subsequent "reception history" of a particular riddle, while only indirectly relevant to the context of Anglo-Saxon England, is still a critical aid for understanding the cultural origins and allusions of the Old English text. Hill starts his survey with the seventeenth-century antiquarian John Aubrey, whose manuscripts included a collection published in the nineteenth century as *Remaines of Gentilisme and Judaisme*, which includes "a series of notes on 'pagan' folk belief and folk practice which Aubrey observed in his investigations" (52). One of these practices Aubrey observed was a game of "molding cockle-bread," in which "young wenches have a wanton sport … viz. they gett upon a Table-board, and then gather-up their knees & their coates with their hands as high as they can, and then they wabble to and fro with their Buttocks, as if the[y] were kneading of Dowgh with their A—." (quoted by Hill, 52). Of important note in Aubrey's entry is that he also references (somewhat incorrectly) a text of Burchard of Worms (*ca.* 965–1025), the "Corrector et Medicus," the nineteenth book of Burchard's *Decretum* (a penitential), one of the sections of which is concerned with women's magic. Following Aubrey's lead, Hill looks at the "Corrector et Medicus" and finds there an assignment of a penance of two years for women who "lie down on their face and having uncovered their buttocks,

they order that bread should be made upon [their] nude buttocks; and having cooked it they give it to their husbands to eat. This they do so that they [their husbands] should burn with love for them [the wives]" (translated by Hill, 54 n. 7). Hill concludes that Burchard must have regarding "using magic bread to increase one's husband's ardor as a grave offense" (54). Hill cautions, however, that "The correspondences and differences between the Old English riddle and these customs [observed and described by Aubrey and Burchard] needs to be defined with some care" (55), mainly because there are not clear textual parallels between the riddle and Aubrey's and Burchard's writings, and further, "the actions defined in these various 'texts' is quite different"; at the same time, "the figurative association of kneading dough and sexual intercourse is implicit" in all three instances (55). On a more cultural-historical level, Hill notes that "The line between what is playful and what is magic in popular custom is clearly difficult to determine.… And the line between what is joking and what is serious in games and rituals of this sort is particularly obscure" (56). And even if we consider Riddle 45 to be "obscene," as many have concluded, this implies, in Hill's mind, that Anglo-Saxon readers "would have understood the distinction between obscene and conventional literary discourse in approximately the same terms that modern readers do. It is far from clear that they did" (56). Hill is willing to concede, though, that the Dough Riddle and others like it in the Exeter Book display an "amused tolerance" of sexuality which sets them apart from medieval Christian discourse that typically condemns sexual desire as sinful. Providing evidence of further instances of the game of molding cockle-bread in English literature and folk custom, Hill includes examples from George Peele's 1595 play *The Old Wives' Tale* and an 1890s compendium titled *The Traditional Games of England, Scotland, and Ireland*. Hill believes the Old English Dough Riddle can be read "against" later texts related to it with some profit, and "while they are all related, what they share is not any necessary connection to one specific tradition of ritual, magic, or game, but rather common assumptions about a certain set of metaphors" (59). Hill worries that Anglo-Saxonists have been too wary about analyzing the traces of pagan customs and beliefs in the corpus of Old English literature, but Burchard's text "is clear evidence of a tradition of Germanic women's magic on the Continent," and the Dough Riddle "may provide some evidence about archaic traditions of Anglo-Saxon women's magic" (60).

Michelle Igarashi's "Riddles" (*A Companion to Old and Middle English Literature*, ed. Lambdin and Lambdin, 336–51) serves as a brief introduction to the Exeter Book Riddles and the Anglo-Saxon riddling tradition. Igarashi begins by providing a codicological description of the Exeter Book, and also provides the details of its provenance and the number and arrangement of the Riddles in the codex. According to Igarashi, whose recent dissertation was a contextual study of the Old English riddling tradition (reviewed in *OEN* 35.2), the Exeter Book riddles provide a unique window on the literary Anglo-Saxon world, reveal the "traditions, norms, and values" of this early English culture, and provide "a glimpse into everyday Anglo-Saxon existence not presented in other poetic genres" (337). Igarashi next provides information on the Latin and Anglo-Latin riddling traditions (Symphosius, Aldhelm, Eusebius, and Tatwine), and makes the argument that, while the Latin riddles are overtly concerned with teaching the Latin language and poetic form, and therefore "neglect the 'game' qualities of the genre," the Old English riddles possess more of a "folk" or oral quality and "maintain the basic interrogative nature of the riddles" (340). In order to illustrate her point, Igarashi undertakes a comparative analysis of Symphosius's Riddle 61, *Ancora*, with Exeter Book Riddle 16 (also generally solved as "anchor"). In order to demonstrate how the Old English riddles are ultimately "literary" in form and nature, Igarashi explicates Riddles 57 ("swallows") and 44 (a double-entendre riddle typically solved as "key"). Igarashi's final concern is with the literary history of the Old English riddle genre, and she provides an overview of all of the editions of the Exeter Book Riddles (from Thorpe's in 1842 to Muir's in 1994), as well as of the major scholarly attempts to provide solutions to the Riddles, to catalogue the history of the various proposed solutions, and to map out the Riddles' sources and analogues. Igarashi concludes by providing brief references to some of the longest-running scholarly debates related to the Riddles, relative to their authorship, the unity of the collection as a whole, their "Latinity," and the possible connections between the Anglo-Latin and Old English riddling tradition. Ultimately, in Igarashi's view, the Old English Riddles reveal both "the Anglo-Saxon literary consciousness, and … the world around us" (348).

Audrey Meaney's essay, "Birds on the Stream of Consciousness: Riddles 7 to 10 of the Exeter Book" (*Medieval Animals*, ed. Pluskowski, *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 18: 120–52), takes its title from a 1962 essay by R.M. Dawson, "The Structure of the Old English Gnomic Poems," where he argued that the Gnomic verses hang together by a kind of "stream of consciousness," and Meaney argues that Riddles 7 to 10—all bird riddles—similarly "hang together for reasons unstated as well as stated" (141). Meaney begins her essay with the curious statement that "relatively few scholars have looked for links between riddles, even when there are similarities of themes" (120),

because, historically, scholars have preferred to concentrate their energies on providing solutions to particular riddles or on analyzing the Riddles' composition and rhetoric. But in recent years, there *has* been an explosion of Riddle scholarship that argues links, thematic and otherwise, between the Exeter Book Riddles, such as writings by John Tanke and Edward Irving in 1994, E.G. Stanley in 1995, Robert DiNapoli, Michelle Igarashi, D.K. Smith, and Edith Whitehurst Williams in 2000, and Patrizia Lendinara in 2001. While it is true that much Riddle scholarship is devoted to solving specific riddles, an interest in exploring connections between the Riddles, especially in relation to various social aspects of Anglo-Saxon culture, is definitely the ascendant pattern. Meaney's interest is not so much in the way the four bird riddles reflect a shared set of social or cultural concerns, so much as they might reflect the interest in local ornithology and natural history of one particular author and/or editor who chose to group the four riddles together in the codex. Meaney acknowledges that "There is nothing in the manuscript which sets these four riddles apart from those preceding and succeeding them" (120), but what Meaney does detect are correspondences between the descriptions of each bird, such that the bird of each riddle "suggests" the bird that follows it. Therefore, Riddles 7 through 10 move from

> the Mute Swan which makes its almost heavenly music with its wings, to the Nightingale which makes all too earthly music with its voice, and which announces spring and encourages lust, to the Cuckoo, which also announces spring, and which is in metaphor a seducer of married women … and whose offspring destroys the children of a legitimate marriage, and finally to the sea-bird, which also appears only seasonally, but in winter, and whose birth is only explained due to a strange, sexless mystery. (141)

Further, the sea-bird "fittingly brings the group to a close and might also be regarded as a type of Christ, with a kind of virgin birth, a baptism in the water, and an ascension" (141). Because Meaney admits an "amateurish interest" in birds, and because "natural history (as opposed to the environment) has not changed greatly over the centuries" (120), she also offers some additional guesses as to the species of the birds in question, although for the most part, she sticks to the solutions that already have wide acceptance. Therefore, she agrees that Riddle 7 is likely "swan," but she would like to support P. Kitson's suggestion that it is the Mute Swan (*Cygnus olor*), and not the wild swan, or whistling swan (*Cygnus ferus*), suggested by Tupper and Williamson. For Riddle 8, Meaney agrees with "nightingale"

as the solution, but she makes it clear that she is aware of the discomfort many scholars have over the idea that the nightingale's song is "scurrilous" (derived from the OE *sceawendwisan* in line 9 of the riddle, and usually associated with *sceawendspræc*, which is glossed as *scarilitas*, for the Latin *scurrilitas*). Meaney convincingly argues, however, that there already existed in other Old English texts the idea of music as scandalous, and of the nightingale as being associated with sexuality, especially of the adulterous variety. Meaney accepts "cuckoo" as the solution to Riddle 9, but admits that Riddle 10 is more problematic, especially since the bird in question, often solved as "barnacle goose," is not attested by name in literature until the twelfth century. (Apparently unknown to Meaney, a 1998 article discusses the history of the barnacle goose in relation to another Exeter Book riddle: Daniel Donoghue, "An *Anser* for Exeter Book Riddle 74," in *Words and Works: Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature in Honour of Fred C. Robinson*, ed. Peter S. Baker and Nicholas Howe [Toronto, 1998], 45–58.) It is possible, Meaney argues, that the life-cycle of certain crustaceans, *Lepas species* (or, "goose barnacles") were conflated with birds because of their similarity of shape. One particular crustacean, *Lepas anatifera* (called by Linnaeus "goose-bearing shellfish") bears an uncanny resemblance to a "miniature long-necked black and white bird," and although "The precise identity of the birds involved is more doubtful," Meaney suggests that the Anglo-Saxon author might have reasonably mistaken these shellfish for Little Auks (*Alle alle*), "whose breeding range is in the Arctic, and which … were often found blown ashore in great numbers in stormy weather" (138). Also worth noting is that the Little Auk "rises to fly directly from the water, without a splashing take-off. It was probably seen more frequently off the coasts of Britain in earlier times, but turns up even today, for example, at Snettisham in north Norfolk" (139). Finally, "the transference of the legend to winter-migrant geese, which were thereby made available for consumption in Lent as if they were fish, is understandable" (139). Meaney posits the Brent Goose (*Branta bernicla*) as the most likely suspect for Riddle 10, since that goose has an all-back head and gray-barred wings, and winters now in England "along the southern, East Anglian, and Northumbrian coasts, and in the Thames estuary, as well as in Wales and Ireland" (139). Ultimately, Meaney believes the author of Riddles 7–10 was someone who was able to closely observe birds, and she speculates that this author might have been situated in East Anglia, where the Mute Swan was likely to have originated. Further, the nightingale is heard today only in midland, eastern and southeastern England, the Little Auk can be found almost anywhere along the coastlines, mainly in extreme stormy weather, and the Brent Goose occupies

larger winter quarters, as mentioned above. Therefore, if composed as a group, all of this "points to an eastern rather than a western origin for these riddles" (142). Meaney concludes by admitting that her hypothesis is, "alas, merely, a tiny straw blowing in the wind" (143).

In "Cithara as the Solution to Riddle 31 of the Exeter Book" (*Pacific Coast Philology* 37: 69–84), Elaine K. Musgrave wants to challenge the longstanding solution to Riddle 31, first proposed by Franz Dietrich in 1859, of "bagpipe," a solution that, in Musgrave's view, has become "the entrenched standard that has remained largely unchallenged to the present day" (70). While some scholars have suggested "fiddle" and "harp," the solution "bagpipe" is the most commonly accepted and the only radical departure from that solution is Donald Fry's more recent suggestion of "feather-pen," a suggestion Musgrave spends some time quashing before advancing to her own hypothesis. Musgrave acknowledges that, historically, the text of Riddle 31 has not been regarded as difficult or ambiguous or in need of much emendation, and therefore, "[t]he challenge in interpreting this text lies mainly in its figurative context, the similes and metaphors that render the poem the riddle that it is" (70). A critical question to be asked, according to Musgrave, is how to view the "creature that the riddler describes in line 7 as *fugele gelice*, 'bird-like' (71). While some commentators have viewed this as, in the words of Paull F. Baum, referring to the bagpipe "pictured in the likeness of a bird over a man's shoulder, head down (its beak, the chanter, on which the tune is played) and feet in the air (the two drones, brother and sister, which make the continuous sound" (quoted by Musgrave, 71), the bagpipe's *neb* (often translated into modern English as "beak"), as Trautmann pointed out, "aims upward, not downward" (71). Trautmann was the first scholar to suggest "cithara" as a substitute for "bagpipe," because it possesses the requisite bird-like shape, but he did not see "how the riddle's details about the *neb* pointing downward and the presence of the neck are to be incorporated into a complete reading," because "after looking at many illustrations of musical instruments," he could not find any "that accurately represent the 'wunderbaren Wesen' of which the riddle speaks" (71). Musgrave admits that "harp-lyre" might be the best way around what is unsatisfactory about "bagpipe" as a solution, especially given archaeological evidence from sites such as Sutton Hoo, but she finds "harp-lyre" ultimately unsatisfactory for a couple of reasons:

> To begin with, such a harp-lyre [as the one found at Sutton Hoo], rather simple in structure, does not have the necessary bird-like characteristics. In addition, adjectives at the beginning of the poem

not only communicate the beauty of the creature but also its rarity: it is *sellic* and *wundorlic* ("strange" and "wonderful" [Bosworth]). Other riddles of the *Exeter Book* sometimes use similar vocabulary to provide a new view of a common and prosaic item, but in such poems the oddity of the riddle-subject is usually referred to once and then dropped. In this riddle, the rarity of the instrument constitutes a recurring theme. (72)

The harp-lyre, then, because it was apparently so common in Anglo-Saxon culture, cannot be the riddle's subject. The cithara was a foremost instrument in Greek musical culture, and as Trautmann originally observed, since the cithara's soundbox is at the bottom of the instrument, this "gives us the needed … voice in the foot … of which the riddle speaks in lines 17a–18a" (76). Simultaneously, "the cithara's relative similarity to the harp would allow a group of people gathered at a feast to experiment in playing on an instrument with which many of them might not be all that familiar" (76). Finally, the cithara has a feature that gives it the required bird-like feature: "the arms or columns at the side of the instrument are like wings" (76). Since Trautmann pointed all this out in 1915, why make the argument again now? Probably because it has not been as well accepted as "bagpipe," due to the possibly mistaken notion, in Musgrave's view, that the cithara could not have made its way to England by the time of the Exeter Book's composition. But Musgrave argues, with reference to an illustration of the cithara in the ninth-century Stuttgart Psalter, that the instrument existed at the appropriate time, and "there appears to be no impediment to the instrument portrayed … making its way over to the British Isles before or during the ninth century" (78). Musgrave's primary "complaint" in her essay is that "most scholars focus too much on looking for an instrument that looks like a bird, rather than being content with one with *fet ond folme fugele gelice* or hands and feet like a bird (line 7)" (78). For Musgrave, the bird's hands are the wings, and these match the elaborate wings of the citharas of the period. Following this, Musgrave also believes we are now "free to read the *neb* not only as 'a bill, a beak, a beak-shaped thing' but also more broadly as 'a nose' or, in a more unusual but still relevant sense, a 'face' or 'countenance' (Bosworth)," and if the *neb* is pointed downward, "this description might refer to the angle of the body of the instrument in performance position. Alternatively, the instrument, when not played, might be stored with its front or face to a wall, angled down" (80). Musgrave admits, in her conclusion, that "the terminology applied to string instruments [by musicologists] … is incredibly confused," and since "it appears that all harp-like instruments would have been referred to frequently by

of the Irish tradition in Old English letters, especially in the religious prose of the period. In the cases where an "insular" influence still made its presence felt, Atherton believes this presence is most recognizable "by its own specific themes, sometimes apocryphal [such as the description of the Otherworld in Vercelli Homily IX], and by its own idiosyncratic use of language and colourful rhetoric" (88). Atherton sees in the poetic *Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn*, for example, themes that resonate with Old Irish prayers, "particularly the famous *loricæ* or 'breastplate' prayers of St. Patrick and of Gildas" (90). Comparing these to passages in Vercelli Homily IV and the first of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*, Atherton concludes that, whereas the Saxon style, best represented by Ælfric, is "more rational and considered, balancing positives and negatives" (91), the Irish and Irish-influenced texts are more "sensual" and "colourful." Delineating Anglo-Saxon from Irish style in this manner strikes this reviewer as, perhaps, too essentialist, and applying terms such as "rational" and "sensuous" to Saxon and Celtic culture, respectively, comes dangerously close, if unconsciously, to recapitulating the very discourse of cultural difference that allowed Ireland to be brutally subjugated over time by various English regimes. Admittedly, describing different literary styles, and trying to categorize those styles within specific historical contexts, can be a vexing yet often necessary task if one wants to historicize what appear to be separate yet also interrelated "literary cultures." Atherton next turns to *Seafarer*, and gives special attention to lines 58–64, "where the man's mind takes on the form of a bird ranging far from him and returning greedy with longing" (92). Although the poem is, Atherton admits, "steeped in the vocabulary and diction of the traditional Germanic epic" (92), he also detects similarities of theme and genre with a Welsh poem on pilgrimage from roughly the same time period, "Maytime is the Fairest Season" (from the *Black Book of Carmarthen*), Muirchú's *Life of Patrick*, and various of the legends of St. Cuthbert. Atherton concludes with Seamus Heaney's poem "Bone Dreams," where Heaney "creates a new synthesis: he takes 'The Seafarer' and its bird/soul symbolism, combines it with the theme of the hall of King Edwin from Bede and supplements it with imagery from *Beowulf* and Irish myth" (95). It is in the poetry, finally, of both the Anglo-Saxons and our more modern poets, that Atherton sees the opportunity for two distinct yet related literary traditions to be reconciled and expressed in new ways, whereas in the prose of, e.g., an Ælfric, they could only be opposed, due to the ideological and political differences of that time. The argument could be made, I think, that Anglo-Saxon England was, in many ways, a colonial society that took great pains in much of its literature to create a myth of origins (Christian, regnal, tribal, cultural, and otherwise)

that often elided or outright eliminated the presence of already flourishing centers of culture and learning such as Lindisfarne and Winchester that clearly had had an influence upon the education of men like Alfred and Dunstan, thereby cutting Irish and other traditions out of the tree of an English genealogy. Postcolonial critique would seem to offer a rich theoretical paradigm within which to further explore early England's relationship to its most proximate Insular neighbors.

E.A.J.

Wanderer

The idea of binding in *Wanderer*, as expressed twice in the phrase *ofer waþema gebind* (at lines 24b and 57a), is the subject of Rosemary Greentree's short note, "The Wanderer's Horizon: A Note on *Ofer Waþema Gebind*" (*Neophilogus* 86: 307–09). Greentree asserts that "some explanations of this phrase have presented inconsistencies that diminish the affecting motif," but a "consideration of seafaring conditions allows another insight into the poet's paradoxical image of the Wanderer in his lonely journey, as he travels bound by the waves" (307). Greentree first surveys previous interpretations of the phrase by Cassidy and Ringler ("the binding of the waves" as a kenning for ice, or "the ocean's surface"), R.F. Leslie (*gebind* as "expanse" or "a large quantity of anything"), and Dunning and Bliss ("frozen waves"). Greentree finds "frozen waves" problematic, "because it is contradictory. Waves are necessarily associated with movement, and, although sea ice appears in many varied forms, waves are not snap-frozen" (308). There is no reason, Greentree believes, to think that the Wanderer's ship is surrounded by ice and unable to move, and she wants us to consider "the limits of the distance which can be seen, in other words the horizon visible to an observer, in this case one who is rowing at sea (as implied in *hreran mid hondum*, line 4a), and sitting on a thwart, hence very close to sea-level" (308). Greentree then cites an item from W.H. Squair *et al.*'s *Modern Chartwork* (Glasgow, 1982):

> In conditions of perfect visibility the distance in nautical miles of the sea horizon from an observer whose height of eye is *h* feet above sea-level is given by the formula $1.15\sqrt{h}$. In metric units, the distance for the observer's height *h* is $2.09\sqrt{h}$.

Greentree admits it would be "futile to attempt to estimate the Wanderer's height, or to try to calculate exactly how far such an observer could see," but it *is* useful "to stress that the field of vision of such an observer, whose eye is so close to sea-level, is very restricted, and, particularly in

heavy seas, would indeed be confined to and limited by the waves, which could even break over the ship" (308). Greentree points to a passage in the Icelandic *Landnámabók* to demonstrate that the "variation and value of observations of the horizon were well known to mariners of the times" (308). Greentree doesn't want to "risk an over-literal interpretation," so much as she wants to make the point that aesthetic considerations, reinforced by nautical knowledge, can be "entirely consistent with the repeated use of the word *bindan* and its variants throughout the poem," and furthermore, "The idea of being bound within the encircling waves enhances the affecting paradox of the lonely exile, at liberty because he is bereft of the bonds of kinship and loyalty, an outcast enclosed in the limitless expanse of the sea" (309).

Perhaps no one has better helped us to see the patterning of Old English poetry, both within individual texts and across the corpus, than Andy Orchard, who in much of his work has revealed what might be called the deep syntactical and cross-referential structures of Anglo-Saxon aesthetics. This is certainly the case in his essay "Re-Reading *The Wanderer*: The Value of Cross-References" (*Via Crucis*, ed. Hall, 1–26), where Orchard makes the argument that *Wanderer* is a "heroic homily," because its author, utilizing the poetic devices of echoing and repetition, "wished to nod in the direction of contemporary Christian homiletic tradition," while he "none the less sought to ground the poem firmly in the phrasing and traditional technique of a secular past, the passing of which is marked with reverence" (2). Orchard attempts to resolve the tension that has existed in previous interpretations of the poem that assume it displays the tics of an irreconcilable opposition between heroic and more religious modes of philosophy. What Orchard sees, instead, is a highly structured, "artful," "deliberate," and "brilliant" combination of themes and thoughts that would have been "familiar to its contemporary audience from both the secular poetic and homiletic prose tradition" (26). Orchard focuses specifically on the repetition of key words and phrases and on the "echoic repetition" the poet employed to link different passages together across line breaks, such that passages that appear firmly "secular" can be seen as being purposefully connected to passages that appear "homiletic." So, for example, the line immediately preceding the final, clearly homiletic passage of the poem, *Swa cwæð snottor on mode, gesæt him sundor æt rune* (line 111), appears, in Orchard's view, to deliberately echo the two lines immediately following the more secular, gnomic opening, *Swa cwæð eardstapa, earfeða gemyndig, / wraða wæsleahta, winemæga hryre* (lines 6–7), thereby forming, through the echoic repetition of *Swa cwæð*, a purposeful connection between what many

interpreters see as two passages at thematic odds with each other. What Orchard sees instead is a careful development in the character of the narrator, from a "wanderer over the earth" (*eardstapa*) into a "wise man" (*snottor on mode*). The entire poem, as Orchard interprets it, is about development, "from an exclusive self-obsession to an inclusive selflessness," or "from the seemingly detached passivity of someone waiting for (or experiencing) favor (*are gebideð*, line 1) to the engaged effort of someone actively seeking it (*are seceð*, line 114)," and the poem's language is purposefully structured to demonstrate this progression (10). Orchard argues further that "Parallels for the kind of structural development enshrined in the text of *The Wanderer* can be discovered elsewhere in Old English verse.… So, for example, the final twenty-five lines of *The Dream of the Rood* demonstrate very similar strategies at work, based on the same principles of repetition and echo" (13). Orchard spends some time undertaking a comparative analysis of the structure, theme, and diction of *Wanderer* and *The Dream of the Rood*, a comparison he believes is apt because he sees both poems as belonging to the homiletic tradition of the Vercelli Book. Orchard also looks at parallels between *Wanderer* and the Old English poems *Homiletic Fragment 2*, *Deor*, and *Seafarer*, in order to "demonstrate the extent to which *The Wanderer* is but one of a number of Old English poems which might be said to employ the same restricted range of poetic techniques and ornamental effects for what might be termed a preaching or homiletic purpose" (20). Orchard next compares *Wanderer* with Vercelli Homily 10, in order to show how the poet of *Wanderer* used and adapted homiletic themes that would have been familiar to his audience. More specifically, Orchard detects three themes that he believes both works share: the *ne to … ne to* theme, the *ubi sunt* topos, and the contrast between earthly and heavenly life. If the audience of *Wanderer* was already attuned to the poetic mechanism of echoic repetition, then, in Orchard's view, they "would surely have sensed a growing development away from the secular traditions of the past and a growing identification with Christian thoughts and values in the course of a poem that offers its audience in its last line (*fæder on heofonum … us*) such a clear echo of the opening line of that most fundamental of all Christian texts, the Lord's Prayer" (26).

E.A.J.

Wife's Lament

Alaric Hall's essay "The Images and Structure of *The Wife's Lament*" (*Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 33: 1–29) provides an extremely meticulous reading of the literary analogues and manuscript pointing of an Old English poem whose

enigmatic nature has long puzzled scholars, in order to advance the somewhat tentative conclusion that, contrary to other scholars' suppositions,

> The situations of the speaker and her *freond* are … neither gloomy landscapes, nor purely pathetic fallacy: they involve distinct motifs, possibly including "women's/lovers' lament" figures, describing environments with images not only of misery, but also, it seems, inversions of the paradisical—images of the hellish. We can read these images simply as traditional *topoi*; but might also view them from a Christian perspective, whereby the pagan associations of the speaker's environment intensify its terror. (22)

Although modern audiences have struggled to identify a literary or more historical context for the speaker's narrative and anguish, Hall believes that Anglo-Saxon audiences may very well have been familiar with the literary allusions of the poem and its "back story," so to speak, and therefore, we can understand the poem "as a woman's lament with Anglo-Saxon and English analogues, both verbal and thematic, dating before and after … [its] extant text" (2). Hall provides a wide range of literary and other analogues to various images and thematic motifs in the poem, including the right-hand panel of the Franks Casket, *Beowulf*, *Wulf and Eadwacer*, *Seafarer*, *Wanderer*, *Deor*, *The Phoenix*, *Genesis A*, *Exodus*, Riddle 27, the Poetic Edda, Nordic prose, runic inscription, Celtic vernacular poetry, Laȝamon's *Brut*, *Sir Tristrem*, the Middle English lyric "Now Springs the Spray," *Gawain and the Green Knight*, and the Bible (it should be noted here that Glenn Wright has written a short note, "'Now Springs the Spray' and *The Wife's Lament*" [*ANQ* 14: 11–14; reviewed in *OEN* 36.2], in which he details the similarities between the Old English poem and Middle English lyric; this note is not included in Hall's bibliography, which is otherwise extremely thorough and exhaustive concerning scholarship on *Wife's Lament*). Thematic elements with which Hall is chiefly concerned in his literary comparisons include women's love-laments, the lamenting woman's abode (grove or cave? wilderness or earth-hall? pagan shrine or hell? for example), banishment, sanctuary, paganism, paradise versus hell, and grave-mounds. In the majority of comparisons, Hall is mainly concerned with identifying the poem's speaker's location, which he ultimately decides, albeit tentatively, would have been "envisaged" by its original audience, "as caves within a burial mound, or at least a mound to which the poem is trying to give connotations of death, surrounded by an enclosure which is surrounded with briars. The place had association with paganism, set in a dim landscape of

almost hellish grimness" (11). Hall admits that the poem is highly allusive, but through comparison with what he finds are its literary and other analogues, he argues we move closer to the narrative context with which the original audience would have been very familiar. The second half of Hall's essay is taken up with the poem's problematic structure, and while he believes examining "aurally and semantically interrelating lines" is useful, he also feels that adducing the poem's manuscript punctuation could be equally helpful. While admitting "the pointings of the Exeter Book seem to be used in a bewildering variety of syntactic contexts," nevertheless, "an understanding of the punctuation can be approached" (13). Indicating that pointings in *Wife's Lament* fall in lines 8, 10, 14, 17, 22, 28, 29, 37, and 40, and that apart from line 37, they each fall at the end of a b-verse, Hall would like to consider that "The majority could be read as modern full stops, though not those in 22, 37, and 40" (13), which somewhat departs from Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe's suggestion that the pointings demarcate "rhetorical pauses" (14). In Hall's view, reading the pointings as full stops allows for a consideration of the poem as being structured around a stanzaic-like "episodic progression." Hall admits that "this sort of stanzaic form is not the norm for surviving Old English poetry, but he sees a similar episodic progression in the structure of *Wanderer*, which he believes at least offers a basis for a strong comparison. In relation to his thoughts on the punctuation and structure of the poem, Hall re-examines what he calls the second half, or third and fourth stanzas, in order to ruminate once again the speaker's probable location and situation. Hall concludes that the speaker's location is most likely a sanctuary of some sort, that only one man (and not two men) is responsible for her seclusion (which might be a banishment), and that the speaker's state of mind reflects the "tensions between a woman's desire to be with her *hlaford*, and his command that she should be in a sanctuary; and between her affection for him and her bitterness that she has been forced from him" (21). Finally, whereas many of the images and thematic motifs of the poem can be read as traditional literary *topoi*, we might "also view them from a Christian perspective, whereby the pagan associations of the speaker's environment intensify its terror" (22).

The remaining two essays published in 2002 on *Wife's Lament* both concern themselves with the long-standing interpretive problems surrounding line 34b of the poem, *leger weardiað*, and both essays attest (in one case, forcefully) to the palpable tension that often exists between more traditional and more modern approaches to Old English poetry. In his essay, "'Leger weardiað': *The Wife's Lament* 34b" (*ANQ* 15: 34–37), Thomas Hill begins with the frank acknowledgement that "[h]ostile critics of OE studies of

the modernist or postmodernist persuasion sometimes say or imply that those of us who work in this area do not really understand even the language of the texts we study" (34). Hill is quite willing to admit that no one can really know Old English "with the kind of assurance that academic specialists in one or another of the modern languages can or should attain in theirs," but he also wants to draw attention to the fact that "it is not so much that we do not know the language but that our knowledge of it reflects the very uneven distribution of the surviving texts" (34). Moreover, since much of the existing corpus, such as homilies and saints' lives, reflect a formal register, understanding more vernacular registers, as they might occur in poetic texts, can be quite difficult. Hill wants to focus particularly on lines 33b–34 of *Wife's Lament*, partly because he believes he has new evidence that could shed some light on a phrase that has always been difficult to translate, but also because he wants to demonstrate "how frustratingly difficult apparently quite simple problems in OE vernacular usage can be" (34). The lines in question, *Frynd sind on eorþan, / leofe lifgende, leger weardiað*, could be literally translated, according to Hill, as "There are lovers [literally 'friends'] on earth, dear ones living, they keep/share [lit. 'guard'] a *leger*," with *leger* essentially meaning "a lying place," "a resting place," or "a bed" (35). The crux of the matter, and the one over which many scholars have argued, is whether or not the lines refer to two lovers who share a bed, or to companions who are resting together in a grave. Because the equation of OE *frynd* with "lovers" is not attested elsewhere in the OE corpus, earlier editors and commentators on the poem, such as S.A.J. Bradley, assumed that the *leger* was a sick-bed or a grave, but more modern editors and critics, according to Hill, "want *The Wife's Lament* to be a poem about erotic love and frustration" (36). Nevertheless, "a translation that accords with current critical orthodoxy, but that is unsupported by external evidence, has to be at least suspect" (36). But in a move reminiscent of his essay on the OE "Dough" Riddle (reviewed above), Hill also believes that there is "some relevant and important ME evidence that has not been cited in this context"—specifically, the fact that the term *leger/leir* "is well-attested in ME in the sense of 'bed' or 'resting place'" (36). Moreover, "in ME not only is there evidence for the erotic connotations of the word … but the erotic connotations of the word are so strong that one of the meanings the editors of the *Middle English Dictionary* assign to *leir* is quite simply 'fornication'" (36). Hill believes that the attested senses of the word in ME (especially in court records of fines for sexual scandals, where a standard term for a fine for fornication was *leire-wite*) are relevant to the OE poem because "the distinction between OE and ME is essentially an academic convenience and … some of the evidence in this case can be dated to the early ME

period when the distinction between ME and OE is purely nominal" (36). Finally, Hill does not believe that looking for parallels for the language of and sentiments expressed in *Wife's Lament* in the extensive corpus of homilies and saints' lives is entirely appropriate, given that the anguish expressed by the speaker of the poem signifies in a different, more vernacular register.

The gloves come off in Kathryn A. Lowe's "'A Fine and Private Place': *The Wife's Lament*, ll. 33–34, the Translators and the Critics" ('*Lastworda Betst*', ed. Hough and Lowe, 122–43), where Lowe expresses her dismay that, since the 1970s especially, "there seem to be few ways of viewing *WL* other than through the steely-eyed, transatlantic glare of women's studies" (124). According to Lowe, even worse approaches to the OE poem have been crafted by those she terms "the gifted spin-doctors of literary criticism" (137), and thus the so-called "temper of the times" blows in and threatens to undermine the integrity of the project of translation of older literatures where, apparently, there was never any sex (or even sexiness?). At the same time, the title of Lowe's essay makes clear the divide she believes exists between "translators" and "critics" (or, let's say, between philology and postmodernism), a divide that Hill, in the essay reviewed above, works gently to question (and even to ameliorate). Essentially, Lowe wants to argue against the current interpretation of lines 33b–34 as "There are dear living lovers on earth, they are in bed together," and instead propose the translation, "There are dear friends, dear ones dwelling in the earth, they inhabit graves." In order to do this, Lowe looks first "at the meaning of *leger*; second, the collocation of the noun with *weardian*; third, the semantic range of *libban*; fourth, the grammar of the clause; and last, the meaning of *þonne* [in the line that follows line 34]" (124). As to *leger*, Lowe wants to establish that "grave" is a much more likely equivalent than "bed." To begin with, "grave" (and its equivalent terms, such as "sepulcher" and "tomb") was always the term of choice for earlier editors, such as Conybeare, Grein, Sieper, and Sedgefield. It was Nora Kershaw in 1922 who first suggested "bed," which influenced the opinions of Krapp and Dobbie, Mackie, Kennedy, and others. In Lowe's view, although its is clear that *leger* can mean "grave' or "bed," it is "interesting to note how infrequently the word is used to mean 'bed' without association with sickness or disease" (126). Apparently, the only example where *leger* is used to gloss *lectum* is in a tenth-century prayer for marriage in the Durham Ritual. More often, *leger* refers to a sick-bed, or grave. (Of course, this leaves aside Hill's point, in his essay reviewed above, that the extant OE corpus is incomplete, especially when it comes to close or appropriate parallels for lyrical texts such as *Wife's Lament*.) After briefly discussing the connotations

of other words used for "grave" and "bed" that are listed in *TOE*, Lowe concludes that "in the Old English period *leger* is only rarely used to mean "bed," and its associations with sickness and disease are marked. Even allowing for the exigencies of metre, the noun seems a strikingly odd (even poor) choice for the poet of the *WL* if he simply wanted to use a neutral term for 'bed'" (128). Lowe does not ignore the development of the noun in Middle English where, as Hill outlined in his essay reviewed above, it clearly carried the connotation of sexual intercourse, but Lowe is more interested in the ME connotation of "a place where someone dwells," and "by translating 'leger weardiað' as 'they inhabit dwellings' (or some such), it could be argued that the poet is contrasting the situation of the protagonist, who is forced to live alone (*ana*) in an otherwise deserted barrow, with that of her friends who live companionably together in an inhabited and habitable place" (129). But Lowe ultimately rejects this interpretation since she has "not been able to find support for this meaning of the noun in Old English" (129). Lowe nexts turns to the collocation of *leger* with the verb *weardian*, a collocation she believes has passed unremarked upon by other scholars. Perusing the dictionaries again, Lowe finds that *weardian* ("to guard," "to hold," or "to keep") is most often collocated with *eard*, and therefore, it is "typically used in Old English to indicate habitation of a (dwelling-)place, territory or other site. Given this, the verb seems more likely to refer to the occupation of a grave rather than a bed" (130). Of course, it's not much of a stretch to imagine a poet, adept at creating new metaphors, envisioning a marriage-bed as a kind of dwelling that two lovers "keep" or "hold" together, in the same way they would "keep" or "hold" a house together, or even, their mutual grave, but Lowe does not allow for this consideration. Regarding the semantic range of *libban* and its context, Lowe points out that modern editors, following Kershaw, have often been discomfited by the idea that the two friends could be *living* together in their grave, whereas living together in one bed appears to make more sense, and those same editors did not believe that *libban* could also carry the connotation of "dwelling" or "inhabiting" until after the Conquest. In an Appendix to her essay, Lowe lists "the full range of conceptual meanings for each verb within the category 'Habitation, sojourn' ... arranged according to their hierarchical classification in *TOE*" (132). Lowe discovers that the most frequently used verbs in this category are *wunian* and *eardian*, and furthermore, *wunian* "overlaps to some extent with the variational space occupied by *libban*, for the former can also mean 'live'" (134). Lowe advises caution in this area, but at the same time, following four examples where *libban* and *wunian* are used together, in *Maxims* 1, *Dream of the Rood*, *Leechdoms*, and the *Dialogues* of Gregory, Lowe suggests that "a meaning for *libban*

as 'inhabit' was current before the Conquest and removes the perceived difficulty of translating *leger* in *WL* as 'grave' rather than 'bed'" (135). Lowe's next quarry is the question of the grammar of the lines in question, and the chief difficulty, in her view, is "whether the present participle 'lifgende' is to be taken as adjectival or verbal; that is, whether the clause means 'there are dear, living friends on earth' (adjectival) or 'there are friends, dear ones living in the earth' (verbal periphrasis)" (135). Lowe argues for the latter, of course, as a "supreme example" of what Fred Robinson has identified as a chief stylistic element in OE poetry: "syntactically parallel words or word-groups which share a common referent and which occur within a single clause" (qtd. in Lowe 136). Finally, Lowe turns to the clause that follows lines 33-34, *þonne ic on uhtan ana gonge / under actreo geond þas eorðscrafu*, a phrase that has posed difficulty, according to some editors such as Kershaw, because "the misery the woman expresses as a consequence of her solitary existence is rendered considerably less effective if she is comparing her lot with that of her friends (mouldering in the grave)" (136). Whereas many editors of the poem have taken *þonne* to mean "when" or "while," Lowe argues for the translation of "in consequence." Therefore, because the speaker's friends are dead in their graves, she is doomed to walk alone through the grave-mounds. Intriguingly, Lowe sees her interpretation of the lines in question as "destructive to our modern sensibilities," but "faithful to medieval ones" (137). Apparently, the Anglo-Saxons sang only of death, and sensual love dared not speak its name, except obliquely, through the lament.

E.A.J.

Works not seen

Bueno Alonso, Jorge Luis. "Renderings of *Wulf and Eadwacer* Revisited." *The Grove: Studies on Medieval English Language and Literature* 8 (2001): 13–38.

c. *Beowulf*

Text, Language, Meter

Carl T. Berkhout, in "*Beowulf* 2200-08: Mind the Gap," *ANQ* 15: 51–58, closely examines that point in the *Beowulf* manuscript (London, BL, MS Cotton Vitellius A.xv) which contains the brief transition between the first and second parts of the poem, that is, between the hero's youthful career in Denmark and his death as an old king in Geatland. This passage "straddles the final leaf (178) of quire 11 and the first leaf (179) of quire 12 in the manuscript" (52), breaking between the words *syððan* and *Beowulfe* on line 2207a. The use of the temporal conjunction or adverb

syððan rather than the expected relative conjunction *þæt* or *þætte* to introduce the following clause has presented a difficulty to editors and translators. Berkhout postulates: 1) that the scribe "accidentally omitted a full clause after *syððan*, amounting to about two or three poetic lines, plus the word *þæt* or *þætte* before *beowulfe*"; 2) that he "discovered the omission after he had completed the writing of 179's quire"; and 3) "that he intended to restore the omitted text on an erased and then more compactly written 179" (54). Leaf 179 *recto* was accordingly erased strongly, but parts of the first three lines on 180 *verso* were also erased by the accident of sticking pages. Then, as 179 *verso* began to be erased as intended, it became apparent that further erasure on this side would tear through the parchment. The plan was then abandoned until some of the erased text on 179 was eventually refreshed. Berkhout believes this "restorer" was not an eleventh-century Anglo-Saxon scribe but more likely the fifteenth-century antiquary Laurence Nowell, "the earliest known owner of the *Beowulf* manuscript" (52), who had "a passable though not a native or idiomatic knowledge of OE poetry" (56).

Alfred Bammesberger had a very productive year in 2002 with eight of his closely focused studies of the language and text of the poem. In "A Detail in the Coast-Guard's Speech (*Beowulf*, ll. 244-245a)," *NM* 103: 399–402, Bammesberger prefers to understand *cuman* in line 244b as a plural weak noun meaning '(new)comers, foreigners', rather than the infinitive 'to come'. The finite past plural verb *ongunnon*, with which *cuman* is associated in the half-line, could then be rendered '(they) behaved, acted, performed' rather '(they) began, proceeded, undertook'. If the comparative adverb *cuðlicor* 'more openly' in line 244a is taken in an extended sense to mean 'friendlier', the lines would translate, "Never have shield-bearing foreigners here behaved in a more friendly way."

In another study in *N&Q* n.s. 49: 312–14, Bammesberger suggests that "OE *ænegum* in *Beowulf*, line 655a," which modifies the dative singular noun *men*, produces a phrase which should be translated "to one man alone" or "to a single man," rather than "to any man," as it is usually rendered. Bammesberger cites two narratological reasons for this change: 1) Hrothgar has already stated in lines 480–88 that in the past he has entrusted his hall to other warriors who vowed to fight Grendel, but they were all killed; and 2) Beowulf has already expressed twice his intention to confront Grendel *ana* 'alone' in lines 425b and 431a. Instead of deriving *ænegum* from the strong declension indefinite pronoun *ænig* 'any', Bammesberger prefers to see it as a form of the weak adjective *anga* 'single, solitary, unique'. The expected dative singular form *angan* appears elsewhere

in the poem, but *ænegum* can be explained here by several influences acting in concert. Bammesberger thus offers for lines 655–57: "Never before have I, since I could raise hand and shield, entrusted the glorious hall of the Danes to one man alone, except now here to you."

In "The Syntactic Analysis of *Beowulf*, lines 750–754," *Neophilologus* 86: 303–06, Bammesberger insists that *sona* in line 750a be taken as the adverb "immediately," rather than as the subordinating conjunction "as soon as." The passage thus consists of three briskly independent sentences: "At once the keeper of crimes realised that he had never met a greater grip in another man of the corners of the earth, of the world. He became terrified. Yet he was not able to get away any sooner" (305). Regarding the subsequent fight, Bammesberger does not believe that the much discussed compound "Old English *ealuscerwen* in *Beowulf* 769A" (*RES* n.s. 53: 469–74) means an ironically terrifying "serving of ale." "Ale-serving" is what should normally occur noisily at night in a hall, but the Danes now hear a very different kind of sound coming from Heorot. Bammesberger, however, prefers to derive the first element *ealu-* 'ale' from Germanic **alu-* 'good luck, safety'. He suggests that the analogous term—*meoduscerwen* '(terrible) mead-serving, terror'—which appears after a feast in line 1526b of *Andreas* was modeled through misunderstanding of the first element of *ealuscerwen* on the *Beowulf* poet's prior use, possibly coinage of the compound. In addition, Bammesberger prefers to see *eorlum* in line 769a not as parallel to the dative plural indirect objects *Denum* and *ceasterbuendum* in lines 767a–68b, but rather as a separate instrumental plural referring to the hero and the other Geatish warriors. Lines 767–69a would then read: "The hall resounded. For all Danes, for the hall-dwellers, for everyone of the bold ones a dispensation of good luck was brought about by the warriors [i.e. Beowulf and his men]" (474).

Bammesberger discusses both "Grendel's Death (*Beowulf* 850–52)," *Neophilologus* 86: 467–69, and "Beowulf's Death," *N&Q* n.s. 49: 314–15. In the case of the monster, Bammesberger stresses that the dative masculine or neuter, singular or plural pronoun *him* in line 852b, *þær him hel onfeng*—normally rendered "there hell received him"—does not refer to the (masculine) person of Grendel, but rather to his *feorh* 'life' (masculine or neuter, line 851b) or to his plural *feorh* and *sawol* 'soul' (feminine, line 852a), yielding either, "there hell received it [Grendel's life]" or "there hell received them [Grendel's life and soul]." With regard to the hero's death, Bammesberger defends the MS reading *hwæðre* 'however' on line 2819b against its usual emendation to the dative noun *hræðre* or *hreðre* '(from his) breast'. He would thus render lines 2817–20: "that was the last

word for the old one in the thoughts of his breast before he tasted the fire, the hot battle waves; his soul, however, went away from him [rather than, "left his breast"] to seek the glory of the righteous" (315)

In *ES* 83: 1–5, Bammesberger asks, "Where Did Hrothgar Deliver His Speech?" at lines 928–56, while he *stod on stapole* (line 926a). Bammesberger takes up Leslie Webster's suggestion (1998) that the noun *stapol* should be understood in its usual sense of "pillar, support," rather than "steps, flight of steps," and that the prepositional phrase means "at" or "by," rather than "on" this structure. Unlike Webster, however, Bammesberger sees this *stapol* not as an ordinary feature of the hall's construction ("just any piece of wood"), but as "a rather important," apparently separate pole or pillar "that could have ceremonial functions" (4). He would thus translate lines 925–27: "Hrothgar made a speech; he was on his way to the Hall, he stood still at the pillar, he looked up to the steep roof, variegated with gold, and at Grendel's hand" (5).

In "An Unnecessary Emendation (*Beowulf*, line 1763a)," *N&Q* n.s. 49: 174–75, Bammesberger rejects the suggestion by Matti Kilpiö (*N&Q* n.s. 48 [2001], 97–98) that the phrase *adl oððe ecg* 'illness or the blade' is a corruption of *adl oððe ece* 'illness or pain'. Bammesberger finds the logic of the passage, which summarizes "the vicissitudes of life," adequate as it stands: "from the hero's point of view there are basically two types of calamities that affect him, namely all kinds of *adl*, which originate in the human body, and *ecg*, which then includes also all adverse forces from outside" (174). Roberta Frank, too, rejects Kilpiö's suggested emendation, plus another, in "An Aspirin for *Beowulf*: Against Aches and Pains—*ece* and *wærc*" (*ANQ* 15: 58–63). Frank argues that an emendation of *ecg* 'blade, sword' to *ece* 'ache, pain [*not* illness, disease]' in line 1763a "introduces into *Beowulf* a word which never occurs in poetry and gives to it the power to take life away, an agency that (unlike fire and water, sword, spear, and disease) it does not have elsewhere in the corpus" (59). She also rejects the building consensus, as recently exemplified by R. D. Fulk (1997, 2000), that instances of *weorc* 'pain, suffering' at lines 1418b, 1638b and 1721b are a West-Saxonizing of Anglian *wærc* 'ache, bodily pain'. Both *wærc* and *weorc* appear in the West Saxon lexicon, the former most commonly in medical texts "signifying a discrete corporeal pain," while *weorc* is used in poetry and elevated prose to mean a more general "anguish shared by body and soul" (61)

Instead of the usual emendation of MS *wræce* (line 3060a) to *wræte* 'treasures' as the direct object of *gehydde* '[he who] hid [treasures]' in line 3059b, Raymond P. Tripp,

Jr., interprets *wræce* as the third person singular past subjunctive of an intransitive or reflexive *wrecan* 'to advance, move; exile [oneself]', which is parallel to what he takes as an intransitive or reflexive *gehydde* '[he who] hid, would hide [himself]' ("Summing up the Dragon Episode: An Apophatic Reading of *Beowulf* 3058–75," *In Geardagum* 22 [2001]: 57–75). These finite verbs might thus be rendered with a pluperfect sense in lines 3058–60a: "Then it was seen that the move did not work out / For the one who *had* wrongly hidden inside, / Who *had moved* [exiled himself?] in under the wall" (70, Tripp's italics and bracketed suggestion). Through "a series of negative queries" or "apophatic" review of "all of the candidates available in the conventional reading of the received text—the 'last survivor,' the 'thief,' the animal dragon, or Beowulf" (71), Tripp concludes that *se secg* 'the man' referred to by the poet in line 3071a is "a single *monstrous* 'man-dragon'" (74, Tripp's emphasis), "a creature who is a thieving survivor of a king turned dragon" (75). Tripp continues this analysis in "*Beowulf* 3073b: *se þe wong strude*: 'He who Plundered the Country,'" *In Geardagum* 23: 29–49, rejecting the common assumption that *wong* "plain, field" in this line refers to the dragon's barrow. Instead, Tripp understands *wong* as the country of the Geats and *se secg* 'the man' (line 3071a) who plunders it to be a creature who was once a man before he was transformed into a dragon by greed.

In "Beowulf, Gold-Luck, and God's Will," *SP* 99: 356–79, John Tanke analyzes the second element of the compound *goldhwæte* in line 3074a as feminine accusative singular of *hwatu* 'omen, divination, prophecy; fortune, destiny, luck,' yielding for lines 3074–75: "[Beowulf] had by no means more readily foreseen good luck with gold, the Owner's favor" (358). Tanke argues that the dragon's barrow is "an ancient shrine or cenotaph" in which the treasure was placed as "a sacrificial offering" (376) and protected by a powerful pagan spell (lines 3071–73) that would kill anyone who plundered the hoard. By killing the hoard's guardian, the hero inadvertently brings down on himself this ancient curse on the gold, which is why the Geats are so careful to rebury all of it in their dead king's mound, "where it still lives now, as useless to men as it was before" (lines 3167–68; p. 376). The failure of the hero's gold-luck in this episode confirms, "without explaining or justifying" (379), the mysterious distance of God's protective favor felt in the second part of the poem.

Sarah M. Elder, in "A Note on the Meaning of *Beowulf*, Lines 1288-1295," *N&Q* n.s. 49: 315–16, submits that nominative *se broga* 'the terror' in line 1291b refers to Grendel's mother herself, rather than to an abstract fear which grips the Danes. The verb governed by this subject, *ongeat*, should

thus be translated with its usual sense of "perceived, saw," rather than "seized" (a meaning of the verb *ongitan* unattested elsewhere in Old English). Elder believes that this interpretation is supported by the whole passage's rhetorical ring-structure in which Hrothgar's warriors are compared chiastically to Grendel's mother according to the pattern ABCCBA, where A refers to location (hall/fen), B to similar actions in seizing tightly (swords and shields/ the old retainer Æschere), and C to different reactions to mutual sight (forgetting of armor/turning to flee). Elder thus translates lines 1288–95: "Then in the hall the hard-edged sword was drawn above the benches, many a broad shield raised, fast in hands; no one thought of helmet or roomy mail-coat when that monstrous thing perceived him. She, when she was discovered, was in haste; she wanted out of there to save her life. Swiftly she had one of the noblemen fast in her grip; then she went to the fen" (316).

In "*Beowulf* 128: *æfter wiste*" (*And Gladly Wolde He Lerne and Gladly Teche*, 147–54), Jun Terasawa revives the view of Ten Brink (1888) that the feast in line 128a refers primarily to eating rather than drinking, and thus to Grendel's cannibalism of Danes rather than to the Danes' own party of the evening before, yielding for the whole of line 128: "Then lamentation was raised up after Grendel's feasting (upon the thirty thanes)" (151).

Margaret Gelling uses the evidence of place-names to help define more precisely some of the poem's topographical references in "The Landscape of *Beowulf*," *ASE* 31: 7–11. She shows that compounds with *-hlið, -hleoðu* 'slope' have a menacing connotation and suggests the more exact sense of "hill with a hollow," such as might hide monsters (8–9). *Hop* in the poem means "a remote, secret place," but carries with it the suggestion of "enclosed ground within a marsh or other waste land" (9–10). *Gelad* refers to a "difficult water-crossing," possibly one prone to flooding (10–11).

John D. Sundquist, in "Relative Clause Variation and the Unity of *Beowulf*," *Jnl of Germanic Linguistics* 14: 243–69, seeks to support the single authorship of *Beowulf* by demonstrating that patterns of relative clause construction "are both unique and homogenous" (266) throughout the entire poem. Following Schücking (1905), proponents of multiple authorship have divided *Beowulf* into two or three originally separate poems: the hero in Denmark (lines 1–1887), Beowulf's homecoming (lines 1888–2199) and the old king in Geatland (lines 2200–3182). Sundquist compares the relative clauses in all three parts of *Beowulf* with those of *Andreas* (lines 1–500), the prose Homilies of Ælfric, *The Battle of Maldon*, and three poems by Cynewulf (*Elene*, *Christ II* and *Juliana*). These last are most important for

Sundquist's argument because they confirm that patterns of relative clause construction remain consistent throughout several poems by the same author. Sundquist finds that the *Beowulf* poet introduces an unusually high number of relative clauses by the compound *se þe* 'he who, that which' (Type C = 40%), as opposed to Cynewulf's next highest usage of Type C at 22%. In addition, the *Beowulf* poet prefers distant antecedents when using Type C clauses (57%), compared to Cynewulf's 24%. Sundquist also notes a distinctive type of antecedent to which *Beowulf*'s Type C clauses generally refer: an indefinite common or proper noun, without "a preceding demonstrative, possessive adjective or indefinite pronoun" (254). Sundquist acknowledges Amos's point (1981) that scribes may "have altered the distribution" of relative constructions when copying these poems, but he believes nonetheless that "general trends in the data" (245 n.5) are sufficient to establish the *Beowulf* poet's own distinctive and consistent practice.

Geoffrey Russom, in "A Bard's-Eye View of the Germanic Syllable," *JEGP* 101: 305–28, applies the "word-foot theory" of alliterative verse he presented in *Old English Meter and Linguistic Theory* (1987) and *'Beowulf' and Old Germanic Metre* (1998) to describe certain phonological principles common to early Germanic languages, using Old English *Beowulf*, Old Saxon *Heliand* and several Old Norse poems like *Hyndluljóð* to illustrate his points. Russom argues that Germanic alliterative verse naturally and simply expresses basic linguistic patterns of syllable length and stress: "metrical positions [are] projected from syllables, metrical feet [are] projected from words, and a binding force, alliteration, … is projected from the Germanic compound stress-rule" (310), which is, "when a foot contains two positions that can accommodate stressed syllables, the leftward arsis is primary and the rightward arsis is secondary (subordinate)" (312). Three features of early Germanic phonology can thus be established: 1) the "minimal length requirement for a syllable is one mora," that is, "a unit of length equivalent to a short vowel or to a single postvocalic consonant"; 2) the "minimal length requirement for Germanic primary stress is two morae"; and 3) "[s]yllables that exceed minimal length are subject to shortening by a principle of least effort" (306, 308). Russom believes that influential but inaccurate claims by Eduard Sievers in his *Altgermanische Metrik* (1893) defining five distinct types Germanic verse "have introduced needless complications into analysis of subordinate stress" (310), not least in Alistair Campbell's authoritative *Old English Grammar* (1959). [This article is also reviewed in 3bi. Language, Phonology.]

In *The Metre of 'Beowulf': A Constraint-Based Approach*, Topics in English Linguistics 36 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter),

Michael Getty joins Russom in challenging Sievers's influential taxonomy of Old English alliterative verse (1893) and Campbell's (1959) application of Sievers's system to Old English phonology, especially syllable stress. Getty uses optimality theory to distinguish between a few inviolable and many violable metrical constraints, greatly reducing the number of supposed violations in *Beowulf* according to Sievers' system. Getty analyzes the meter of *Beowulf* according to a model of 51 constraints, which he lists and ranks (where possible) in Fig. 129 (311–13). Furthermore, he explains as the result of these constraints the preference for Subject-Object-Verb word order in *Beowulf*, as distinguished from the syntax of Old English prose texts in which the Verb normally holds the second position relative to the Subject and Object. Applying the model of language acquisition and use proposed by Hayes and Boersma (1999), Getty suggests for poetic composition as well that there are "(a) categorical rules, … (b) variable rules, … and finally (c) patterns in which variable rules apply within particular frequency ranges" (327). In composition, the poet, like any speaker of the language, has an ongoing sense of the frequency of possible linguistic and metrical forms that is *stochastic*, "meaning that (a) constraints are ranked along a scale of strictness as opposed to a rank-by-rank prioritization, and (b) these scalar rankings are subject to random variation" (326). Poets rely "on a robust but often covert ability to perform rapid statistical analysis" (329) of grammatical and metrical usage in order to optimize a multitude of competing factors in poetic expression.

Yasuko Suzuki studies "The Prosody and Syntax of Light Elements in West Germanic Alliterative Verse: With Special Reference to *Beowulf*," in *New Insights in Germanic Linguistics II*, ed. Irmengard Rauch and Gerald F. Carr, Berkeley Insights in Linguistics and Semiotics 38 (New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 225–50. These light elements include conjunctions, pronouns, short adverbs, and short common finite verbs (forms of "to be" like *wæs* 'was' or auxiliaries like *sceal* 'must'), all of which tend to cluster at the beginning of clauses in Old English, Old Saxon and Old High German poetry. Suzuki argues that neither the requirements of alliterative prosody *per se* (e.g., Kuhn [1933] and followers) nor the constraints of syntax alone (e.g., Pintzuk [1991, etc.] and others) explain this phenomenon, but that several further factors play a role as well. For instance, the early placement in a clause of the light first element of a compound verb (like *wæs* …) changes the normal Subject-Object-Verb word order to create an interrogative, negative or imperative effect, although such light verbs prefer the second position in a clause rather than the very first, probably for metrical reasons (e.g., *þa wæs* …). Clause-linkers—conjunctions, relatives, and deictic or

specifying adverbs (e.g., *þa* 'then, when')—are placed for pragmatic reasons at the beginning of the clauses to which they connect. Pronouns, too, are "placed at or close to the left-periphery of the clause" because information tends logically to flow "from known to unknown" (240). The positioning of light finite verbs like *wæs* in the second position in a clause eventually led, Suzuki speculates, to a change of the normal word order of Subject-Object-Verb in supposedly early poetic texts like *Beowulf* to a norm of placing the verb in the second position relative to Subject and Object, as illustrated in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and later Germanic texts.

Ursula Zehnder undertakes "A Metrical Comparison of *Beowulf* and the *Old English Riddles* of the Exeter Book," in *Authors, Heroes and Lovers: Essays on Medieval English Literature and Language*, ed. Thomas Honegger (Bern: Peter Lang, 2001), 27–46. She finds that the poet or poets of the *Riddles* tend to use metrically regular but lighter verse types than the *Beowulf* poet, that is, those containing more unstressed function words and many fewer "heavy" poetic compounds, for which "*Beowulf* is famous" (42). Zehnder suggests that these light verses are appropriate to a ludic genre in which the reader is teased quickly with "a string of metaphoric allusions and disguises" (42) designed temporarily to conceal, but eventually to reveal, their referent.

Sources and Analogues

Michael Swisher, in "Beyond the Hoar Stone," *Neophilologus* 86: 133–36, adduces evidence from Anglo-Saxon charters, Blickling Homily 17 and *Andreas* 841b to suggest that the formulaic phrase *under/ofer harne stan* "under/over the grey stone," which appears four times in the poem at lines 887b, 1415a, 2553b, and 2744b, invokes the traditional motif of a boundary stone or "ancient monolith," signifying the threshold "between the known, familiar world of human activity and the frightening realm of monsters" (133).

In "Form and Representation in *Beowulf* and *Grettis Saga*," *Neophilologus* 86: 613–20, Dean Swinford compares two analogous scenes in the Old English epic and the Icelandic saga—the beginning of Beowulf's fight with Grendel and of Grettir's with Glámr—to illustrate not the close similarities of plot, which have long been recognized, but rather sharp stylistic differences between the two genres. Swinford assumes a common Germanic source from which both stories ultimately derive, but finds the saga's style, "like the Icelandic landscape," rhetorically "barren, minimalistic," while that of the OE poem is comparatively "overwrought, linguistically baroque" (616), using parallelism and variation to create "a complex, yet distinctly

heteroglossic, unified narrative structure from the sep-arate overlapping perspectives of the characters" (617). Unlike the saga writer, for instance, the Old English poet explicitly describes the subjective consciousness of Gren-del, investing this monster with a depraved and demonic malice which is intended to enhance his psychological menace, whereas the Icelandic "zombie" proves formida-ble to Grettir (at least in the initial part of their encounter) primarily because of his physical size and strength.

Alexander M. Bruce, in *Scyld and Scef: Expanding the Analogues*, with a Foreword by Paul E. Szarmach (New York: Routledge), has collected forty-three texts with trans-lations of all the available medieval references to these two figures, including lines 1–52 of *Beowulf*. Bruce uses a model of analysis derived from Georges Dumézil (1970, etc.) to suggest that the legendary founder "Shield" son of "Sheaf" was invented to explain how society came to be organized into two main classes of warriors and cultivators. In addi-tion, the Anglo-Saxon royal genealogies use the figure of Scef as a fourth son of Noah born in the Ark to link Ger-manic dynastic tradition with biblical history. In the later Middle Ages, English chroniclers continued to use these figures to demonstrate ethnic affinities and dynastic antiq-uity. Twelfth-century Icelandic historians, too, seem to have adapted the Anglo-Saxon pedigrees back to Scyld and Scef in order to establish their own culture's "connections to the very roots of both the Germanic and the Christian past" (83). In Denmark, Saxo Grammaticus and his suc-cessors used the figure of Scyld as a *Fürstenspiegel* "mirror of a prince" in their depiction of his justice and generos-ity. Saxo also tells how Scyld as a youth revealed his preco-cious courage by managing to bind a huge bear with only his belt: "Already at fifteen he had grown to such a stature that he presented a perfect specimen of manhood, and so forceful were the proofs of his talent that the other Danish kings assumed from him the common title of Skioldungs. Skiold's boldness, then, outstripped the full develop-ment of his strength and he fought contests which some-one of his tender years would scarcely have been allowed to watch" (trans. Peter Fisher [1980]). Thirteenth-century Icelandic sources associate Scyld with the old pagan war-gods, the Æsir, but do so to demonstrate the interdepen-dence of martial and agrarian social functions through the union of Skjöldr and the fertility goddess Gefjon. Bruce concludes that "the account of Scyld Scefing in *Beowulf* is at once a part of the tradition that considered Scyld as the model for all kings as well as a reminder of the suc-cessful balance between the warrior and agricultural social classes; as such, *Beowulf* shares a bond both with sources such as Sven Aggesens's [twelfth-century] *Short History of the Kings of Denmark* and Saxo's [early thirteenth-century]

Gesta Danorum as well as with works such as Snorri Sturlu-son's [early thirteenth-century] *Ynglinga Saga*" (87).

In "*Gifeðe* as 'Granted by Fate' in *Beowulf*" (*In Gearda-gum* 23: 51–66), Frank Battaglia understands the four appearances of *geofon* 'sea, ocean' in the poem to be allu-sions to the ancient Germanic fertility goddess whose name appears in Norse sources as *Gefjon* or *Gefion* 'Giving' and who has knowledge of and some considerable authority over the future. Battaglia further sees in line 49a—*geofon on garsecg* 'they gave [Scyld] to the sea'—the possibility of a double reference to "Gefion, on the waves," since this god-dess is specified as the supernatural consort of Skjöldr (OE Scyld) in *Ynglinga Saga*, ch. 5. The adjective *gifeðe* 'given, granted by fate' in the poem may still be charged with "sacral overtones" (65) deriving from the period of the fer-tility mother's cultic preeminence. But the rise of war-cults after *ca.* 500 A.D. transformed the kind of good fortune thus granted primarily into battle-success, a semantic pro-cess further strengthened by "the Anglo-Saxon Christian redactor" of the poem (62), which Battaglia understands to be pre-Christian in its original form.

In "From Judith to Grendel and Beyond the Prepuce: The Blood of Menstruation, Decapitation and Circum-cision," Chapter 1 of his *Sir Gawain and the Knight of the Green Chapel* (Lanham, MD: U Press of America), 32-74, Norman Simms sees Beowulf's fight with Grendel's mother at the bottom of the mere as a "psychohistorical" event (63) in which the young male hero must confront a monstrous female mother/lover who threatens to engulf him. Instead, he penetrates her with a phallic sword, symbolically forc-ing her "into the culturally-sanctioned submissive role of the female": "As the bloody mess of her death rises to the surface of the black waters, Grendel's Dam seems at once to be a menstruating woman and a mother giving birth" (59). The reborn hero who thus emerges from the "mēre" (*sic*) has finally passed "from youth into manhood" (61), after decapitating his dangerous male alter-ego whose carnivo-rous sexuality has been punished by this symbolic castra-tion or, alternatively, tamed into positive procreative force by a symbolic circumcision. Judith does something simi-lar for girls coming of age when she cuts off the head of Holofernes in the next poem in the manuscript.

Michael Kennedy, in "Tolkien and *Beowulf*: Warriors of Middle-Earth," *Amon Hen* 171 (2001): 15–16, quotes from no. 25 of Tolkien's *Letters* (1981): "*Beowulf* is among my most valued sources …" (15). Kennedy demonstrates the truth of this claim in two tables, the first listing in alphabetical order twenty-two Old English words or phrases from *Beowulf* that appear in some form in the fiction of J.R.R.

Tolkien. A second, separate list names twenty-five kings of Rohan and their kin in *The Lord of the Rings* (1954-55) that are derived from *Beowulf*. Kennedy is careful to note that "[n]ot all of the Old English words" cited as Tolkien's sources in these lists "are specific to *Beowulf*" alone (16)

Criticism

Michael D.C. Drout has edited J.R.R. Tolkien's *Beowulf and the Critics*, MRTS 248 (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies). This manuscript exists in two versions in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tolkien A26/1-4, both printed in this volume for the first time: an earlier A version (31–78) and a longer B version (79–146). These were probably composed in 1934–35 and were drawn upon by Tolkien for his famous British Academy lecture, "*Beowulf*: The Monsters and the Critics" (1936), as well as for his 1940 essay, "On Translating *Beowulf*." Drout supplies textual and explanatory notes to both A and B versions, as well as translations (when not offered by Tolkien) of quotations from Old and Middle English, Old Saxon, Old Norse, Old High German, and Latin. Drout's Introduction (1–29) makes clear the regional, class and ethnic associations that are involved in Tolkien's response to *Beowulf*: West Midlands, middle class, Anglo-Saxon of a blond-haired, blue-eyed, beer-loving (but Nazi- and *apartheid*-hating) sort. Drout demonstrates Tolkien's nostalgia for the ancient language and rural landscape of England, revealed in his insistence upon *Beowulf* as a particularly English, not a Norse or an early Germanic, poem:

> Tolkien believed that in some way English soil and northern sky had forged an important and valuable identity for the people of his country. This identity had been encapsulated in the speech, stories, and traditions of Old English, and had been mostly shattered by the Norman Conquest and the subsequent imposition of French upon the common speech of England. Tolkien's work on the language of the [early Middle English] Katherine Group showed that the Old English roots ran deep, and had persisted in spite of the onslaught of French. But even if an Old English culture had valiantly held on in the West Midlands, it had, long before Tolkien's time, succumbed. (15)

Tolkien responds most strongly to four prior critics of the poem: R.W. Chambers, Archibald Strong, John Earle, and W.P. Ker. His resistance to these scholars rests primarily upon what he sees as their approach to *Beowulf* as a mine of historical information, rather than as a work of poetic imagination. But he was not thereby an early New Critic, as argued by Clare Lees (1994). Rather, Tolkien's critical approach is eclectic, growing out of his own philological, religious and patriotic impulses, as well as something of a personal identification with the *Beowulf* poet and his view of life. The tragedy in *Beowulf* for Tolkien is not the old king's death from the dragon—death is inevitable—but his lack of a son to forestall the impending destruction of his people. The sadness of the *Beowulf* poet's own situation, as Tolkien imagines it, is that he came "at the end of an epoch, … telling of things already old and weighted with regret, and he expended his art in making keen that touch upon the heart which sorrows have that are both poignant and remote. So that if the funeral of Beowulf moved once like the echo of an ancient dirge [for the poet], it is to us as a memory brought over the hills, an echo of an echo" (B version, 145). In the poet's distant mourning of an even more ancient loss, Tolkien laments the parallel loss of what he himself cares for most in the world: the old language, stories and values of the English people which he saw embodied in *Beowulf*. In his philological work and in *Beowulf and the Critics* in particular, Tolkien sought "to allow that long-dead language to speak to us across the centuries and rekindle in the readers of *Beowulf* what [he] believed to be an essential truth about the poem and the world" (28). That truth is the inevitability of loss, "combined with the obstinate faith in the value of the doomed effort" to preserve what was good in that lost world (B version, 130). Tolkien concludes his manuscript: "To recapture such echoes is the final fruit of scholarship in an old tongue (and its most honourable object).… For such reasons ultimately do we study 'Anglo-Saxon'" (B version, 146).

Fred C. Robinson sees the view of the past in *Beowulf* as part of a broader pattern of "Retrospection in Old English and Other Early Germanic Literatures," in *The Grove: Studies on Medieval English Language and Literature* 8 (2001): 255–76. He concludes that the Christian poets of various Germanic peoples looked to their pre-Christian progenitors for personal inspiration and a sense of national identity and pride. He also suggests they did so out of a kind of spiritual compunction or *pietas* toward those good people who tragically died without the eternal salvation offered by the Christian faith: "They knew that their noble pagan ancestors could not enjoy Christian immortality, but by looking back on them and keeping them alive in memory they conferred on their pagan ancestors the only immortality available to them: the immortality of being remembered" (271).

In contrast to Robinson, Susanne Kries stresses the distinctiveness of *Beowulf*'s view of the past in "Historizität

im *Beowulf*: Zum Problem der Auseinandersetzung mit der germanischen Frühzeit," *Germanische-Romanische Monatsschrift* 52: 219–35. She notes that of the earliest surviving examples of Germanic literature only *Beowulf* offers a complex awareness of historical continuity and change, contradicting Mikhail Bakhtin's pronouncement in *The Dialogic Imagination* (1981) that traditional epics preserve an authoritative "monologic" view of a past which is separate from and superior to the present. Kries describes how the past in the poem is layered through time and far from unequivocally ideal. For example, the hero, who loses his life against a dragon, is revealed as fallible when compared with his more successful dragon-slaying predecessor, Sigemund. But mention of Fitela, Sigemund's nephew and son by incest, serves to undermine that earlier hero's stature as well, demonstrating a continuum of imperfection from a rather idealized distant heroic age to a more prosaic present. History falls into three successive stages in the poem: an ancient age of legendary heroes (Sigemund and Fitela, Heremod, Finn and Hnæf, and Offa) connected by the two dragon-fights to the time of the action of the poem, an "Age of Beowulf" (and of Hrothgar, Hrothulf, Hygelac, and Ingeld). This second age is joined in turn to the contemporary Anglo-Saxon world by the figure of Scyld Scefing, since he was understood to have founded both of the royal family of Denmark in the poem and of the West Saxon kings in the time of the poet and his audience.

In "The Narrative Strategy of Double Voicing in *Beowulf*," *North Dakota Quarterly* 69: 40–49, Lidan Lin joins Kries in challenging Bakhtin's view "that epic contains only one voice, which is the voice of tradition" (41). Lin argues that the *Beowulf* poet both respects and distrusts the tradition of heroic values he has inherited. The poet uses various feud narratives—the Finnsburh lay, the account of Ingeld and Freawaru, the recollections of reciprocal hostilities between the Geats and Swedes or Franks—to question and "disrupt" the idealized ethos promoted in the main story of the hero (40). Lin describes these heroic ideals as spontaneous courage and absolute fidelity to king and kin expressed through vengeance, "whether such a revenge is morally justified" or not (44). For instance, Beowulf's loyalty to Hrothgar is revealed in his fearless prosecution of the feud against the king's enemy Grendel, but similar courage, loyalty and vengeance is depicted with far more disturbing consequences in the story of Finn, Hengest, and Hildeburh, thus subverting the same virtues celebrated in the hero. Lin concludes (apparently now returning to Bakhtin's view of traditional epic as unyieldingly authoritarian), that the *Beowulf* poet was constrained by his tradition "to reproduce the official heroic ideology," in spite of his own attempt "to break away from the prescriptive confines of

this tradition" through his inclusion of feud stories cast in a darker light (48). Lin does not address the complication that these other narratives, too, came to the poet from the same heroic tradition they are said to undermine.

Johann Köberl would go even further than Lin to insist not only on the poet's ambivalence toward heroic values, but *The Indeterminacy of 'Beowulf'* as a whole (Lanham, MD: U Press of America). He uses the analogy of the Rorschach test in which an image (like a duck/rabbit) can be perceived to bear equally valid but mutually exclusive meanings. Köberl believes the stark ambiguities of the poem operate at all levels, from the lexical, syntactic, referential, and tonal in terms of language and style, to the historical, symbolic and thematic with regard to its interpretation. Köberl suggests we embrace the ambiguities of *Beowulf*, since they may "actually constitute the theme of the poem," which systematically demonstrates "how evaluations can be made in different and contrary ways," that "objective value judgments are not really possible" and that "what we see depends on our point of view" (178). However, even this conclusion is too restrictive because *Beowulf*, like any work of art, is not "a static entity but … a creative process, the sum total of the discourse on its material basis" (that is, the text in Cotton Vitellius A.xv), which is still ongoing (178). The unresolved ambiguities of the poem thus contribute toward a more general "theme of transience and mutability in a form of *mise en abime*, … the indefinite deferral of definite solutions by a refusal to apply any form of closure to the critical discussion that constitutes *Beowulf*" (11). Köberl does not notice the use of this image of the poem as *mise en abîme* in two recent articles by Joseph Harris: "*Beowulf* as Epic," *Oral Tradition* 15 (2000): 159–69, and "'Double Scene' and '*Mise en Abyme*' in *Beowulf*ian Narrative," in *Gudar på jorden: Festskrift till Lars Lönnroth*, ed. Stina Hansson and Mats Malm (Stockholm/Stehag: Symposion, 2000), 322–38.

Robert L. Schichler examines three kennings for the sea in which animals form some component in "From 'Whale-Road' to 'Gannet's Bath': Images of Foreign Relations and Exchange in *Beowulf*," *Reading Medieval Studies* 28: 59–86. Schichler believes these kennings are used to reveal a shift in the quality of the Danish kings' relations with neighboring peoples: Scyld Scefing intimidates his neighbors and forces tribute from them over the *hronrad* 'whale-road' (line 10a), while Hrothgar cultivates freer and more friendly exchanges over the *swanrad* 'swan-road' (line 200a) or *ganotes bæð* 'gannet's bath' (line 1861b). Whales pose both a literal and a symbolic danger in the poem, confirmed by this sea-beast's characterization in the Old English *Physiologus* (lines 24-31a), as well as its presentation in various other

biblical, exegetical and poetic sources. Sea-birds, however, have more positive associations in Old English poetry: swans in *Andreas*, *Elene* and (by extension) *The Phoenix* (though not, Schichler is careful to note, in *Juliana*); gannets in *The Seafarer* and the *Paris Psalter*. "Gannet's bath" occurs in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (*sub anno* 975) in a favorable notice of the honor King Edgar enjoyed from the kings of many nations over the sea, suggesting to Schichler an allusion to that king in *Beowulf*'s depiction of Hrothgar and thus a late tenth- to early eleventh-century date for the composition of the poem in which such a regime of friendly foreign relations would be fondly recalled.

In "From Epic to Romance: The Literary Transformation of Private Blood Feud into Societal *Ressentiment*," *Comitatus* 33: 37–57, Michael Pantazakos compares *Beowulf* to the *Chanson de Roland* to demonstrate a fundamental change of social feeling which he believes took place in the eleventh century. The Old English epic celebrates forthright face-to-face courage against tribal enemies, and a focused duty of revenge for the slaying of one's own kind, whereas the Old French poem (which Pantazakos understands as a literary form transitional to romance) sees all non-Christians as enemies, as agents of supernatural evil regardless of their actual offenses. Pantazakos blames this shift of villain from the tribal enemy of epic to the evil Other of romance on theologians like St. Anselm of Canterbury (d. 1109). Anselm stressed the Passion of Christ (over the Incarnation or Resurrection) as the central event of Christian history, thus inspiring a societal thirst for revenge upon all enemies of Christ, especially the Jews who supposedly killed him. Pantazakos cites the one passage in *Roland* that reveals such reflexive anti-Semitism in lines 3661–65, where Charlemagne (with telling religious ignorance) orders not only the mosques of Saragossa to be cleansed of their idols, but the synagogues as well (44). Pantazakos believes the *Roland* poet further inflames religious hostility against the Jews by modeling his hero's martyrdom, instigated by a Judas-figure Ganelon, on the crucifixion of Christ. The author then cites some more explicitly anti-Semitic passages in later medieval romances to exemplify this new trend of religious hatred, adopting to describe it Friedrich Nietzsche's special use of French *ressentiment* 'resentment' in *The Genealogy of Morals*. Pantazakos sees a synonym for this attitude in the *bealo-nið* 'evil rancor' to which Hrothgar refers on line 1758a of *Beowulf* and suggests that the poet has personified its symbolic force in the three monsters. The noble hero Beowulf eschews this ideological vice, killing dangerous monsters and other actual enemies of his people, to be sure, but subduing with fairness and self-restraint, without demonization, the malice of a potential human enemy like Unferth.

Frederick M. Biggs focuses upon issues of succession in "The Naming of Beowulf and Ecgtheow's Feud," *PQ* 80 (2001): 95–112. He suggests that the naming of the hero is delayed in the poem in order to give Hrothgar himself an opportunity to adduce the reason for Beowulf's journey to Denmark. That journey is intended to repay the old king for the assistance he once gave the hero's father Ecgtheow long before. The weakness of the Danes in their current feud with Grendel is thus balanced against the Geats's former weakness against the Wylfings, a people whom Ecgtheow had offended by slaying Heatholaf. At the same time, however, a more important difference between Danes and Geats is revealed by this comparison: the two peoples follow contrasting models of royal succession, each with its own strengths and weaknesses. The Danes practice an older system of *ætheling* competition which can produce violence among members of the royal family, but yields strong leaders, like Hrothgar who inherited the throne from his older brother Heorogar and Hrothgar's nephew Hrothulf, whom the poet implies will occupy the throne at the expense of Hrothgar's sons. The Geats, on the other hand, prefer to restrict royal eligibility "too drastically to sons" of the ruling monarch, thus leaving themselves sometimes without a worthy heir to the throne, as in the case of Hygelac's son Heardred, or with weak bonds of loyalty toward pretenders from collateral lines, like Beowulf, who in any case brings the Hrethling dynasty to an end through his lack of a son (106). These considerations are pointedly relevant to the changing "politics of succession" in the poet's own Anglo-Saxon society, prompted by the introduction of a new "Christian model of kingship" based upon primogeniture (107).

In "Beowulf's Fight with the Nine Nicors," *RES* n.s. 53: 311–28, Biggs examines the two accounts of Beowulf's swimming match with Breca: 1) Unferth's version which contains no mention of sea-monsters, and 2) the hero's in which they are said to have attacked him and been killed. This discrepancy suggests to Biggs that Beowulf has made up the story of the sea-monsters, within the conventions of the flyting or verbal dual, in order to imply that he sees himself at that moment as surrounded by dangerous enemies, one of whom—Unferth—would very much like to drag him down (322) and whose personal crime of fratricide is "emblematic of the Danes as a whole" (323). "Beowulf has constructed the aborted monster-feast on the ocean floor in order to mirror his immediate situation" and to suggest that the Danes themselves "occupy the place of the monsters in his account" (321). The hero's symbolic use of monsters in this instance prepares the poem's audience to see the subsequent monster-fights not "as real [historical] events" (312), but rather as dramatic projections or allegories of

the political circumstances depicted in the poem. "Within the fiction of the poem, the monsters are, of course, real for Beowulf; he kills Grendel and Grendel's mother, and he dies fighting the dragon" (318). But Grendel, according to Biggs, is simply a vivid personification of the fratricide which will engulf the Danish royal family through its surplus of æthelings eligible for the throne while, in contrast, the solitary dragon at the end of the poem is meant to embody the inability of the Geats to continue their royal line after the death of the sonless Beowulf.

Robert Boenig, in "Scyld's Burial Mound," *ELN* 40: 1–13, reminds us that ship-burials, like those discovered at Sutton Hoo in East Anglia or Oseburg and Gokstad in Scandinavia, were understood to symbolize and initiate a spiritual journey of the dead to the Otherworld. Boenig argues that lines 26–52 are likewise intended to imply such a ship-burial for Scyld and that the poet imagines "Scyld departing in his boat not into a literal but into a mythic sea" (3).

In "Horror in *Beowulf*: Mutilation, Decapitation, and Unburied Dead," in *Early Medieval Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, ed. Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies), 81–100, Gale R. Owen-Crocker finds that, with a few brief exceptions, the *Beowulf* poet's depiction of violence between human warriors is not particularly graphic, with much left to the imagination of the audience. Furthermore, the poet lavishes detailed attention upon ritual obsequies—a ship funeral, cremations on a pyre, burials in a mound—all of which serve to naturalize loss of life, even violent death in battle, as part of the normal course of human events, however sad. In contrast, the poet creates a sense of unresolved emotional distress—horror—in his account or anticipation of "unnatural" violence which is not subject to appropriate social closure, including cannibalism, the permanent severing of important body parts (hands, arms and especially heads), their display as trophies, the loss to the enemy and despoiling of the dead, the hanging or leaving of corpses as food for carrion fowl and other scavengers.

The year 2002 saw several Eastern European and Far Eastern contributions to the study of *Beowulf*. From the Czech Republic, Jan Čermák compares the spatial schemes of two Old English poems, *Beowulf* and *Exodus*, in "Zápas o světlo: Poznámky k pojetí prostoru v epice Anglosasú [The Fight for Light: Notes Towards the Conception of Space in Anglo-Saxon Epics]," in *Kultura a místo: Studie z komparatistiky III*, ed. Vladimír Svatoň and Anna Housková (Prague: Centrum komparatistiky Filozofická Fakulta Univerzita Karlova, 2001), 187–207. The depiction of space

in both poems is impressionistic and unsystematic, but reflective of their central themes. In *Beowulf* the world of human action is centralized and defensive in orientation, displaying parallel polarities of center and margin, light and dark, order and chaos, mead-hall and monster-lair. In *Exodus*, on the other hand, the movement of the poem is centrifugal and dynamic, seeking through a destabilized spiritual landscape the light of a promised new center.

N.IU. Gvozdetskaia, in "Semantika drevneangliyskoy poeticheskoy formuly (na materiale *Beovul'fa* i *Videniya kresta*) [The Semantics of Old English Poetic Formulas (Based on Materials from *Beowulf* and *The Dream of the Rood*)]," in *Lingvistika na rubezhe epoh: Idei i toposy: Sbornik statey* [*Linguistics at the Turn of the Millennium: Ideas and Topoi: A Collection of Essays*] (Moscow: n.p., 2001), 245–62, observes that Old English poetry developed in an environment of dynamic interaction between two verbal traditions, the oral pagan Germanic and the written Christian Latin. The basis of this interaction was the poet's willingness to depict biblical themes and characters in the formulaic language of traditional verse, thus creating for that traditional diction a far wider range of meanings and connotations. The "grafting of meaning" on traditional forms worked both ways. Gvozdetskaia cites instances in *Beowulf* where traditional motifs of heroic action—the readiness of the hero for battle or his triumph over a defeated enemy—are invested with Christian meaning. Conversely, similar motifs in *The Dream of the Rood* inflect scenes from scripture with the sentiment of traditional heroic epic.

I.B. Gubanov, in "Epicheskiy tekst kak istoricheskiy istochnik: metodologiya issledovaniya (na primere *Beovul'fa*) [The Epic Text as a Historical Source: Research Methodology (Based on the Example of *Beowulf*)]," *Peterburgskoe Lingvisticheskoye Obshchestvo; Nauchniye Chteniya—2001* [*The Linguistic Society of St. Petersburg 2001 Conference*], supplement to the journal *Yazyk I Rechevaya Deyatel'Nost'* [*Language and Language Behavior*] 4.1 (St. Petersburg: U of St. Petersburg), 27–38, calls for an interdisciplinary approach to the study of Scandinavian culture from the end of the eighth to the second half of the eleventh centuries, using epic texts like *Beowulf*. Since the text of *Beowulf* cannot be considered a document reliably chronicling actual events, it must first be compared with other sources, like the account of Hygelac's raid against the Franks and Frisians in Gregory of Tours's *Historia Francorum*, to ascertain its value as a historical source. However, a second and much more productive approach is to use the poem as a source of ethnographic information on the social customs and institutions of the northern Germanic peoples,

including warband organization, funeral rites, etc. A third approach would compare *Beowulf* with related texts in Old Icelandic that depict situations and characters analogous to those of the Old English poem, like the motif of the lamenting woman. This third approach requires a close study of the precise meaning of key terms in certain well-defined contexts, which Gubanov illustrates by describing the senior and junior warbands designated by the words *duguð* and *geogoð*, respectively. [Thanks for assistance with the articles in Russian to Alexander Woronzoff-Dashkoff, Professor of Russian Language and Literature, Smith College.]

Through a study of the many synonyms for sea in the poem and the contexts in which they are used, Insung Lee finds "The Symbolic Meaning of the Sea in the Old English Poem *Beowulf*," *Jnl of English Language and Literature* 47 (2001): 337–54 (in Korean), to be essentially malign, the representation of *a priori* evil in the world.

In "Heroic Poetry including *Beowulf*," Chapter 3 of his *A History of Old English Literature* (Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview), 51–90, Michael Alexander quotes generously from his own alliterative verse translations of *Beowulf* (1973) and other Old English poems (1966) to describe and illustrate the form and content of Old English heroic verse. Alexander believes that "*Beowulf* defines the species of heroic poetry in Old English. It dominates the extant verse literature to an extent that defeats perspective—as Shakespeare does in English Renaissance drama or *Paradise Lost* does with the epic poem in English. A tenth of the lines of Old English verse are to be found in *Beowulf*, as are most of the memorable lines, scenes, and sentiments" (76).

Dissertations

A number of doctoral dissertations devoted substantial attention to *Beowulf*. In "Altered Identities: Time and Transformation in *Beowulf*," Diss. U of Oregon (*DAI* 63A: 2236), James Dyas Thayer argues that the "world of *Beowulf* is one that is tyrannized by the relentless passage of time and the turmoil of change." The hero himself is the "unwitting" servant of the Christian God, helping to prepare for a new era which he himself cannot enter. Joseph Robert Carroll compares *Beowulf* to the Old Icelandic *Prose Edda* and *Heimskringla* in "Snorri Sturluson and *Beowulf*," Diss. U of Connecticut 2001 (*DAI* 62A [2001]: 3041). Carroll finds a similar understanding of history and the nature of kingship in all three works, especially as they negotiate the transition between the world-views and value systems of pagan and Christian times. Eileen A. Joy, in "*Beowulf* and the Floating Wreck of History," Diss. U of Tennessee

2001 (*DAI* 63A [2001]: 180), argues that *Beowulf* studies, as part of Anglo-Saxon scholarship, have arisen not primarily as part of an ethnocentric ideological program, as has recently been proposed, but "through a series of historical accidents intersecting—sometimes randomly, sometimes more purposefully—with what Michel Foucault termed 'the more enduring structures of history.'" The poem itself is "one of the more beautiful scraps" of this "floating wreck of history" in which both random contingency and social purpose combine.

Yvette Louise Kisor, in "The Inner *Beowulf*: Theories of Structure and Composition of the Poem and Their Implications for Modern Readers," Diss. U of California, Davis, 2001 (*DAI* 62A [2001]: 3041), examines different analyses of the organization of *Beowulf*, especially David Howlett's recent theory of the poem's patterns of biblical numerology (1995, 1997) in relation to other views of the poem as modeled in part upon Virgil's *Aeneid*. Kisor believes that the narrative discontinuities in *Beowulf* are intended as sites for readers' activity and thus important to the way "the poet controls the emotional momentum of the poem" and "how the reader experiences the poem as a dramatic event." Natalia Calvert, in "Reading between Medieval Epic and Romance: Violence in *Beowulf* and Wolfram von Eschenbach," Diss. Stanford U, 2001 (*DAI* 62A [2001]: 3384), argues that both Wolfram (in *Parzival* and *Willehalm*) and the *Beowulf* poet draw upon the conventions of several different literary forms—epic, romance, allegory, and hagiography—in their representation of violence. Samantha Alison Jones studies "The Loathly Lady and the Margins of the Middle Ages," Diss. U of Cincinnati, 2001 (*DAI* 62A [2001]: 2770). Grendel's monstrous mother is the prototype of this figure and reflects "the multiple, systematic oppressions" of women in medieval society. Her secret knowledge of the past, her mysterious female physicality and motherhood, her social marginality, are all conceived as threats to masculine authority. The hero "wins the battle yet loses the war" when he destroys this demonized mother, bringing his people into dire peril and his own family line to an end.

Translations, Translation Studies, Teaching Beowulf

2002 saw two new Norton Critical Editions of the poem, each using a different translation. Daniel Donoghue edits Seamus Heaney's poetic rendering in *Beowulf: A Verse Translation: Authoritative Text, Contexts, Criticism* (New York: Norton), which includes Heaney's explanatory Introduction (xxiii–xxxviii), earlier published as part of a 1999 English edition and a 2000 American bilingual edition. In *Beowulf: A Prose Translation: Backgrounds and*

Contexts, Criticism (New York: Norton), Nicholas Howe edits E. Talbot Donaldson's 1966 version, used for many years in *The Norton Anthology of English Literature* until it was replaced in the 7th edition (2000) by Heaney's verse translation. Both critical editions include background essays, glossaries of names and selected bibliographies. In their samples of criticism, only Roberta Frank's 1982 essay on "The *Beowulf* Poet's Sense of History" is included in both volumes.

Howell Chickering, in "Beowulf and 'Heaneywulf'," *The Kenyon Review* 24: 160–78, undertakes a thorough examination of Heaney's verse rendering. He reminds us that Norton had originally commissioned the poet "to represent the Old English poem to undergraduates in a … relatively faithful translation" (160) for its new *Norton Anthology* mentioned above. Chickering finds Heaney's rendering of the dramatic speeches, which make up two-fifths of the poem, to be very effective: "passage after passage delivers the sense and tone of the Old English with effortless grace" (162). Chickering notes that Heaney has determined upon a particular rhetorical style for the whole poem, a deliberate forthright dignity of utterance that can also work very well for some passages of narrative, as in the hero's journey to Denmark (lines 210–28). However, Chickering also finds that this "foursquare" style (Heaney's adjective) is not necessarily appropriate for the poem as a whole, which can be both "restrained and exuberant, often ironic, oblique, ceremonial, sometimes sententious" (164), moving "back and forth between pell-mell narrative and lingering reflection" (166). In fact, Chickering finds that Heaney himself frequently breaks the stylistic decorum he has chosen without any obvious prompting from the text. There are "dull stretches" and "overwrought images," "clunky over-alliterations" and "wildly varying dictional choices" (167), the latter of which take three main forms: "the chummily colloquial," "clichés of speech … which you simply don't expect in a poet of Heaney's stature" and "deliberate Ulsterisms" (168). These last, of which Chickering lists about a dozen (173), have generated the most controversy. Rather than leading to "some unpartitioned linguistic country," as Heaney says he longed to do in the Introduction to his Bilingual Edition (xxv), not included in *The Norton Anthology* version, the Ulsterisms self-consciously flag politically charged differences of culture and language of uncertain relevance, obtruding themselves unnecessarily into the reader's grasp and appreciation of the Old English poem. Chickering thus finds Heaney's translation to be both self-contradictory in theory and inconsistent in practice. It might even be considered a bit "self-serving" (173), in that Heaney has appropriated the Old English poem for inclusion in his "own canon" (175), rather than serving more disinterestedly

the student readers of *The Norton Anthology* for whom he had agreed to produce the translation.

Loren C. Gruber, in "'So.' So What? It's a Culture War. That's Hwæt! Seamus Heaney's Verse Translation of *Beowulf*, Bilingual and Critical Editions," *In Geardagum* 23: 67–84, finds many of the same problems that Chickering does with Heaney's approach and achievement. He quotes from Heaney's own description of his attitude toward the help offered by "the W.W. Norton-appointed" scholar Alfred David: "I … persisted many times in what we both [Heaney and David] knew were erroneous ways,' and—using [Heaney's] term—'skewed' the translation" (Gruber, p. 72; my clarifications in square brackets). This admission by Heaney can be found in the concluding Acknowledgements of the Bilingual Edition (2000) at p. 219, which Gruber observes (72 n.16) is absent from Donoghue's Norton Critical Edition (2002). In addition, Gruber finds both politically misleading and semantically anachronistic Heaney's choice of Anglo-Irish *bawn* 'fortified dwelling which the English planters built in Ireland to keep the dispossessed natives at bay' as a term for Hrothgar's hall (so defined by Heaney in the Bilingual Edition, p. xxx; Donoghue's Critical Edition, p. xxxviii): "It is one thing to say the Irish are victims of English conquest and colonialism; it is quite another to imply that Grendel and his mother are victims of Danish hall-sprawl" (74; cf. Chickering, above, who calls Heaney's analogy "deeply confused" [p. 174]). Gruber agrees with Tom Shippey (1999) in deploring Heaney's use of the "foursquare" indicative mood throughout to override the poet's frequent use of the subjunctive, as well as other grammatical errors and insensitivities. Gruber's title refers to the first word of the poem, the high-register "epic-opening *Hwæt*" (77), which Heaney renders with the self-consciously colloquial "So."—an idiom recollected from his Ulster uncles. Gruber concludes strongly: "I resent what appears to be Heaney's co-opting the poem to reflect his war with the English. Seamus Heaney is a wonderful poet. He is not a faithful translator.… John Leyerle [1965] suggested that Beowulf suffered hubris when he desired to view the dragon-guarded treasures. Perhaps the same could be said of Heaney and his recreation of *Beowulf*" (80).

Joseph McGowan takes the opposite view in "Heaney, Cædmon, *Beowulf*," *New Hibernia Rev*. 6: 25–42. He stoutly defends Heaney's Ulsterisms and suggests that criticism by some scholars, mainly Nicholas Howe (2000), was predictable and motivated by linguistic and other forms of prejudice: "The roar over a 'revisionist *Beowulf*' has less to do with a handful of words and a few echoes and much more to do with some lingering discomfort that the foremost poet writing in English should come from where he does,

and is who he is" (40–41). McGowan believes that Heaney should be compared to his seventh-century Northumbrian counterpart Cædmon, a figure with whom Heaney himself closely identifies in *The Spirit Level* (1996). Just as the cowherd Cædmon was once inspired to render foreign biblical story in the poetic idiom of his own people, so the farmboy Heaney, "working from a beleaguered Anglo-Irish tradition," has rendered "a great English epic … for inclusion in the most influential textbook of English literature [*The Norton Anthology*]" (42). As a consequence, McGowan believes that Heaney's *Beowulf* "may do more for Anglo-Irish literary relations than any other text of the late twentieth century" and "represents, at least, the crowning of Heaney's long apprenticeship as scop" (42).

Mary K. Ramsey has edited a collection of essays on *'Beowulf' in Our Time: Teaching 'Beowulf' in Translation*, *OEN* Subsidia 21 (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publ.), for which she has written a Foreword (1–2). Alfred David, who assisted Heaney in his translation of the poem as editor of the medieval section of the 7th edition of *The Norton Anthology* (1–467, at 32–99), joins McGowan in defending Heaney's Ulsterisms against Nicholas Howe ("Scullionspeak," *New Republic* [2000]) and Chickering (see above) in "The Nationalities of *Beowulf*: Anglo-Saxon Attitudes" (3–21). In the example of lines 975b–77a, David stresses the poet's ability to capture freshly through dialect the hero's "grim *Schadenfreude* with which [he] describes the damage he has inflicted on the fleeing monster"—"He is hasped and hooped and hirpling with pain"—even if the reader does not know the "exact denotation for *hirpling*," that is, "hobbling" (4). In addition, David points out that there are plenty of hard words and *hapax legomena* in the Old English text itself, so that Heaney can be seen in this regard to reproduce the experience of reading *Beowulf* as the poet and scribes have left it to us (5). David then reviews the history of *Beowulf* studies in the eighteenth and nineteeth centuries, noting their often nationalistic or Romantic inspiration. He concludes (again with McGowan) by suggesting that critics of Heaney reveal a certain academic, even linguistic or ethnic provincialism in their "Anglo-Saxon attitudes" (21; from Lewis Carroll, *Through the Looking Glass* [1872]). Rather than "circling the wagons," David urges his fellow Anglo-Saxonists to "become more flexible in the ways we define what is literature, what is English literature, and what is English" (17). We should celebrate the multicultural "communion" through time among great writers of different nations and languages, living and dead, like Seamus Heaney and the *Beowulf* poet (21).

In "Skalded Epic (Make It Old)" (*'Beowulf' in Our Time*, 41–66), Stephen Glosecki, describes his own experience of translating the poem using the analogy of smithcraft from the tradition of Norse skaldic poetry. An earlier version of his essay appeared in *PNR* 26 (2000): 52–55, summarized in *YWOES* for that year. John M. Hill closely examines lines 642–70, which describe Wealhtheow's first cup-serving in the hall and Hrothgar's placement of its protection in the hands of the young hero ("Translating Social Speech and Gesture in *Beowulf*," *'Beowulf' in Our Time*, 67-79). Hill first construes the passage by considering the range of known denotations, connotations, and possible ironies for the dramatic sequence of words and images, and notes that deliberate progress by half-line steps "restrains rhetorical overflow such that … even one repetition with a difference can be thunderous" (68). He then reviews excerpts from translations by Donaldson, Garmonsway, Heaney, Liuzza, Lehman, Conybeare, Gummere, Gordon, Glosecki, and Osborn to see how they succeed in conveying the "intensely performed" social gravity of the scene (79). For instance, Donaldson (1966) strikes a fluent balance between formal discourse and literal accuracy, but obscures the almost sacral enormity of the king's charge to Beowulf and the grandeur of his exit from the greatest hall on earth for his noble queen's bed. Hill finds that Gordon (1926) perhaps best succeeds in capturing the ritual weight of the passage, in spite (or perhaps because) of a biblical style which Tolkien called in his own essay, "On Translating *Beowulf*" (rpt. 1997), "a form of language familiar in meaning and yet freed from trivial associations" (quoted by Hill, 78).

R.M. Liuzza, who published his own verse rendering at the same time as Heaney, describes his changing sense of the translator's duty as teacher in "*Beowulf* in Translation—Problems and Possibilities" (23–40). At first Liuzza sought to reproduce for his students a version "that sounded like the poem I heard in my own head when I read *Beowulf*," one which would give them "a fuller, more authentic experience of the original poem" (27). Yet he began to realize that such an experience is something of an illusion, since even the single surviving manuscript is also "a kind of translation—the copy … of a copy [in which] an unknown number of scribes have had a hand … and almost certainly made changes" (30). Even the very first written version of the poem came out of an oral tradition, each performance of which was "provisional, … a retelling of an old story for a new audience, a look backwards from some present perspective—not unlike the work of a modern translation" (31–32). All representations of the poem are thus "adaptations and interpretations of a prior version" (28) in which current literary tastes and implicit cultural expectations shape "the translator's response far more powerfully than any linguistic knowledge of the text itself" (39). Every

translator in every age hears a different *Beowulf* inside his head, rendering it in the idiom of his or her own time. A good teacher's task is thus twofold: to engage students deeply in the new version, even as they are brought to realize the contingent, culturally conditioned process of literary interpretation that it inevitably reflects.

Liuzza develops this theme further in "Lost in Translation: Some Versions of *Beowulf* in the Nineteenth Century," *ES* 83: 281–95, tracing the history of the very earliest translations of the poem: Thorkelin's Latin prose (1815), Gruntvig's Danish verse (1820), Conybeare's English Miltonic blank verse (1826), Kemble's English prose (1837), Ettmüller's German alliterative verse (1840). Liuzza destabilizes an easy evaluative distinction between translations which strive to render the Old English text with philological accuracy and those which pursue various strategies to make it moving and meaningful to readers. For instance, "[b]oth Longfellow [1845] and Morris [1895] produced translations which most modern readers would not hesitate to call 'bad,' but they worked from strong poetic principles and sought to make the poem speak to them in their own language; the line of prose versions which runs from Kemble [1837] to E.T. Donaldson [1966] produced 'good' translations which have had absolutely no impact on the poetics of our age" (294). While Liuzza admits that "an accurate understanding of the surviving text must be, at some level, the basis of all translation," he would finally judge a given version's success or failure "by how well it makes the poem seem like a living thing rather than a dead one" to the readers of its own age (295).

In a similar way, Emilio J. López Cantarero feels that the value of Heaney's *Beowulf* and the "*luscious* debate" it has provoked (183, his emphasis) is "something essentially positive in order to keep Anglo-Saxon studies alive" (186; in "Big-Voiced Scullions: A Few Considerations on Seamus Heaney's New Translation of *Beowulf*," *The Grove: Studies on Medieval English Language and Literature* 8 [2001]: 171–88). After reviewing this lively controversy to the time of his writing, López Cantarero finds Heaney's poem to be "halfway between the scholarly version and the readable remaking" (185), both of which are legitimate choices. However, any version offering itself as an accurate reflection of the original poem, rather than a "revisionist exercise" or personal adaptation, "should need no further translation than itself," referring to Heaney's glossed Ulsterisms and Gaelicisms (185). López Cantarero concludes: "I think Heaney's responsibility as translator should be prior to his inner conflicts and outer claims.… Perhaps we will have to wait for a more scholarly version or choose among those which already exist" (185-86). López Cantarero seems to

be unaware of Liuzza's new verse translation mentioned above, one which very well may satisfy his desire for a new, "more scholarly version."

Osmo Pekonen, in "How Beowulf Sailed to Finland," in *The Kalevala and the World's Traditional Epics*, ed. Lauri Honko, Studia Fennica, Folkloristica 12 (Helsinki: Finnish Literature Soc.), 149–54, notes some curious points of background to "the first complete verse translation of *Beowulf* into Finnish" (153), which he published with Clive Tolley (Helsinki, 1999): 1. Pekonen observes that Joseph Harris (1999) derives the first element of the hero's name from that of a barley divinity *Beow*, cognate with Norse *Byggvir*, the ale-server of the gods in *Lokasenna*. This name may also be related to that of a Finnish-Estonian god of barley and ale *Pek(k)o*, so that the Anglo-Saxon hero, the Finnish divinity and the translator Pekonen himself might all be considered namesakes of a sort (150). 2. After his adventure with Breca in the poem, Beowulf is carried to *Finna land* 'the land of the Finns (or Lapps [Saami])' (line 580b), "the earliest mention of 'Finland' in English literature" (151). 3. In the spring of 1918 the German warship *Beowulf* aided the liberation of Helsinki from Bolsheviks, seizing and rechristening two Russian gunboats as *Beo* and *Wulf* to become part of "the first navy of an independent Finland" (152).

E. L. Risden, in "Teaching Anglo-Saxon Humor or Yes, Virginia, There is Humor in *Beowulf*," *SMART* 9: 21–38, believes that discussing with students the kinds of sophisticated humor that may be found in Old English poetry will serve better to illustrate the complexity of human experience depicted there and its continuity with our own. Risden counts "sixty-seven instance of humor in *Beowulf*, the most common using irony" (34). He further notes "one hundred and two instances of litotes, twenty-four of which are humorous," though of a rather grim sort (35). There are "eight examples of verbal humor …, most turning on figures of speech, and six examples of situational humor, most of which involve insult or an appeal to superiority" (35). Risden also cites what he finds to be humorous moments in *Judith*, *Andreas*, *Daniel*, and *Juliana*.

Richard E. Zeikowitz, in "Befriending the Medieval Queer: A Pedagogy for Literature Classes," *College English* 65: 67–80, argues that the term *queerness* should not be used simply to refer to homosexual desire, but rather to "any nonnormative behavior, relationship, or identity," or to "an alternative form of desire that threatens the stability of the dominant norm" (67). For instance, Grendel's cannibalism can be seen from this perspective as a form of "disruptive queerness" (67) against the "homosocial normativity"

of Heorot, a world of "socially acceptable male-male bonding and intimacy that may at times be erotically inflected" (71). Zeikowitz asks: "Might Grendel be simply operating under a very different understanding of homosociality? Could he possibly be merely desiring some physical contact with the warriors? Must we assume that he intends to kill the men?" (72). Such sympathy for Grendel, Zeikowitz hopes, will "encourage students to denaturalize their own social identities" and "to interrogate critically the origins of … traditional viewpoints" which find expression in medieval texts like *Beowulf* (78).

Finally, Daniel Mersey provides a prose retelling of the poem with an overview of its historical contexts in "Beowulf: Warrior King of the Geats," Chapter 4 of his *Legendary Warriors: Folklore's Greatest Heroes in Myth and Reality* (London: Brassey's), 77–100.

C.R.D.

d. Prose

Twelve items in this section appeared in *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations* (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies), ed. Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser, hereafter abbreviated *EMETI*. Another five appeared in *Via Crucis: Essays on Early Medieval Sources and Ideas in Memory of J. E. Cross*, ed. Thomas A. Hall with Thomas D. Hill and Charles D. Wright, Medieval European Studies 1 (Morgantown, WV: West Virginia UP), hereafter *Via Crucis*.

Juan C. Conde-Silvestre explores "The Code and Context of *Monasteriales Indicia*: A Semiotic Analysis of Late Anglo-Saxon Monastic Sign Language" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 36 [2001]: 145–69). London, BL, MS Cotton Tiberius A.iii contains several monastic rules and *Monasteriales Indicia*, an explanation of the sign system the Benedictines at Christ Church, Canterbury used during daily periods of silence. Signs are grouped by place: words for liturgical books, vestments, and objects follow 'church' and 'chapel'; foods and utensils follow 'refectory'. Lists of foods, bedding, and clothes reflect both the Rule's strictures and its moderation, but signs for bathing go beyond similar Continental texts, suggesting that Anglo-Saxon interest in cleanliness surpassed the Rule's. Signs for people include monastic hierarchy and 'king' and 'queen', indicating their importance in the Reform. Conde-Silvestre then turns to semiotics, specifically kinesics (the study of gestures). He distinguishes between simple and compound, and free and bound signs. Most of the monastic signs are iconic or mimetic, and none are primary (pointing directly to an

object); all are derived, connected to referents by synecdoche, metonymy, or metaphor. Some signs' derivation can be traced, but others have become so stylized as to seem arbitrary. Conde-Silvestre concludes that some of the principles of the sign language have become assumptions of Western culture: up and right are better than down and left. These signs may reflect not only the monastery but the outside world as well.

Compounds in poetry have been much studied, but compounding also contributes to the lexicon of homilies and related religious texts, as Don Chapman demonstrates in "Poetic Compounding in the Vercelli, Blickling, and Wulfstan Homilies" (*NM* 103: 409–21). Chapman argues that compounds heighten style, create sound effects, and produce new images for sermons. Nineteen specific compound words appear only in poetry and in the sermons; and three more appear in poetry, these sermons, and only one other prose text. Often the compounds produce aural effects: alliteration, two-stress phrases (especially in Wulfstan), and echoes. Occsionally kennings or *kend heiti* (figurative terms that indicate the referent directly) add color. As in poetry, some elements of compounds are synonyms or intensifiers, to increase the words' impact. The ambiguous relationship between two elements in a compound may also be exploited for wordplay. Finally, just as poets use compounds for variation, sermon writers use them for lists. Chapman concludes that while poetry sometimes influenced sermons, e.g. through specific words or elements, more often homilists created these effects independently.

The late Phillip Pulsiano's prelimnary edition of "The Old English Life of St Pantaleon" (*Via Crucis*, 61–103), with final corrections by Joseph McGowan, offers a facing-page Latin and OE text. A brief introduction provides numerous references to the popular saint in medieval Latin hagiography, histories, hymns, sequences, litanies, and calendars. Pulsiano then describes the damaged London, BL, MS Cotton Vitellius D.xvii, two previous editions (unpublished master's theses), and the Latin life that most closely matches the OE, in London, BL, MS Cotton Nero E.i and Salisbury Cathedral Library MS 222 (both unpublished). He briefly recounts Pantaleon's story and notes where Latin and OE diverge, indicating that neither of these Latin texts was the translator's source. He concludes with explanations of editorial principles, including filling lacunae wherever possible with clearly marked additions (many suggested by Patricia Matthews's thesis).

Pulsiano also edited "The Passion of Saint Christopher" (*EMETI*, 167–99) from London, BL, MS Cotton Vitellius

A. xv (the text also appeared in the now badly burned Cotton Otho B.x as well). The Vitellius version shows some agreement with the Latin in *Acta sanctorum*, but Pulsiano follows Ker in arguing, with support from an *explicit* the Bollandists recorded, that the OE shows closer ties to the still-unedited BHL 1768 or 1769. "The Passion" has been edited unreliably by Einenkel (1895) and somewhat better by Herzfeld (1889); Rypins's semi-diplomatic transcription is not a full edition. As a result, work on the text remains sparse. Pulsiano used fiber-optics and ultraviolet light to produce a new, conservative edition. Though he supplies punctuation, Pulsiano takes cues from manuscript pointing, and capitalization generally follows the manuscript. One apparatus notes manuscript problems, while another records the work of other editors and scholars. Brief notes and additional bibliography follow. Pulsiano also supplies the Latin text from *Acta sanctorum*, keyed to his edition's line numbers, and concludes with a full glossary. Joseph McGowan will complete the edition of the three prose texts from the *Beowulf* manuscript that he and Pulsiano began together.

Hugh Magennis edits *The Old English Life of St. Mary of Egypt* (Exeter: U of Exeter P). His introduction surveys the saint's tradition in the West; the OE version and manuscripts (one nearly complete and two fragmentary); transmission and relations among OE texts; and the source, which he finds close though not identical to her Cotton-Corpus Legendary *vita*. While the language is primarily Late West Saxon, non-Winchester vocabulary, spelling, and syntax suggest an Anglian origin. The style is fairly elevated and sometimes Latinate throughout. A brief Select Bibliography precedes the OE text, edited from London, BL, MS Cotton Julius E.vii with full apparatus. His facing translation is fairly literal and helps convey the style of the OE. A brief commentary covers sources, grammatical matters, and some analogues and historical notes, and Variant Readings from the fragments. Lastly, he edits the *Vita* from the earlier Cotton-Corpus Legendary manuscript with reference to the other manuscript and another version of the *Vita* with significant differences (Cotton Claudius A.i). His Latin text also has a facing-page translation into Modern English and textual apparatus. The volume concludes with a full glossary for the OE.

Michael S. Armstrong and Peter Jackson examine an OE *Life of Malchus* extant only in London, BL, MS Cotton Otho C.i for "Job and Jacob in the Old English *Life of Malchus*" (*N&Q* n.s. 49: 10–12). In this life, which closely follows Jerome's *Vita*, Saracens make Malchus a husband and shepherd before Malchus and his chaste wife escape to separate convents; while a shepherd, he compares himself to Job and Moses. In the Latin source, he names two erstwhile shepherds, Moses and Jacob. W.A. Oldfather collated over 100 manuscripts for a never-completed edition; Paul Harvey has the collations for his own edition, and Armstrong examined photostats of sixty-three other manuscripts as well. In virtually every one, *iacob* clearly appears—but two have *iob*, with the insertion *ac* above and between *i* and *o*. Harriet Clara Jameson groups these two texts into different families, so they appear to be independent errors. They incorrectly represent both Job and Moses as shepherds; the Old English, however, correctly identifies only Moses as a shepherd. The Old English writer apparently had an incorrect copy but knew his Bible well enough to make sense of the passage.

Some scholars have suspected "The Continental Origins of Æthelberht's Code"; Stefan A. Jurasinski goes further to analyze syntactic and stylistic evidence in detail (*PQ* 80 [2001]: 1–15). Features traditionally taken as oral residue, such as "indicative verb in subordinate clauses, verb-final main clauses, unmarked shifts of referent between passive and stative clauses, and the preference for passive conditional clauses in injury laws" (10), differ from later English laws, but prove consistent with written Merovingian legislation. Only the "independent dative of purchase" seems to be archaic OE. Jurasinski also notes that the systematic structure of Æthelberht's Laws, often viewed as evidence for oral transmission (where later laws, it is argued, have little order because drafted to respond to specific problems), parallels the careful structures of written Merovingian laws. He concludes that though Æthelberht's code displays archaic morphology and phonology, its style and syntax seem modeled on Merovingian legislation. These similarities indicate that the single twelfth-century copy accurately reproduces the conversion-era laws, but they also suggest that the code cannot provide much evidence about archaic Old English style and syntax or Kentish oral laws.

In "Two Kentish Laws Concerning Women: A New Reading of Æthelberht 73 and 74" (*Anglia* 119 [2001]: 554–78), Carole Hough also reads Æthelberht's laws as a complete, organized code with Continental forebears. Hough notes that these two clauses appear after a long section detailing compensation for specific injuries and opening a section on women. Most scholars have read them as either fines for women's sexual crimes or compensation paid to women. Hough argues first that *locbore* in 73 does not indicate long hair, and even if it did, there is little evidence that long hair designates either free birth or marital status. Instead, she suggests *loc* as 'settlement', as in other OE documents: *locbore* indicates a legally responsible adult.

The offense, *leswæs hwæt*, is not sexual; elsewhere, similar usages indicate violence: she argues that Æthelberht 3 refers to violence committed in the king's presence and finds support in various early Continental codes. Those codes also address violence by women, and the fine in 73, thirty shillings, fits with compensation for assaults. Hough concludes that Æthelberht 73 uses *leswæs hwæt* to refer back to the previously enumerated acts of violence, as Alfred thirty-eight uses *ðises hwæt*; 73 makes a transition between personal injury laws and laws concerning women.

Editors have unanimously taken Æthelberht 74's *hapax legomenon*, *mægþbot*, as compensation due a maiden, and they read the clause to set such compensation equal to men's. Yet other Germanic laws prescribe higher compensation for women capable of child-bearing than for men. Moreover, *-bot* compounds work variously, and Hough argues that *mægþbot* is closest to *hloþbot*, compensation paid *by* a *hloþ* member. The compensation is to equal that paid by a "man"—but here, as elsewhere in the laws, "man" is not gendered masculine, Hough argues, but can be read "woman": a maiden must pay the same compensation as an adult woman, and the term *fri* in both clauses cements the parallel between Æthelberht 73 and 74. Hough concludes that this reading makes the logic of Æthelberht's code clear, helps narrow the sense of *lysu*, and shows the code to be consistent with Continental Germanic and later Anglo-Saxon laws.

David Dumville's "What Is a Chronicle?" (*The Medieval Chronicle II: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle Driebergen / Utrecht 16–21 July 1999*, ed. Erik Kooper, Costerus n.s. 144 [Amsterdam: Rodopi], 1–27) opens by tracing Greek and Latin terms and etymologies. Medieval writers did *not* distinguish chronicles and annals (chronologically arranged summaries of events) but distinguished those from history (treating causes and connections), and scholars should do likewise. He traces and defines several other terms, correcting inaccurate usages (and particular scholars). He takes Michael McCormick to task for *Les annales du haut Moyen Age* (1975): *pace* McCormick, late antique and Gaelic Christians wrote annals in paschal tables before Dionysius, and well before the English did. The earliest annals appeared in Easter tables, which sometimes attracted registers of consuls, and then registers of clerics and kings and other tables. The cartulary-chronicle, in which church holdings were catalogued chronologically with appropriate documentation included, arose in the late ninth century. Early medieval synchronisms, tables relating the dates in different systems (regnal lists, papal lists) attracted annals, and some were embedded in computus texts, chronicles,

or histories. Eusebius and then Jerome provided frameworks for later chronicles and universal histories. Isidore of Seville's advances include using *annus mundi* dating from Creation and embedding his Chronicle in his *Etymologiae*. Bede's dating from Christ's birth caught on for dates A.D., but most writers used *annus mundi* dating instead of Bede's B.C., even as many Carolingians extended Bede's chronicles. Hybrid chronicles emerged, including "part-chronicles" like Asser's *Life of Alfred*, which inserts a Latin translation of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* into a biography. By the twelfth century, chroniclers incorporated many sources, posing new questions of genre. Early writers often used the Seven Ages of the World to demarcate periods; later writers used the Ages less, but centuries were not standard divisions until the 1500s. Many chronicles had political purposes (often decreed by patrons), but they were sometimes continued and adapted for other purposes by later writers. Dumville closes by urging scholars to adopt basic generic definitions and use them accurately and precisely, but not to multiply terms or divide different realizations of the same basic form.

In the same volume, Jennifer Neville investigates a specific text: "Making Their Own Sweet Time: The Scribes of *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle A*" (*Medieval Chronicle II*, 166–77). Though it does not preserve the earliest or most reliable account, the A Chronicle's text reveals reader response through later additions and changes. Chronicle readers expect truth and chronological structure; they do not generally expect literary flourishes or interpretation of events. Yet later scribes attempt to impose some coherence. Scribe 12 began an abortive (and later erased) marking of fifty-year blocks. The A Chronicle supplies several possible origin myths for Wessex, but the addition of the Regnal List, with its references to Cerdic, makes his reign an originary moment both for that compiler and for at least one scribe, 8b, who adds a comment connecting Cerdic to all later kings of Wessex. Genealogies, notices of regnal length, and narratives from before the year in which they are noted elevate some figures. New writers continued to alter the meaning of earlier events and the Chronicle itself, especially as the *Acta Lanfranci* asserted continuity with the new Norman regime. Each writer's present changed the meaning of the past.

In "Noble Counsel, No Counsel: Advising Ethelred the Unready" (*Via Crucis*, 393–422), Alice Sheppard analyzes the *Chronicle*'s criticisms of Æthelred as failures of lordship. The *ASC* famously denounces Æthelred for *unræd*, "bad counsel" or "bad policy," but less famously specifies his inability to fight or pay tribute at appropriate times. Sheppard argues that the Chronicler condemns Æthelred less

for bad policy than for inability to maintain crucial personal and lordship relations. Fighting *and* tribute can work, but Æthelred does not form close ties (like Emperor Otto in the *Chronicle*) nor act decisively (like Ulfcytel). Ælfric and Wulfstan's theories of kingship do not require the king to fight personally; Æthelred fails not by not leading troops, but by not inspiring the heroic loyalty evident in Ulfcytel's followers and *The Battle of Maldon*. Byrhtnoth's personal ties sustain deep loyalty even after his death; Æthelred had no such loyalty and so attracted little. The *Chronicle* then contrasts Cnut rebuilding strong lordship bonds to unite Danes and Anglo-Saxons under his rule

R. D. Fulk's "Myth in Historical Perspective: The Case of Pagan Deities in the Anglo-Saxon Royal Genealogies" helps conclude *Myth: A New Symposium* (ed. Gregory Schrempp and William Hansen [Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press], 225–39). Fulk draws together threads from previous papers (none on Anglo-Saxon myth) and traces the rise of terminology and studies of mythology, focusing particularly on the highly charged and ever-shifting division between myth and history. He then examines a specific case: the inclusion of deities in the Anglian collection of genealogies. Woden, Geat, and Woden's sons (some known also in Norse mythology) appear here despite the fact that the likely compilers were clerics, and Bede too includes pagan deities in his *Historia ecclesiastica*. Euhemerization may help explain how gods remained in the documents or were understood by some Anglo-Saxons but is not itself a sufficient explanation. Projecting our own skepticism onto Bede is too easy, Fulk concludes; the point of his illustration is that we can*not* know exactly how and when the gods entered the genealogies. Our attempts reflect our own ideological preoccupations more than Anglo-Saxon ones. Fulk concludes that the line between myth and history remains unfixed, and "we should think of myths as stages in developing processes, processes governed by changing historical conditions" (236) and examine those processes in time, rather than looking for specific origins.

Greta Austin argues that Anglo-Saxons conceived race differently than we do in "Marvelous Peoples or Marvelous Races? Race and the Anglo-Saxon *Wonders of the East*" (*Marvels, Monsters, and Miracles: Studies in the Medieval and Early Modern Imaginations*, ed. Timothy S. Jones and David A. Sprunger, Studies in Medieval Culture 42 [Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publ.], 25–51). Modern discourses of 'race' began in the seventeenth century, while Old English *genus* and *cyn* group people who share physical characteristics and territory or describe the whole of humanity. The division between human and animal is one of the major concerns of *Wonders*, which begins with animals

and then progresses through hybrids (people with lower bodies of asses or heads of dogs) to increasingly human, and civilized, peoples, displaying curiosity more than fear or disgust. Austin focuses on the text and illustrations of *Wonders* in London, BL, MS Cotton Tiberius B.v. Even some fairly bestial beings are represented as human, especially through speech, as described in the text or signified by gestures in illustrations. The "visitor" (an Anglo-Saxon figure who appears in some illustrations) and violations of the frame suggest that the audience are not entirely removed from these exotic peoples. Austin concludes that the ordered hierarchy of peoples points to salvific concerns; two of the *Wonders* have the apocryphal Christian story of Jamnes in hell warning Mambres against sorcery, and other apocryphal fragments accompanying one or more texts also suggest the possibility of salvation for these ultimately human peoples.

Taking a very different tack in the same volume, Andrea Rossi-Reder finds the roots of colonialism in "Wonders of the Beast: India in Classical and Medieval Literature" (*Marvels, Monsters, and Miracles*, 53–66). The now-lost account of India by the Greek Scylax first introduced such beings as the Skiapodes (with a single leg) and Otoliknoi (with huge ears). Ktesias, a Persian doctor around 400 B.C., compiled accounts of bizarre races, some the same as Scylax's. Rossi-Reder argues that two characteristics connect all these races: a hybrid (human-animal) appearance, and inability to communicate. Homi Bhabha views hybridity as the necessary result of colonialism: the Other is seen as subhuman, so bestial and not endowed with speech (also noted by David Spurr), as evident in nineteenth- and twentieth-century writers like Townsend, Kipling, and Forster. Rossi-Reder reminds us that *xenophobia* and *barbarian* were Greek words for outsiders. Ktesias turns these Others inside-out to abject them: to expose and shame them. Rossi-Reder identifies abjection and "linguistic abjection" at work in *Wonders of the East*: it describes peoples (some from Ktesias) as incomprehensible, inside-out, half-human hybrids—Alexander even kills some for their monstrosity. She argues that to Europeans, Egypt and Africa would seem close to India. The narrator of *Wonders* displays no real sense of wonder and no interest in interpretation: Westerners find the East incomprehensible, a void of meaning onto which to project fear and abjection. Thus classical and medieval literature prepared the expectations that Renaissance explorers held, and ultimately the xenophobic and colonial discourses of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Alfred the Great enjoyed another good year. In "King Alfred's Preface and the Teaching of Latin in Anglo-Saxon

England" (*EHR* 117: 596–604), Malcolm Godden argues that scholars have misunderstood a key sentence from Alfred's Preface to the *Pastoral Care, Lære mon siððan furður on Lædengeðiode ða ðe mon furðor læran wille ond to hieran hade don wille*, as evidence that Alfred ordered Latin be taught to future clerics. Scholars often render *hieran hade* as "holy orders," but it means "higher status," clerical or lay; Alfred uses *halgum hade* to indicate specifically holy orders. Like Bede and Ælfric, Alfred expected poor Latinists among the clergy, and he used translation to ameliorate the problem. The king and other nobles learned Latin but remained laity. Godden concludes that Alfred permits Latin to be taught to those who may reach higher office, clerical or lay, but does not require it. Latinity did not correspond to a simple clerical/lay split, and Alfred's program focused on English, not Latin.

Using all extant manuscripts, Carolin Schreiber studies and partly edits *King Alfred's Old English Translation of Pope Gregory the Great's 'Regula Pastoralis' and Its Cultural Context*, Münchener Universitätsschriften 25 [Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang]). Her extensive introduction reviews Gregory's *Regula pastoralis*, its early reception, and Alfred's cultural setting. Schreiber then argues that R.W. Clement's work on the Latin source text uses too few variants and ignores agreements between Alfred's translation and some French and Italian manuscripts. She suggests that Alfred's exemplar could have derived either from Augustine's library or a Carolingian copy. Schreiber treats Alfred's methods briefly but provides valuable lists of omissions, additions, and changes. She concludes, based on consistent vocabulary and the fact that most of Alfred's helpers were non-native speakers, that Alfred was responsible for the translation himself. After detailed descriptions of each manuscript, Schreiber constructs a new stemma and suggests possible provenances. Drawing upon evidence from all manuscripts, Schreiber next investigates the translation's language. She affirms Wrenn's conclusion that early West Saxon had no unified, stable form, while from the later manuscripts she supports Gneuss and Gretsch's notion of a standard late West Saxon. Drawing upon Cosijn and Horgan, Schreiber lists dialectal evidence from phonology and morphology in different manuscript families, concluding that non-WS features appear in all early scribes' work, and that the Junius transcript's forms are unreliable, while MS C reproduces early features most accurately. Building on Simon Keynes's work, Schreiber argues that Alfred pursued a "policy of integration" towards nobles from Mercia and Kent to create a unified "Kingdom of the Anglo-Saxons" (131)—and dialectal mixing. The later manuscripts show a marked decrease in non-WS and a shift towards late WS features. Two manuscripts contain a text with much-revised vocabulary and syntax from before 1000. The reviser's errors show that he did not work from Gregory's text: he sometimes substituted incorrect late WS words for original (often Anglian) OE words and sometimes altered meanings when changing syntax. Lexical substitutions sometimes fit Winchester usage, but not consistently. The reviser also returned some Scriptural quotations to Latin following not Gregory but the Vulgate—from memory. He added a few explanations, including an identification of Luke 16's *dives* with Tantalus otherwise found only in the *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*. The reviser's vocabulary points to southern England (but *not* Winchester) after the Monastic Revival. Horgan suggested Rochester, but slender lexical evidence and that see's poverty admit doubts. The reviser's use of Wulfsige's copy makes Sherborne a more likely home. Wulfsige III, Bishop of Sherborne and sometime Abbot of Westminster, had learning, contacts with Wulfstan and Sigeric, possibly acquaintance with the *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*, and interest in Gregory's *RP*. He or one of the monks he brought from Westminster might well have used the vocabulary found in the revision. Schreiber's edition follows Sweet's pagination and lineation, and she consulted Carlson's edition, Ker's facsimile, and Kim's collation as well as the manuscripts. She reproduces the manuscripts, except for punctuation and accents, without emendation, noting all spelling variations except þ/ð alternation. She edits the Prose and Verse Prefaces (the latter as poetry); Chs. I-IV, XIX-XXVI, XXXVI-XXXVII, XLVII-LVI, and LXV; and the Metrical Epilogue (as verse). An appendix offers MS T's *Expositio de secreto gloriosae incarnationis Domini Nostri Iesu Christi*. Her detailed commentary analyzes lexical differences among the earlier manuscripts, compares usage with Alfred's other three translations, and examines the original and later replacement words. An extensive bibliography follows, and the volume concludes with an index of all words studied in the introduction and commentary.

Paul E. Szarmach laments "Editions of Alfred: The Wages of Un-influence" (*EMETI*, 135–49) and suggests future work. Alfred studies thrived a century ago, but poor editions have obstructed the field since. Szarmach cites Klaeber's *Beowulf*, a "full-service" edition, as a standard for comparison. Sedgefield's edition of the *Boethius* proves difficult to read and misrepresents the prosimetrum, shunting the Meters in the Cotton manuscript to the end and replacing them with the prose Bodley translations. Krapp and Griffiths edit only the Meters. Since the original delivery of this paper, Szarmach notes, Malcolm Godden has begun the Alfredian Boethius Project to produce a full-service edition, while Kevin Kiernan's team is working on an electronic edition. A new edition should bring fresh analysis

of relations between prose and meters. Szarmach next criticizes Carnicelli's *Soliloquies*: Carnicelli refers to the Latin text in his commentary but does not provide it. He also missed important manuscript elements and ignored the extract from *Soliloquies* in London, BL, MS Cotton Tiberius A.iii that suggests at least one superior reading. New scholarship on Augustine's text makes Alfred's *Soliloquies* a fruitful work to pursue. Similarly, recent work on early traditions of Gregory's *Cura pastoralis* should inform scholarship on Alfred's *Pastoral Care*, but scholars have studied the Preface and largely ignored the main text. One full-service edition does exist: Patrick O'Neill's edition of Alfred's Psalms provides extensive introduction and commentary, referring often to Latin Psalm commentaries. Szarmach suggests that post-modern conceptions of authorship and studies of the Alfredian-circle works could inform each other, leading to new understandings of author and text, and of oral-literate tensions. Szarmach concludes that poor editions have led literary scholars to neglect Alfred (especially as poet) even as historians have embraced him, have hindered work on ninth-century English philosophical thought, and have impeded discussion of editing theory in Old English.

Janet Bately examines a specific problem with editions in "Book Divisions and Chapter Headings in the Translations of the Alfredian Period" (*EMETI*, 151–66). Editions of Alfredian texts show clear structures: tables of contents, books, and chapters. Yet this apparent "house-style" (153) is actually a modern imposition; Alfredian manuscripts show little consistency. The OE *Bede* and *Dialogues* follow the Latin book division, but the *Orosius* has fewer books than its Latin counterpart. *Bede* and *Orosius* have different chapter divisions than the Latin texts, and chapter numbers appear only in some manuscripts of the *Bede* and *Pastoral Care*, not in all. Alfred's *Boethius* follows the Latin book division (though with one break misplaced), but the chapters (marked only in one of the two extant manuscripts) do not match Latin divisions. Bately argues that capitals and spacing divide these works more clearly than numbering, but editors do not generally note them. Manuscript chapter numbers, where they exist, were added later, even carelessly. Moreover, only some manuscripts even have tables of contents, only some contents match section headers within the manuscript, and some content lists *and* headers diverge from the actual contents of specific chapters. Bately concludes that modern editions often present divisions that may not be the work of the author or even of the main scribe, that scribes showed little concern for subdivisions, and "the contents lists are clearly of varying quality and authority" (166). We cannot assume we know the authorial structure of Alfredian manuscripts.

Richard Louis Evans's "From Greek and Latin to the *Old English Orosius*: Dialogic Contexts for Translation and Reception" (Diss. Univ. of South Carolina; *DAI* 63A: 1823) begins by acknowledging his theoretical debts, especially to Bakhtin and Gadamer. Evans then argues that *Orosius* scholarship has been too narrowly philological and treats language simplistically as representation; Bakhtin and Volosinov's dialogic hermeneutics offers a fresh approach. His second chapter, "Translation in a Residually Oral Context," argues that polyglossia and heteroglossia made text and language more fluid than Anglo-Saxonists often acknowlege. Chapter 3 treats translation as reported speech, escaping the literal/loose binary. The fourth chapter reads a specific episode in the *Orosius* (concerning Cyrus's horses) not as the transmission of "trust and authority" but as dialogic transformation from Greek to Latin to OE. Evans concludes that as an outsider (a comparatist), he can bring valuable insights to Old English studies, replacing the search for fixed language, literal sources, and accuracy with a hermeneutics of suspicion and a recognition of ideological and linguistic contestation.

In "The Old English *Bede* and the Construction of Anglo-Saxon Authority" (*ASE* 31: 69–80), Nicole Guenther Discenza argues that while other Alfredian-era translations draw authority from the translator or patron's name in an original OE preface, the *Bede* draws authority directly from its source text author, translating the Latin preface and leaving Bede's voice intact as if he wrote the OE. The translator omits most of the Latin documents that Bede copied into his work to authorize it, rendering only a few into OE, and most of those were written by Englishmen. The pope's role and voice diminishes while Anglo-Saxon voices dominate, recorded as if they wrote these documents in OE themselves. Where Bede wrote of the English branch of a universal church, the *Bede* writes of the English church and people with occasional reference to Rome. Bede's own voice, not documentation, authorizes the text. Discenza concludes that the *Bede* takes the next logical step in Alfred's program to legitimate English language and culture; it may have been a late translation, perhaps done after Alfred's death.

Non-Alfredian translation also enjoyed much attention. Bruce James Davis studies "The Art of Translation in the Age of Æthelwold: A Legacy of King Alfred" (Diss. Arizona State Univ.; *DAI* 63A: 592) with modern Translation Studies. Davis locates Bishop Æthelwold's translation of the Benedictine Rule as a key transitional moment between Alfred the Great's foundational program and Ælfric and Wulfstan's more polished translations. The first chapter sets Æthelwold in the context of the Benedictine Reform,

the second in the context of the bishop's predecessors. The third chapter studies the Rule's effect on Æthelwold's practice, and the fourth, Æthelwold's translation itself, through the lenses of classical, medieval, and modern translation theory. Davis finds formal equivalence used for translation of Scripture, while the more flexible dynamic equivalence is often employed to translate patristic texts. Moreover, the minimal unit of translation varies from the phrase to passages as long as several sentences, as Æthelwold employs metaphor and analogy to make a translation useful to Anglo-Saxon readers.

Jane Roberts examines a translator's alterations in "The Case of the Miraculous Hand in the Old English Prose Life of Guthlac" (*ANQ* 15: 17–22). Two OE versions (one partial) of Felix's *Vita sancti Guthlaci* show evidence of deriving from a single translation (probably Mercian, from around Alfred's reign); editors of London, BL, MS Cotton Vespasian D.xxi have charged the translator with misunderstanding the Latin in one episode. In the Latin, the Hand of God reaches to a cross outside the house where Guthlac's mother is in labor; in the OE, the Hand extends a shining cross to the door. Roberts first shows how the translator abridged the ornate Latin, then quotes an eleventh-century Worcester office for Guthlac that describes a radiant hand extending a cross to the door. Roberts concludes that the redactor recalled the detail of the cross from the office and reshaped the story to fit as he trimmed an older translation of the extravagant Latin life.

Roberts also scrutinizes "Two Readings in the Guthlac Homily" (*EMETI*, 201–10). Vercelli Homily XXIII and the Life of Guthlac both derive from a now-lost, fuller, northern translation of the Latin *vita* but underwent separate transmission and revisions. Roberts examines Scragg's edition of the Vercelli homily and compares it with Pilch's "sentence analytical" edition and earlier editions. The first reading she examines, *big fer*[*c*]*ede* from lines 81-2, presents a rare verb which editors have emended variously, but Roberts finds parallels and support for Scragg's retention of *fercian*. With [*h*]*recetunge* (126), however, she differs from Scragg. While Scragg thinks the hellish context led the scribe to use a form meaning "to vomit," Roberts suggests *ræscetunge* 'coruscation, gleam of lightning' (209), used similarly in *Judgment Day II*.

Yoshitaka Kozuka's "Syntactic Uniqueness of the Gospel of John in the *West Saxon Gospels* and Their Authorship: Additional Evidence for the Divided Theory" (*Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature* [Japan Society for the Study of Medieval English] 17: 59–74), won the Matsunami Prize for 2001: Commendation Essay. Drake

argued in 1894 that one translator rendered Matthew; another Mark and Luke; and then a third, or the first again, John. Several scholars have attacked his methods and conclusions since, but Sato, like the text's most recent editor R. M. Liuzza, also favors multiple authorship. Liuzza argues specifically for a division between Mk and Lk on the one hand and Mt and Jn on the other, and a lesser distinction between Mt and Jn. Kozuka used the four early manuscripts of the Gospels. Examining *cweðan* + *to* + dative, other instances of *to* + dat, and verb + *to* + dat, Kozuka finds a variety of orders among the synoptics, but Jn alone never puts *to* after *him*, and never places *to him* before the finite verb in principal clauses. Turning next to Hiltunen's work on "phrasal adverbs" (P) with verbs (e.g., *gan ut*, *cuman up*), Kozuka discovers that the orders SV and VS tend to take different orderings (PV vs VP) in the synoptics, but Jn almost invariably puts the phrasal adverb after the verb regardless of SV order. In each case, Kozuka finds that the syntax of the Latin Vulgate had little or no impact on the OE. Kozuka concludes that the evidence supports multiple authorship, especially a different translator for John than for the synoptics.

R.M. Liuzza revisits his own edition in "The Devil and His Father: A Case of Editorial Irresponsibility in the Old English Gospels?" (*ANQ* 15: 22–28). The OE translators' reach surely sometimes exceeded their grasp. Yet the translation of John 8:44, where Latin and Greek present an ambiguous pronoun, may not be simple error. Where others render "the devil is false and the father of lies," the OE has "the devil is a liar and his father too." In his edition, Liuzza wrote a short note about the mistaken antecedent. However, a junior devil tempts Adam and Eve in *Genesis B*, and *Juliana*'s demon twice mentions his father. Origen and Augustine's rejections of such readings of Jn 8:44 show their long tradition. Though erroneous, the translation reveals an Anglo-Saxon cosmology with a demon patriarch whose spawn run loose in the world. The case poses broad questions of how and how much to annotate, and the limits of the editor's knowledge. Liuzza concludes that commentaries are always provisional, not final readings but invitations to further work.

David Moreno Olalla focuses on the OE Gospel of Luke in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge 140 in "Neologismos y errores léxicos en la traducción anglosajona del evangelio según San Lucas" (*Analecta Malacitana* 24 [2001]: 153–73). The translator (or translators) uses several strategies for proper nouns. Some become indeclinable, usually nominative; some have OE declensions for dative or genitive, but Latin for accusative; some are inconsistent; and a few add OE declinable endings. Etymological significance is

generally lost, but Jesus often becomes *Hælend*, translating Latin *Saluator*. The translator makes use of many neologisms and calques that Christian conversion and Mediterranean culture had already introduced into the language, and he introduces *predican* alongside the pre-existing *bodian*, perhaps from clerical jargon. Moreno Olalla suggests that *tumbian*, translating Lat. *saltian*, has more specificity than Bosworth-Toller suggests: *tumbian* appears only for Salome's dancing and suggests sensuality and feminine wiles. Next, Moreno Olalla notes the difficulty of determining the source of errors: a Latin copyist, translator, or OE copyist may be responsible. Most mistakes involve specialized or secondary senses of verbs, but the most conspicuous errors involve nouns; only two mistakes occur with adjectives and prepositions. After reviewing several specific errors, Moreno Olalla concludes that the translator has a firm grounding in grammar and theology, but weaker in vocabulary. Indeed, one change (*lar* for *fermentum*) suggests less an error than an allegorical reading of the passage—aided by Bede's commentary or an interlinear gloss. The translator rendered the Gospel pragmatically for those with poor or no Latin. The rubrication in this Gospel marks it out as a liturgical work, while the accompanying translations of Matthew and John have very little rubrication, suggesting later, less enthusiastic efforts.

Loredana Teresi revises her 1994 master's thesis into "*Be Heofonwarum 7 be Helwarum*: A Complete Edition" (*EMETI*, 211–44). The short OE homily on Judgment (and especially hell) is in two late-eleventh to early twelfth-century manuscripts (K, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 302; and J, London, BL, MS Cotton Faustina A.ix). Both these *temporale* manuscripts collect Ælfrician and anonymous homilies and share a common ancestor; differing contents may be due to losses. Teresi provides a detailed description of each manuscript. Clemoes argued for a southeastern ancestor, probably Canterbury, based on orthography and the origins of some items; Godden suggested Rochester. Both manuscripts exhibit late WS orthography, with a decline in inflectional endings, and a few Anglian or Kentish variants, probably due to copyists. Teresi then reviews themes and topoi in the homily, noting that sources are sometimes awkwardly joined, and some point to a Hiberno-Latin origin. Linguistic evidence favors a southeastern origin, perhaps Anglian, perhaps with later Kentish scribes, but the evidence is not conclusive. She follows Gneuss's *DOE* editing guidelines to produce a conservative edition based on J, placing orthographic, morphological, and lexical variants from K in footnotes. Her commentary and a complete glossary of J and K conclude the edition.

N.G.D.

As part of this year's bumper crop of Ælfric scholarship, Aaron Kleist's "Ælfric's Corpus: A Conspectus" (*Florilegium* 18.2 [2001]: 113–64) builds on the seminal work of Peter Clemoes's "Chronology of Ælfric's Works" and John Pope's introduction to the *Supplementary Homilies* to provide an overview of Ælfric's writings. Despite the recent editions of Ælfrician material by Clemoes, Malcolm Godden, Susan Irvine, and others, Kleist notes that certain features of Ælfric's collection remain unclear. On the one hand, there are the texts themselves: as both Ælfric and his successors revised, augmented, and adapted his material, the textual history and interrelationship of his works is far from straightforward. On the other hand, there is the daunting array of scholarly editions: some lingering from the nineteenth century, some completed since Pope's study, a number remaining in unpublished dissertations, and others proposed but yet in process. As many of these fail to account for all the extant manuscripts, however, gaps nonetheless remain. While such information may be gleaned from the recesses of numerous introductions and appendices, Kleist's survey seeks to serve as a summary reference to Ælfric's writings and the major editions thereof, revealing in the process what work remains to be done. Treating the First and Second Series of *Sermones catholici*, Pope's *Supplementary Homilies*, and the *Lives of Saints* as collections, but the rest of Ælfric's works individually, Kleist provides summaries of the works' origin and contents; date (either from Clemoes's "Chronology" or from more recent scholarship); editions, translations, and facsimiles (where available); and notes on prominent features of the texts, relating to major sources, relationships to other Ælfrician works, manuscripts overlooked in various editions, debate regarding authorship, scholarly treatments of the works, and so forth. (Kleist is also preparing a new version of the Conspectus, incorporating new scholarship and works recently ascribed to Ælfric, as well as a new assessment of the chronology of Ælfric's works based on scholarly developments in the half-century since Clemoes's article.)

In perhaps the only electronic version of Ælfrician material recognized as the standard edition of those works, Stuart Lee's "Ælfric's Homilies on *Judith*, *Esther*, and *The Maccabees*" (Oxford, 1999; http://users.ox.ac.uk/~stuart/kings/) replaces the nineteenth-century editions of those texts by Bruno Assmann and W.W. Skeat. Building on his 1992 Ph.D. dissertation at King's College, University of London, Lee accompanies his edition with an introduction to Ælfric's Old Testament narratives and his accounts of Judith, Esther, and Maccabees in particular; descriptions of the ten manuscripts in question; brief discussions of authorship, style, date, and Ælfric's handling of his sources; summary of patristic commentary on the texts; studies of

major themes therein; paleographic and textual notes; a full glossary; and a select bibliography for further reading.

A strikingly unusual Ælfrician text is treated by Mary Clayton's "An Edition of Ælfric's *Letter to Brother Edward*" (*EMETI*, 263–83). The *Letter* falls into three sections respectively containing prohibitions against eating blood, remonstrations against abandoning English for Danish customs, and censure of certain countrywomen's habit of eating and drinking at beer parties while relieving themselves. Clayton confirms John Pope's attribution of the letter to Ælfric, noting not only Ælfric's characteristic rhythmical prose in the second and third sections but verbal similarities between the first section and other Ælfrician letters. In terms of the second section, where Ælfric decries those who insult their people by adopting Danish "bare necks and blinded eyes"—a hairstyle similar to that seen later in the Bayeux tapestry, where the Normans may have been "'proclaiming their Scandinavian roots'" (271 n. 43)—Clayton suggests that Ælfric's concern is for the abandonment of Christian as well as ancestral ways, the new hairstyle marking a potential shift to pagan as well as Danish allegiance. Clayton considers Ælfric's reluctance elsewhere to address shameful practices, the interrelationship between the three parts of the letter, its date of composition, and the possible identity of "Brother Edward," whom she posits may be the only member of Ælfric's family to whom we have any reference. Clayton finishes by providing an edition and translation of this short but intriguing text.

In "Ælfric as Grammarian: The Evidence of His *Catholic Homilies*" (*EMETI*, 13–29), Malcolm Godden analyzes changes in Ælfric's understanding of grammar over the course of his work. The implications of such changes, he notes, may not be insignificant: Was Ælfric attempting to impose rules on a language whose rules were fluid? Or do the changes in Ælfric's works indicate that the language was in transition? Godden traces four categories of Ælfrician revisions to early versions of the *Sermones catholici* that sought to bring them into line with his later work: Ælfric's use of prepositions such as *þurh*, which often takes the dative in early copies of the *Sermones* but which he later consistently altered to take the accusative; his use of nouns whose forms he altered from weak to strong or whose gender he modified over time; his choice of verb moods in subordinate clauses, changing for example from indicative to subjunctive after *gif*; and his use of relative pronouns such as *se þe*, which he often replaced with the indeclinable particle *þe*. Godden concludes that Ælfric's early grammar, far from being a standardized product of the Winchester school, was in many respects not only inconsistent with itself but with contemporary Old English practice. While

Ælfric did correct his manuscripts as his grammatical practice changed over time, his corrections were not pervasive or methodical, suggesting that the subject was "a passing matter rather than a pressing concern" (25). As with Ælfric's changing vocabulary, Godden concludes, grammar was more a matter of feel than rules: a stylist rather than a grammarian, for Ælfric "variety of expression and nuances of rhythm and tone evidently mattered more than … grammatical consistency" (29).

Michael Fox's study of "Ælfric on the Creation and Fall of the Angels" (*ASE* 31: 175–200) considers Ælfric's keen interest in the extra-biblical story of the origin and corruption of the angelic host. Fox surveys Ælfric's treatment of the subject in texts spanning nearly the whole of Ælfric's career: *De initio creaturae* (*CH* I.1), *Interrogationes Sigewulfi in Genesin*, the *Hexameron*, the *Letter to Sigeweard*, and the *Letter to Wulfgeat*, referring also on occasion to *De creatore et creatura*. Having summarized the contents of the various accounts, Fox treats the texts in detail, showing how the *Interrogationes Sigewulfi* departs from its Alcuinian source and then discussing how the other works differ from one another, emphasizing different elements or incorporating to varying extents such passages as Isaiah 14:13–14. One key motivation for Ælfric's alterations, Fox concludes, is his apparent desire to make his accounts conform more closely to scriptural passages (such as the Isaiah account) traditionally associated with the Angelic Fall. Focusing more closely on Ælfric's relation to this tradition, Fox notes that while Ælfric would have had access to such seminal expositions as Gregory the Great's homily for the third Sunday after Pentecost, either directly or through such intermediaries as Paul the Deacon, and while Gregory might constitute Ælfric's primary ultimate influence, texts such as *De initio creaturae* also bear striking resemblances to Martin of Braga's *De correctione rusticorum* and the Old English *Genesis A*. Unlike Gregory, Bede, or Augustine, however, authorities for whom he had unquestioned respect, Ælfric approaches the angelic account by formulating not just exegesis but a narrative—a narrative shedding insight into man's present condition by tracing the origin of sin in Satan.

Alfred Bammesberger's "OE *bysegan* in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*, ii.440.20" (*N&Q* n.s. 49: 9–10) evaluates a reference to an episode in Luke where Jesus defends Mary's choice to listen at Jesus' feet rather than to help her sister Martha serve (Lk 10:38–42). Martha, Ælfric notes, wished to have Mary "to hire bysegan," *bysegan* having previously been taken as a variant of the infinitive *bysigian* (possibly meaning "to labor") or as a weak adjective used substantively ("a laborer"). Bammesberger suggests

instead that the word may represent a *-um > -am > -an* weakening of *bysegum*, one form of the dative plural of *bisgo* ("labor"); Martha would thus be wishing to have Mary "for her labors"—that is, to have Mary help with Martha's household chores, the very point Martha makes in the biblical passage.

Mechthild Gretsch's "Ælfric's *Sanctorale* and the Benedictional of Æthelwold" (*EMETI*, 31–50) proposes a fascinating connection between the two bodies of work. Taking up Michael Lapidge's call for further inquiry into Ælfric's rationale for selecting saints for commemoration in his homilies and lives (32), Gretsch first reviews factors that have hitherto been proposed: texts' parallels to contemporary political situations (providing, for example, models for heroic resistance); the interests and preferences of Ælfric's patrons; and the contents of that key Ælfrician source, the Cotton-Corpus legendary. In addition, however, Gretsch highlights parallels between Ælfric's hagiographic selections and the contents of the Benedictional of Æthelwold, one of the most prominent works in the collection of Ælfric's teacher at Winchester. Of the thirty-eight feasts of the *sanctorale* provided with blessings in the Benedictional, thirty-six are treated by Ælfric in his *Sermones catholici* and *Lives of Saints*. Iconography, too, may have played a role: Ælfric composes sermons for all the saints and *sanctorale* feasts represented in the Benedictional's miniatures, including the feast of Epiphany (two portraits of the Adoration of the Magi and the Baptism of Christ corresponding to Ælfric's two homilies for Epiphany in the First and Second Series of *Sermones*) and the grouping of Gregory, Cuthbert, and Benedict (treated sequentially in the Second Series), among others. Examining the eighteen remaining hagiographic narratives by Ælfric not found in the Benedictional, Gretsch notes that four offer models of resistance toward persecutors, four commemorate English or British saints, two depict the lives of virgin couples, and others treat such major figures as the apostles Mark, Philip, and James—selections, in short, not assembled at random, but ones which Ælfric found particularly interesting or appropriate given the current political climate (40). The majority of his choices, however, may have been shaped by the blessings of the book with which he not only would have been acquainted but which he himself may conceivably have had a hand in composing (49).

Dabney Bankert's "Reconciling Family and Faith: Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* and Domestic Dramas of Conversion" (*Via Crucis*, 138–57) examines two saints' Lives traditionally treated as virgin martyr legends, those of Agnes and Gallicanus/Constantia, as they are conjoined in London, BL, MS Cotton Julius E.vii. Bankert points to two

unusual aspects of the pairing: first, as the feasts of the two saints are five months apart, the pairing contravenes liturgical order; second, it juxtaposes apparently opposing models of and lessons on virginity: while the virginity of both is challenged by pagan suitors, Agnes embraces conflict and martyrdom while Constantia avoids both death and matrimony. By the combination, Bankert says, Ælfric affirms that women who imitate the example of Constantia rather than Agnes can benefit the faith without suffering mutilation and death (156). Like Whatley's study below, therefore, Bankert suggests that Ælfric's reworking of his material reveals his sensitivity to his audience, who might be prone to draw the wrong lesson from Agatha's story. While Bankert's argument does not explain the presence of other virgin-martyrs in Ælfric's works, if granted, it would mean that Ælfric's efforts reflect "an acute awareness of the apparent contradictions between hagiographic models and practical social realities" (156).

Liesl Ruth Smith's "Virginity and the Married-Virgin Saints in Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*: The Translation of an Ideal" (Diss. Univ. of Toronto; *DAI* 61A: 4379), considers three other pieces of Ælfrician hagiography: the Lives of Julian and Basilissa, Cecilia and Valerian, and Chrysanthus and Daria (*LS* I.4, II.34, and II.35). Smith begins by studying vocabulary related to purity and the body in works by Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Aldhelm, writers of particular importance in championing virginity in the Christian life, suggesting that the "symbolic, sacramental claims of virginity proposed in these texts call into question modern interpretations of virginity as the repudiation of sexuality and the means by which male authors exercised control over women's bodies" (ii). Smith then turns to analogous vernacular vocabulary in Ælfric's *Letter to Sigefyrth* and *Natiuitas sanctae Mariae uirginis* (Assmann 3) to argue that Ælfric's vision of virginity in both sexes arises from his concern for purity in religious service. Finally, Smith contrasts Ælfric's Lives with their Latin counterparts in the Cotton-Corpus Legendary, concluding that for Ælfric the key issue is not so much physical purity as it is the saints' eternal priorities: it is "virginity's symbolic, sacramental capacity," she says, that Ælfric pushes to the forefront (ii–iii).

Another dissertation, this time from the City University of New York under Gordon Whatley, also reflects on Ælfric's views of physical and spiritual purity: Robert Upchurch's "The Hagiography of Chaste Marriage in Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*" (*DAI* 62A: 3042). Drawing on the same three Lives treated in Smith's study, Upchurch asks what relevance such works might have had in Ælfric's mind for his pious secular patrons and his extended circle of lay-readers.

Upchurch suggests that Ælfric defines *clænnysse* or purity both literally and figuratively so that through the lives of the married saints he may offer special couples the option of virginal marriages, couples without children the chance to live uprightly, and every married Christian the opportunity to remain spiritually chaste. Using Ælfric's teaching on lay virginity in the *Sermones catholici* as a starting-point, Upchurch discusses the Lives of Julian and Basilissa, Cecilia and Valerian, and Chrysanthus and Daria in turn, surveying the knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England of the Latin Lives and comparing them to Ælfric's vernacular versions. Upchurch facilitates further comparison of the texts, moreover, by providing transcriptions of the unpublished Lives from the Cotton-Corpus Legendary, indicating parallels between the versions with italics.

Gabriella Corona's treatment of "Ælfric's Life of Saint Basil and Its Latin Background" (Diss. Univ. of Toronto; *DAI* 63A: 2234) focuses on a figure of importance to Ælfric, if Ælfric's use of Basil for his *Admonitio ad filium spiritualem* and *Hexameron* serves as any indication. Noting the paucity of studies on individual Ælfrician Saints' Lives, Corona begins by examining the origin and nature of Ælfric's source for his *Life of Basil* (*LS* I.3), tracing the circulation of the Latin Life after its (hypothetical) mid-ninth-century translation from the Greek, and comparing existing editions of the Latin Life to the witness of that key source for Ælfrician hagiography, the Cotton-Corpus Legendary tradition (2-3). She then considers the knowledge of Basil and his works in England, starting with the late-seventh-century commentaries of Theodore and Hadrian, evaluates Ælfric's interest in the saint, analyzes departures in Ælfric's text from his Latin source, discusses aspects of Ælfric's style, and surveys manuscripts witnesses to the Life before providing a critical edition of Ælfric's work and a "working edition" of his putative source for purposes of comparison.

Following on the heels of her doctoral work, in her "Saint Basil in Anglo-Saxon Exeter" (*N&Q* n.s. 49: 316–20) Gabriella Corona sets forth evidence for insular interest in the saint at Exeter during the reign of Æthelstan (924–39). Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auct. D.2.16, on the one hand, a charter from Exeter dating from the first half of the tenth century, includes a considerable list of relics imported by Æthelstan from the Continent. Basil's name appears relatively prominently in the list, which cites his tooth and crosier as being among the relics. Exeter, Cathedral Library, FMS/3, on the other hand, a contemporary manuscript, provides the earliest English witness of the Latin Life of Basil, the source of Ælfric's vernacular hagiographic treatment of the saint (*LS* I.3). Corona suggests

that the manuscript may be an early copy of a continental text, now lost, that had conceivably accompanied the relics to England. Corona prints the extracts of the Latin Life in FMS/3, which survive only as binding fragments used to reinforce a fifteenth-century Exeter cartulary. Taken together with the relics listed in Auct. D.2.16, however, the extracts testify both to Exeter's interest in the saint and its connection with Continental Europe during this period.

Alison Gulley discusses Ælfric's vernacular *Life of Cecilia* in her "'Seo fæmne þa lærde swa lange þone cniht oðþæt he gelyfde on þone lifigendan god': The Christian Wife as Converter and Ælfric's Anglo-Saxon Audiences" (*Parergon* 19: 39–51). Recapping the contents of the *vita*, in which Cecilia persuades her new husband to join her in virginity and brings about his and others' conversion, Gulley notes that the account stresses the value of faith as much as virginity or martyrdom: though various characters in the tale demand proof of Christianity's veracity, they receive such corroboration only after they have believed. Ælfric's alterations to his source, in fact, produce a streamlined narrative that emphasizes the fact rather than the detailed process of conversion. Turning to the relevance of Cecilia's model for Ælfric's audience, Gulley reviews the multifaceted nature of the readership of Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, positing the presence of widows and virgins both in the lay circles of Ælfric's patrons and in the nunneries where such hagiographic material might have been used. Sketching the evidence for contemporary virginal marriages (such as Cecilia and her husband modeled), Gulley also notes Ælfric's exhortation to purity of those living in sexually-active marriages. The effect of such advice, she concludes, would be to affirm for disparate members of Ælfric's audience—virgins, wives, and widows—the possibility of purity and righteous living.

Alexandra Olsen's "Ælfric and Old English Poetry" (*In Geardagum* 22 [2001]: 1–18) complements Wright's study of Vercelli XXI (below) by examining (albeit with far less precision) poetic elements present in vernacular prose. Stating that analyses of Ælfric's style focus on the presence of alliteration to the neglect of poetic formulas and themes, she argues for the presence of such themes in homiletic or otherwise-ecclesiastical works. In the *Old English Martyrology*, anonymous Lives, and various sermons by Ælfric, for example, Olsen sees variations on the theme of the Hero on the Beach—that is, a figure surrounded by his retainers in the glow of a flashing light in a liminal space (such as a beach) at a journey's beginning or end. In certain Blickling and Vercelli homilies, moreover, she traces the theme of the Cliff of Death, analogous to that surmounting Grendel's mere in *Beowulf*. In the end, Olsen affirms the

complexity of this "fusion of cultures," calling for further research into the relationship of the traditions of vernacular orality and Latin literacy (13–14).

Reflecting on Ælfric's condemnation of what he perceived as unorthodox or non-authoritative sources such as Marian apocrypha, Gordon Whatley's "*Pearls before Swine*: Ælfric, Vernacular Hagiography, and the Lay Reader" (*Via Crucis*, 158–84) reconsiders a recent trend in scholarship to view Ælfric's disapproval of such texts less as a matter of personal concern than as a sensitivity to patristic censure. Whatley examines a variety of passages illustrating either Ælfric's "awareness of and anxiety about unsupervised and ill-informed readings of sacred literature" or his "active selection and re-shaping of sources to inhibit potentially problematic 'reader responses'" (161). He turns, for example, to Ælfric's *Preface to Genesis*, in which Ælfric expresses his concern that some might draw literal rather than allegorical lessons from the account. Rather than dismissing Ælfric's anxiety as groundless, Whatley suggests that Ælfric's complaints "imply the existence of opinionated readers and self-appointed interpreters, resisting or ignoring 'learned' traditions […] to justify a secular lifestyle" (163). Next, examining Ælfric's homily for the feast of the martyr Clement (*CH* I.37), Whatley considers Ælfric's preemptive address to those who might question God's ability to protect his saints. Whatley takes Ælfric's elaborate defense as evidence that certain texts were problematic to some medieval listeners, and that Ælfric was well aware of this fact. Whatley then considers ways in which Ælfric packages the *Lives of Saints* for his secular patrons. Though Ælfric describes the *Lives* as representative of saints celebrated by the monastic community, Whatley notes several examples in which Ælfric de-emphasizes or omits entirely texts that portray monks' struggle with temptation and failure or that present an ascetic, contemplative form of monasticism: the one was "private stuff, best kept safely within the monastic walls, decently protected by the Latin language"; the other "flagrantly contradicted and implicitly critiqued the kind of monastic establishment that [Ælfric's patrons] had been persuaded to support" (176). In short, Whatley's study sheds insight on this key tension in Ælfric's narratorial approach: though on the one hand Ælfric feels responsible for fulfilling the priestly duty of teaching God's Word, he is reluctant to provide translations of texts for public consumption except "in a highly abridged and selective form, preferably embedded carefully in sermons, or hedged about with lengthy prefaces and judicious conclusions" (161).

In her discussion of "Ælfric's Authorities" (*EMETI*, 51–65), Joyce Hill returns to an important theme in her work:

Ælfric's use of his immediate versus ultimate sources. Reviewing Ælfric's reference to his authorities in his Latin Preface to the First Series, Hill distinguishes between the homiliaries of Paul the Deacon, Smaragdus, and Haymo—the first two explicitly identifying the patristic sources of their selections, the last blending patristic material without attribution—before considering again the question of Ælfric's relation to Smaragdus. Source-hunters, she notes, have often given precedence to Paul the Deacon where he overlaps with Smaragdus: Ælfric, they assume, can only be shown to have used Smaragdus for occasional details not present in Ælfric's other putative sources. That proof of Ælfric's use might be limited to such details, however, does not mean that his use was so limited: Hill points out that Ælfric may well give prominence to Smaragdus in his preface because "the verbatim textual overlap allowed Ælfric to move more consistently and more easily between Paul the Deacon and Smaragdus than between Haymo and either of the other two" (58). Hill focuses in detail on Pope's source-study of *Supplementary Homilies* I.7, I.10, and II.17, showing that the details seemingly drawn from diverse authorities may in fact derive largely or exclusively from Smaragdus. In the process, she calls us to re-evaluate the number of Ælfric's immediate sources, suggesting that to a greater extent than previously thought Ælfric may rely on this Carolingian compiler whose stature for the Benedictine Reform was significant and whose compositional methods paralleled his own.

In his "The Transmission of Ælfric's *Letter to Sigefyrth* and the Mutilation of MS Cotton Vespasian D.xiv" (*EMETI*, 285–300), Jonathan Wilcox traces the history of a provocative text through the political complexities of Elizabethan England and the early study of Old English. Ælfric's *Letter to Sigefyrth* survives in three forms: as an imperfect preface from which the ending and the letter itself have been removed; as a general homiletic reworking of the text by Ælfric; and as a further homiletic adaptation perhaps not by Ælfric himself. It is the first on which Wilcox focuses, the preface found in London, BL, MS Cotton Vespasian D.xiv, which fortunately was transcribed along with the now-missing letter by Matthew Parker's Latin secretary, John Joscelyn. The letter treats a subject of keen interest both to Ælfric and Parker, the question of priestly marriage. For Ælfric, such marriage was anathema; for Parker, it was a personal reality which he defended in print. Despite Parker's position, however, and his habit of altering manuscripts that passed through his hands, Wilcox suggests that Parker was not responsible for excising the *Letter to Sigefyrth*: on the one hand, he notes, where Parker removed folios, he tended to expunge or cover bits of text (like the imperfect preface) left over on adjacent pages. On the

other hand, Wilcox points out, Parker chooses to "neutralize" rather than suppress the *Letter*, foregrounding in his writings the fact that Sigefyrth, to whom Ælfric writes, was being advised by an anchorite that priestly marriage was permissible. Parker is hardly the only candidate for the *Letter*'s loss, however: other early students of Old English manuscripts who worked with Vespasian D.xiv include Robert Talbot, Laurence Nowell, John Joscelyn, Richard James, and Sir Robert Cotton. It is the last, another book-collector in the habit of rearranging and removing material, at whom Wilcox points the finger of accusation. Finally, Wilcox draws our attention to a final rearrangement of information related to the *Letter*: its nineteenth-century edition by Assmann, who, unhindered by a "postmodern-inflected appreciation of the fragmentary," creates from the various versions "a work that never was" (299–300).

Several items on Wulfstan and anonymous homilists also appeared in 2002. Using the shortest of Wulfstan's homilies, Bethurum XXI, as a case study, Andy Orchard's "On Editing Wulfstan" (*EMETI*, 311–40) surveys the challenges and desirability of re-editing Wulfstan's works—a project with which Orchard himself is engaged. The challenges are numerous and manifest: the wide-ranging and interrelated nature of Wulfstan's legal and homiletic works; the tendency of both Wulfstan and his readers to recast his writings in different contexts; Wulfstan's characteristic use of formulaic phrases, complicating (among other things) the question of the chronology of his works; and an incomplete understanding of the extent of his vernacular and Latin corpus, to name a few. Orchard argues that current editions of Wulfstan's works do not adequately account for such factors. Bethurum XXI, for example, survives in four distinct versions present in three manuscripts; Dorothy Bethurum's 1957 edition of the text, however, produces what Orchard calls "a chimera which not only does not match what is found in any surviving manuscript, but relegates to the critical apparatus material which has at least as strong a claim to authenticity" (316). Orchard's Appendix I, by contrast, prints a simplified version of the text from one manuscript, with significant additions, omissions, and variants listed separately (318). Orchard shows, moreover, that Bethurum misreports readings and fails to give due attention to important elements of the manuscripts, such as the consistent association of the homily with Wulfstan's legal works and the forms of pointing (punctuation) that attest to an authorial pattern of two-stress phrases. Arguing that such two-stress phrases "lie at the heart of Wulfstan's compositional technique" (321), Orchard in Appendix II offers a representative list of verbal parallels between phrases in Bethurum XXI and phrases from (primarily Wulfstanian) material elsewhere. While the full significance of such

parallels must await further study, the potential insights offered by such new information highlight the desirability of a new edition. If for Wulfstan nuances of structure complement and reinforce conceptual themes, for Orchard a Wulfstan edition should do no less, offering the scholar the opportunity to view those details on which the author lavished his attention.

Don Chapman's examination of "Germanic Tradition and Latin Learning in Wulfstan's Echoic Compounds" (*JEGP* 101: 1–18) suggests that this feature of Wulfstan's style—the echoing of one constituent of a compound in a nearby simplex or compound, as in *wedlogan ne wordlogan* 'oath-liars nor word-liars' (1)—derives from a vernacular practice reinforced by Latin learning. Chapman points to the presence of echoic compounds in Old English charms and laws, arguing that such works, like homilies, display both oral origins and "the learning of the church." In such material, Chapman suggests, the native oral tradition should be viewed not as separate from but as interwoven with ecclesiastical rhetorical practice. Though rooted in the one, moreover, Wulfstan may well have been conscious of the influence of the other: medieval grammars stressed the importance of compounds, his condensations of Latin texts and translations into the vernacular show a sensitivity to parallel structures in which many echoic pairs occur, and punctuation in manuscripts associated with Wulfstan likewise consistently attest to his attention to such parallelism. While Wulfstan's prose may thus flow naturally from his native idiom, therefore, it also reveals an awareness of Latin principles that complement and sharpen that vernacular device.

Ariane Lainé's "L'Antéchrist dans les homélies eschatologiques de Wulfstan: un mal du siècle" (*Historical Reflections / Reflexions historiques* 26 [2000]: 173–87) considers the concerns and techniques of Wulfstan's six eschatological homilies, among his earlier works. Asking whether Wulfstan's attitude towards the imminence of the end times changes after the turn of the millennium, Lainé notes that ultimately Wulfstan affirms that "no man knows the day or the hour," viewing the reality of the last times as a pressing and ever-present motivation for all Christians to repent and live righteously. To this end, Lainé notes, Wulfstan's homilies and law-codes go hand-in-hand: his is a holistic approach to judging human activity, whether it fall under the ecclesiastical or secular sphere. Lainé contrasts Wulfstan's restrained treatment of the Antichrist and the end times with those of anonymous homilies such as Blickling VII or Napier XLII and its source, Adso's *Libellus de Antichristo*, with their incorporation of extra-biblical details. Such choices, she suggests, may be grounded not only in

the largely orthodox emphasis of the Benedictine Reform, but in the real-world dangers which his work acknowledges. In this regard, Wulfstan's content parallels his choice of style: succinct and memorable, the sermons strive for rhetorical effectiveness, urging his audience through a recognition of spiritual and temporal peril to godly living.

Winfried Rudolf's "Style and Composition of Napier XVIII—A Matter of Person or a Matter of Purpose?" (*Authors, Heroes and Lovers*, ed. Thomas Honegger [Bern: Peter Lang, 2000], 107–49) calls into question not only the authorship of this and other texts attributed to Wulfstan, but the value of searching to determine authorship of anonymous homilies in general. To begin with, Rudolf suggests that it was far less important for such texts to be original or self-referential (establishing intellectual "celebrities," as he puts it) than to be derivative and useful—that is, rooted in a multiplicity of sources and tailored to the needs of the immediate audience. Rudolf reviews the criteria used by Napier, Jost, and Bethurum for ascribing homilies to Wulfstan, and then turns in detail to one homily so ascribed, Napier XVIII, a re-working of Ælfric's *De falsis diis* (*SH* II.21). Examining words or clauses altered or omitted in the revised text, he concludes that nearly all the changes serve to sharpen the sermon's rhetorical force and ease of delivery. While such features as adverbial intensifiers, repetition, and two-stress patterns have been viewed as core characteristics of Wulfstan's style, Rudolf stresses that the data are inconclusive. Such changes, he says, could have been made by "any person with a sense of musicality and the knowledge of material of similar style," or could be stylistic features or a larger tradition or even school, perhaps based at Worcester, rather than that of a single preacher (123 and 125). The intellectual property of such homilies, he concludes, "is impossible to be assigned to a single 'author'"; indeed, he sees "no point in continuing the search" (136). Rather, anonymous homilies should be appraised on and valued for their individual merits.

Hiroshi Ogawa's "Aspects of 'Wulfstan Imitators' in Late Old English Sermon Writing" (*Studies in English Historical Linguistics*, ed. Jacek Fisiak [Frankfurt: Peter Lang], 389–403) addresses a question going back over a century: the extent to which eleventh- and twelfth-century composite homilies drawing on Wulfstan may be said to be "Wulfstan imitators." Using fifteen sermons listed in Jonathan Wilcox's 1992 study of the dissemination of Wulfstan's homilies under the heading "Use by Later Sermon Writers," Ogawa notes that while some sermons simply incorporate Wulfstan material verbatim, others make significant changes to their source—changes, moreover, that are consistent with their approach to other source-material. Whether the

results are seen as pedantic or verbose, whether limited to word-order or other aspects of style, the variety of ways in which Wulfstan is handled argue against the notion of Wulfstan imitation *per se*. Rather than imitating details solely from Wulfstan, Ogawa suggests, these writers drew upon details from any number of sources, among whom Wulfstan was simply one of the most prominent. To varying extents, moreover, these writers preserved personal characteristics in their work, revealing individual attitudes towards their homiletic forebears even while working in a broader tradition or "period of accepted plagiarism" (397).

Charles Wright's study of "More Old English Poetry in Vercelli Homily XXI" (*EMETI*, 245–62) turns to a text that resists easy categorization as vernacular verse or prose. Vercelli XXI contains a number of "verse-like outcroppings" whose nature has been the subject of scholarly debate. On the one hand, there is an account of the Last Judgment that also appears in various forms in Vercelli II and in a sermon in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 201: Paul Szarmach's edition of Vercelli XXI prints the passage in verse while that of Don Scragg prints it as prose. In addition, there is a depiction of Judgment that Angus McIntosh printed as a five-line passage of classical verse, describing it as a fragment of an otherwise-lost Old English poem. A third section, moreover, has been described as a "prose dilution" of the poem *An Exhortation to Christian Living*, another prose version of which appears in a pseudo-Wulfstan homily. Scragg has also pointed to a fourth area in which loose alliteration "suggests dependence" on a lost poetic work (253). To such proposed outcroppings of verse, however, Wright adds another: lines 141–49, a passage interposed between Scragg's loosely-alliterative section and the "prose dilution" derived from the *Exhortation*. Wright prints an "optimally emended verse lineation" of the passage not so much to reconstruct the "classical" form of its original source, but to show the extent to which the passage currently corresponds to standards of classical verse. Despite its defects, the text's alliteration, metrical parallels to other prosaic poetry, distinctively poetic vocabulary, and formulaic similarities to vernacular verse all provide what Wright calls "compelling evidence of poetic intention" (259). Particularly in light of the composite nature of the homily as a whole, Wright concludes that this passage too derives from an Old English poem which no longer survives.

In his "Vercelli Homilies XI-XIII and the Anglo-Saxon Benedictine Reform: Tailored Sources and Implied Audiences" (*Preacher, Sermon and Audience in the Middle Ages*, ed. Carolyn Muessig [Boston: Brill], 203–27), Charles Wright provides an admirably cautious and persuasive

model for drawing nearer to identifying the audiences of anonymous homilies. Reviewing the posited audiences of Ælfric and Wulfstan, preachers whose careers give us certain historical contexts in which to place their work, Wright then turns to the more elusive problem of the recipients of Vercelli XI-XIII, a set of homilies arguably composed by a single author. Wright notes that their audience need not be that of the homiliary as a whole. While scholars have viewed the Vercelli collection as a reading book, with many of the homilies originally composed for laity, the works fall into various groups of differing origins that potentially were composed for a variety of audiences. The internal evidence of Vercelli XI-XIII includes (for example) exhortations to teach and to carry relics that suggest a clerical address; comparison of these texts to known sources and to a newly-discovered parallel in Cassian's *De institutis coenobiorum*, moreover, reveal a consistent omission of references to specifically monastic values such as the renunciation of possessions. In addition, there is the debated conclusion of Vercelli XI, in which the homilist complains about the depredation of spiritual orders (*godcundan hadas*) by ecclesiastical and temporal powers; Wright views the passage as potential evidence for the reaction of secular clergy to the Benedictine Reform. Taken together, such evidence suggests that secular clerics may have been the original intended audience for these texts, highlighting not only the presence of a non-monastic view of piety in tenth-century England, but the importance of omitted source-material as a potential clue to such homilies' anonymous recipients.

Charles Wright's "The Old English 'Macarius' Homily, Vercelli Homily IV, and Ephrem Latinus, *De paenitentia*" (*Via Crucis*, 210–34) addresses the difficulty of determining to what extent OE homilies are composite—drawing together materials previously translated in vernacular homilies—and how homilies that share analogous material are related to one another. His case in point is Vercelli IV, whose introduction "overlaps considerably" with the text known as the Macarius soul-and-body homily from Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 201. While Don Scragg and Malcolm Godden take Macarius to be the later text, Wright reexamines their thesis through an examination of what he identifies as their ultimate source, a sermon by the Syriac Father Ephrem of Edessa (d. 373). Setting extracts from Macarius, Vercelli, and Ephrem's *De paenitentia* side-by-side, Wright concludes that the Vercelli homily derives from and expands upon an earlier version of the Macarius homily, which in turn derives from Ephrem. In conclusion, moreover, Wright outlines the larger ramifications of his study: first, it confirms the chronological relationship of the Macarius and Vercelli homilies; second, it has

implications for textual criticism, identifying corrupt passages in Macarius; third, it has bearing on stylistic analysis, showing how a vernacular writer adapts his Latin original; fourth, it sheds light on the manuscript context of the Macarius homily, given the relationship of Ephremic sermons with clerical regulations such as Theodulf's *Capitula*; and finally, it contributes to our understanding of Anglo-Saxon intellectual history and spirituality by tracing the influence of a particular patristic source from the ninth through the eleventh century.

Following up on Don Scragg's suggestion in his edition of Vercelli 6 that the homily draws at three points on the *Euangelium pseudo-Matthaei*, Fred Biggs's "Vercelli Homily 6 and the Apocryphal *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*" (*N&Q* n.s. 49: 176–78) gently expands our understanding of the potential knowledge and use of the apocryphon in Anglo-Saxon England. The latter half of the *Gospel* is actually a late addition; the *Gospel*'s most recent editor, who excludes this late material, dates the joining of the pieces to the eleventh century. Noting that the source-material cited by Scragg stems from both the original and appended sections of the *Gospel*, Biggs tentatively suggests that if Scragg's proposal is correct, Vercelli 6 might constitute evidence that the joining occurred even earlier—at least by the second half of the tenth century, the date of the Vercelli manuscript. Examining the putative links between the works in detail, however, Biggs concludes that the evidence "is too uncertain to support this claim": the passages in Vercelli seem to echo biblical passages or "standard conclusion[s] in Christian texts" as much as material from the *Euangelium pseudo-Matthaei* (176 and 178).

A.K.

Works not seen

Yakovlev, N. A. "Metrika propovedey El'frika" ["The Meter of Ælfric's Sermons"]. *Sankt-Peterburgskiy gosu-darstvennyi universitet. Materialy XXX mezhvu-zovskoy nauchno-metodicheskoy konferentsii pre-podavateley i aspirantov. Vypusk 19. Istoriya yazyka. Romano-germanskii tsikl. 1-17 marta 2001 g.* [*St Petersburg State University: Materials from the 30th Multi-institutional Academic and Methodological Conference of Professors and Graduate Students. Issue 19: Language History. Romano-Germanic Series. March 1-17, 2001*]. St Petersburg: Philological Department of the U of St Petersburg, 2001. 42–45.

5. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works

a. General

A defense of Medieval Latin against the calumnies of classicists, Carolinne White's "Medieval Senses of Classical Words" (*Peritia* 16: 131–43) explores how and why word meaning developed in the period between the Roman empire and the Renaissance. White makes the perennial argument of the relativist against the prescriptivist: a living language changes because it must adapt to new social circumstances. So for the medievals the Vulgate Bible became a model to rival (if perhaps not equal) Cicero, and the language becomes crowded with useful neologisms of many sorts—back formations from Classical terms (*nuere*, for example), new derivatives (so useful a word as *neutralitas*), loans from the vernaculars (e.g., *grutum* "malt" from OE), with compounds (*nivicollinus*, an inhabitant of Snowdonia), and many new senses of old words. White is a lexicographer with the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British and Insular Sources*, and she has drawn these examples from a vast cornucopia. The lexicographer's view also informs White's estimate of the historical importance of the medieval language: it preserves many occurrences of genuinely Classical words not found it in the scanty remains of ancient writings, and it alone preserves some examples of words used in an original etymological sense. If any classicists remain unpersuaded, White points out to them that medieval writings outnumber Classical texts many times over and sketch a historical past much more richly detailed than anything we can hope to know of Rome. The essay is decidedly old fashioned—White never mentions what sociolinguistics has to say about modern standards, an area where many of her major assertions about language change were accepted long ago—but the detailed knowledge of Latin from many regions and times makes for an interesting read.

In 1997 Richard Sharpe published *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540*, Publications of the Jnl of Medieval Latin (Turnhout: Brepols)*,* a fundamental research tool of immense value which lists authors from Abbo to Wulfstan in over 800 pages. It was reissued with additions and corrections in 2002. A typical entry gives biographical information about the authors, editions, and important studies of their works; there are frequent detailed manuscript citations, and many citations by other medieval authors. If authenticity of attribution is less than certain, Sharpe reviews the evidence supporting authorship. Lost and spurious works are duly noted, and authors known only via the Renaissance witnesses Bale and Leland are exhaustively listed. It is hard to voice anything but praise for the enormity of the undertaking. The list of abbreviations alone runs to more than eight pages. As Sharpe tells in his preface, he inherited some of the work from Mynors and was able to compile much more while doing lexicographical work for the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British and Insular Sources*. Michael Herren's foreword mentions as well Sharpe's work with Michael Lapidge on the *Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature 400-1200* as yet another way his survey benefited from other projects and other scholars. Nevertheless, Sharpe expended great energy in compiling this huge mass of material, and his care for consistency and accuracy of presentation are everywhere evident. A word about its limitations: it is an author list, so anonymous works are not covered, though (perhaps illogically) fictional writers *are* included ("John Mandeville"). As Sharpe observes, such works as this are never truly finished, and the 2002 edition has incorporated many additions and corrections to the original of 1997. A separate pamphlet appeared this year (*A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540: Additions and Corrections, 1997-2001* [Turnhout: Brepols]) to supplement the 1997 volume.

Fascicles of the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British and Insular Sources* are coming at lightning speed. *Fascicle VI: M* (Oxford: Oxford UP), replete with additions and corrections, appeared in 2001, and now we have *Fascicle VII: N*, which extends this fundamental reference by seventy-eight pages. *O* was published in 2003 and will be reviewed in next year's *YWOES*.

Michael Gorman has collected fifteen of his previously published articles in *Biblical Commentaries from the Early Middle Ages*, Millennio Medievale 32, Reprints 4 (Florence: Sismel Edizioni del Galluzzo). Most of these concern works by continental writers, but several relate to England, mostly those on works previously attributed to Bede such as "Wigbod and the 'Lectiones' on the Hexateuch Attributed to Bede in Paris Lat. 2342," "The Commentary on the Pentateuch Attributed to Bede in *PL* 91.189-394 (Parts I and II)," and "The Glosses on Bede's 'De temporum ratione' Attributed to Byrhtferth of Ramsey." Also included is his review article of Michael Lapidge's book on Theodore and Hadrian, "Theodore of Canterbury, Hadrian of Nisida and Michael Lapidge," *Scriptorium* 50 (1996), in which he praises Lapidge's work but finds the many of the biblical glosses themselves "fairly trivial," and he notes that they "do not seem to have participated in or contributed to the

major exegetical traditions." He uses this point to support his criticisms of Bischoff's *Wendepunkte* article, which he makes in "A Critique of Bischoff's Theory of Irish Exegesis: The Commentary on Genesis in Munich Clm 6302 (Wendepunkte 2)," though his more detailed article, "The Myth of Hiberno-Latin Exegesis," *RB* 110 (2000): 42–85, is not included in this collection.

Several works that range across the Anglo-Saxon period appeared in 2002. Mark Stansbury's "Collected Works: *Spolia* and Latin Textual Culture, 500-900" (*DAI* 63A: 1493–94) is a study of the genesis and transmission of compiled texts. The introduction of the codex and the subsequent assembling of texts into organized collections marked a break with Classical practice. In Stansbury's words, "The central portion of the study examines two important genres, the biblical commentary and the letter collection. By tracing the development of the commentary from Antiquity through the Carolingians I show how its authors adapted this genre [compilations] to new ends, such as making scarce texts available in the eighth and ninth centuries during the rapid growth of monasteries."

François Dolbeau calls for more attention to be paid to the unexplored realm of Latin hagiographical texts in verse in "Un domain négligé de la littérature médiolatine: Les textes hagiographiques en vers," *CCM* 45: 129–39. In the words of his abstract, "The transmission of these versified pieces is usually limited. They generally circulate in booklets or in comprehensive dossiers concerning a patron saint. When they are transcribed in passionaries, they are almost always subordinated to prose versions. Hagiographic poems represent a type of rewriting in an epic mode, which can be interpreted as a literary effort to equal the nobility of the subject. Many factors contributed to their proliferation, most notably the classroom exercise of poetic paraphrase." Although most of the texts he mentions are continental, given the popularity of the prose and poetic versions of Aldhelm's *De virginitate* in England and the numerous Old English poems of saint's lives, his discussion should be relevant to most Anglo-Saxonists.

In "The Miracle of the Lengthened Beam in Apocryphal and Hagiographic Tradition," in *Marvels, Monsters, and Miracles*, ed. Jones and Sprunger, 109–39, Thomas N. Hall discusses the miracle in which a piece of wood that has been cut too short is miraculously lengthened. He documents its appearance in numerous saint's lives, presumably based on the occurrence of the story in the various infancy Gospels. David Howlett's "'Tres Linguae Sacrae' and Threefold Play in Insular Latin" (*Peritia* 16: 94–115) looks at a number of works in Anglo-Latin and Hiberno-

Latin to see how far they exploit themes of three (possibly at the inspiration of the tripartite nature of the "perfect" languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, as well as of the trinity). He does the numbers on these works in his usual fashion; also included are examples of works written in Latin code.

Two chapters of Lynne Long's *Translating the Bible: From the 7th to the 17th Century*, Ashgate New Critical Thinking in Theology & Biblical Studies (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001) deal with Anglo-Saxon topics (chap. 2 "From Bede to Alfred"; chap. 3 "The Practice of Glossing: The Writings of Ælfric"). The aim here is to analyze, from a translation perspective, biblical writings in English, a program most often executed in a narrative framework. There are indeed many statements with which it is hard to disagree— that Latin outranked English, that English had to develop a written prose tradition in order to assimilate biblical text, that psalter glossing reflects a stage of this development, and so forth—but Long has entirely missed the last quarter century of scholarship. There is no account of the work of Lapidge and others on the Canterbury school of Hadrian and Theodore, of Roy Liuzza's work on the OE Gospels, or of Phillip Pulsiano's work on psalter glosses. This work is a puzzlement.

b. Early Anglo-Latin, Exclusive of Bede

In "An Interpolation in the Text of Gildas's *De Excidio Britanniae*" (*Peritia* 16: 161–67) Alex Woolf would excise as an intrusive gloss the famous passage containing the phrase "cyulis, nostra longis navibus." After removing any objections of syntax or vocabulary, Woolf reconstructs the passage to "ut lingua nostra exprimitur, cyulis, latina longis navibus" (keels in our language, long boats in Latin), i.e., an English gloss added to the archetype of all surviving manuscripts

Using his characteristic numerical analysis, David Howlett, in "The Prophecy of Saxon Occupation in Gildas, *De Excidio Britanniae*," (*Peritia* 16: 156–60) links a prophecy in Gildas' text with Æthelbert's law code, issued by the Augustinian missionaries.

In "*Ut Beda boat*: Cuanu's Signature?" (*Ireland and Europe in the Early Middle Ages: Texts and Transmission / Irland und Europa im früheren Mittelalter: Texte und Überlieferung*, ed. Próinséas Ní Chatháin and Michael Richter [Dublin and Portland, OR: Four Courts], 45–67) Francis John Byrne examines numerous versions of the Irish annals with source citations such as *ut Beda boat* and *ut Eusebius ait*. He suggests that the principle behind these phrases is

alliteration and notes that the only places these alliterative formulas occur are in manuscripts of the Annals of Tigernach. He discusses the references to the Book of Cuanu that were added to the Annals of Ulster and comes to the conclusion that the alliterative source citations were made by Cuanu himself, and are thus his "signature."

Several articles discuss the writings of Adomnán, two of them by David Woods. In "Four Notes on Adomnán's *Vita Columbae*" (*Peritia* 16: 40–67) Woods seeks to clarify certain cruces in that work: about the locale of an earthquake; about the meaning of the word *cristilia* (evidently 'barnacles on a boat', a reading with ramifications for the meaning of the text); about certain sea monsters which are to be identified as dolphins; and about a book borne by an angel. In "Arculf's Luggage: The Sources for Adomnán's *De Locis Sanctis*" (*Ériu* 52: 25–52) Woods chases down a few disparate leads about an important source used by Adomnán. The source, a commonplace book assembled by one Arculf (rightly Arnulf), included a life of Constantine that contributed details of geography and history and a Latin translation of miracle stories that furnished information about Palestine. The interesting part is that the texts accompanied a relic collection lost in a storm in the Channel. Unbeknownst to either Arculf or Adomnán, the collection was subsequently recovered by Continental beachcombers. Woods has found the story of the recovery in the *Gesta abbatum Fointanellensium*, whose relevant sections he translates.

Michael Enright, "Further Reflections on Royal Ordination in the *Vita Columbae*" (*Ogma*, ed. Richter and Picard, 20–35) responds to some criticisms of a suggestion he put forth in the 1980s on certain passages in Adomnán's *Vita Columbae* concerning the consecration and anointing of kings. T. M. Charles-Edwards, for example, has argued that the passages reflect the story of Isaac and his twin sons, but Enright reaffirms his position that Adomnán was attempting to identify Columba's consecration of Aidan with Samuel's anointing of Saul, thus emphasizing the role and authority of the church in ordaining kings.

The manuscript in the title of Jean-Michel Picard's "Schaffhausen Generalia I and the Textual Transmission of Adomnán's *Vita Columbae* on the Continent," (*Ireland and Europe*, ed. Ní Chatháin and Richter, 95–102) is especially important because a scribal colophon gives a precise time and place of origin: Iona, sometime before the scribe's death in 713. The question here is how and when did the manuscript wind up in Reichenau. Picard shows that it was not brought by Viking raiders, as some have suggested. The numerous progeny of the manuscript allow Picard to

plot a clear trajectory. It was in St. Gall in the 890s, when Notker Balbulus plagiarized it, but it did not arrive there before the death in 849 of Walahfrid Strabo, who had no knowledge of it. Picard also discerns a motive for the acquisition of the manuscript by the St. Gall community—the close link to Columbanus through a direct tradition of spiritual descendants. It probably remained at St. Gall well into the tenth century, when scholars associated with Metz consulted it. Textual influence on manuscripts of northern France suggest the manuscript circulated in that area before its arrival at St. Gall.

In "Authority and Duty: Columbanus and the Primacy of Rome" (*Peritia* 16: 168–213) Damian Bracken examines Columbanus's letter to Pope Boniface IV. In the letter Columbanus shows his support for the authority of the pope during the Three Chapters Controversy, when many churches in the East and West had decided to break communion with Rome. Columbanus also, however, calls on the pope to fulfill his duty as watchman over the church to protect it from heresies and schism.

Aidan Breen discusses the complicated textual history of the seventh-century Hiberno-Latin *De XII abusivis* in "*De XII Abusiuis*: Text and Transmission" (*Ireland and Europe*, ed. Ní Chatháin and Richter, 78–94). He divides the manuscript into two families based on an ascription to either Cyprian or Augustine. Although the current modern edition by Hellmann from 1909 is based on the Cyprian recension, Breen shows that this version is instead a ninth-century Carolingian revision and that the Augustine recension more closely reflects the Insular original.

Since 1981 a group of scholars has been editing apocryphal literature for the Corpus Christianorum series. In "Apocryphal Infancy Narratives: European and Irish Transmission" (*Ireland and Europe*, ed. Ní Chatháin and Richter, 123–46), Martin McNamara reports findings brought to light during these efforts. Following a brief account of the tradition and previous scholarship on it, McNamara focuses on those narratives which treat the infancy of Jesus, and how and when those narratives were transmitted to Ireland. The tales fall into two compilations, one roughly of Carolingian times (the J Compilation), one much earlier (the I Compilation), "in the seventh century at the latest." The author finds in the close comparison of the narrative components considerable evidence for the rearrangement and expansion of apocrypha within an Irish milieu.

In "Links between a Twelfth-Century Worcester (F. 94) Homily and an Eighth-Century Hiberno-Latin Commentary (*Liber questionum in evangeliis*)," (*Via Crucis:*

Essays on Early Medieval Sources and Ideas in Memory of J. E. Cross, ed. Thomas N. Hall *et al.*, Medieval European Studies 1 [Morgantown, WV: West Virginia UP], 331–54), Jean Rittmueller investigates the connections between a Hiberno-Latin commentary on Matthew, a twelfth-century homily and Paschasius Radbertus' *Expositio in Matheo*, all of which misattribute a quotation from Mark to Luke. Rittmueller finds that the source of the misattribution is the earlier Hiberno-Latin commentary on Matthew by Frigulus, but that both the twelfth-century homily and Paschasius Radbertus were drawing on the *Liber questionum*. She also discusses the complicated textual tradition of the *Liber questionum* and discusses from which branch the versions used by the twelfth-century Worcester homilist and Paschasius Radbertus descend.

The Matthew Commentaries in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM 14311 have long been thought to be of Hiberno-Latin provenance. At work over a number of years on a critical edition of it, Bengt Löfstedt has uncovered considerable evidence to suggest otherwise in his "Zum Mathaeuskommentar in CLM 14311," *Aevum* 75 (2001): 263–66. Of the numerous sources for the Matthew Commentaries in CLM 14311, only the writing of the Pseudo-Hieronymus Gospel Commentary is identified as Hiberno-Latin. More compelling still are the text's many peculiarities of spelling that are principally associated with continental Medieval Latin. The omission of the final -s, *multa* for *multas*, *aliu* for *alius* and of the final -*t*, *reliqui* for *reliquit*, *conforta* for *confortat*, are typical of Italian Medieval Latin. The use of the accusative for the nominative case parallels developments in the Latin of Medieval Italy and Spain. The most striking evidence to suggest a continental origin for the Matthew Commentaries in the CLM 14311 is found in the use of the word *rausus* (Old French *raus*, Modern French *roseau*). This word, of Gothic origin, does not occur in any Medieval-Latin text from outside the Gallo-Roman area. Though not conclusive, the accumulation of evidence points to a continental, as opposed to Irish, origin for the Matthew Commentaries in CLM 14311. (Reviewed by Thomas Miller)

The text named in Pádraig Ó Riain's "A Northumbrian Phase in the Formation of the Hieronymian Martyrology: The Evidence of the Martyrology of Tallaght" (*AB* 120: 311–63) is an abbreviated martyrology which circulated in Ireland. Ó Riain cuts through a welter of textual complications to uncover a hypothetical ancestor originating in Northumbria, perhaps at Lindisfarne, *ca*. 700. After acquiring the unabbreviated text (the Hieronymian Martyrology) from the Continent, Benedict Biscop or Ceolfrith (or an anonymous Anglo-Saxon) will have transported it to Northern England, where it underwent substantial modification through the deletion of some saints' names and the addition of others. Ó Riain's analysis makes sense of the anonymous redactor's methods, and these conclusions bear on the complex transmission history of the text. Yet other evidence points to an intermediate version which contributed to the Martyrology of Tallaght, to Bede's Martyrology, and to the Martyrology of Echternach. "All principal versions of the Hieronymian Martyrology can be shown, simply by comparison with the text of the Martyrology of Tallaght, to have gone through what may be described as a Northumbrian phase."

Michael Lapidge has done much to advance knowledge about the seventh-century Canterbury of Hadrian and Theodore, and in "Rufinus at the School of Canterbury" (*La tradition vive: Mélanges d'histoire des textes en l'honneur de Louis Holtz*, ed. P. Lardet, Bibliologia 20 [Turnhout: Brepols], 119–29) he breaks new ground on the subject. Simple and straightforward collation uncovers interesting new details about the method of textual annotation that, apparently, was the centerpiece of Canterbury instruction. Varying versions of glosses on Rufinus's *Historia Ecclesiastica* (from the Leiden Glossary and from a Milan manuscript) are complementary, perhaps recording different parts of the same original annotation, perhaps sometimes resulting from the differing interests of individual students. Pretty clearly, however, most of these glosses "are independent records of … one explanation," i.e., that of the seventh-century master. Further comparisons turn up a manuscript from Lorsch of *ca*. 800 whose text and glosses match the Canterbury Rufinus items: it descends from a Canterbury manuscript of Rufinus's *Historia*. In closing, Lapidge finds a further close match between the Canterbury glosses and many phrases in Aldhelm's prose *De virginitate*. Aldhelm himself may have written some of the glosses during his student days under Theodore. Suddenly the Dark Ages are that much less gloomy. What can be learned from the other texts with multiple batches in the Leiden Glossary—Sulpicius Severus, Gildas, Cassian, Isidore, and Phocas?

Claudia di Sciacca tackles the question of whether Isidore's *Synonyma* was known at the school of Theodore and Hadrian. In "Isidorian Scholarship at the School of Theodore and Hadrian: The Case of the *Synonyma*" (*Quaestio* 3: 76–106) she begins by affirming the popularity and influence of the *Synonyma* in late Anglo-Saxon England, and by noting that several other works by Isidore were known in seventh-century Canterbury. Aldhelm too knew several works by Isidore, including the *Synonyma*. She comes to the conclusion, however, that there is as yet no evidence that the *Synonyma* were known in the school of Theodore

and Hadrian, mostly by comparing the vernacular glosses found in the Anglo-Saxon manuscripts (a list of which she includes in an appendix) with the glossaries that contain material from the Canterbury school. Nevertheless, her conclusion that "a thorough study of both the Old English and Latin glosses to the *Synonyma* may shed light on the relevance of this text in the early Anglo-Saxon period" (103) seems promising, especially for the Latin glosses.

In "Who Is the Nun from Heidenheim? A Study of Hugeburc's *Vita Willibaldi*" (*MÆ* 71: 29–46) Pauline Head examines the role of Hugeburc as the female author of the *Lives of Willibald and Willibrord*. Though many Anglo-Saxon and Frankish women seem to have been well educated and even copied books, her position as a female hagiographer is unique. Hugeburc prefaces her Life of Willibald with a preface in which she likens herself to "an inexperienced child" who has "little skill," in contrast to the venerable Willibald. Although it seems similar to the standard modesty topos found in numerous contemporary saints' lives, Head suggests such distancing of the author from the subject reflects Hugeburc's "ambivalence about her role as a hagiographer" (31) and the growing segregation between women and men growing in eighth-century Francia. Head then turns to the descriptions of Willibald's pilgrimage in the East, noting how, unlike the separation seen earlier, in this section Hugeburc "shares in the excitement and the spiritual growth of [Willibald's] activity, implicitly conveying their similarities and drawing them together" (38). Her narrative "reflects and interprets both the pilgrim's, apparently secular, fascination with the strangeness and beauty of distant places and his desire to be present at sacred sites" (41).

c. Bede

In "Bede the Theologian" (*The Medieval Theologians*, ed. G. R. Evans [Oxford: Blackwell, 2001], 57–64) Benedicta Ward uses the occasion of recent editions and translations of Bede's many commentaries, to reposition him primarily as theologian and exegete, and only secondarily as the father of English history. Ward cites the honorific, *Doctor Anglorum,* given him at the time of his canonization, in arguing for a theological engagement that not only transformed English cultural and spiritual life, but, also, that of European civilization across successive ages. Bede himself recognized Augustine, Jerome, Gregory and Ambrose as the four Latin Fathers of the church; Ward adds his name to these as a "fifth" Latin Father. In contrast to these, his patristic "predecessors," and unlike later doctors of the church, such as Anselm and Aquinas, "Bede…was not a great systematic theologian but a supreme communicator."

Although he made "no new contribution to doctrinal definitions of the central tenets of the Christian faith," Bede was a master at receiving, verifying and transmitting the writings of earlier theologians. Following the example of his predecessors, Bede concentrated upon the exact grammatical meaning of the text, striving for a sound theology consistent with already established church doctrine. The rigor of his method, learned from those who preceded him, was a model used by following generations. Among those works connected with Bede's care, Ward cites the immensely important *Codex Amiatinus,* the oldest surviving text of Jerome's Latin translation of the *iuxta hebraica.* In addition, his commentaries were held in sufficiently high regard to be included in the eleventh-century *Glossa Ordinaria;* they were widely esteemed as standard biblical commentaries for the Middle Ages. (Reviewed by Thomas Miller)

Verity Allan also concentrates on Bede's commentaries in asking who Bede's projected audience was in "Bede: Educating the Educators of Barbarians," *Quaestio* 3: 28–44. Allan examines first Bede's Latin style and the punctuation Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 819. She suggests that the complex system of punctuation there was perhaps developed by Bede himself as a way to make the syntax of his Latin more apparent to students using the works. She then turns to the transmission of Bedan manuscripts on the continent, finding a marked concentration in the Carolingian heartlands and Switzerland. Allan finds that Bede was writing to educate priests who were then responsible for educating "barbarians," that is laymen.

In "'Nostrorum socordiam temporum': The Reforming Impulse of Bede's Later Exegesis" (*EME* 11: 107–22) Scott DeGregorio examines the rhetoric of reform in Bede's biblical commentaries, showing how the emphasis on reform of his late "Letter to Ecgberht" can be found even in his earliest commentaries. He concentrates especially on his later commentaries "On Ezra and Nehemiah," "On the Tabernacle," and "On the Temple" to show how Bede is concerned with the lack of devotion to pastoral care among contemporary bishops and priests. Even the choice of these texts for commentaries speaks to his condemnation of the excesses and indolence of current priests, with Ezra and Nehemiah as "reformers who repeatedly recalled the people from their sinful ways" (115) and the tabernacle and temple based on "the high standards of priestly purity" (121). Thus the commentaries are not simply repositories of patristic lore nor is the Letter of Ecgberht "an isolated outburst" (113), but all these texts speak to Bede's serious and growing concern with the spiritual degeneration he saw in

early eighth-century Northumbria and the pressing need for reform.

Michael Gorman begins his essay "Source Marks and Chapter Divisions in Bede's Commentary on Luke" (*RB* 112: 246–90) with a synopsis of the history of printed Bede editions, taking editors such as Johan Herwagen, Charles W. Jones and David Durst to task for their "unscholarly methods," especially in their handling of manuscripts. He then focuses on two areas in particular in which they ignored the manuscript evidence, causing much confusion in their editions: Bede's pioneering use of source citations and chapter titles and divisions. He includes a long and thorough discussion of the development of these.

Stephen Harris discusses the famous story of Gregory the Great and the Anglian boys in the marketplace at Rome in "Bede and Gregory's Allusive Angles," *Criticism* 44: 271–89. He suggests that the passage be read not as either a sign of lechery of unmarried Catholic priests suggested by early Protestants nor as a series of playful puns as in the more modern era, but rather as Bede intended, as a sign of Gregory's sedulousness. He points out the numerous biblical allusions that allow the boys to be seen typologically as predisposed to receive the grace that will allow the *gens Anglorum* to gain salvation. He then examines the Old English translation of the passage, noting how the translator took pains to maintain the spiritual and biblical allusions of Bede's Latin, changing however the emphasis on race. Where Bede was concerned with portraying the salvation history of the *gens Anglorum*, the translator at once "collapses all races … current in ninth-century Britain into a single people" and also, by avoiding racial designations, "excises the Celts from this originary English narrative" (277).

Michael Benskin takes several modern scholars to task for misreading Bede's statements concerning which Germanic tribes played a role in the settlement of England in "Bede's Frisians and the *Adventus Saxonum*," *NOWELE* 41: 91–97. He suggests that the idea that the Frisians were involved in the Germanic settlement of Britain in the fifth century can be traced to a 1970 article by J.N.L. Myres, who misread Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* bk. 5 chap. 9, thinking it said that there were many nations "in Germany from whom the Angles and Saxons, who now live in Britain, derive their origin," including the Frisians, Rugians, Danes, Huns, Old Saxons and Boructuari. He also notes the error in Colgrave's 1969 translation that reaffirms this point of view. Benskin shows that this list of nations are not those "from whom" the Angles and the Saxons come, but are instead the nations still residing in Germany, in contrast to

the Angles and the Saxons, who came to Britain. He concludes with the point that regardless of whether or not the Frisians actually played a role in the settlement, there is no support in Bede's history for their involvement.

In "Konflikt kak predmet isotioriopisaniia v 'Tserkovnoi istorii angliiskogo naroda' Bedy Dostopochtennogo" ["Conflict as an Object of Historiography in the Venerable Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation*"] (*Politicheskie konflicty v proshlom i nastoiashchem: Mataerialy Vserossiiskoi nauchnoi konferentsii, Ivanovo, 24-26 aprelia 2001* [*Political Conflicts in the Past and Present: The Materials of the All-Russian Scholarly Conference, Ivanovo, April 2-27, 2001*], ed. A.Z. Chernysheva, Ministerstvo obrazovaniia Rossisskoi Federatsii [Ivanovo: Ivanovskii gosudarstvennyi universitet, 2001], 59–61) S.V. Maiorova argues that Bede believed that history should educate by means of good examples and use situations in which good triumphs over evil, in order to teach people how to avoid harmful and vicious things. Gregory the Great's wise policy led to the largely nonviolent conversion of England. Bede showed that persuasion, argument, dispute, and investigation (*quaestio*) helped resolve religious conflicts. Only the conversion of the Isle of Wight was the result of conquest. On the whole, we see in the book how religion serves peace and mutual understanding, not war and enmity. (Reviewed by Anatoly Liberman)

In "The Accuracy of the 'St Petersburg Bede'" (*N&Q* 49: 4–6) Daniel Paul O'Donnell corrects a widely held misconception. Contrary to what K. O'Brien O'Keeffe, R.D. Fulk, and M. Parkes claim, more than six errors can be found in this manuscript of Bede's *Historia*. O'Donnell traces the myth of the six errors back to the introduction of the 1969 edition by Colgrave and Mynors. That number refers, however, to six errors shared by all the good witnesses and so probably descending from Bede's autograph. O'Donnell's corrective has deflating consequences for the lofty arguments built on the earlier assumption. Scholars will have to accommodate a much less perfect text, one whose mistakes number in the dozens.

Ed Eleazar presents a survey and discussion of "Visions of the Afterlife" in *A Companion to Old and Middle English Literature* ed. Laura Cooner Lambdin and Robert Thomas Lambdin, (Westport, CT: Greenwood), 376–97. Although most of his examples are from post-Conquest literature, he includes several pages on the visions of Fursey and Drycthelm in Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*.

Gerald M. Browne has produced a translation of *The Abbreviated Psalter of the Venerable Bede* (Grand Rapids,

MI: Eerdmans), based on his edition of the Latin text, *Collectio psalterii Bedae Venerabili adscripta*, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Munich: K.G. Saur, 2001). He notes in the introduction that Benedicta Ward's translation, published as an appendix to her 1991 Jarrow Lecture, *Bede and the Psalter*, is based on a defective Latin text. As the flyleaf makes clear, this little book, whose "convenient size allows it to be readily at hand whenever there is need for its message of consolation and hope," is aimed at an audience of "persons of faith," who will "find his little book a constant source of devotion and strength." Thus persons of scholarship will need to be circumspect in how they use it. The eleven-page introduction is quite general and includes Bede, the *Opus Dei* of the Benedictine Rule (although Browne says we are not certain which Rule Bede followed, he also refers to Bede as "a Benedictine monk"), and a very brief discussion of the allegorical interpretation of the psalms, though he does not note any specific allegorical readings in the text of the translation itself. The translation is well done and presented with just a few verses per page.

Bede opened his computus *De Temporum Ratione* with a calendar, but while the computus text is well attested the calendar has long thought to be lost. Now Paul Meyvaert, in "Discovering the Calendar (*Annalis Libellus*) Attached to Bede's Own Copy of *De Temporum Ratione*" (*AB* 120: 5–64), makes the important claim to have found Bede's original. It was lurking in, of all places, a printed edition of 1998! This is A. Borst's *Die karolingische Kalenderreform* (*MGH*, Schriften, 46 [Hanover: Hahn]). The calendar was edited by Borst but because it was hidden under a great load of additions, especially saints' days, the editor mistakenly (in Meyvaert's opinion) identified it as Carolingian and so gave it a late eighth-century date. Borst's meticulous recording of the many manuscript readings (in a subsequent publication) allowed Meyvaert great scope for textual comparison, and he offers strong arguments for the English origin and earlier date. By removing the accretions, he reconstructs a calendar that has many connections to Bede, the most convincing of which is the interplay with Bede's text of *De Temporum Ratione*. The reconstructed calendar is edited in an appendix.

Bede figures only briefly in a note on Paulinus of Aquileia's *Versus de Herico* in Armando Bisanti, "Note e appunti di lettura su testi mediolatini," *Filologia mediolatina* 8 (2001): 111–22. Bisanti discusses Paulinus's use of river names in his lament poem, a feature he finds elsewhere in early medieval Latin poetry such as the *De virginitate* of Venantius Fortunatus and mentioned by Bede in his *De arte metrica*. Perhaps because of the authority of

Bede, the device was picked up by numerous Carolingian and later poets.

Bede also makes a brief appearance in Mark Vessey's "From *Cursus* to *Ductus*: Figures of Writing in Western Late Antiquity (Augustine, Jerome, Cassiodorus, Bede)" in *European Literary Careers: The Author from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, ed. P. Cheney and F. de Armas (Toronto: U Toronto P), 47–103. Vessey explains how greatly the medieval Christian's concept of authorship differed from that of the antique pagan. The change was incremental, important stages being represented by the authors of the title: whereas the late antique authors were aristocratic dilettantes, Augustine was a professional defined by his writings. For Jerome, the ancients were individualistic writers working in various genres while Christian authorship was monolithic, united by a common practical and rhetorical aim. These conceptual changes were accompanied by contemporary transitions—the roll was replaced by the codex, and the place of socially and politically prominent Romans was taken by ascetic writers known only through their written word. To Vessey, Cassiodorus furnishes a prime example, since he so well fulfills both definitions of the man of letters. A long consideration of literary concepts and authorship *chez* Cassiodorus closes the study proper. A colophon on Bede shows how well that Anglo-Saxon writer embodies the tendencies foreshadowed by his predecessors.

Finally, two articles appeared on Pseudo-Bedan works. Anke Holdenried's "The Bedan Recension of the *Sibylla Tiburtina*: New Manuscript Evidence and Its Implications" (*Latin Culture in the Eleventh Century: Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Medieval Latin Studies*, ed. Michael W. Herren *et al.*, 2 vols. Publ. of the Jnl of Medieval Latin 5 [Turnhout: Brepols], I: 410–43) falls outside our period in a strict sense, since the "Bedan" recension of this text is in fact an eleventh-century pseudo-Bedan recension, as published in Herwagen's sixteenth-century edition. Holdenried's work on the manuscripts clarifies the complicated transmission and reception history of the text named in her title.

Thomas Hill, "A Riddle on the Three Orders in the *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*?" (*PQ* 80 (2001): 205–12) discusses the solution to the riddle "Vidi bipedem super tripodem sedentem, cecidit bipes, corruit tripes." He is not entirely satisfied with the solution "a man sitting on three-legged stool who falls over" proposed in the recent edition by Martha Bayless and Michael Lapidge. Rather, Hill argues, the riddle is an early text "referring to an important medieval social ideal, the theme of the three estates" (206). He cites a passage from Wulfstan's *Institutes of Polity* on the throne:

"Ælc riht cynestol on þrym stapelum, þe fullice ariht stent…" (206–7). Thus, "the three orders are the three supports or pillars of the royal throne.… The kingdom is thus a tripes or tripod upon which the king, a bipes, is enthroned" (208–9). The riddle supports firm royal rule.

d. Alcuin and the Carolingian Age

Mary Garrison examines Alcuin's view on tragic events in two articles. In "The Bible and Alcuin's Interpretation of Current Events" (*Peritia* 16: 68–84) Garrison examines Alcuin's use of "biblical structures of meaning" in order to throw light on his "inner world," in particular how he dealt with the tragedies of the late eighth century, especially the sack of Lindisfarne in 793. She shows how through typology "biblical figures could serve as the support for theological questioning in a time of trial" (78). Garrison suggests that in the letters he wrote in the immediate aftermath of that tragedy, he looked more to Job as a figure of consolation, expressing an Augustinian inability to understand God's purpose in inflicting hardships on Christian peoples. He strikes a balance between consolation, offering several possible explanations for the suffering of innocents, and admonition, on the chance that the attacks signal God's disapproval. By 796, however, faced with further turmoil in Northumbria, he changes to Jeremiah as a model, having lost his confidence that his admonitions in the earlier letters could lead to any improvements. His previous uncertainty over the cause of such destruction evolved into "a sad recognition of how the unchecked corruption and violence of Northumbria had brought about such a scourge" (80).

In "Alcuin, *Carmen IX* and Hrabanus, *Ad Bonosum*: A Teacher and His Pupil Write Consolation" (*Poetry and Philosophy in the Middle Ages: A Festschrift for Peter Dronke*, ed. John Marenbon, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 29 [Leiden: Brill, 2001], 63–78) Garrison compares the tone of consolation in two poems: Alcuin's poem to the monks of Lindisfarne after the Viking raid and Hrabanus Maurus's poem to Hatto, a former schoolmate in the school of Alcuin. According to Garrison, Hrabanus frequently borrows phrases and entire lines from Alcuin, but through subtle variations of words and images, he presents a much darker view of divine order. Whereas Alcuin suggests that all things occur for a reason and takes pains to point out positive events along with the negative, Hrabanus shows a much bleaker view of suffering in the world.

In "Psalm Use in Carolingian Prayer-books: Alcuin and the Preface to *De psalmorum usu*" (*MS* 64: 1–60) Jonathan Black discusses Alcuin's contribution to private devotion in the Carolingian period. He presents a critical edition of the preface of the *De psalmorum usu*, which has been ascribed to Alcuin, and discusses the question of Alcuin's authorship of the preface and its influence on later prayer-books.

I Deug-Su examines the position of Rome as a seat of authority in saints' lives written during the Carolingian period in "Roma e l'agiografia latina nell'alto medioevo," (*Roma fra oriente e occidente*, Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo 49 [Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo], 561–85). Though most of the works are continental, there is some attention given to the Life of Boniface and to Alcuin's *Vita Willibrordi*.

The topic of Christiane Veyrard-Cosme's "Problèmes de réécriture des textes hagiographiques latins: la *Vita Richarii* d'Alcuin et ses réécritures" (*Latin Culture*, ed. Herren, II: 476–502) is not so much Alcuin's text as it is the use it was put to by two eleventh-century continental writers. Angelramne's versified version preserves much of Alcuin's verbiage but incorporates alterations to fit a changed time and circumstance (jettisoning the politically obsequious dedication of the original, for example, and substituting a more abstractly religious preface suitable to the genre). The adaptation by one Hariulf, in his *Chronicon*, meanwhile, enhances Alcuin as a historical source by making choice additions and omissions, even while diminishing the paradigmatic role of the saint himself. The upshot: in this naturally derivative genre, rhetorical aim often shifts the central focus of narrative.

In "Alcuin before Migne" (*RB* 112: 101–130) Michael Gorman reviews the recent Alcuin *clauis* (*Clauis scriptorum latinorum Medii Aeui, Auctores Galliae 735-987, tomus II, Alcuinus*, ed. Marie-Hélène Jullien and Françoise Perelman [Turnhout: Brepols, 1999]). He suggests that of the more than 100 prose items listed as authentic (not counting the *epistolae*), it is likely that only seventeen works are truly to be considered works of Alcuin while the rest are dubious or spurious and should have been listed in a separate section. He also provides a list of the early printed editions of these seventeen works.

e. Ninth Century

Three articles and one book-length study of Asser's *Vita Alfredi* appeared in 2002. Alfred P. Smyth's *Medieval Life of King Alfred the Great: A Translation and Commentary on the Text Attributed to Asser* (New York: Palgrave) provides a new translation but recapitulates the argument from his 1995 *King Alfred the Great* (Oxford: Oxford UP). A brief

introduction reviews the controversies surrounding Asser's authorship and Smyth's 1995 book. Smyth's translation usefully marks his interventions, the author's borrowings from the *Chronicle*, and passages that may have been interpolated later. Smyth translates *pagani* consistently as "pagans," rejecting the looser "Vikings" of Keynes and Lapidge's 1983 Penguin translation. Smyth generally notes his major divergences from Keynes and Lapidge, and from Whitelock's *EHD*. Though there are, not surprisingly, a few arguable points, a solid, generously spaced translation runs 55 pages; notes run 35, in small type. "Commentary" includes chapters on the manuscripts (of the *Life* and other texts which use or resemble it), the *Life*'s author, Latin style, use of the *Chronicle*, and a conclusion. Both the translation's endnotes and the chapters argue a major point of Smyth's 1995 book: that Byrhtferth of Ramsey forged the *Life ca.* 1000. Smyth further argues that other texts previously believed to rely on the *Life* instead represent later versions that Byrhtferth rewrote or forged for various purposes. As support, Smyth cites shared errors and Latin style; though his 1995 evaluation of errors and style sparked the fiercest rebuttals, most notably Simon Keynes's "On the Authenticity of Asser's *Life of King Alfred*" (*JEH* 47 [1996]: 529–51) many of Smyth's points remain the same. Smyth argues that the style and imagery are late tenth century, not ninth. He notes obscure words that Byrhtferth and the *Life*'s author share, and that they are otherwise unattested early. Yet longer quotations often appear in English, with only a few Latin words in parentheses, and those from Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion* come from the old Crawford edition rather than Baker and Lapidge's superb 1995 one. Statistics are not given, and comparison and contrast with other Latin works is minimal; Aldhelm appears only as the source of passages or images found both in the *Life* and elsewhere in Byrhtferth. Smyth disregards differences between the *Life* and Byrhtferth's canon: "Other scholars have noted variations in Byrhtferth's use of vocabulary and style across the range of his works" (155). Smyth again argues that this *Life* is modeled on Odo's *Life* of Gerald of Aurillac and so must postdate 940, despite a lack of verbal echoes (though borrowings from Einhard's *Life* of Charlemagne are obvious). The *Life*, oddly, lists Alfred's age repeatedly, but with increasing errors. Smyth ascribes the numeration to Byrhtferth's "obsession" with numbers and computus, imputing mistakes to Byrhtferth's haste in forging. Smyth argues at length that the *Life* provides very little independent information about Alfred, and that facts it does offer either came from a source available to Byrhtferth, resulted from a good guess, or are simply wrong. Many specific criticisms appear first in the notes to the translation, and then in the chapter on the *Life*'s author, the chapter on use of the *Chronicle*, or both (and some appear twice within the

ASC chapter itself). Smyth attributes differences from the *ASC* to hasty copying and even misreading. He argues that it is hard to imagine the historical Asser, if he were really a Welsh monk (which no independent source confirms), translating an OE *Chronicle* into Latin. Further, true Welsh information and idioms appear only in a few chapters, culled from a real Welsh historical source and perhaps glossary by Byrhtferth. Smyth writes that most Welsh "information" is fabricated, suggesting that native English speaker Byrhtferth frequently misread the *ASC* due, again, to haste. He dates the compilation of the *ASC* to 896 or after, making it unavailable for an Asser writing in 893, but without reference to Bately's crucial work on the subject. Smyth concludes that Byrhtferth fabricated the *Life* as part of a larger scheme of recreating history to restore learning to England after Viking mayhem, making Alfred a secular role model and strong supporter of education and monasteries. The political messages of victory over pagan Danes, against civil strife, and incidentally for the importance of St. Neot, all provide ample motive for the forgery—or so Smyth argues—although they apparently provide insufficient motive to write a clear or consistent one. Smyth raises some fascinating and important questions about the *Life*, but they are mostly the ones he raised in 1995. Whether by Asser, a contemporary forger, or a later forger, the *Life* poses many puzzles even as it offers a tantalizing glimpse at an Anglo-Saxon mindset. Is that mindset late ninth or early eleventh century? What is fact, and what fiction? Smyth, sadly, frustrates a reader genuinely interested in the answers with repetitive and sometimes circular arguments and occasional *ad hominem* attacks on proponents of "the genuine Asser." (Reviewed by Nicole Discenza)

Alice Sheppard, "The King's Family: Securing the Kingdom in Asser's *Vita Alfredi*" (*PQ* 80 [2001]: 409–29), starts from the premise that Asser's *Vita Alfredi* is authentic to late ninth-century England and reads the text in terms of the question of audience. Noting that Alfred's kingdom consists of distinct regions, Mercia and Wessex, and that Franks, Frisians, Gauls, Vikings, Welsh and Irish populate his court, Sheppard sees a need for expressions of cultural and political identity. The two principle models for Asser's *Vita,* the annals of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicles* and the Carolingian mirror for princes, fail to articulate models of kingship adequate to the needs of the diverse populations of Alfred's kingdom. The Carolingian model for kingship presents the king as a paragon of virtue and moral piety; it assumes that a unified kingdom already exists. The annals of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicles* presents kingship in terms of an accumulation of power gained on the battlefield, neglecting the subsequent need to maintain authority. Asser explores the retention of power and the accumulation

of royal authority by shifting the focus of his text from the battlefield to the court. Citing the more explicit example found in the *Regula pastoralis*, coeval to the *Vita,* Sheppard sees Asser's text as promoting the model of 'teacher king' as the unifier of the kingdom's diverse elements. Through learning comes justice, through justice peace, through peace royal authority. (Reviewed by Thomas Miller)

In "The Educated Barbarian? Asser and Welsh Learning in Anglo-Saxon England" (*Quaestio* 3: 45–58) Kaele Stokes discusses the mutually beneficial areas of interchange between Alfred's kingdom and the Welsh. The southern Welsh rulers who submitted to Alfred gained protection from attacks by Mercia, as well as from the Vikings and their northern Welsh allies, while Alfred was able to extend his power into the Welsh kingdoms. With learning as well, not only was Asser able to bring his erudition, for which the community of St. David's may have been well known, but while at Alfred's court, he was also exposed to Frankish intellectual traditions and a knowledge of contemporary Carolingian politics that he could take back to Wales. Such interchange continued at least into the tenth century, when the Welshman Iorwerth, author of the *Altercatio magistri et discipuli*, was active at Winchester.

In "The Crowning of Alfred and the Topos of *sapientia et fortitudo* in Asser's *Life of King Alfred*" (*Neophilologus* 86: 471–76) Thomas Hill points out that in the passage where Alfred takes the throne, Asser uses the familiar topos of *sapientia* and *fortitudo* to praise the king. He then suggests that this topos might explain the two halves of the text. The first part of the *Life*, those containing the accounts of Alfred's and his predecessors battles with the Vikings, praises his *fortitudo*, while the second part which focuses on his education and governance reveals his *sapientia*.

Alfred's own translations are examined by Pádraig Ó Néill in "Irish Transmission of Late Antique Learning: The Case of Theodore of Mopsuestia's Commentary on the Psalms," (*Ireland and Europe*, ed. Ní Chatháin and Richter, 68–77). Ó Néill demonstrates that Alfred in composing the prose paraphrases to the Psalms made direct and indirect use of the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia (one or more Latin reflexes of his original Greek Psalm commentary, as well as various intermediate texts). Circumstantial evidence suggests these sources arrived via Ireland, perhaps through the agency of Asser, who was well stocked with books, or of a scholar like Grimbald, who was well connected with Irish on the Continent. Ó Néill discounts the influence of Theodore of Tarsus in this transmission; his punctilious orthodoxy would have disapproved of the Greek author's questionable theology.

f. Tenth Century and Beyond

In "The Irish Contribution to Anglo-Latin Hermeneutic Prose," (*Ogma,* ed. Richter and Picard, 268–82) Jane Stevenson suggests that one route of influence from Ireland to England in Latin prose style lay through the intermediary of the Carolingians. During the ninth century numerous Irish scholars, such as John Scotus Eriugena, Sedulius Scotus, and others, left Ireland for the continent, bringing Irish works such as the *Hisperica famina* and the *Lorica* of Laidcenn with them, as well as their own compositions. Many of the specific centers or regions, such as Fleury and Brittany, where the copying of these works is well attested, had numerous contacts with England during the tenth century, especially in the circle of Benedictine reformers in the later tenth century. Stevenson, however, examines the earlier Æthelstan charters and suggests that the introduction of such texts may have been through figures such as the Breton Israel the Grammarian, who was a visitor at Æthelstan's court. She continues the connection by discussing the large number of hisperic words in the Harley Glossary, which clearly drew on many of these texts, as well as a few in the Cleopatra Glossary, although the etymology of *Alleluia* she mentions may have more to do with an original Anglo-Saxon tradition than anything Celtic. She concludes by stressing the role of the court of King Æthelstan, rather than the reform monasteries, in the transmission of hisperic poems and vocabulary to tenth-century England.

Armando Bisanti discusses an anonymous medieval Latin poem of twenty-four verses on the Battle of Brunanburh in "Un carme mediolatino sulla battaglia di Brunanburh," *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 37: 195–207. He discusses the mechanics of the Latin poem and then its historical background, including the Old English poem. A brief comparison of the two poems finds that while the Old English was described the events of the battle itself, the Latin poet was more intent on writing a poem in celebration of victory. He concludes with a comparison of the poem with other medieval Latin victory poems, mostly from the eighth and ninth century.

K. Delen, A. H. Gaastra, M. D. Saan and B. Schaap in "The Paenitentiale Cantabrigiense: A Witness of the Carolingian Contribution to the Tenth-Century Reforms of England" (*Sacris Erudiri* 41: 341–373) rename the so-called *Paenitentiale Sangermanense* to *Cantabrigiense* and provide a thorough discussion and new edition, based on the text in Cambridge, Corpus Christi Library MS 320, a manuscript from St. Augustine's dated to the third quarter of the tenth century. They provide a thorough discussion of the penitential's sources among continental penitentials such

as the *P additivum Ps-Bedae-Egberti* and Halitgar's *Peniten-tial*. They suggest that this penitential was written at Canterbury.

In *Excerptiones de Prisciano: The Source for Ælfric's Latin-Old English Grammar*, Anglo-Saxon Texts (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer), David Porter has edited and translated the Latin grammar on which Ælfric's Old English grammar was based, an abridgment of Priscian's grammatical works. In the introductory chapters Porter discusses the surviving manuscripts, Priscian's Grammar and the growth of Priscian's influence on grammatical studies in England and on the continent, and the organization of the *Excerptiones*. The most interesting part of the introduction is his suggestion that "the likeliest candidate for author is in fact Ælfric himself" (24). He shows how both the compiler of the *Excerptiones* and Ælfric had access to the same sources, not only Priscian but Donatus, Isidore and various grammatical commentaries, and notes the similarity in style of excerpting in the *Excerptiones* and the OE Grammar. Porter does not push this suggestion too far, however, noting problems such as the hermeneutic style of the Latin text, which differs from Ælfric's usual plainer style. The translation is readable and accurate and should make this text much more accessible than it has been up to now.

A very interesting piece of detective work, Melinda Menzer's "Speaking *Brittonice*: Vowel Quantities and Musical Length in Ælfric's *Grammar*" (*Peritia* 16: 26–39) addresses Ælfric's famous preface, which condemns the Welsh pronunciation of *pater* with a short vowel. Ælfric believed that, *in prosa* at least, the word should have a long vowel. But, as Menzer explains, the word *prosa* did not have the modern meaning "prose" but referred rather to rhythmic Latin poetry: "Ælfric's objection … to those speaking *brittonice* may be that their pronunciation … as realised in the chant of *prosa*, conflicts with duration in the music. This would explain his vehement instance on the 'wrong' (that is, non-classical) quantity; he is opposing the rules of music to the rules of grammar. As music is divine and unchanging, its rules take precedence over the manmade [i.e., conventional] rules of grammar."

Another grammatical work is examined in "*Anima quae pars*: A Tenth-Century Parsing Grammar," *Jnl of Medieval Latin* 12: 181–204. Don Chapman edits and analyzes the unique copy of a short grammatical text from Worcester, Cathedral Library MS Q.5, a late tenth-century Canterbury product. Likely originating on the Continent but possibly from England, *Anima quae pars* is typical of Carolingian grammatical traditions. It has the question-and-answer format of its genre, but is still a pretty odd specimen:

anima is the only word parsed, for example. Chapman lucidly outlines the text (noteworthy for a prolix emphasis on *qualitas*), discusses immediate sources (generally Carolingian, though an ultimate Irish source known through reflexes makes an interesting appearance), and describes the setting in which the work was composed (likely but not certainly a Northeastern French school that taught basic grammar but maybe textual exegesis as well). If it was written or taught (and not just copied) in England, Chapman's inferences about sources and classroom practices offer new information about Anglo-Saxon learning.

For Anglo-Saxonists, A.M. Peden's edition of *Abbo of Fleury and Ramsey, Commentary on the Calculus of Victorius of Aquitaine* (Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi 15 [Oxford: Oxford UP]) is interesting for the light it throws on Abbo, influential associate of the Benedictine Reformers and teacher of Byrhtferth of Ramsey. Victorius's calculus is a fifth-century "series of tables of multiplication, which shows the numbers 1000 to 1,444 multiplied by 2 to 50." Since many of Victorius's numerals are represented by confusingly similar symbols, and since the tables are generally presented without explanation, Abbo's commentary and explanation must have been welcome to medieval learners of mathematics (just as they are to us). Peden here edits both Victorius's and Abbo's texts, giving an account of their contents, of their manuscripts and of their reception in medieval schools. Abbo in his comments comes across as a restless and vigorous intellect who spices his math with philosophy, science, religion, and *belles lettres*, all of which feed into one another. Calculation is important, he say, because "all things were created according to number, measure and weight." This fact entails many ontological considerations about unity and composites, about the physical and the incorporeal, and about the properties of substances, to give a few examples, the sorting out of which is the realm of the seven liberal arts. But the practice of these differs little from the search for salvation, since both are means to approach wisdom and, ultimately, God: "Abbo's *Commentary on the Calculus* is the most wideranging of his education works, and displays a confidence that Creation is rational, numerical and knowable through any and all of the liberal arts."

Thomas Haye examines an entirely different aspect of Abbo's learning, his use of classical rhetoric, in "Mündliche und schriftliche Rede: Ein Beitrag zur rhetorischen Kompetenz des Abbo von Fleury," *FS* 35 (2001): 273–92. Haye finds that modern scholars have generally ignored Abbo's knowledge and use of rhetoric although he was apparently highly praised by his contemporaries for the eloquence of his oral addresses. Haye concentrates on Abbo's letters in

particular, since they continue many of the rhetorical conventions and strategies passed down from antiquity.

Ted Johnson South has provided an excellent new edition and translation of the *Historia de sancto Cuthberto: A History of Saint Cuthbert and a Record of His Patrimony*, Anglo-Saxon Texts 3 (Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer). South provides a thorough introduction covering the surviving manuscripts and their relationships, but perhaps the most interesting portion concerns the composition of the text, which has usually been seen as a compilation of different pieces added at various times from the tenth to the late eleventh century. Previous scholars have suggested that sections 14-19 are an interpolation, but South shows that they form an integral part of sections 1-28. He makes the plausible, if ultimately inconclusive, argument that the text was not composed in the mid-tenth century as previously argued, but that the entire text was composed in the late eleventh century, as a product of the renewal of interest in historical writing in the later eleventh century. The text itself is edited accurately with a very readable translation.

Latin Culture in the Eleventh Century, edited by M. Herren, C. McDonough, and R. Arthur, an anthology of papers from the International Conference on Medieval Latin Studies at Cambridge in 1998, is a hefty collection amounting to over a thousand pages in two volumes. Despite the limits of time and language, its fifty-odd papers address the widest range of topics—individual authors or works, histories, science, archives, prosody, music, manuscripts, etc., and from the widest geographical boundaries, from Ireland and Spain in the west to Germany and central Europe in the east. It is entertaining to dip at random into this variety, and one comes to realize that, in the eleventh-century West, culture and Latin culture were almost but not quite identical. Moreover, as Claudio Leonardi observes in his concluding remarks, the eleventh century was an important transition point between early and late medieval. Thus some papers are backward facing, taking on as they do topics proceeding from Carolingian antecedents (e.g., Christiane Veyrard-Cosme's paper on the reworking of saints' lives), while others, such as John Marenbon's "Some Semantic Problems in Anselm's *De grammatico,*" analyze the new and revolutionary. Anglo-Latin topics are not a major focus, but the two papers reviewed below by Dumville and by Lapidge and Mann are worthy of note (Veyrard-Cosme's and Holdenreid's contributions are reviewed above).

David Dumville's "Images of the Viking in Eleventh-Century Latin Literature" (I: 250–63) seeks to adumbrate "literary history" with "eleventh-century presentations of the viking theme." The survey (ranging from English and Insular writers to Continental writers of Brittany and France) certainly reinforces the familiar picture of raiders unencumbered by conscience, but there are a number of new wrinkles showing how the Vikings had become endenizened in the cultural landscape of the eleventh-century: In a saint's life, they may be instruments of divine anger, in a chronicle an ongoing political threat, or elsewhere a one-dimensional stereotype of the crudest type. In closing, Dumville suggests that the Viking stereotype was early shifted onto the inhabitants of Ireland—a very early chapter of anti-Irish sentiment.

Did Anglo-Saxons read Aesop's fables in Latin prose? This is the question Michael Lapidge and Jill Mann ask in their contribution to the Herren volume, "Reconstructing the Anglo-Latin Aesop: The Literary Tradition of the 'Hexametrical Romulus'" (II: 1–33). The authors proceed by comparing several reflexes of this hypothetical work. The most important is the "Hexametrical Romulus," a version in Latin hexameters whose diction and prosody strongly resemble Aldhelm's poetic practice. It must be an Anglo-Latin composition of the tenth century, the authors conclude, and so is to be associated with the Benedictine Reform and the Winchester school. The two other proposed reflexes are similarly intriguing: the fables of Marie de France and the border of the Bayeux tapestry. Commonalities link all three of these, but because they diverge in significant ways the authors propose common descent from the same ancestor, a Latin prose version which is unfortunately lost. Lapidge and Mann will offer an edition of the hexametrical poem, along with various related works, in the *Anglo-Saxon Texts* series.

Thomas N. Hall discusses the early transmission of the three marriages of Anne in "The Earliest Anglo-Latin Text of the *Trinubium Annae* (*BHL* 505zl)," in *Via Crucis*, ed. Hall, 104–37. Hall prints a text of the *Trinubium Annae* preserved in a Bury St. Edmunds manuscript written in the late eleventh or early twelfth century, a century earlier than other known copies.

Alexander Rumble's "*Interpretationes in latinum*: Some Twelfth-Century Translations of Anglo-Saxon Charters" (in *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, ed. E. Treharne and S. Rosser, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 252 [Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies], 101–117) inventories twelfth-century writs and charters that translate original OE content into Latin. There are more than a dozen such documents, most with extant OE sources, and these are likewise inventoried. As Rumble explains, the Anglo-Saxon legal establishments

were immediately relevant to twelfth-century questions of tenure, so the Latin versions represent careful, though not always accurate, attempts to reconstruct pre-Conquest legal language. This translating activity was rendered obsolete by later developments such as the circulation of a more or less standardized glossary of Old English legal terms and the arbitrary limiting of earliest legal precedent to the year 1189.

Nicholas Orchard's two volume edition of *The Leofric Missal,* Henry Bradshaw Society 113–114 (London: Henry Bradshaw Society) is a vast advancement over Warren's 1883 edition. Orchard lays out clearly the three parts of the "missal": Leofric A, a sacramentary which he suggests was written by a foreign scribe based upon foreign models but presumably for Archbishop Plegmund; Leofric B, a calendar and other liturgical materials added to the manuscript at Canterbury over the course of the tenth century; and Leofric C, materials added at Exeter during the time of Bishop Leofric, whose donation inscription is written in the volume. Orchard goes through each section with meticulous detail in the 387-page introduction, discussing the origins of each section and setting it in the context of other continental and Insular liturgical practices. He also marks these different layers in his text through the use of different typefaces.

Finally, three valuable editions were published in the Oxford Medieval Texts series. John Hudson edits and translates the *Historia Ecclesie Abbendonensis: The History of the Church of Abingdon*, Oxford Medieval Texts, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford UP). Given the prominence of Abingdon in the Benedictine Reform, a new edition of its chronicle is very welcome. Anglo-Saxonists, however, will have to show more patience. Hudson begins with Volume 2 (from 1066) in order to use Susan Kelly's new edition of Abingdon charters. The volume contains a statement of editorial principles, discussion of the manuscripts, text with translation, a very full index, and appendices of supplemental texts.

Michael Winterbottom and Rodney M. Thomson edit and translate *William of Malmesbury, Saints' Lives: Lives of SS. Wulfstan, Dunstan, Patrick, Benignus and Indract*, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Oxford UP). Of the five saints' lives edited here only the first two survive complete. Those of Patrick, Benignus, and Indract are fragments and have never been edited or translated before. The introduction presents in detail discussions of the surviving manuscripts and the sources William used. The editors show clearly how the three fragmentary lives were written at the request of the monks of Glastonbury, where those saints were venerated, and based on local reports and legend, and thus were presumably of little interest elsewhere.

Christopher N.L. Brooke has revised and updated David Knowles's edition and translation of *The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc*, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Oxford UP), originally published in 1951. Brooke has kept the earlier edition largely intact, with only slight revisions through the text and translation, though he has provided new introductory chapters on the audience, date and sources of the text. He suggests that Lanfranc wrote the Constitutions around 1077, and that the inclusion of the word "abbot" throughout the text may suggest it was written in part for the community of St. Albans, whose abbot was his nephew Paul. Brooke has also updated the discussion of manuscripts and the critical apparatus to reflect advances in our knowledge of manuscript transmission and the text.

D.W.P., P.R.

Works not seen

Meyer, Heinz. "Die Problematik und Leistung der Allegoriedefinitionen Bedas Venerabilis." *FS* 35 (2001): 183–200.

6. Manuscripts, Illuminations, and Charters

'Lastworda betst': Essays in Memory of Christine E. Fell, with her Unpublished Writings includes an edited text of a paper that Fell gave to a seminar of the Research Group on Manuscript Evidence at the Parker Library, Corpus Christi College Cambridge, on 16 December 1989 entitled "Some Questions of Layout and Legal Manuscripts" (229–241). The first part focuses on questions of clause division in the laws of Æthelberht—a problem with which I myself have wrestled extensively. The manuscript itself does not number clauses. Therefore any clause structure of necessity imposes an editorial viewpoint on the text which may or may not have been the intention of the compiler: as Fell points out, "It is my word processor, not myself, that believes the word 'editor' to be spelled 'ediot'" (233). Editors have tended to accept the work of their predecessors with little and often inconsistent emendation, of which Fell

provides numerous examples. She then moves to the laws of Ine, and discusses how editorial and translatorial practice often are based on the Latin rather than Old English versions. Fell finishes with the admonition that "there seems an extraordinary willingness to take editorial principles and practices on trust. Much less is changed between editions than one would expect.… I am particularly looking forward to a new edition of the laws of Æthelberht which is not cribbed, cabined and confined by the editions produced so far" (236). A footnote indicates that Fell is referring here to the edition currently under preparation by her former student, Carole Hough; I hope that Fell would also have found my recent *The Beginnings of English Law* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2002) to be acceptable. [See the review below in section 7]

L.O.

Another posthumous publication is Phillip Pulsiano's "Jaunts, Jottings and Jetsam in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts" (*Florilegium* 19: 189–97 + plates), thankfully pulled together by Kirsten Wolf, William Schipper and Joseph McGowan. Pulsiano claims that "[t]he margins of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, although far less dynamic and lacking the interplay that we find in later manuscripts, especially French and Flemish, nevertheless offer access to a world of some activity, both by Anglo-Saxon and later users of these manuscripts" (195). He begins by presenting several entertaining doodles which "bring us into the world of modest play, of readers and scribes seeking distraction and succumbing to the urge to interrupt the silence of blank space" (190). Pulsiano points out the similarities in several instances to Picasso, but neglects the obvious comparisons to James Thurber. The Eadwine Psalter and Paris Psalter both provide instances of drypoint sketches indicating different design intentions than were carried out in finished illustrations. Furthermore, the Paris Psalter has some mysterious patterning in the margins, at times occasionally accompanied by letters and words, occasionally written backwards. Could these perhaps be distinctive versions of the next category of marginalia Pulsiano discusses: the *probationes pennae*? These are "stylized additions, not pen-trials at all" (193); one instance which occurs in two copies of Aldhelm begins *Tres digiti scribunt. totum corpusque laborat*. The marginal note Anglo-Saxon scholars are likely to find most immediate is the *god me helpe* scrawled beside a computistical passage in London, BL, MS Cotton Tiberius B.v.1. Extending the definition of margins, Pulsiano points out that fols. 163r and 170v of the Sherborne Pontifical are "notably darker than the other folia, which clearly indicates that the leaves served as outer covers of a booklet.… [The] straightforward conclusion [is that] this quire and its

homily traveled as a separate booklet" (194). Finally, Pulsiano urges that "As we collect more of these jaunts and jottings—and we should begin to keep a record of them—we may come, if not to understand, as least to take quiet pleasure in the neglected and, most often, hidden world occupying the margins of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts" (195).

Helmut Gneuss provides an update of the status of "A handlist of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts" in *Latin Culture in the Eleventh Century*, ed. Herren *et al.* (1:345–352). The projected booklist will inventory "all manuscripts, except single-leaf charters and records, known to have been written or owned in Anglo-Saxon England, recording their present location and shelfmark, their contents (as fully as possible), their date and place of origin and, especially where the place of origin cannot be ascertained, their Anglo-Saxon and/or post-1100 provenance" (345). This will expand and update Gneuss's "Preliminary List of Manuscripts Written or Owned in England up to 1100" (*ASE* 9: 1–60) and incorporate both recent scholarship and new finds ("mainly fragments and *membra disiecta* of manuscripts," 348). The chosen cut-off of 1100 means that about fifty manuscripts will no longer be included, but must be referenced in Richard Gameson's forthcoming *Manuscripts of Early Norman England*. Gneuss gives two examples of the utility of such a listing. First, the paucity of manuscripts produced in England in the ninth century compared with the outpouring on the continent seems to provide support for Alfred's statement that churches filled with books had been ravaged and burned. Second, the abundance of immediately post-Conquest manuscripts at the great episcopal centers implies a conscious Norman buildup of patristic materials. Gneuss finishes with a plea that we "not ignore the Old English Benedictine achievement: nowhere else in Western Europe in the tenth and eleventh centuries would one have found" the richness of content and lexicon provided in Anglo-Saxon England (352). In the same volume Birgit Ebersperger introduces "Bernhard Bischoff's Catalogue of Ninth-Century Continental Manuscripts" (298–303). Bischoff left incomplete at his death a catalogue that will contain in published form more than 7000 entries (as opposed to the fewer than 2000 listed in *Codices Latini Antiquiores*). "Bischoff's intention was to draw up an inventory of all the manuscripts that survive from the ninth century, with the exception of manuscripts from the British Isles and Visigothic manuscripts" (299). "Apart from a short characterization of the main script, Bischoff's descriptions provide information on decoration, display script(s), marginal notes, *signes de renvoi*, etc.… [He] was especially interested in detecting and tracing the hands of individual scribes, whose wanderings throw light on the relations of various scriptoria.… He further

collected information on manuscripts containing Tironian Notes, which he considered of crucial importance for a full understanding of the Carolingian education system … [and also] included earlier manuscripts with additions entered in the ninth century" (300–301). The catalogue was left incomplete at the time of Bischoff's death; Epersberger describes the editorial choices made for publication, which tend towards non-interference with the original work. Indeed, Bischoff's researches spanned many decades, and as his opinions changed over time on manuscripts he had the opportunity to revisit, so they may well have done on manuscripts he had not seen since the early thirties. When complete, the catalogue will run to three volumes with a supplementary fourth by Epersberger containing emendations and additions. Praise for Epersberger monumental labors in bringing the catalogue to print begins Michael Gorman's "Bernhard Bischoff's Handlist of Carolingian Manuscripts," *Scrittura e civilta* 25: 89–112. Gorman then laments some gaps left by Bischoff himself: "What we miss is the kind of introduction that Lowe provided for all the main centres covered in *Codices Latini Antiquiores* or the extensive explanations Bischoff offered for the manuscripts from southern German centres in the two volumes of his masterwork *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit*" (92). Gorman further criticizes Bischoff's "cavalier attitude towards the content of manuscripts" (97) and hopes that eventually an index of contents contained in these manuscripts can be generated. Another future improvement would be the addition of photographic places "showing the most important or most representative kinds of scripts" (101) and the expansion of many of the 700+ abbreviations that make for unnecessary density in Bischoff's catalogue. Gorman concludes that "[t]he impression one walks away with after an extended vacation with the first volume of Bischoff's *Katalog* is that his paleographical judgements were safely stored away in heaven (or some other inaccessible place). If an angel were to descend from that portion of heaven where such judgements are registered and preserved and inform me that they were in fact all quite true, I would still like to know the reasons for them and not have to depend on pure faith in Bischoff's *auctoritas*, genius and intuition.… Bischoff's method of presentation seems to preclude using the *Katalog* as a learning device. It is a compendium of his opinions but the motivations behind them (and I assume these existed) are not given" (103). Nonetheless, "Bischoff's descriptions represent the starting point for any discussion of the manuscripts and script of the Carolingian period" (104) and can serve as a prolegomenon for "one of the legitimate goals of Carolingian paleography, [namely] a paleographical geography of the Carolingian kingdom" (95). Gorman finishes by listing some of the contents of the manuscripts; in descending order of frequency this list begins with Augustine, Bede, Jerome, Gregory, and Isidore, with Ambrose ranking "a very distant sixth" (89).

Palaeography is a discipline that by its very nature tends to focus on individual trees rather than take a sweeping view of the forest. Yet it is the latter approach which David N. Dumville takes in "Specimina Codicum Palaeoanglicorum," *Kansai University Collection of Essays in Commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of the Institute of Oriental and Occidental Studies, October 2001* (a special issue of *Kansai Daigaku Tōzai Gakujutsu Kenkyūjo kiyō* 34 [2001]: 1–24). Indeed, this looks very much like a preliminary introduction to the major study of the same title which Dumville had proposed to the editors and publishers of *EEMF*. Regrettably, this excellent series has been cancelled, and thus the intended publication of the volume—"a corpus of facsimiles of all Old English hands from codices and fragments of codices" (18)—will be delayed until another publisher can be found for this useful, necessary, and expensive collocation. In the work at hand, Dumville surveys in turn vernacular writing in Anglo-Saxon England; modern scholarship on (and facsimiles of) Anglo-Saxon manuscripts; the history of insular script; the specialization of Anglo-Saxon scripts (including the development of new specializations in the Anglo-Norman period); and finally both the historical and scholarly fates of the corpus of manuscripts containing Old English.

The only major new edition this year is Edward Pettit's version of the *Lacnunga* under the title *Anglo-Saxon Remedies, Charms, and Prayers from British Library MS Harley 585* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 2001). The first volume begins with an overview of the collection; a survey of previous scholarship; and a reassessment, including the question of who composed and used this collection. Pettit proposes that the compilation "might be intended for the use of a wealthy tenth- or eleventh-century secular [perhaps even royal] lord or, more likely, his physician" (liii). This is followed by an edition with a facing-page translation. The volume concludes with appendices on codicological description; variant versions, sources and analogues; linguistic description; an Old English glossary and an Old Irish glossary. Volume Two contains extensive commentary with references, and the bibliography. Crucially lacking here is Calvert Watkins discussion of the Old Irish charm in ll. 94–5 in *How To Kill A Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (Oxford, 1995), 520–522.

Francesca Tinti provides her own abstract for "From episcopal conception to monastic compilation: Hemmings Cartulary in context," *EME* 11: 233–61:

This article examines the structure and the contents of the late eleventh-century Worcester cartulary which forms the second part of London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A.XIII. Its sections are analysed and checked against the explanatory statements on the composition of the *libellus* provided by Hemming in his *Enucleatio*. This essay then contextualizes the composition of the cartulary through an analysis of its various components. Particular attention is paid to the development of the monastic community of Worcester in the late eleventh century and the ways in which the manuscript seems to reflect their acquisition of a specific and distinctive identity. The development, therefore, of their relationship with the bishop of Worcester is especially significant. The evidence provided by the cartulary suggests that, by the time the Norman Samson succeeded Bishop Wulfstan II in 1096, the monks' attitude toward their bishop had noticeably changed from the time when Wulfstan had first suggested the cartulary's composition (233).

In "Anglo-Norman lay charters" (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 25: 153–175), Richard Mortimer provides a template for judging the authenticity of eleventh-century Anglo-Norman charters, derived from analyzing the diplomatic of six single-sheet Anglo-Norman lay charters which seem to date from 1066 and *ca.* 1100. Mortimer begins by giving a summary of the content of the charters, then proceeds to analyze their salient characteristics. He concludes that "[w]e might find additions and afterthoughts tacked on to the end of a document; no form of address clause; grammatical confusion, with verbs not agreeing in number with their subjects and changes of tense. We can expect vagueness to be a feature, about the donor, about the beneficiary, about what is being granted and on what terms it will be held. We might find *concedo* being used for grants, and *signa* in the middle of a document as well as at the end; documents can stop abruptly, with no sealing clause or witnesses, let alone corroboration or warranty" (170). These features give us a starting ground for suspecting later forgeries: "The vagueness of eleventh-century definitions of what is granted and the terms of tenure make these clauses obvious targets. On the other hand one can hardly imagine a later forger copying out an earlier document solely in order to insert an up-to-date sealing clause. Therefore a purportedly eleventh-century document with a sealing clause of later standard type is likely to have been extensively rewritten or completely forged, whereas one with a suspicious-looking degree of precision in the dispositive clauses, but otherwise conforming to the kind of practices

we have been seeing in the originals, is more likely to have been interpolated" (172).

David H. Higgins concentrates on the development of boundaries for a single charter area in "The Anglo-Saxon Charters of Stoke Bishop: a study of the boundaries of *Bisceopes stoc*," *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 120: 107–131. Higgins begins with the explanation that "the 'Stoke' under consideration … was far larger territorially than the subsequent 19th century parish of Stoke Bishop, whose area in remote times, with other substantial land, 'Bishop's Stoke' once included" (107). Higgins investigates the boundaries of three early charters. The first is that of 883, in which "the abbot and community of Berkeley ceded part of their wide Mercian estates to the Crown" (107). Higgins compares previous studies done on these boundaries, and concludes that C.S. Taylor's "grasp of and understanding of the charter (1900) emerges as swift, comprehensive and, except in one controversial particular, probably correct" (108). This particular is the *waldes well* that Taylor identifies with the more picturesquely named Mother Pugsley's well. Higgins argues that the derivation of *wald* should be taken not from OE *wudu* 'wood', but rather from OE *wald* 'wold', and that the spring referred to is Bewell's well, which lay on the upland height of Kingsdown. Higgins then turns to the charters of 969 and 984, for which, despite the proximity in time, "the surveyors were almost certainly not the same. Their work is strongly contrasting in style and efficacy: the 969 charter appears jejeune, almost a sketch, while the 984 charter displays quality of style and a finer professional competence" (119). Nonetheless, Higgins brings evidence to show that the two areas in question "are most probably, for the most part, identical … [and] the boundaries, *contra* Lindley, respect the provisions of the charter of 883" (119).

Verity Allan's discussion of Bede's educational practices is slightly misleadingly titled "Bede: Educating the Educators of the Barbarians" (*Quaestio* 3: 28–44), because it has little actual discussion of barbarians or their educators. Allan begins by hypothesizing two audiences for Bede's work: standard school students for the reference texts "demonstrating how to write well, calculate Easter accurately and gain a working knowledge of the lunar and solar cycles" (31), and incipient preachers for the "commentaries, teaching people how to understand the Bible and giving ideas for preaching through allegorical and spiritual interpretations"; particularly useful for those who "would have to preach to less learned people" (31). She proposes that Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 819 (s. viii), an early product of Wearmouth-Jarrow, may demonstrate in its systematic use of punctuation that "teachers were fully

aware of the difficulty of reading [Bede's] long Latin sentences, and that either Bede himself, or possibly a pupil of his, used the punctuation to help the reader in analyzing the text" (37). Finally, she looks at the Continental distribution of early Bede Biblical commentaries, concluding that it is "centred most strongly on the Carolingian heartlands, with another large cluster in Switzerland" (40). In the same volume of *Quaestio* (77–107), Claudia di Sciacca investigates "Isidorian Scholarship at the School of Theodore and Hadrian: The Case of the *Synonyma*." She begins by looking at quotations from Isidore's *Etymologiae* in the Canterbury *Biblical Commentaries* and in the Leiden Glossary, which also contains a chapter on glosses from Isidore's *De ecclesiasticis officiis*. She compares glosses in various MSS of the *Synonyma* to try to determine if they might stem from a tradition originating in Canterbury, but concludes that "the evidence provided by the Old English glosses to the *Synonyma* … lead to essentially negative conclusions concerning the presence of this Isidorian text at the Canterbury school" (99). Even the fact that Aldhelm, who spent perhaps as many as ten years at Canterbury, knew the *Synonyma* does not allow us "to infer that the *Synonyma* were present in the library of the Canterbury school or found some use in Theodore's and Hadrian's classroom," as Aldhelm may easily have had access to them elsewhere.

David Ganz examines literary evidence, textual quotation and the influence of uncial in his listing of "Roman Manuscripts in Francia and Anglo-Saxon England" (*Roma fra oriente e occidente*, 607-47). Although the majority of books that came from Rome seems to be "copies of the scriptures and of works of Gregory the Great" (612), there is evidence for a great variety of other texts, the most important of which are collections of canon law. The important centers for early manuscripts from Rome on the continent were Corbie and Fleury, while Benedict Bishop's collection was the most important in Anglo-Saxon England. Ganz finishes by questioning some of the items on Petrucci's list of uncial manuscripts that might have been copied in Rome, but adding two fragments that perhaps should have been included. The importance, both for England and the continent, of the use of uncial is that this script "carried an association with a Roman tradition, the Rome of the apostles and martyrs" (641). Appropriately enough for a study on manuscripts, the word division at line end in the published article follows medieval rather than modern practice, which is simultaneously disconcerting and educational.

In "Texts and scripts in surviving manuscripts in the script of Luxeuil" (*Ireland and Europe*, 186–204), Ganz examines the remaining manuscripts written in what Lowe described as the "script of Luxeuil" and argues that most

of these "were produced for export, or imitated the script of such volumes" (189). Ganz describes in turn forms of minuscule, uncial, and page decoration. Initials are not only ornamented, but also "used to transform the appearance of the text on the page.… Luxeuil manuscripts thus reveal a new vision of the book, in which decoration is made far more prominent, and the open page becomes a single unit" (195). He goes on to list the contents of the extant lectionaries, and concludes that "it is difficult not to regard the monastery as a major source for their definition and dissemination" (198). Appended to the article is a table of Luxeuil manuscripts and groupings.

Klaus Zechiel-Eckes begins "Vom *armarium* in York in den Düsseldorfer Tresor" (*DAEM* 58: 193–203) with an advertisement and invitation to scholars to visit the large and largely underexamined collection in the treasury at Düsseldorf, upon which I now formally place first dibs [L.O.]. This article concentrates on four fragments from an early codex whose origin "weist den Weg zu einer Epoche, als der nachmalige große Kaiser Karl eben das Licht der Welt erblickt—oder vielleicht gerade seinen ersten Zahn verloren hatte" (193). The pages seem to come from a codex "der wohl um die Jahre 772/3—im Gepäck des Alkuin-Schülers, Missionars und Klostergründers Liudger—die Reise vom nordostenglische Metropolitansitz York in Richtung Kontinent angetreten hat" (196). Zechiel-Eckes describes these fragments, which contain excerpts from Johannes Chrysostom, *De reparatione lapsi* and *De compunctione cordis*, and the conclusion of the *Vita Sancti Iusti pueri.*

Via Crucis: Essays on early Medieval Sources and ideas in memory of J.E. Cross contains two essays relevant to the study of manuscripts. One is Paul E. Szarmach's working edition of three sermons, intermediaries between Alcuin's *Liber de virtutibus et vitiis* and Homily XX from the Vercelli Book ("Pembroke College 25, Arts 93-95," 295–325). Szarmach prefaces this new edition with a summary of the transmission of Alcuin's text through ninth- and tenth-century copies. This transmission has been divided into two groups, Class I, which preserve the treatise in its fullest form, and Class II, which lack Alcuin's introductory letter, list of chapters, the *peroratio* (The earliest Latin witness in England, a tenth-century text preserved in London, BL, MS Cotton Vespasian D.vi, assignable to St. Augustine's, Canterbury belongs to Class II). In Pembroke 25, this material has been further adapted into three separate homilies; although the articles in Pembroke 25 were themselves written *ca.* 1025, they represent an older reworking of Alcuin's treatise made within a generation of the author's death (and thus pre-date Vercelli). Szarmach offers a concise study of the methods of the ninth-century redactor,

demonstrating how the he divided the *Liber* into three sermons along "expected thematic divisions" (301) and makes only a token effort to confront structural difficulties that some modern scholars have seen in the original. The redactor would have found, Szarmach argues, some easy choices in the material covered by article 93, due to "relatively clear presentational method" and "rhetorical cues" in Alcuin's original (301). The structure for the portions of the remaining two articles is looser, with little or no sense of the organization of the chapters. Nonetheless, Szarmach's own abbreviated description successfully shows how the redactor approaches the text with intelligence and occasional independence, "suggesting some impulse towards retaining the thrust of the overall Alcuinian treatise while balancing it within some sort of perhaps now undefinable limit dictated by the circumstances of presentation." (300). The article concludes with a cursory glimpse at the working relationship of the eleventh-century hands responsible for Pembroke 25. The same collection of essays contains "Comments of the Codicology of Two Paris Manuscripts" (326–330), in which Frederick M. Biggs explains the codicological problem in Paris, BNF, lat. 13408 of the intertwining of three homilies by postulating that the quires of the exemplar were taken out of order, in a sequence *M, *O, *N, *P. For Paris, BNF, lat. 5564, Biggs supposes that a gathering of four leaves has been lost following folio 12. Finally, the pattern of rubrication suggests that this manuscript linked the texts of the Invention and the Exaltation.

Modern technology gives us new tools for addressing such problems, as described in Kevin Kiernan, Brent Seales and James Griffioen's fascinating look at computer approaches towards providing virtual restoration of damaged manuscripts in "The Reappearances of St. Basil the Great in British Library MS Cotton Otho B.x," *Computers and the Humanities* 36: 7–26. The life of St. Basil is the first in this manuscript, heavily damaged in the Cotton library fire and subsequently broken up (one folio is in the Bodleian) and miscollated in the rebinding (where the current fragmentary folios 6 and 50 are actually the two halves of a single original). Among many difficulties in the reconstruction work is the fact that the fragments are no longer flat but three-dimensional, being variously warped by usage, fire damage, humidity, or previous attempts at restoration. The authors discuss the pros and cons of available technologies such as ultraviolet light, laser reading, digitization and three-dimensional imaging for bringing to light the damaged text. They also address how to lay out a glossarial database to aid in reading partially-legible manuscripts. The article finishes with an appropriate plea to university systems to support such cross-disciplinary work between the humanities and computer programming.

Another kind of interdisciplinary, technical analysis—the composition of paint materials—is not just for conservators or science geeks any more, argues Mark Clarke, in his "The Analysis of Manuscript Pigments: Why, What, and How?" *Gazette du livre médiévale* 40: 36–43. But why should art historians and codicologists investigate pigment? For several reasons, he answers: to look for patterns, anomalies, and idiosyncrasies in the use of materials, as a tool to distinguish or sort hands in manuscripts, to localize and date manufacture, to identify the common traits attributable to ateliers, or to isolate anachronistic features resulting from repair or forgery. What should we look for? Patterns that result from impurities in the raw materials or from methods of preparation. For example, his own analysis of 100 English manuscripts shows that blue pigments change over time, with ultramarine being rarely used in earlier centuries. Therefore the presence of ultramarine in the late-tenth century manuscript Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 23 is unusual and supports an attribution to Christ Church, Canterbury since ultramarine is also found in a manuscript known to have been made there, London, BL, MS Cotton Cleopatra C.viii. How should such an analysis be accomplished? Clarke recommends establishing standards (derived from "material of known composition, e.g. paint samples reconstructed according to medieval artists' recipe books" (39) and comparing them with evidence from manuscripts. Of course, it is often a challenge to collect evidence, given the general prohibition of taking samples from manuscripts for analysis. But simple visual analysis of color and appearance is not good enough. Mechanical procedures, such as the fineness of grinding, can change how a pigment looks even under a microscope. Clarke describes how new, unambiguous, and non-invasive techniques like micro-sampling (the removal of extremely small bits of material) increase the possibility of and potential for pigment analysis. Clark claims that well-chosen micro-samples actually may be better for manuscripts than "non-destructive" observational methods for two reasons: first, the manuscripts are handled more delicately in sampling than was the case with older observational methods; second, a thorough, accurate analysis eliminates the need to repeat the process in the future. What is needed is the construction of a larger data set for comparative analysis, and the final section of his article briefly describes the methods that a researcher may wish to use.

"The Cotton-Corpus Legendary into the Twelfth Century: Notes on Salisbury Cathedral Library MSS 221 and 222" (*Early Medieval Texts and Interpretations*, 341–352) represents Joana Proud's examination of the copying practices of these two manuscripts. Both of them seem to have been

produced in haste, responding, perhaps, to a high demand for hagiographical materials between 1060 and 1200. For the first collection, "the legendary was constructed as a series of five structurally independent units, with occasional variation in the size of quires as scribes gauged the amount of material to be copied. Each of the booklets was the responsibility of a main scribe, who received assistance from others to keep the work progressing.… In the copying of the second volume, the frequency of scribal alternation is particularly high, suggesting that the scribes involved had other occupations within the Cathedral apart from writing, to which they were called during the copying" (348). There are no significant additions other than material on Blaise in MS 221 (for which there is "no obvious reason," 350), indicating again that these compilations may have been made very quickly with no attempt to adapt them to the context of Salisbury.

Jennifer Ramsey proposes "A possible 'Tremulous Hand' addition to *The Grave* in MS Bodley 343," ANQ 49: 178–80, by suggesting "that the additional verses to *The Grave* need not have been written later than the first quarter of the thirteenth century, thus placing it within a time-frame in which the tremulous hand would have been at the beginning of his career" (178). "The fine tremble in the hand that wrote the additional verses to *The Grave* was suspicious enough to warrant investigation" (180). Several letter forms resemble those of "his earlier hand, similar to that found in Worcester Cathedral MS F. 174, the manuscript containing [among others] the *Soul's Address to the Body*" (179). Ramsey adduces thematic similarities between these two poems that suggest "that the *Soul's Address* could have been the exemplar for *The Grave*" (180).

E. G. Stanley wades into "Paleographical and textual deep waters: <a> for <u> and <u> for <a>, <d> for <ð> and <ð> for <d> in Old English," *ANQ* 15: 64–72. Stanley questions here Michael Lapidge's hypothesis that confusion of these letters in the *Beowulf* manuscript points to an "early eighth-century archetype in Anglo-Saxon set minuscule" (cited p. 65). Stanley asserts that these confusions may not be firmly datable, and substantiates his claim by an examination of similar replacements in the Arundel Psalter.

In "The Dating of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11'" *ASE* 31: 141–173, Leslie Lockett provides a compelling argument for dating Junius 11 to the late tenth rather than—as is commonly the case—to the eleventh century. Lockett integrates examination of every facet of the manuscript in her discussion, a technique applicable not to Junius 11 alone. "[T]his integated and spectrum-based method of dating has the potential to steer us away from datings based on an isolated feature of a manuscript or on rigid and narrow periodization, thereby casting new light on other Anglo-Saxon manuscripts in need of fresh consideration" (173). Lockett applies finely detailed comparative analysis to Junius 11. She concludes that "codicological evidence suggests c. 950–c. 1010. The decorated initials seem likely to have been produced in the years around the 970s, while the style of the first artist's figure drawings points to a date of execution after c. 950 and before c. 980.… Palaeographically, many of the characteristics of canonical Phase II script are conspicuously absent from the work of Scribe 1, as are Caroline and Vernacular features, suggesting a range of dates between the middle of the tenth century and the 990s. Finally, the pointing of the Old Testament verses of Liber I is chronologically inconclusive because it may have been imported either directly from Latin poetic manuscripts during the Benedictine Reform or from pointed Saxon or Old High German exemplars much earlier in the tenth century.… I consequently suggest that Junius 11 be redated to the period c. 960-c.990" (172–3).

The issue of dating is joined by that of provenance in Nicholas Orchard's "Some notes on the Sacramentary of Echternach" (*Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 43/44: 1–21). First, the arrangement is in three books, although Orchard argues that this similarity to the Vatican Gelasian need not reflect direct influence. Second, Echternach's content in large part "embodies a Tours sacramentary of the last decade of the ninth century" (4). Third, the order of the masses for days of the week, known as "*missae sancti Augustini*," seems to represent "an offshoot of a set originally compiled somewhere in southern Europe, possibly in northern Italy or the region that is now Switzerland, possibly in Spain" (6). Fourth, the *missa specialis* "seems particularly at home in southern Europe … [a]nd, as far as matters of style are concerned, it is clear that our prayers are neither purely Roman nor strictly Gallican in character.… Rather, they are 'hybrid' in nature: Roman in general form but not as succinct as true Roman prayers tend to be" (15). Finally, the votive mass *missa communis vivorum et mortuorum* containing the preface *qui cum unigenito filio tuo* may have "belonged to a distinctive collection of votives originally assembled somewhere in central or northern Italy" (17) and likely dates to "some point in the eighth century" (20). Pending further research, "it remains to be seen whether this was a collection particularly favoured by, or even known to, Anglo-Saxon missionaries" (20).

Several studies this year concentrate on the Book of Kells. Bernard J. Muir's contribution, "The Genealogy of Christ and the Decoration of Folio 188 of *The Book of Kells*," *Reading Texts and Images: Essays on Medieval Art and Patronage*

in honour of Margaret M. Manion, ed. Bernard J. Muir (Exeter: U of Exeter P), 7–18, belongs to a volume devoted to the relationship of text to image; his particular approach reads the decoration in Kells within in the immediate environment of the book, in what Robert Calkins calls the "fourth dimension" or sequential flow of time, rather than as isolated elements (12). The immediate context of folio 188, the *Quoniam* page, is the first three chapters of Luke, which relates the story of the Nativity and traces the genealogy of Christ backwards through David to Adam. While not proposing that every element or every scene contains a decipherable message, he contends that the designers did intend to create "a collage of allusions" that link the genealogy in Luke to appropriate analogues from the book of Genesis, and he identifies "at least two Old Testament incidents relating to the genealogy of Christ in the illustration of fol. 188—the swearing of an oath by Abraham and the birth of Esau and Jacob" (12). The identification of the first "incident" requires a new view of the two figures in the lower right-hand corner of the page (contained within the *m*) whose curious pose suggests that they reach their hands up each other's clothes. Rejecting the interpretation that the artist depicts homosexual or parodic acts, as some previous art historians have suggested, he argues that the scene may refer to the practice of swearing an oath by placing one's hand under the thigh. This ritual is mentioned in two incidents in Genesis relevant to the genealogy of Christ, the oath of Abraham's servant (Gen. 24: 2–9) and Joseph's oath to Israel (Gen. 35:10–12). His second identification similarly involves a reinterpretation. The scene in question is just to the left of the "Oath" (outside the bowl of the *a*) and depicts several figures and a proffered chalice (this scene has been sometimes identified as a parody of the Eucharist). In his interpretation this is the "first recorded instance … of an iconographic formula for the depiction of the birth of Esau and Jacob" (13) Christ's genealogy extends from Jacob, thus connecting the proposed identification with the Lucan text. He concludes, almost as an aside, with a brief discussion of the figures depicted in the margins of the genealogical lists (especially fol. 201v). One figure, often linked to the name Iona, he identifies as Joseph, arguing that the artist uses the same yellow pigment to adorn both the figure and the name of the patriarch. Muir explains Joseph's prominence, in part, through the patriarch's involvement in an oath-swearing ritual of the type described above. Another figure on fol. 201 portrays Abraham's seminal role in the genealogical structure; the figure sits atop Abraham's name and "rests his back on the two names above it … Isaac and Jacob" (14).

Another look at the Book of Kells is found in "Biblical Imagery and the Heavenly Jerusalem in the Book of Armagh and the Book of Kells," in *Ireland and Europe in the early Middle Ages*, 205–14. In this article Hilary Richardson discusses "the striking and meaningful correspondence" (214) of the plan of the Holy City (fol. 170r) and the theme of the Pentecost in the Book of Armagh with the Temple in Jerusalem depicted in the scene of the Temptation of Christ in the Book of Kells (fol. 202v). Richardson points to similarities in the use of the lozenge-shape in both manuscripts, describing how the scribe responsible for Armagh's text, Ferdomnach, shapes the closing verses of John (21:24–25; fol. 103r) so that a lozenge shape occupies the middle of the page. "Though no known texts particularise the meaning of the lozenge, from its importance to St. John's Gospel and other vital passages, it can be deduced with confidence that the lozenge stands for Christ, the second person of the Trinity, the Logos" (208). Richardson notes its presence in Kells in the Symbols page at the beginning of John (fol. 290v), in the genealogy of Christ in St. Mathew's Gospel (fol. 30v and 31r), and on the Chi-Rho page (fol. 34r). Richardson then moves on to a discussion of the plan of the Heavenly Jerusalem that occupies part of leaf at the conclusion of the Apocalypse of John (fol. 170r). The plan represents the city as a square, with twelve gates and inscribed with the names of the twelve tribes, twelve precious stones, and twelve apostles. Within the plan, a rectangular area is labeled "Our Lord, Jesus Christ." Richardson relates the interest in numerology and gems to the decoration of the Ardagh Chalice and the headdress of Coptic monks. Attention then turns to the depiction of the Temptation of Christ in the Book of Kells (fol. 202v), in particular the building representing the temple. Richardson suggests that the building is represented in a double perspective, with simultaneous views of the (western) front and the lateral walls and roof; seen in this way, the building resembles, Richardson contends, contemporary churches like the one at Kilmalkedar, Co. Kerry. Furthermore, Richardson states "it is possible to read the entire frame of the Temptation page as a simple ground plan of a church. The four stepped features that are equidistant to each other should be understood as pillars drawn in cross section." (211). "The Rectangle at the top of the picture in the Temptation is reminiscent of the rectangular shape, inscribed as Christ, in the Book of Armagh plan" (211). Richardson suggests it represents an altar, flanked with chalices and vines. Pentecost emerges as an important theme in the last section, when Richardson takes up the unfinished decoration on fol. 203r of the Book of Kells, dominated by the words *Jesus autem plenus Spiritu Sancto*. Richardson explains that the "lace-like circular decoration in the center of Christ's name appears to have meanings linked to the Holy Spirit and the Eucharist" and compares it to the decoration on the bottom of the foot of the Ardagh and the Derrynavlan

chalices in terms of the filigree and numerical symbolism. Finally, attention shifts once again, back to Armagh, to the verso of the folio containing the plan for the Heavenly City which was left blank. Notes for a homily relating to Pentecost were added on this verso. Richardson describes structure outlined by the notes of the homily, its reliance on Psalm 46 and the parallels made between the Pentecost of the Jews and that of Christians. The final lines of the notes discuss the importance of the number seven, an interest in numerology that hearkens back to patristic discussion of Pentecost. For Richardson, this discussion, especially its emphasis on the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Spirit, may suggest an interpretation for the "significance of the groupings of seven at major points in the designs of the Derrynavlan Chalice, the Cross of Patrick and Columba … and many other places." (214).

The Book of Kells also is also a focus of Małgorzata Krasnodębska-D'Aughton in her "Decoration of the In Principio initials in early Insular manuscripts: Christ as a visible image of the invisible God," *Word & Image* 18/2: 105–122. Her focus is at first much broader than one book, as she seeks to explain certain motifs in decoration of the initials to the Gospel of John in Insular manuscripts "may be understood with reference to the theology of *imago*" (105) as developed in early Christian exegesis. She explains how patristic writers and their Insular heirs established interpretive links between the story of Creation in Genesis and the assertion of the Incarnation of the Word in the Gospel of John. This linkage in turn rests a foundation established by the Apostle Paul in his Christological Hymn (Colossians 1:15–23). For Paul, the acknowledgement of Christ as the only image of an invisible God provides a lesson on *imago*, a lesson which in turn interweaves "such crucial biblical themes as the creation and fall of man, the Incarnation of Christ as well as the restoration of man to divine grace" (105). For later exegetes, including Insular writers such as Bede and Columbanus, this lesson develops into a complex theology in which the "concept of the image bears in itself a multiplicity of connotations which included biblical and artistic meanings" (105). This discussion introduces the real focus of the article, the *In Principio* initials in six Insular manuscripts: Book of Durrow (Dublin, Trinity College, 57, fol. 192v), Durham Gospels (Durham, Cathedral Library, A.II.17, fol. 2r), Echternach Gospels (Paris, BNF, lat. 9389, fol. 177r), Lindisfarne Gospels (London, BL, MS Cotton Nero D.iv, fol. 211r), Barbarini Gospels (Vatican City, BAV, MS Barbarini lat. 570, fol. 125r), and the Book of Kells (Dublin, Trinity College, 58, fol. 292r). Evidence falls under four primary headings. First, the belief that Christ is the image of God is evoked in the initials through details such as tiny loop at the top of the letter

b in the word *verbum*. Second, that the decoration of the "In Principio" pages demonstrate that "Christ the Creator is revealed through his creation" through numerical symbolism, through the flora and fauna interlaced within the initials, and the use of a lozenge shape to refer to the "quadrangular world" worked by the Creator (107). Third, "the culmination of the divine creation is man, whose presence is hinted at by the motif of human heads that are inscribed within these initials" (118). A final section is devoted more pointedly to the *In Principio* page in the Book of Kells. Departing from previous interpretations, she understands the figure at the top of the page "as the depiction of Christ as the creating Word who is verbally revealed on the same page" (116). She defends this proposition through reference to both visual and literary evidence. She notes that the figure in Kells stands above a circle which she likens to the compositions found in the Maiestas image in the Codex Amiatinus, mosaics in San Marco, and continental examples "which evoke the ideas of creation and majesty" (116). She also links it to the writings of Maximus the Confessor (580–662) whose texts draw "a direct parallel between the Word made flesh and the Word expressing himself in 'syllables and letters'" (117). She ends by returning to the theme of the imago with which she began. Connecting the salvific, eucharistic references within the page (such as the chalice held by the figure at the top, right hand side), to the man wrestling a beast on the lower right, she writes: "The presence of the wrestling figure within the In Principio page may, therefore, be elucidated in light of the theology of the image: the human wrestling is the result of the fall through which man lost the celestial image; the image is restored by the Incarnation of the Word and daily by the sacrament of the Eucharist" (118).

Slightly later than Kells (late ninth/early tenth century), the Book of Deer (Cambridge, University Library, Ii.6.32) is a small-format gospel book, notable for its abbreviated text of three of the four Gospels (John is complete), its sequence of illustrations and Gaelic *notitiae*. In "The Sword of the Spirit, The Word of God and the Book of Deer," *Society for Medieval Archaeology* 46:1–28, Dominic Marner concentrates on the illustrations of this unusual manuscript and demonstrates that the images create an intelligible, coherent, and consistent iconographical program; he then considers the origin and date of the manuscript's manufacture, re-situating its historical context. The book contains some thirteen different illustrations, including initial pages, a Chi-Rho decoration, and several different kinds of figurative panels; Marner here is primarily concerned with the figures prefacing each of the Gospel texts and their connections to the text and their thematic ties. He begins with the figure introducing Mathew. Holding a sword, wearing a

four-pointed beard, and surrounded by two smaller attendants, this figure has been identified previously as either the evangelist himself or the patriarch Abraham. Focusing first on the attendants, which he identifies as angels, and then the sword, Marner locates the image within a web of textual references centering on Ephesians 6:10–17 (which outlines Christian spiritual armor). "The relationship is, of course, between the sword as protective armour, the sword as Word of God, and the power of the Word of God to defeat evil forces, Christ as Logos, as Word, is therefore both a Warrior and a Judge" (9). This image resonates with the abbreviated text of Mathew because, Marner argues, this gospel is especially concerned with the theme of Christ as a spiritual warrior. Notably, the text in the Book of Deer ends at Mathew 7:23, "a section of the Sermon on the Mount that elaborates upon Jesus in the role of eschatological Judge" (12). His attention then turns to the representation of the figure that prefaces the abbreviated text of Mark (fol. 16v). He concentrates the object held by the figure, arguing that it represents a book satchel suspended from the neck of the wearer. This "alludes to a book rather than representing a physical book per se … that aspect of the book, that is, the Word, which has talismanic power." He continues, "in this sense, the satchel becomes part of the metaphorical armour referred to in Ephesians and as such is analogous to the sword held by Christ in the previous image" (14) As was the case with Mathew, the Marcan prefatory image relates to the decision to abbreviate the Gospel, which in this case ends with Mark 5:35, which tells of a sick girl cured by touching Christ's hem: ending at this spot "the scribe brought the attention of the reader to a healing miracle and by doing so provided evidence of Christ's power to heal" and the image with its talismanic satchel and halo represents "another Christ, this time referring to Christ's healing ministry" (15). Marner then builds on the Christological identifications of the previous two images to suggest that the outstretched arms of the figure introducing Luke's Gospel refers to crucifixion (some previous interpreters see this as *orans* pose). Again, Marner ties the image to the abbreviated text of Luke; he notes that in the Book of Deer the word *diabolo*, the last word of Luke 4:1, leads into the story of Temptation in the Desert. He offers this interpretation, "the way in which Christ defeats the devil in the desert is by using the written work as protection … each time Christ is tempted he answers by saying, 'It is written,' thereby making a pointed reference to the power of the written Word of God" (18). Given this trajectory, it is no surprise that Marner concludes that the subject of the final figurative preface, that before John. This illustration shows a man surmounting a small cross and flanked by six attendants which Marner argues also refers to Christ, this time as celestial Judge at the end-times. Looking at the program as a whole, he summarizes "Clearly the book was concerned with the power of the Word of God. Its texts and images expand upon the theme of Christ as Logos and the power of that Word to both heal and conquer evil. The book itself was probably worn in a satchel of an individual for precisely these reasons, a suggestion that is confirmed by repeatedly depicting satchels around the necks of figures rather than having them hold books as was the norm. The implication of proposed interpretation of the Book of Deer is that its makers would have been quite sophisticated in their approach to the relationship between word and image." (22) The article ends with a short discussion of date and origin. Marner asserts a possible connection to the abbey at Dunkeld, a center of ecclesiastical power associated with St. Columba, a saint noted for his efficacy as a patron for Christian warriors. He suggests that the manuscript should be seen in the context of the struggle for control in the transition from Pictish to Scottish power in the ninth and tenth centuries, and that the manuscript may have been brought to Deer upon the destruction of Dunkeld in 1027.

"It surely would have been an easier to create a series of individual hangings," writes Gale R. Owen-Crocker ("The Bayeux 'Tapestry': Invisible Seams and Visible Boundaries," *ASE* 31: 257–273); "why did the creators go to so much trouble to make a single continuum?" (258). We may never know the precise answer(s) to this question but we certainly learn more about its manufacture from this consideration of the barely visible seams that join the separate strips that are the fabric of the embroidery. Owen-Crocker bases her study on a concern with the embroidery as a textile, the single largest example of cloth from early medieval Britain. She outlines its construction from eight separate sections of varying lengths, the last one famously missing its original ending. She draws our attention to the nearly invisible stitched seams that join these sections as important evidence in the history of sewing and for the process of the Tapestry's manufacture. Attention to these joins makes visible the illusion of the Tapestry's continuity; what appears to be one unified product is really the result of "an interrupted sequence in which one hand gave way to another" (259). These seams and hence the sections they join correspond to the boundaries of the visual narrative only two times. It would seem that the commission for the work was farmed out to different workshops which subtly re-interpreted the master design, expressing differences in the details of dress and fashion, among other things. Her concern with the physical boundaries of the cloth and the decisions made about how to join them leads Owen-Crocker to re-examine the larger picture that results from this work. The Tapestry is, of course, best understood when seen as

the long strip it is; scanning along its length, she points out how scenes at different points in the story can be seen to mirror, anticipate, or look back to others. These patterns reveal potential narrative links and large scale narrative structures that change our understanding of its meaning. The famous images in the border comment and amplify meaning by serving as heraldic identifiers (lions near King Edward), suggesting state of mind (the "shame or horror" of the animals at Harold's arrest), extending the narrative, as when they are invaded by armed figures and dying warriors. It is not in the declarative, formulaic Latin inscription, she concludes, "but in the images that we are invited to see a meaning, a moral, a pattern to events. This then is the reason why the makers stitched together the strips of linen into a continuous whole … they were constructing a single, complex unity with a meaningful design." (269) The article ends with Owen-Crocker's informed musing about the missing end of the Tapestry. She suggests it would have ended much as it began, with an image of the King, now the victorious William, seated on a throne surrounded with "his trusty half-brothers, the insignificant Robert and the magnificent Odo" (273).

Elizabeth C. Parker outlines an allusive series of visual relationships centering on the donation of the Cross represented in London, BL, MS Stowe 944, in "The Gift of the Cross in the New Minster *Liber Vitae*," *Reading Medieval Images: The Art Historian and the Object*, ed. Elizabeth Sears and Thelma K. Thomas (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P), 177–86. She begins by mapping the spaces of the representation. She contends that "the hierarchical arrangement of the composition sets out three interrelated tiers of social/sacred realms" (177) as the figures of King Cnut, Queen Emma/Ælfgifu before the altar are the intermediaries joining the monks below and Christ, Mary, and St. Peter, above. These three realms "can also be read as a schematic rendering of the sanctuary space of New Minster itself: choir, high altar, and apse" (178), with the upper zone of the illustration perhaps an indication of the actual apse decoration at New Minster (whose church, Parker notes, was dedicated to St. Mary and St. Peter). The representation may also tell us something about activities within that space: the preface to the *Liber Vitae* tells us that the names of benefactors recorded on its pages were recorded on earth so that "they may be inscribed on the pages of the heavenly book" (178). Both Mary and the monk in the central arch display the open palmed gesture of supplication and both hold books. Mary's book, in turn, is visually linked to one held by Christ and to the Cross on the altar through the application of yellow pigment. "The image confirms what the liturgy achieves: the commemoration at the high altar in New Minster is enacted in the presence of the Most

High" (178). The benefits of membership are indicated in the following opening on fols. 6v-7r, a two-page depiction of the Last Judgment. Parker pursues the network of allusions created by the scene of donation, tracing the significant literary and visual of the theme of the Cross as an agent of salvation. Parker argues that Cnut's martial gesture (he pointedly grasps his sword), Ælfgifu's presence on the left side (seen in some Byzantine examples of Helena) may be purposeful recollections of the Legend of the True Cross and of Helena and Constantine as founding Christian rulers. This blends with memories of a more immediate, local past through allusions to King Edgar and the frontispiece of the New Minster Charter. In the *Liber Vitae*, Cnut's presence asserts his "role as successor to Edgar in his efforts on behalf of the abbey" while Ælfgifu's presence "affirms her special importance to the king's political program" (180). As Parker concludes, "to draw out the association and the see this queen and king as adopting the roles of the 'new Helena' and 'new Constantine' when they place the cross on the altar adds a further layer of meaning to this image of their power sharing in a period of crisis of Anglo-Saxon rule" (183).

Richard Gameson had a busy year describing manuscripts and colophons. Gameson assumes that "The Insular Gospel Book at Hereford Cathedral" (*Scriptorium* 56.1: 48–79) was "probably made in the later eighth or earlier ninth century, either in Wales or western England" (48). He examines in turn "the physical fabric of the volume [which 'affiliates the volume to the Celtic rather than Anglo-Saxon tradition of book production' (54)], its text [which 'belongs to a distinctive Irish or Insular recension, with numerous departures from St Jerome's version' (55), and which is further marked with crosses in the margins, indicating the intended use as a lectionary], its script [which 'implies that the Hereford Gospels was produced in an otherwise unattested provincial Insular centre to the west rather than to the north or east of Mercia' (65)], its decoration [which 'sparing though it is, was monumentally conceived' (69)], and the Anglo-Saxon additions" (48), which provide us not only with "early examples of handwriting that is certainly localisable" at Hereford Cathedral (70), but also with an extremely entertaining legal look into the fractious Days of Our Lives for an Anglo-Saxon family. Gameson concludes that the gospel book "gives the impression of being the *magnum opus* of a minor centre—a sacred working book with was made as handsomely as local resources would permit" (74).

The title of Gameson's "The colophon of the Eadwig gospels" (*ASE* 31: 201–222) does not really do justice to the content, as it concludes with a detailed description of the

Eadwig Gospels and treats in turn "its material fabric, content, textual characteristics, scribes, decoration and history" (214). The article itself begins with a recounting of "the salient points of Eadwig's career, in so far as they are known" (202). Gameson then discusses Eadwig's hand, which "unites the rotundity that characterized the finest Winchester Caroline minuscule of the later tenth and early eleventh century (the so-called 'Style I') with the greater rectilinearity that distinguished much Canterbury writing of the same period ('Style II').… [T]he distinctive Old English letter-forms were preserved but their overall aesthetic was assimilated to that of Caroline minuscule" (204–5). This work "was not an isolated turning point in the history of English script, but rather an intelligible crystalization of certain pre-existing currents.… How much the diffusion of the style owed to Eadwig personally is, indeed, a moot point" (206). The crux of the discussion of the colophon itself centers around the use of N, *nomen*, for the beneficiary. Gameson argues that "The advantage of using *nomen* in such a context was that it universalized the imprecation. Eadwig's appeal [*memor esto mei*] was thereby appropriate for every reader" (210).

Fittingly, this section will end with a discussion of Gameson's Chadwick Lecture entitled *The Scribe Speaks? Colophons in early English manuscripts* (H.M. Chadwick Memorial Lectures 12 [Cambridge: U of Cambridge, Dept. of Anglo-Saxon, Norse, and Celtic]). Gameson contradicts his own statement that most medieval colophons "are predictable, repetitive, and—dare one say it—a little dull" (3). This may be true of the colophons themselves, but hardly of Gameson's lively excursion through the world of the approximately forty Anglo-Saxon colophons: English, Latin, and even visual. Gameson considers localization, chronology, authorship and content, and finishes with a "summary catalogue" of the colophons, which contains text, translation, manuscript information and references. So we finish by citing a Continental colophon: "The pen speaks thus: 'Hold me firmly and put me down gently. If you have not written well, you will have a bad day'" (2). Or perhaps better and closer to home, a colophon to Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 206: "Every scribe who writes has fun, as writing scribes are happy scribes" (19).

L.O., B.W.

Works not seen

Pallister, M., J. Eastaugh, and F. Milton. "A Charter for Abbascombe." *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History* 144: 31–39.

7. History and Culture

a. General Sources and Reference Works

Karen Jolly's contribution to *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe*: *The Middle Ages*, ed. Bengt Ankarloo and Stuart Clark (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P) is Part I: "Medieval Magic: Definitions, Beliefs, and Practices" (1–71). It is a general but admirably lucid examination of three elements: the assumptions modern historians have brought to the study of medieval magic, conceptual changes in the meaning ascribed by medieval men and women to the term magic, and, finally, evidence for the actual practice of magic. Chapter One surveys the evolution of the magic-religion-science model in modern historiography, a model which emerged in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and which was only recently supplanted by an emphasis on accommodation and commonalities (context and not comparison). Jolly then shows in Chapter Two how people in the early Middle Ages conceptualized magic as a "binary structure of demonic magic versus divine miracle" (20). During the twelfth-century Renaissance, however, magic was redefined to accommodate aspects of the new learning such as the "good" magic of astrology. It was also during the high Middle Ages that the Church's attitude toward magic changed from one of demonic association with paganism to demonic association with heresy. In the later Middle Ages, Jolly argues, new conditions such as the increase in lay literacy brought about a synthesis of folk ways and classical and Christian texts resulting in the rise of magic, noting that "what is most characteristic of this period … is the seriousness of magic and its potential to both empower and to disrupt Christian society" (26). The final chapter considers the evidence for actual practices, divided into the categories of healing, protection, divination, occult knowledge and entertainment. While this book does not supplant either Valerie Flint's *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval England* (Princeton, 1994) or Richard Kieckhefer's *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000), it would be a good place to begin any study of the topic.

Janet Nelson's "England and the Continent in the Ninth Century: I, Ends and Beginnings" (*TRHS* 6th ser. 12: 1–21),

her 2001 presidential address to the Royal Historical Society, is a broad survey of historiography from the postwar era to the present, contrasting the attitudes assumed in Carolingian and Anglo-Saxon studies toward the ninth century. Nelson observes a shift in attitudes from "the relatively limited participation of British scholars in post-war scholarship on earlier medieval Continental Europe" (10 n. 31) to an increase in commerce between the two fields, with results that have been salutary for both. These developments have in turn led to a new appreciation of the richness of the ninth century, a period once relegated to an uncertain position between antiquity and feudalism. On the basis of such developments, Nelson "argue[s] for the ninth century … as a fundamentally formative and defining period" (15). Her ensuing discussion of the extraordinary correspondence between Charlemagne and Pope Leo III, "reveal[ing] multiple exchanges with Anglo-Saxon England, and a wider world of connections in which the Vikings were starting to figure," has important implications for students of Anglo-Saxon history, particularly as the correspondence demonstrates the extent to which "the Anglo-Saxons felt more strongly than ever the pull of Rome" (20). Nelson's essay vividly demonstrates the perils of insularity in Old English scholarship, as well as the potential gains of cultivating a perspective that is mindful of the interrelatedness of Anglo-Saxon and Continental affairs.

In *King Arthur: Myth-Making and History* (London: Routledge), N.J. Higham presents a persuasive argument that the earliest Welsh "historical" references to Arthur, war-leader of the Britons, were manufactured to bolster the fortunes of the patrons of those texts; it is therefore extremely unlikely that they can have any historicity at all. This argument is bracketed by a survey of scholarly views from 1868 to 2000 regarding the existence of a historical Arthur (ch. 1) and a survey of Arthur as cultural icon from 1100 to 1889 (ch. 5), both informative enough but not directly pertinent to the central issue. Chapters Two, Three, and Four form the core of the volume. "The Genesis of Arthur" sets forth the material from which the figure of Arthur was later developed: Gildas's *De Excidio Britanniae*, with its association between the last Roman Ambrosius Aurelianus and the battle of Badon; bear-god cults; and the Arthur of folklore, who had perhaps been based on a Roman named Artorius. "Contested Histories: Anglo-Saxons and Britons *c*. 730–830" analyzes the passage about Arthur found in the *Historia Brittonum* by setting this text in its contemporary political context. Higham's analysis, expertly juxtaposing literary and historical information, argues that the *Historia* was written for Merfyn of Gwynedd, who was engaged in conflicts with other Welsh kings as well as with the

Mercians. The *Historia*'s Arthur, Higham shows, is primarily a biblical construct, developed as a British Joshua to follow St. Patrick's British Moses. The list of battles associated with Arthur was similarly contrived, most likely by the author, from sources that were neither particularly early nor authoritative. "Text in Context: The *Annales Cambriae c*. 954" examines the second Latin text written in Wales to refer to Arthur, getting a running start on the problem by reviewing the earlier Welsh heroic poetry, *Y Gododdin*, Asser's *Life of Alfred*, and the *Armes Prydein*. Higham shows that the two Arthurian entries in the *Annales Cambriae* are not independent of the *Historia Brittonum*; as is not surprising, he argues that these entries are included for purposes specific to St. David's, where the annals were written, and the political and dynastic agenda of Owain ap Hywel of Deheubarth, who claimed descent from Arthur on his mother's side. At this point, given Gildas's silence about Arthur, the Old Testament characterization of Arthur in the *Historia Brittonum*, and the reliance of the Arthurian entries in the *Annales Cambriae* on the *Historia Brittonum*, even the most die-hard believers in a historical Arthur will be feeling rather desperate. The rest of us, shamed by Higham's procession of scholars who couldn't quite commit themselves to publicly stating that there is no plausible early textual evidence for a historical Arthur, will have to steel ourselves for taking an unpopular, if evidently correct, position.

David Rollason's "Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People" (*The Historian* 73: 6–10) is a high-level summary of the problems and possibilities facing modern studies of the *Historia ecclesiastica*. Rollason begins with the problems: the most recent editions and notes have not superseded those produced by Plummer in 1896; we do not fully understand Bede's sources; and it is difficult to relate Bede's account of seventh-century England with the archeological record. On the bright side, the use of Bede to understand the early eighth century has been fruitful, both in terms of understanding the *Historia* as a message for Bede's own troubled times and in terms of relating it to patristic writings.

Comparing Aelred of Rievaulx's *Vita Sancti Niniani* with the late-eighth-century hagiographic poem *Miracula Nynie Episcopi*, James E. Fraser ("Northumbrian Whithorn and the making of St Ninian" [*The Innes Review* 53: 40–59]) seeks a better understanding of their source, the now lost *liber de vita et miraculis* of St. Ninian. (An abstract of this work was evidently also one of the sources of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*.) Fraser provides a general reconstruction of the text and examines some of the underlying interpretative problems. He proposes that the author of the

liber assembled a handful of Gallovidian traditions about St. Uinniau while misreading the saint's name as Nyniau. The author's ignorance of the saint's real name implies that he worked at a Northumbrian monastery other than Whithorn, the location of Uinniau's shrine. In addition, the author seemed to be drawing parallels between his subject and St. Wilfrith, and this suggests that the *liber* was written at Hexham, whose bishop Acca was one of Wilfrith's most devoted followers and who is known to have contributed information to the *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Fraser concludes by speculating that the motivation for composing the work was to demonstrate the logic of establishing a Northumbrian bishopric at Whithorn.

In *Property and Piety in Early Medieval Winchester: Documents Relating to the Topography of the Anglo-Saxon and Norman City and Its Minsters*, Winchester Studies 4.iii (Oxford: Oxford UP), Alexander R. Rumble takes an interdisciplinary approach to the study of the thirty-three charters relating the city of Winchester as a whole and not just its religious foundations. This is a fascinating collection of sources, liberally discussed and well placed in their topographical as well as historical context. Scholars of many disciplines will find something of interest, including several new editions and translations of important documents such as King Edgar's refoundation charter of 966 for the New Minster.

David Preest's translation of William of Malmesbury's *The Deeds of the Bishops of England (Gesta Pontificum Anglorum)* (Woodbridge: Boydell), is a very welcome stop-gap between the Latin edition in the Rolls Series, upon which it is based, and a facing translation in the OMT series. One of William's two major historical works, the *Gesta* presents England's ecclesiastical history from the conversion through William's day, organized by dioceses. Like William's other works, it is uneven at best, but full of interesting stories about the figures, rogues as well as saints, who peopled England's early church. The edition is lightly footnoted and contains an index and select bibliography.

In *English Local History: An Introduction* (Stroud: Sutton) Kate Tiller revises her 1992 handbook that surveys current knowledge about and approaches to English local history. This book is intended for a general audience, but Chapter Two, "The Saxon Centuries," provides a useful political chronology as well as short discussions of archaeological, place-name, settlement and diplomatic evidence for the period. A much more detailed county-by-county survey of the materials available to the local historian is *English County Histories: A Guide*, ed. C.R.J. Currie and C.P. Lewis (Stroud, 1994).

Two very useful guides were published in 2002 as part of the ASNC Guides series. The first, Simon Keynes's *An Atlas of Attestations in Anglo-Saxon Charters, c. 670–1066, I: Tables*, ASNC Guides, Texts and Studies 5 (Cambridge: U of Cambridge, Dept. of Anglo-Saxon, Norse, and Celtic), is an indispensable handbook for working with charters in this period. Organized by reign, this set of tables compiled by one of the foremost scholars of Anglo-Saxon charters allows patterns to jump off the page and should stimulate much new research in the future. The next guide in the series is Rebecca Rushforth's *An Atlas of Saints in Anglo-Saxon Calendars*, ASNC Guides, Texts and Studies 6, which, because it tabulates the names of saints contained in the twenty-seven extant calendars, should spark the interest of anyone working on saints' cults.

For scholars of Domesday Book, 2002 was a very good year because the translations from the very fine facsimile edition undertaken in the 1980s were made available in a single paperback at a reasonable cost (Ann Williams and G. H. Martin, eds. *Domesday Book: A Complete Translation*, Alecto Historical Editions [London: Penguin]). Although somewhat cumbersome to use (small print and a whopping 1,436 pages in a single paperback!), it is a much superior translation to that in the Philimore editions, and includes Little Domesday as well as Great Domesday. An index of place names makes searching the survey easier than ever before.

At first glance, *The Penguin Atlas of British & Irish History* (ed. Barry Cunliffe, Robert Bartlett, John Morrill, Asa Briggs, and Joanna Bourke [London: Penguin, 2001]) is irresistible, at least to a history buff who likes maps. It covers British and Irish history in five parts and includes a Chronological Table, lists of the rulers of Britain and Ireland, and short but good bibliographies. Part Two, "Medieval Britain and Ireland," covers "The Migration Period," "Saxons and Celts," "The Viking Age," "Viking York," "The Age of Unification," "The Normans," "The Medieval Church," "The Angevin Empire," "Britain and the Crusades," "Castles," "The Plantagenet Hegemony," "Medieval Landscapes," "The Hundred Years War," "The Medieval Economy," "The Black Death," "The Later Middle Ages," and "Medieval Norwich." All except the sections on York and Norwich are organized around a large map of the British Isles and one or more smaller-scale maps, plus photographs, illustrations, and side-bar quotations. The text provides good, up-to-date overviews for the general public and is careful to give the perspective of Celtic-speaking peoples as well as that of Anglophones; however, the material will be familiar to specialists. Although this probably would not be the best choice for a textbook, even in a survey class, the maps

might be useful handouts. On second thought, then, the attractions of this glossy *Atlas* ought to be resisted, unless of course you want a clear, graphical introduction to some *other* period of British or Irish history.

b. Religion and the Church

Michael W. Herren and Shirley Ann Brown acknowledge that their *Christ and Celtic Christianity: Britain and Ireland from the Fifth to the Tenth Century* (Woodbridge: Boydell) is likely to arouse objections from several quarters (p. x). Staunch believers in the orthodoxy of Christianity in Ireland will resist their argument that Pelagianism and semi-Pelagianism strongly influenced Irish theology, religious practices, and religious art. New Age believers and other romantics will be disappointed that Herren and Brown find nothing "Celtic" about the Christianity of Celtic lands. Still others will be irritated by Herren and Brown's tendency to work backwards from their assumptions rather than proceeding from evidence and argument to conclusions. However, the strength of this work is that the evidence is laid out clearly, and readers may make up their own minds. *Christ and Celtic Christianity* consists of an introduction, seven chapters, an epilogue *cum* summary, and an appendix containing a study and translation of *Precamur patrem*, a hymn from the seventh-century Antiphonary of Bangor. The introduction sets forth Herren and Brown's division of Celtic church history into three periods: *ca.* 450 to *ca.* 630, which saw relative harmony in theology and practice in Britain and Ireland (their so-called common Celtic Church); *ca.* 630 to *ca.* 750, when the Irish Church became divided into the *Hibernenses* in the north and the *Romani* in the south; and *ca.* 750 to *ca.* 850, a time of synthesis of Roman and Hibernian ideals in Ireland under the hegemony of the *Céli Dé* movement. The introduction also defends some of their key concepts, such as the "common Celtic Church," the "defining" nature of Pelagian doctrines on that Church, and the radical nature of monkhood in early medieval Ireland, and it reviews the history of scholarship on these topics. The first chapter, "The Growth and Development of Monasticism in the British Isles," is a straightforward survey, touching on Nynia, Pelagius and his associates, Patrick, Uinniau, the Synods of St. Patrick, the *Céli Dé*, and the evidence about monasticism in Anglo-Saxon England provided by Bede, Aldhelm, and the penitential ascribed to Theodore. Throughout, the interpretive emphasis is on the objective of "monasticizing" as much of society as possible. Chapter Two, "The Theology of Christ in Insular Christianity," explains the heterodoxies that were alternately influential and abhorred, namely Arianism, Pelagianism, the "Three Chapters" controversy, Monothelitism, and the practices of the

Quattuordecimans and Judaisers. Chapter Three, "Pelagianism in Britain and Ireland," first examines in some detail the beliefs of the Pelagians and their semi-Pelagian contemporaries. It then presents what Herren and Brown see as survivals of Pelagianism in Britain and Ireland. They interpret Patrick's writings and Gildas's censures as anti-Pelagian, and they find that numerous Irish texts from the seventh to ninth centuries show either the influence of Pelagian thought or polemical engagement with it. Furthermore, Bede's criticism of several works attributed to Julian of Eclanum is taken to show that Pelagian writings were in circulation in Northumbria around the turn of the eighth century. Chapter Four, "The Common Celtic Church," explores the beliefs and practices that Herren and Brown believe set Christianity in these lands apart from the Christianity of western Europe: the importance of the Scriptures, which in turn gave rise to Judaising tendencies; the ideal of the literate monk; the rejection of hagiography and scriptural commentary; the treatment of the sacraments, especially penance; and the xenophobic and ostracizing emphasis on excommunication. At this point, the logic underlying this study begins to break down. The first four chapters have stated that not only did the common Celtic Church preach salvation through strict adherence to divine law, but that people could not—strictly speaking—imitate Christ, for they were only human and Christ was not. This part of the book ends with the leading question "What place was there for Christ in all this?" (134). The reader, naturally expecting the answer to be "little" or "none," is startled to find that the remainder of the book deals with Celtic Christology. Chapter Five, "Christ Revealed in the Texts," is therefore the weakest part of the overall argument, for the authors must confront the fact that Christ did indeed have an important place in Celtic Christianity (regardless of the changing views as to which aspect of His nature was most important to consider at any particular moment). This chapter reviews the Celtic explications of Christ as perfect monk, as warrior-hero, as wonder-worker, and as judge of human souls. Not surprisingly, given the authors' insistence on the centrality of monasticism, they conclude that "the most enduring Celtic image of Christ was Christ the Perfect Monk," an assertion that the last two chapters do not bear out. Chapter Six, "Non-Representational Images of Christ," returns to firmer ground with its survey of crosses, symbols of Christ, and the chi-rho monogram of Christ in the stonework and manuscripts of Ireland and Northumbria. Nonetheless, several objections can be raised. The statement that, in contrast to the Romano-British period, the era of the common Celtic Church saw a resistance to making figural representations of Christ seems less than convincing when the authors give only one example of a Romano-British figural

representation of Christ. It is also not possible to agree with their evaluation of Celtic culture as one that enjoyed a long history of abstract art. On the contrary, a quick glance at any book about Celtic art will show human faces and figures in objects from the first millennium B.C. on. Last but not least is a certain amount of equivocation: in discussing the abstract decoration of the Ahenny crosses, the authors seem to favor a date in the last quarter of the seventh century, and they relegate to a footnote the fact that Christ is depicted on the bases of both crosses (202–204), yet Chapter Seven, "The Representational Images of Christ," begins with the statement that it was during the eighth century that Christ was first directly represented in Insular art. Here, too, one could object to the authors' rhetorical strategies—the Ahenny crosses are hardly "almost iconoclastic" (237), whether they mean the term literally or figuratively, and their own evidence does not support the characterization of the "transformation" of Irish figurative art as "fairly sudden" (274)—and one must object to the interpretation of the importance of the Old Testament to the Irish as being incompatible with a theology of grace. Augustinian salvation history, for example, presents the time of the Old Law as an integral part of God's plan for humanity, a plan to which grace is central. Still, this chapter provides an interesting contextualization for the later figurative images of Christ, which Herron and Brown see as responses to the depredations of the Vikings. A highlight is their interpretation of the illustration on fol. 11r of the Book of Kells, which shows a Christ whose upraised arms are grasped by a man on either side. Despite the reference on this page to Mount of Olives, the scene does not correspond directly to anything in the Gospels, and the authors suggest a typological interpretation based on the aid that Moses gives the Hebrews in their battle with Amalekites (Exodus 17:8–17) by holding his arms up in the air. Because the Hebrews have the advantage until Moses begins to tire, Aaron and Hur support Moses's arms, one on each side, until sunset, when Joshua's victory was assured (245). All in all, Herron and Brown succeed in their overall goal of showing that Celtic Christianity involved more than tonsures and the correct way to calculate Easter, but their tidy periodization of Insular church history and their turning to Pelagianism and anti-Pelagianism as the explanation for the particulars of Irish monasticism, penitential practices, and art may not convince all readers.

One unconvinced reader is Gerald Bonner, who in "The Pelagian Controversy in Britain and Ireland" (*Peritia* 16: 144–55) criticizes an article by Brown and Herren previewing the main points of *Christ and Celtic Christianity*. First eviscerating their assumptions about the Pelagian attitude towards art, Bonner then points out that their postulated common Celtic church goes against the judgments of scholars such as Kathleen Hughes, Wendy Davies, and Donald Meek. Finally, Bonner proposes a different explanation for the Celtic fondness for decorative art over representational art: instead of its being due to so-called Neo-Pelagian influence, it may be due to the fact that Celtic knotwork is easily produced with grids and compasses, whereas figure drawing requires a more artistic skill. Bonner's essay is also useful in a more general way, for his conclusion that the influence of Pelagianism on early Britain and Ireland has been exaggerated is prefaced by a crisp survey of the evidence and its reception by modern scholars.

An important collection of essays on the location and localization of saints' cults, *Local Saints and Local Churches in the Early Medieval West* (Oxford: Oxford UP), was compiled under the editorship of Alan Thacker and Richard Sharpe. Thacker opens the volume with the introductory essay "*Loca sanctorum*: the Significance of Place in the Study of the Saints" (1–43), which surveys the different ways place played a role in the popularization of cults in the early medieval West. Thacker's second contribution, "The Making of a Local Saint" (45–73), investigates the rites associated with saint-making in early Anglo-Saxon England, which he argues deviated little from those begun in Francia by Merovingian court bishops. The prominent feature by the seventh century in both kingdoms was the "freestanding sarcophagus usually of stone and sited behind the altar in a well-lit eastern apse" (63). Richard Sharpe's analysis of the evidence for late Antique cults and their localization is presented in "Martyrs and Local Saints in Late Antique Britain" (75–154). Sharpe concludes that martyr cults did exist in post-Roman Britain, based primarily on the evidence for the cults of St. Alban and St. Sixtus, as well as the existence of secondary relics. The significance of Merovingian influence, which was explored by Thacker in the introduction, is continued in greater detail in John Crook's "The Enshrinement of Local Saints in Francia and England" (189–224), although the conclusions are the same. Catherine Cubitt changes the focus from local to universal cults in "Universal and Local Saints in Anglo-Saxon England" (423–53), which surveys the evidence for two types of popular cults, those with likely lay origin, such as the cult of King Oswald, and those associated with the early fathers and founding figures of monastic communities. Cubitt shows how the literature before Bede exhibited little interest in local saints. "Bede's achievement," she argues, "was also remarkable not only in textualizing native saints but also in universalizing them" (443). Local saints gained in importance because they were less remote and, because relics were often involved, they bolstered community identity in ways that martyrs and other universal saints could

not. The final contributions to the volume are two by John Blair, one a "preliminary list of saints whose principal cult sites are known to have existed, or can reasonably be inferred to have existed, in pre-Conquest England" (495). It does not include Welsh, Cornish or continental saints, except those whose relics were known to have been in England before 1066. In this list, which is organized alphabetically, Blair includes biographical information about the saint, where possible, references to resting-places lists and pre-Conquest litanies, comments, bibliography, and feast day. Blair's essay, "A Saint for Every Minster? Local Cults in Anglo-Saxon England" (455–94), which precedes the handlist, is in large part based on an analysis of its information. Among Blair's conclusions: "there was a basic continuum in the local cult practices of Brittonic and English societies, only superficially obscured by variant patterns in hagiographical output and folklore survival and in the promotion of a few major cults" (486). In other words, Blair's analysis tends to undermine the long-accepted belief that the English and "Celtic" churches were so different, at least in this respect.

The Early Church in Herefordshire: Proceedings of a Conference Held in Leominster in June 2000, ed. Ann Malpas *et al.* (Leominster: Leominster History Study Group, 2001), contains several essays of interest to Anglo-Saxonists. In "The Anglo-Saxon Church in Herefordshire: Four Themes" (3–13), John Blair uses Herefordshire as a case study to survey key developments in the Anglo-Saxon church from 600 to 1100. Topics include continuity with the British church, the importance of family minsters, and the transition from minsters to parish churches. Joe Hillaby's "The Early Church in Herefordshire: Columban and Roman" (41–76) surveys the evidence for the establishment of the two major ecclesiastical foundations in the shire, the monastery of Leominster and the cathedral see of Hereford. The former, he argues, was founded *ca.* 660 by the Columban church, but the latter was chosen for the see in *ca.* 684 for strategic reasons. Much of Hillaby's evidence is a reasoned analysis of each foundation's holdings. Other articles by John Harper, Ann Malpas and Keith Ray consider liturgy, iconography and archaeology. The most significant conclusion is contained in the last: Ray argues that Herefordshire "remained British for as much as two centuries after the economic collapse of 'Roman Britain'" (139).

Steven Basset's *Anglo-Saxon Coventry and Its Churches* (Dugdale Society Occasional Papers 41; Dugdale Society, 2001) is based on very little evidence but nevertheless lays out a convincing case for identifying Holy Trinity Church, one of the two chapels associated with St. Mary's Coventry—the Benedictine abbey turned cathedral in 1139—with

an Anglo-Saxon minster of the first rank. On the basis of what was there later, the citing of the various buildings, and the number of churches in the area, Bassett argues that after Leofric and Godgifu refounded the Benedictine abbey of St. Mary's in 1043, Holy Trinity provided pastoral care for the abbey's tenants. St. Michael's, the other chapel, was perhaps the parochial church for the rest of the minster's parish. Bassett's reconstruction further gives St. Osburg "an authentic role in Coventry's history" (50).

In "Canterbury and Rome: The Limits and Myth of *Romanitas*" (*Roma fra oriente e occidente*: *19–24 aprile 2001* [Spoleto: La Sede del Centro], 797–829), Nicholas Brooks tests the Gregorian and Bedan accounts of Canterbury's links to Rome against the evidence of archeology, codicology, paleography, liturgy, and numismatics. He concludes that the creation of a new "Roman" culture by the seventh-century Roman missionaries was a delicate exercise in myth-making. Many of its aspects—such as monopolies on essential resources, the right to exact tolls, and the production of gold coins—were likely to appeal to Æthelberht and his successors, but the adoption of this agenda required the obliteration of the British past and the denigration of British Christianity. Interestingly, Brooks does not note that this side of the Roman project also might have had its attractions for Anglo-Saxon kings.

Richard Sharpe's short notice, "The Naming of Bishop Ithamar" (*EHR* 117: 889–994), investigates episcopal naming patterns in seventh-century England. Sources show that many early bishops, influenced by Rome, took "ecclesiastical names," such as Honorius and Boniface. It wasn't until *ca.* 660 that English bishops came to be known by their English names, even though this had been the pattern in the British church. Ithamar, who was ordained bishop in 644, took neither a Roman name nor did he keep his English name, according to Sharpe. Rather, he argues for an Old Testament influence. Although the Old Testament was not a popular source for ecclesiastical names on the part of Romans, they were common in the British Isles (e.g., David and Daniel). The implications of this short article are thought provoking. As Sharpe argues, the influence of Old Testament names "attests the otherwise invisible influence of such Britons in the early seventh-century English church" (894).

Clifford Offer, the Archdeacon of Norwich and the Canon Librarian of Norwich Cathedral, goes *In Search of Clofesho* (subtitled *The Case for Hitchin* [Norwich: Tessa]) and provides much circumstantial evidence that Clofesho, where many of the great councils of the church met in the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries, is the Hertfordshire

town now known as Hitchin. Working from the assumption that Clofesho most likely was in Mercia, Offer is convinced of Hitchin's early medieval identity on the basis of two kinds of evidence. The most persuasive is geographical and onomastic: Hitchen possesses a cleft hill (*clofa* + *hoh*), is in an area with many *-hoh* place-names, and is conveniently situated on the Icknield Way at the intersection with the Roman road from Verulamium. The historical evidence is more speculative, for Offer first suggests that Hitchin was a fortified stronghold belonging to the king of Mercia and the site of an early Anglo-Saxon minster, and then he extrapolates backwards from that hypothetical eighth-century situation to argue Hitchin was "therefore" a good place to hold synods in the seventh century.

Brad Bedingfield's "Public Penance in Anglo-Saxon England" (*ASE* 31: 223–55) is concerned with the puzzling fact that public penance is attested by a number of English liturgical witnesses even though Anglo-Saxon England is known to have been "dominated by the system of private penance propagated by the Irish" (226). That evidence for the observance of this custom is scanty and often ambiguous has caused some scholars to doubt whether public penance ever played much of a role in the religious life of the Anglo-Saxons. After a detailed consideration of a broad array of evidence, Bedingfield concludes that the extant liturgical witnesses often fail to adequately differentiate between public penance and more "general" penitential remedies (255). The consequent difficulties involved in distinguishing the two rituals contributed in Bedingfield's view to an erroneous impression that public penance was irrelevant to the religious situation of early England.

Michael Drout considers the question of "Anglo-Saxon Wills and the Inheritance of Tradition in the English Benedictine Reform" (*SELIM* 10: 5–53) and argues that the ten wills mentioning the souls of the testators' ancestors show that the reform influenced the beliefs and practices of lay Anglo-Saxons. Drout begins by linking the dozens of extant wills (all in the vernacular) with monastic scriptoria and reviewing their legal status, structure, and conventions. He then turns to the testators' desire to perpetuate their identity after death and provide remediation for their own souls and those of others. He correlates the wills that mention ancestors' souls with the time of the Benedictine reform, discusses the anomalous ones that date from other periods, and examines the geographic distribution of these wills, which turn out to benefit reform-founding or reformed houses such as Glastonbury, Bath, and Ely. He associates the testators' desire to make permanent dispositions with the perceived permanence of reformed monasteries, and he considers the differences between the wills

of women and men. Charts, maps, tables, and a list of the relevant wills round out this study.

In "St Albans, Westminster and Some Twelfth-century Views of the Anglo-Saxon Past" (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 25: 65–83), Julia Crick considers how the Anglo-Saxon past was shaped, through the production of spurious charters, at post-Conquest Westminster and St. Albans. Although both houses forged charters to authenticate title to estates and immunities, Crick argues that diplomatic similarities between the two suggest "small-scale contamination rather than whole-scale borrowing" (80). While the tendency has been to see St. Albans as a client of Westminster's in the forging business, she points out that some of the forgeries indicate they were rivals for certain estates. In the end, she argues, the monks at Westminster were leaders in the business of forgery, but they were clearly not sole practitioners.

The historiographical use of a saint's incorrupt body is the subject of Virginia Blanton-Whetsell's "*Tota integra, tota incorrupta*: The Shrine of St. Æthelthryth as Symbol of Monastic Autonomy" (*Jnl of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 32: 227–67). In this lengthy article, Blanton-Whetsell explores how the *Liber Eliensis* repeatedly invokes the shrine and incorrupt body of its founder, St. Æthelthryth, "as a rhetorical maneuver by which the community defines its identity as a sovereign and autonomous political entity" (232). Blanton-Whetsell argues that the abbey's estates and autonomy were vulnerable to predation, just as the virgin's body was vulnerable to sexual violence by aggressive suitors, and that the compilers of the *Liber* make the analogy clear through representations of sexualized violence not only against the saint, but against her shrine and community as well.

David Cox explores the lengths to which the thirteenth century monks of Evesham went to distance themselves from their likely tenth-century founder in "St Oswald of Worcester at Evesham Abbey: Cult and Concealment" (*JEH* 53: 269–85). The reason, he suggests, was to protect themselves from encroachment by contemporary bishops of Worcester. The *Gesta abbatum*, written in the thirteenth century, implies it was Æthelwold and not the diocesan, Oswald, who reformed the house, but Cox believes Oswald's role was purposefully suppressed. His argument is based primarily on circumstantial, but striking evidence, that Oswald was actually one of Evesham's premier saints in terms of veneration. The community purportedly possessed a relic (arm or part thereof) of Oswald, and liturgical evidence puts his cult very high among those the community honored. Cox's argument that the monks sought to maintain their coveted papal exemption, granted in the

twelfth century, by downplaying Oswald's role, is speculative, but well reasoned.

c. Ecclesiastical Culture

In "Byzantium, Rome and England in the Early Middle Ages" (*Roma fra oriente e occidente*, 363–400), Michael Lapidge explores the literary contacts between England and Byzantium, which were made possible by both lands' close connections with Rome. Beginning with Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury and Abbot Hadrian, Lapidge proceeds to Willibald's diary of his experiences in Arab-occupied Palestine and Syria, the report of the letter sent to King Alfred requesting funds to rebuild Greek churches in Jerusalem, and the remedies that *Bald's Leechbook* says Patriarch Elias sent to Alfred in connection with the above request. Further direct contacts between Byzantium and England were provided by various Greek visitors to England such as the monk Andreas and the "archbishop" Constantine. Perhaps most interesting of all was the Greek bishop Sigewold (= Nikephoros?), who fell into disfavor with the emperor Constantine Porphyrogennetos, fled to England, and became a respected adviser to King Edgar. Lapidge suggests that Nikephoros was the source of the many Greek words found in the Latin scholarship produced at Winchester under Æthelwold, as well as of the contemporary Byzantine naval terminology found in Ealdorman Æthelweard's *Chronicon*.

Simon Keynes's "Apocalypse Then: England AD 1000" forms one chapter of *Europe Around the Year 1000* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2001, 247–270); Anglo-Saxonists might also be interested in the chapters on Scotland, Ireland, Denmark, the Holy Roman Empire, and the climate. Editor Przemysław Urbańczyk gave his contributors a free hand in their task of commenting on the state of a particular part of Europe at the turn of the last millennium, and Keynes chose to cap an overview of Anglo-Saxon England with an examination of the question of whether the English thought that the year 1000 would bring the end of the world. Both informed and discursive, Keynes covers English geography, society, kingship, law-codes, land-ownership, church, the events of Æthelred's reign, and the important figures associated with him. Keynes then shows that the rhetoric of the Last Days had been directed at the English as early as 601 and as late as 1014, and that there seems not to have any mass hysteria approaching 1000.

In "Ælfric's Schooldays" (*Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, ed. Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser [Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies], 301–

9), Michael Lapidge investigates the homilist's implication that there was a distinction between the Welsh and English pronunciations of Latin. Lapidge argues that "to Ælfric's ear, the Welsh pronunciation of Latin preserved a distinction between short and long vowels" (306), a distinction that suggested a more conservative approach to Latin education in Wales. Although a connection between the Winchester school and Welsh Latin is not immediately obvious, Lapidge suggests that one of Ælfric's teachers was the Welshman Iorwerth, who was probably the author of several Latin poems known to have been composed at Winchester.

M. Bradford Bedingfield's *The Dramatic Liturgy of Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: Boydell) focuses attention on this relatively neglected aspect of English ecclesiastical culture. Drawing from liturgical manuscripts as well as preaching texts and other sources, Bedingfield demonstrates how the Anglo-Saxons expressed the meaning of the main rituals of the liturgical year through their careful staging. After a very useful introduction, the book begins, as the liturgical years begins, with Christmas and Epiphany and proceeds through Candlemas, Ash Wednesday and Lent, Palm Sunday, Holy Week and Easter, Rogationtide and the Ascension. A chapter on baptism is sandwiched between Easter and Rogationtide. Throughought, Bedingfield describes not just the liturgical elements associated with these festivals, but the ways in which lay men and women as well as clerics were made to identify with biblical figures through staging. Such staging, Bedingfield argues, was a "strategy of sympathetic connection" (11), which was reinforced in vernacular preaching. This is an important book with much to offer Anglo-Saxonists of all stripes.

The thesis of Patrizia Lendinara's "Was the Glossator a Teacher?" (*Quaestio* 3: 1–27) is that the "process through which glossaries came into being can sometimes still be traced and studied in surviving manuscripts, and in such cases it provides a valuable index to the way in which Latin texts were studied in medieval schools" (18). Ultimately, however, Lendinara comes to emphasize the limits of what glossarial literature can tell us about the practice of education in early medieval England. While "glossing activity should undoubtedly be seen as a reflex of Medieval English schooling," Lendinara points out that glosses might come about under other auspices that are not as obvious, perhaps issuing "from the hand of a lonely reader intrigued by a text he was perusing for his own study or entertainment. Their copying and bringing together may be dictated by a sort of collector's penchant" (26). Lendinara's essay is a major synthesis of current scholarship on glossarial

literature especially useful for those curious about this important subfield of Old English studies.

d. Society and the Family

In "Politik und Kultur im Britannien des 10. Jahrhunderts" (*Europa im 10. Jahrhundert: Archäologie einer Aufbruchs- zeit; Internationale Tagung in Vorbereitung der Ausstellung 'Otto der Große, Magdeburg und Europa'*, ed. Joachim Hen- ning [Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern], 209–26), Mar- tin Carver brings together a wide range of smaller-scale archeological studies to create a theoretically sophisticated overview of late Anglo-Saxon England. He finds three cul- tural programs there: a Scandinavian one, which is char- acterized by stone monuments and churches owned by laymen; a Celtic one, which is distinguished by monastic centers as well as by stone monuments; and that of Wessex, which is identified by a centralized diocesan church and a network of urban fortifications. These programs represent three kinds of social organization. The Scandinavian pro- gram privileges the aristocracy and the individual lord; the Celtic-monastic system is sustained through donations of land, which provide the means of living for non-inherit- ing sons; and the West Saxon organization depends on its centralized taxation and its royal church to keep power in the hands of the king, suppressing the initiatives and aspi- rations of the aristocracy. Carver sees this last program as proceeding to a considerable extent from the Anglo-Sax- ons' ideas about Rome, rather than entirely following the principles of the Frankish empire of the Carolingians.

e. Gender and Identity

In "Anglo-Saxon Women: The Art of Concealment" (*Leeds Studies in English* 33: 31–51), Gale R. Owen-Crocker exam- ines the positioning of names on Anglo-Saxon artifacts and finds that in most cases, men's names are located in the most visible places, whereas women's names tend to be hidden. She interprets this as evidence that women's roles were less public than men's but were not without power and the worth of self-recognition.

An essay by Clare Lees and Gillian R. Overing ("The Clerics and the Critics: Misogyny and the Social Symbolic in Anglo-Saxon England," in *Gender and Debate from the Early Middle Ages to the Renaissance,* ed. Thelma S. Fen- ster and Clare A. Lees [New York: Palgrave], 19–39) seeks to counter the presumption among some scholars that Anglo-Saxon England has little to contribute to contem- porary debates about gender in the Middle Ages. Among the causes Lees and Overing identify to explain the fact that "Anglo-Saxon culture barely enters modern critical

consciousness about medieval debates on gender" is that "this period is not seen as making an identifiable 'case' for, or against, women" and accordingly is seen as having little to tell us about the vigorous debates over the status of women that surface in the later Middle Ages (19). Lees and Over- ing argue that such views may reflect, among other things, a widespread inattention to the predominantly "proscrip- tive" rhetoric adopted by Anglo-Saxon sources when the conversation turns to women. The primary question in much Old English literature is not whether the category "woman" is to be condemned or exalted—Lees and Over- ing in fact argue that the existence of such a category is not apparent in any extant sources—but rather what women should and should not do. The marginality of Anglo-Saxon England within the contemporary scholarly discussion of gender is also held to be an effect of periodization strat- egies that unconsciously emphasize the "originary" and "tribal" nature of the pre-Conquest era, with deleterious results for Old English sources: "In such a narrative, the medieval world starts to resemble the modern only after the Anglo-Saxon period" (26). This essay makes a num- ber of suggestive observations, among them that the tra- ditional opposition of "Christian" and "pagan" elements in *Beowulf* ignores the presence within this and other poems of a "[d]idacticism … predicated on a notion of a desir- ing and volitional self … that is educable through such dis- ciplinary processes as exegesis (spiritual interpretation of Scripture, sermons, and saints' lives) and ritualized behav- ior" (27). Thus, while the presence of "Christianity" as con- ventionally understood may be somewhat muted within the poem, there is less doubt about the extent to which the "sociohistorical formations" engendered by Christian- ity structure its contents. Conspicuously absent from this essay is a summary of the debates over marriage and gen- der in the code of Æthelberht. Old English legislation is in fact hardly discussed at all with the exception of a single reference to Alfred's code. Some reference to the Biblical origins of the characterization of woman as wisdom in the pseudo-Bedan *Collectanea* would have been helpful. Given the importance of such statements to the argument of this essay, it would have been worthwhile for the authors to dis- tinguish the portions of this *topos* that are clearly deriva- tive from those that may reflect attitudes toward women in Anglo-Saxon England. These absences may be due to the essay's being a summary of a much longer work, and they do not get in the way of its being a major contribution to an important discussion.

As much as we value elegance and logic in our schol- arship, students of humanity must acknowledge that real life can be untidy and inconclusive. D.M. Hadley certainly demonstrates this in "Viking and Native: Re-thinking

Identity in the Danelaw" (*Early Medieval Europe* 11: 45–70), which touches on a large number of areas in which a "Danish" identity might have been manifested in tenth- and eleventh-century England and essentially argues that these areas do not support the identification of a "Danish" identity in any sustained way. There evidently was no clear and innate ethnic difference between the descendants of the Danes and the English north of Watling Street; whatever the inhabitants of England wished to signify about themselves and their world in the later ninth and tenth centuries, they did not do so with reference to artifacts drawn exclusively from either Scandinavia or England. Although it is frustrating to learn that neither language nor place-names, personal names, material culture, artwork, burial practices, or skeletal evidence can be used to distinguish the English from the descendants of the Danes, Hadley's proposal to interpret expressions of ethnicity based on their contemporary political context makes sense.

Antonina Harbus's "The Medieval Concept of the Self in Anglo-Saxon England" (*Self and Identity* 1: 77–97) is an attempt to demonstrate to modern psychologists some things that are well-known to medievalists, namely, that people in the Middle Ages had a strong sense of themselves as individuals with separate identities and were no strangers to introspection and identity crisis. She develops this into a study of the psychology revealed in Old English poetry that is prefaced by a review of the ideas about the soul and the self in the Anglo-Saxon Christian prose material. Focusing on *The Wife's Lament*, *The Seafarer*, and *The Wanderer*, Harbus concludes that the poems encode the Anglo-Saxon understanding of the self as the dominantly reflective individual identity, dynamic, private, and often troubled. The interest in self-reform and the idea of the self as a source of agency have close parallels in modern psychology. But whereas introspection is considered a process of self-discovery today, in Anglo-Saxon England it seemed to be a process of mental realignment, needed to shape power over individual reality. The Anglo-Saxon distinction between self and mind is a further difference from modern psychological concepts of fragmented or multiple identities.

John Hines explores the symbolic use of material culture by both "Culture Groups and Ethnic Groups in Northern Germany in and around the Migration Period" (*Studien zur Sachsenforschung* 13: 219–232). He begins with a comparison of the approaches of German archeologists studying the Saxons and British archeologists studying the Anglo-Saxons; this leads to a consideration of the importance of theoretical archeology for both endeavors. The central part of the essay illustrates Hines's thesis that the

Germanic material must be understood as actively creating group identity, whether with the purpose of differentiating groups (as in the contrasts in the material culture cultivated in the "Saxon," Anglian, and Kentish areas of England), or with the purpose of establishing transregional identification among the elite (as in the adoption of Frankish and Thuringian styles of dress-accessories in an area of the Continent formerly Saxon). Hines closes with a plea for the inclusion of identity as one of the essential elements of archeological analysis, and a very persuasive case he makes for it.

Elaborating on the question "Welsh and English: Mutual Origins in Post-Roman Britain?" (*Studia Celtica* 34: 81–104), John Hines accepts the common notion that the idea of Wales required the presence of an England for it to be defined against, and goes on to argue the reverse as well. After reviewing first the Anglo-Saxon employment of material culture to symbolize group identity and then the development of the sense of "Englishness," Hines turns to the relationships between the Britons and the English in the fifth to seventh centuries. Using the examples of metalwork, dress-accessories, and art styles, he finds hybridization within one group, transitions across the border of neighboring groups, and long-distance exchange between widely separated groups. After surveying the textual evidence for the rhetorical unification of the Britons, Hines concludes that Celtic/Anglo-Saxon difference in Britain was nurtured culturally and ethnically and was only subsequently adopted politically. The idea that the Welsh and the English developed in antagonistic isolation from each other is not supported by the archeological evidence.

In "The Kingdom and Name of Elmet" (*Northern History* 39: 157–71), Andrew Breeze brings us up to date regarding the available evidence relating to the Celtic kingdom of Elmet, which became a buffer state between Northumbria and Mercia until it was conquered by Edwin of Northumbria in 616 or 617. As well as reviewing the Latin and Celtic sources and summarizing the scholarly disputes around their interpretation, Breeze adds his own speculations as to the meaning of the name, suggesting that *el* + *met* is "(those who) cut down many" (i.e., killers, warriors). Finally, he accepts the identification of Gwallog—a name known from Welsh poetry—as the king of Elmet in the 580s and offers interpretations of three fragments of poems about him. As this identification is possible but not proven, these interpretations are correspondingly open to question.

Another of Breeze's onomastic musings is presented in "The Battle of *Alutthèlia* in 844 and Bishop Auckland"

(*Northern History* 39: 124–25), which argues that the place-name *Alutthèlia* is a corrupted Latinization of *Alclut* (i.e., *Al Clut* 'Rock on the Clyde') plus *thelu* (OE pl., 'planks, plank bridge'). The location of this "Plank Bridge at Al Clut" is identified as Bishop Auckland, eight miles south-south-west of Durham.

f. The Economy, Settlement and Landscape

Christopher Dyer's *Making a Living in the Middle Ages. The People of Britain 850–1520* (New Haven: Yale UP) is a lucid account of Britain's social and economic development from the Viking age to the Reformation. Drawing on recent work in a variety of fields, but impressively devoid of jargon, Dyer's survey is divided into three parts, the first of which will be of the most interest to our readers. Part One, "Origins of the Medieval Economy, c. 850–1100," traces the major economic developments such as the tendency toward nucleation in the so-called "village belt" (the swath of land running along England's eastern side from Scotland down through the midlands to Dorset and Hampshire), the imposition of field systems and concomitant developments in resource management, the fragmentation of great estates, and the rise of towns. The expectations of England's landowners, townsmen, and peasants are also considered throughout the three chapters that comprise this first part. Chapters two and three also consider the impact of Viking incursions and the growth of the state on the economic development of Britain (including Scotland and Wales). Consistent with recent historiography, Dyer argues that the Vikings influenced, but did not transform, the English economy. Indirectly, the growth of the state in response to the Vikings did play a formative role in economic transformation, particularly in the imposition of a uniform and stable coinage. In terms of towns, Dyer conjectures that as much as 10% of the population lived in an urban setting between 1066 and 1086, up from about 2% in *ca.* 850. The final chapter in part 3, "Conquest, c. 1050-c.1100," primarily concerns the post-Conquest period (notably the evidence in Domesday Book), but begins by discussing the social and economic effects of an increase in thegns in pre-Conquest England. The book is clearly aimed at a more general audience, as it lacks scholarly apparatus, but a short bibliography makes it useful for college courses and for scholars looking to come up to speed on their economic history.

Dyer's second piece follows up his work in the *Cambridge Urban History* volume with a look at the significance of small towns in "Small Places with Large Consequences: The Importance of Small Towns in England, 1000–1540" (*Historical Research* 75: 1–24). Although this article deals almost exclusively with the period 1086 to 1500, readers who are interested in English urbanization will surely find this survey worth their time. I have always admired the clarity of Dyer's prose, and once again he does not disappoint. Small towns, he argues, have fared poorly in modern historiography, despite the importance they played in England's social, economic and political development. Comprising 80% of all towns, those with a population of fewer than 2,000 inhabitants were nevertheless similar in quality to larger towns and boroughs; they featured, for instance, occupational variety, a distinctive topography, social stratification, self-governance and cultural activities. The difference, Dyer argues, was, in most cases, only one of scale. The article concludes with a consideration of the function of small towns, which were, not surprisingly centers of exchange for the surrounding countryside, but also opportunities for people to pursue different ways of life. In the end, small towns were important for three reasons. One, they tell us a great deal about informal governance because they lacked the layers of restriction and regulation of boroughs. Two, they acted as "barometers of economic and social change" (23); for instance, the growing prosperity of some small towns after the Black Death suggests these two centuries were not as grim as previously thought. Finally, distinctions among small towns contribute to discussions of regional difference, which have typically only been made with reference to the world of lords and peasants.

The central concern of Paolo Squatriti's "Digging Ditches in Early Medieval Europe" (*Past & Present* 176: 11–65) is Charlemagne's grand but failed digging project of 793, which aimed to link the Danube and Main rivers. Because the extant evidence does not fully explain why it was even attempted, Squatriti widens his inquiry to examine several other large trenches built in the "long eighth century" in Jutland, Mercia and Thrace. For Anglo-Saxonists, then, the examination of Offa's Dyke might be of interest. This is a very long article, the conclusion to which is fairly straightforward: rulers such as Offa and Charlemagne sought to consolidate and express their power through the building of monumental projects like trenches. While they certainly had strategic and territorial ramifications, Squatriti argues that more than anything they were signs that the rulers who built them were worthy of respect along these contested borders precisely because they could compel the labor and resources of thousands of locals.

"A Late Saxon Pottery Industry in Staffordshire: A Review" (*Medieval Ceramics* 22-23: 11–36) is a substantial yet deliberately inconclusive survey of what is known about the production and distribution of Stafford-type pottery in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Debbie Ford explains

that she is in the middle of further investigations, and until they are complete, she can only discuss the geological and geographical contexts, the historical background, the evidence for pottery production in Staffordshire, the dating evidence from the production sites, the pottery itself, the source of the materials, how Stafford-type ware compares to other types of late Anglo-Saxon pottery, and the distribution of Stafford-type ware. She ends with several unanswered questions and other issues worth exploring, such as the fingerprints left by Anglo-Saxon potters on their work.

As James Graham-Campbell explains, "The Dual Economy of the Danelaw" (subtitled "The Howard Linecar Memorial Lecture 2001," *British Numismatic Journal* 71: 49–59) refers to the use of bullion as well as coinage as media of exchange. Graham-Campbell uses the route of the "Great Army" of Danes to organize his survey of hoards of gold and silver deposited between 871–930, and he concludes that while there is very clear evidence for the introduction of a bullion economy by the Great Army in the 860s, its continuation as late as the 920s anywhere in the Danelaw is less certain, despite the opinions on this topic held by the otherwise much esteemed scholar Mark Blackburn.

Two articles of relevance to our readers appeared in *East Anglia's History: Studies in Honour of Norman Scarfe*, ed. C. Harper-Bill *et al.* (Woodbridge: Boydell). The first, James Campbell's "Domesday Herrings" (5–17), is a dense but useful survey of major developments, mainly post-Conquest, in the herring and salt industries. Campbell focuses on major towns such as Dunwich, Yarmouth and Norwich, but also considers developments across the region. Although interesting, Carole Rawcliffe's contribution, "'On the Threshold of Eternity': Care for the Sick in the East Anglian Monasteries" (41–72) looks only at the post-Conquest period.

"The Use of Soil Analysis in the Interpretation of an Early Historic Landscape at Puxton in Somerset" (*Landscape History* 23: 27–38), by S.J. Rippon, M.H. Martin, and A.W. Jackson, correlates the results of soil analysis at a medieval site with the results of earthwork surveys, fieldwalking, and archaeological excavation. The soil tests included the relatively untried technique of heavy metal analysis in addition to the well-established techniques of phosphate analysis and magnetic susceptibility. The authors found that both medieval occupation and post-medieval dumping can produce very similar chemical signatures and that other techniques are required to distinguish the two.

Helena Hamerow's "Angles, Saxons and Anglo-Saxons: Rural centres, trade and production" (*Die Altsachsen im*

Spiegel der nationalen und internationalen Sachsenforschung: Neue Forschungsergebnisse, ed. Hans-Jürgen Häßler; Studien zur Sachsenforschung 13 [Oldenburg: Isensee, 1999], 189–205) compares the role of long-distance trade and non-agrarian production in rural settlements in Migration Age and Viking Age England with that in the continental homelands of the Anglo-Saxons. For example, new evidence from Schleswig-Holstein reveals that almost all categories of long-distance trade goods found at the trading center of Hedeby are also well represented at the Viking Age settlements of Schuby and Kosel. Migration Age sites likewise show that the surplus production and redistribution of basic commodities such as pottery, querns, whetstones, and iron could be organized and operated by agrarian village communities. The evidence for a similar situation in Anglo-Saxon England is much less clear-cut, but nothing disproves that the situations were indeed parallel. Hamerow calls for more archeological investigation of English rural sites and for better analysis of what has already been found.

J.R. Maddicott's "Prosperity and Power in the Age of Bede and Beowulf" (*PBA* 117: 49–71) takes on the fascinating question of how Anglo-Saxon kings came to exploit the extraordinary prosperity of the seventh and eighth centuries, thereby permitting the institution of kingship to attain new heights of power. His thesis is that demands for rents and hospitality from their subjects, along with whatever wealth would have been acquired through plunder, would in themselves have been insufficient to transform kingship into the sort of institution we encounter in Alfred's era. Far more important was the emergence of England as a center for the production of woolen cloth (whose quality is lauded in a number of extant sources) along with the rise of a thoroughly monetized economy. As they constituted an imperishable and easily portable item of exchange, coins allowed for the development of new forms of taxation and thus augmented the revenues that royal households might accumulate, while the establishment of the *wics* "allowed much foreign trade to be channeled through a few fixed points and so taxed more easily" (65).

g. Law, Politics, and Warfare

Along with Patrick Wormald's *Making of English Law* (1999)*,* Lisi Oliver's *Beginnings of English Law* (Toronto: U of Toronto P) is one of the major contributions to the study of pre-Conquest legislation to have emerged in the last several decades. Though its scope is more limited than the title implies (the book in fact confines itself to a description of the royal legislation of early Kent as attested in the twelfth-century *Textus Roffensis*), Oliver's study

deftly employs the methods of comparative philology to sketch from this notoriously taciturn body of legislation our most detailed portrait to date of the social and institutional world underlying the earliest written English law. The book is a revision of Oliver's 1995 doctoral dissertation, the first study of the code of Æthelberht to offer a range of cogent phonological and syntactic evidence in favor of the text's archaism. Those familiar with the dissertation will find an even richer study containing an authoritative and highly entertaining introduction to the historical circumstances surrounding the arrival of written law in England, comprehensive discussions of the many interpretive problems with which generations of philologists and historians have contended, and editions of the Kentish codes which give the reader a more accurate sense of their manuscript setting. (Its edition alone represents a great leap forward from F.L. Attenborough's edition of 1922, whose status as the "standard" for English-speaking scholars into the present is primarily attributable to its being the *only* modern translation of early Anglo-Saxon legislation published in English since Benjamin Thorpe's *Ancient Laws and Institutes.*) Indeed, one of the book's true marks of distinction is that it engages so many disparate aspects of Old English legislation so successfully; certainly not since Felix Liebermann's edition have these texts found an editor with such a firm grasp of philology and history. Many of Oliver's claims about the code of Æthelberht seem rooted in a conviction that the code should be seen as an example of archaic Germanic lawmaking preserving traces of both the vocabulary and style of early law—a conviction shared with some of the code's earlier editors and commentators from Jacob Grimm to Dorothy Bethurum, and confirmed by a wealth of evidence, much of which is given a fuller exposition here than in any other discussion of the code. (That such a study exists in English would itself have consoled Frederic William Maitland, who upon the publication of Liebermann's *Gesetze der Angelsachsen* famously lamented the permanent loss of the Anglo-Saxon laws to German scholarship.) Whether the approach described above is invariably the best to assume toward these materials may eventually seem a legitimate matter for debate. This is particularly the case given the new tendency in Old English scholarship to look critically at the supposedly objective basis upon which the great legal historians and philologists of the nineteenth century reconstructed a unified system of Germanic law—an issue that is given great significance in Wormald's *Making of English Law* but does not receive much discussion here. Certainly one cannot avoid acknowledging the perils inherent in the methods employed by Grimm and Heinrich Brunner, however indispensable they have been, and some attempt to acknowledge the increasingly circumspect attitude of

scholarship toward the assumptions upon which this study heavily depends might have been welcome. This is, however, a small complaint about a text that will certainly do much to advance our understanding of Anglo-Saxon legislation, and whose arguments about the many fascinating interpretive problems posed by this code are the best that have been made available for many decades.

2001 also saw the arrival of an important essay collection containing two noteworthy contributions to Anglo-Saxon legal history—particularly those branches concerned with perceptions of the Anglo-Saxon past in the later Middle Ages. Anthony Musson's "Appealing to the Past: Perceptions of Law in Late-Medieval England" (*Expectations of the Law in the Middle Ages,* ed. Musson [Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001], 165–180) is concerned with the rhetorical significance that legislative monuments of the eleventh and twelfth centuries attained in the public imagination. Musson's article offers an illuminating discussion of what was often at stake in allusions to pre-Conquest history in writing of the late Middle Ages, and of the process by which early sources came to acquire evidential value in the settlement of disputes. Musson observes a developing tension in juridical writing between the evolving concept of precedent and that of "right," a term denoting "a form of natural justice characterized by reason and rationality" employed by judges who had grown protective of their freedom to interpret the law apart from the dictates of prior decisions. He also notes the capacity of some legislative monuments to attain "symbolic status" as "touchstone[s] of good governance" (175), a tendency that contributed to the Anglo-Saxon past being imagined by many in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries as a kind of "Golden Age" that could be "located under the codes of legislative icons such as Alfred, Cnut, and St Edward the Confessor" (179). Julia Crick's "Liberty and Fraternity: Creating and Defending the Liberty of St Albans" (91–194) is a narrower but equally satisfying consideration of the evolving deployment of precedent in post-conquest litigation whose focal point is the unusual "zone of legal privilege" enjoyed for over eight hundred years by the monastic community at St. Albans. Securing these privileges required this community to demonstrate repeatedly the descent of their freedoms from directives issued by Anglo-Saxon kings; the founder of the house was alleged on the authority of charter evidence to be Offa, king of Mercia. Crick observes that the arguments advanced by the monks "uniformly rested on fundamentally anachronistic expectations" (91), an inescapable conclusion given Wormald's observation that charters guaranteeing exemptions like those enjoyed by St. Albans are invariably inauthentic. According to Crick, effacing the "fundamentally anachronistic" character of their claims may

have required the house to exploit the ambiguities inherent in the word *libertas,* a term common in pre-Conquest charters whose more expansive meaning in the later Middle Ages was undoubtedly substituted for the more limited meaning that had obtained in Anglo-Saxon England. "Whatever its original meaning," Crick argues, "the mere presence of the word *libertas* in the archive left it open to later misconstruction and reconstruction" (99).

An important legal text whose background has long been in need of a satisfactory discussion finally receives it in Bruce O'Brien's "The *Instituta Cnuti* and the Translation of English Law" (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 25: 177–97), a major examination of this twelfth-century Latin rendering of portions of Cnut's code along with selections from the legislation of Edgar and Alfred. According to O'Brien, Liebermann's tendency to present texts such as the *Instituta* as "subservient to their sources" led scholars who depended on his edition to be less interested in the question of what the text and its counterparts (the *Quadripartitus, Consiliatio Cnuti,* and *Leges Henrici Primi*) might be able to tell us about the culture of translation that produced them. It is this problem that O'Brien addresses after a comprehensive discussion of the text's editorial history and a tweaking of the stemma that appears in Liebermann's edition. (That the *Instituta* was sufficiently popular to have left us with so many witnesses is itself an argument for a fuller exploration of its backgrounds.) O'Brien notes that the form in which Liebermann chose to edit the *Instituta* suggests an oversimplified understanding of the nature of translation in the period after the Conquest, one which perhaps discourages consideration of the *Instituta* as an independent text. How the *Instituta* functions not merely as a translation of one or more vernacular witnesses of Cnut's code, but as an autonomous treatise on pre-Conquest institutions, is thus the main issue with which O'Brien's study is concerned. Since the author of the *Instituta* has furnished us with no explicit statement of his purposes, his intentions must be inferred from his method. That his text reflects the attitudes of a Norman audience is clear from the privileged position it gives to Cnut's code, as Cnut was clearly an object of Norman fascination. Also of significance is the possibility that the *Instituta* may have been viewed as possessing sufficient authority to function as a "replacement for the source," as its treatment in the *Textus Roffensis,* a compilation otherwise inclined to include original Old English source texts, would seem to indicate, for here it appears where we would expect to find Cnut's code (189). It is probably significant that "no surviving manuscript copy of the *Instituta* combines both Old English source texts and Latin translation" in the manner of Liebermann's edition (189). O'Brien ultimately argues that the *Instituta*

and its counterparts "reflected not only the immediate needs of insular audiences after 1066, but also the rise of Latin in the late eleventh and twelfth century as part of the intellectual and cultural renaissance in western Europe, a renaissance in large part propelled by translation" (196). While it is true that Norman-English relations are important to understanding the background of these translations, O'Brien contends that to fully appreciate their significance we must understand that the eleventh- and twelfth-century culture of translation prized "barbarian knowledge," which would have been understood in this era as "anything outside of the three sacred languages: Hebrew, Greek, and Latin" (197). One of the chief virtues of O'Brien's study is that it opens up new avenues of inquiry. The work of situating the twelfth-century compilations of Old English law within their cultural context may yield fascinating results for future historical scholarship.

In "Reading between the Lines: The Place of Mercia within an Expanding Wessex" (*Midland History* 27: 1–15), Nicola Cumberledge challenges the conventional view that that various Anglo-Saxon kingdoms amalgamated peacefully into one under the leadership of the house of Wessex. Her reconstruction of the narrative of the formation of England examines the ninth-to-tenth-century expansion of West Saxon rule from the perspective of Mercia. Using evidence ranging from the titles given to the Mercian Ealdorman Æthelred to the poem *The Battle of Brunanburh* (which she sees as asserting rather than suppressing claims for Mercian independence), she concludes that the Mercian acceptance of and cooperation with West Saxon rule co-existed with separatist inclinations up until 1017.

Richard Abels rexamines the evidence for the military campaigns of Kings Alfred and Æthelred in "From Alfred to Harold II: The Military Failure of the Late Anglo-Saxon State" (*The Normans and Their Adversaries at War: Essays in Memory of C. Warren Hollister*, ed. Richard P. Abels and Bernard S. Bachrach [Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001], 15–30) to determine why the former was successful and the latter seemingly not. Challenging popular notions, including the idea that they faced very different threats, Abels finds that Alfred's revolutionary (and successful) defensive measures, including the burghal system and a year-round standing army, were allowed to detiorate over time, so much so that by the time Æthelred faced a similar threat, "the very memory of Alfred's burghal system had been forgotten" (23). Although Æthelred undertook his own building program and sought to strengthen his fighting forces, Abels argues that his lack of an overall defensive strategy, together with disloyalty and incompetence on the part of his own nobility, led to the king's ultimate failure.

In "Some Reflections on the 'Foreign Policy' of Edgar 'the Peaceable'" (*Haskins Soc. Jnl* 10: 17–37), Shashi Jayakumar re-examines Edgar's reputation as a "peaceable" king, which he argues was "carefully cultivated by the Worcester/York nexus via Ælfric and Wulfstan" (21). Citing some ancillary evidence that Edgar ruled with an iron fist, Jayakumar investigates the possibility that Edgar, like many kings throughout Christendom, employed Viking mercenaries to help keep the much-heralded peace. Although he admits it is pure conjecture, Jayakumar makes a good case for viewing the incident at Chester in 973, in which Edgar supposedly received the submission of many kings, as a recruiting effort, particularly of war-fleets under the command of neighboring Scandinanvians.

Ryan Lavelle's *Æthelred II: King of the English 978–1016* (Stroud: Tempus) is heavily dependent on Simon Keynes's conclusions in his masterful study of the king's charters, *The Diplomas of King Æthelred 'the Unready' 978–1016: A Study in their Use as Historical Evidence* (Cambridge, 1980), and is therefore based on solid historiographical footing. It is, however, not a particularly easy read, and I would prefer to recommend Ann Williams's biography, *Æthelred the Unready. The Ill-Counselled King* (Hambledon), published in 2003 and to be reviewed in next year's *YWOES*.

In the author's preface, Frank Barlow tells us that he agreed to write *The Godwins: The Rise and Fall of a Noble Dynasty* (Harlow: Longman) to keep himself busy in his old age, and there may be an element of truth to this. But this is no mere scholarly diversion; rather it is, in many respects, the culmination of a long and illustrious career of an eminent historian of Anglo-Saxon England, its institutions and its sources. Among his many publishing credits Barlow counts the edition and translation of the primary source for this family, the *Vita Ædwardi Regis*, and a biography of King Edward the Confessor; thus few are as well suited to writing the story of this important family. Even fewer could have done so in such an engaging and reasoned manner. The usefulness of this survey of the family's rise to power in the 1020s and its devastating collapse in 1066 lies less in what new light it sheds on the subject than in its ability to cast light broadly on the people and events both central and peripheral to the political events it details. Despite its relative brevity, this book should find welcome space on the shelf of specialist and general reader alike.

J.L. Grassi's reassessment of the wealth of the penultimate king of Anglo-Saxon England, entitled "The Lands and Revenues of Edward the Confessor" (*EHR* 117: 251–83) attempts to provide a more comprehensive survey than those previously provided by scholars such as Frank Barlow, R.H. Davis, and, more recently, Robin Fleming. Grassi asserts that all have underestimated Edward's wealth (and therefore his political strength) because they did not include certain estates, dues, and renders that he believes contributed to the king's overall balance sheet. In other words, these scholars have approached the subject too conservatively. As a correction, Grassi proposes to include estates known to have belonged to King Edward but not assessed pre-Conquest values (by appropriating their post-Conquest values), to attribute to Edward estates held by King William but not known to have been held by Edward, and to include various revenues besides land, such as tributes and tolls paid by towns and their burgess, nights' farm, and others. The end result is, not surprisingly, a much higher figure: where Davis valued Edward's lands at £5,000 and Fleming around £6,000, Grassi's valuation produces the significantly higher figure of £8,100. Because of Domesday's notorious incompleteness and inconsistencies across counties, it is very unlikely we will ever know who is correct. In the end, though, it probably does not matter, since Grassi's conclusions are the same as everyone else's: the wealth and power of Godwinesons were unrivaled among the earls, but King Edward clearly held his own. Given David Roffe's recent caution against using the survey in this manner at all (see the review in 2000 *YWOES*), there is something to be said for at least approaching it conservatively.

Benton Rain Patterson's *Harold and William: The Battle for England A.D. 1064–1066* (New York: Cooper Square Press) is a popular account that draws on the work of Frank Barlow, Denis Butler, David C. Douglas, Rupert Furneaux, David Howarth, Alan Lloyd, Edwin Tetlow, and Peter Poyntz Wright. In his afterword, Patterson implies that his aim was to provide a version of the events that was not only readable—rather than "dull"—but that was also in chronological order. Historians, consider yourselves rebuked.

The rationale for Stephen Pollington's *The English Warrior from the Earliest Times to 1066* (Hockwold-Cum-Wilton, Norf.: Anglo-Saxon Books, 1996) is the curious assertion that in spite of his "almost central position in the pre-Christian English social scheme" and his significance to the most well-known monuments of Old English verse, scholarly interest in "the warrior … has been lessened by a climate which is, in the main, unfavorable towards military subjects" (21). Pollington laments that it has been "acceptable for some time to praise early English Christianity and learning, but not to take due note of the political and military success which made possible the performance and preservation of these other accomplishments," all of which is evidence in his view for "an extraordinary

double-standard" (21). The ensuing discussion, which depends heavily on lengthy quotations from *Beowulf* and Tacitus to delineate the nature of "the Germanic warrior mentality" (22), ultimately does not demonstrate the justice of the swipe at contemporary scholarship with which this study begins. Readers are unlikely to leave this book with an impression that they know a great deal more about the martial life of Anglo-Saxon England than they knew before. Like so many books that are indifferent to developments within contemporary scholarship, Pollington's study often seems, particularly in its insistence that there are no Christian theological influences on *Beowulf,* and in its faith that the poem is "very much a window onto a vanished world" (22) rather than an idealized one, a throwback to the attitudes that dominated Old English studies in the nineteenth century. The book does contain a lively and thorough discussion of Anglo-Saxon weapons and methods of warfare that is not without interest.

Bernard S. Bachrach's *Warfare and Military Organization in Pre-Crusade Europe* (Aldershot: Ashgate) is a collection of articles that originally appeared between 1975 and 1995. Four items are of particular interest to Anglo-Saxonists. "*Caballus et Caballarius* in Medieval Warfare" provides many interesting details about the needs of warhorses and their riders in the early Middle Ages, with the Bayeux Tapestry used as a major source of information. "Military Technology and Garrison Organization: Some Observations on Anglo-Saxon Military Thinking in Light of the Burghal Hideage" gives a practical analysis of the kind of fighting predicated by the Anglo-Saxon network of fortifications. The attackers were expected to storm the defenses but not use siege weapons, and the defenders evidently used bows and short pikes, not long-swords or two-handed axes. A mathematical appendix calculates the effectiveness of a barrage of arrows. "On the Origins of William the Conqueror's Horse Transports" looks at the question of how William managed to transport a herd of two or three thousand horses in battle-ready condition across the English Channel. Bachrach argues that the Bayeux Tapestry cannot possibly be accurate in its depiction of the horses being transported in the same kind of ships that carried the footsoldiers. Instead, the medieval sources indicating that special ships were used for the horses should be accepted. Most likely the design for the horse transports was of Byzantine provenance and reached William through Normans who had spent time in southern Italy and Sicily. "Some Observations on the Military Administration of the Norman Conquest" considers the logistics of housing the Norman invasion force in the month before they crossed the Channel. Bachrach looks at issues ranging from the number of men and horses (and the amount of

excrement produced by same) to the identity of the magnate responsible for running the camp (most likely Roger II of Montgomery). Two appendices treat the garrisons at Pevensey and Hastings and the number of English males eligible for military service.

Arne Emil Christensen's "Dark Age Naval Power: Superb Seamanship or Not?" (*International Jnl of Nautical Archaeology* 31: 134–136) turns out to be a review of the second edition of John Haywood's *Dark Age Naval Power* (1999), and a critical review it is. Among the book's many shortcomings are these: Haywood relies on non-specialist archeological works, reads too much into historical sources, and—worst of all—confuses boatsmanship on inland waters with the quite different activity of seafaring proper.

Kelly DeVries invokes the notion of "military legitimacy" in his account of the Welsh-English wars of the mid-eleventh century ("Harold Godwinson in Wales: Military Legitimacy in Late Anglo-Saxon England," in *The Normans and Their Adversaries at War*, ed. Abels and Bachrach, 65–85). That is, in the Middle Ages, conquest was an accepted justification for asserting one's right to rule. DeVries reviews the attempts of Edward the Confessor to prevent Welsh raiding in Herefordshire, which culminated with Harold Godwinson's invasion of Wales and the beheading of the Welsh king by his own subjects, whom Harold had presumably cowed. This exercise of military power, DeVries suggests, was so impressive that it forced Edward to revoke his bequest of the English throne to Duke William of Normandy and grant it to Harold instead.

Ian G. Peirce's *Swords of the Viking Age* (Woodbridge: Boydell) is the first book-length treatment of this subject since Jan Petersen's *De Norske Vikingesverd* in 1919. It is actually something of a collaborative effort, with Ewart Oakeshott supplying an introduction, Lee A. Jones providing an overview of hilt and blade classifications and a discussion of blade construction and pattern welding. Peirce is responsible for eight color plates and the catalogue of sixty swords, each illustrated with one or more photographs, ownership and accession number, details such as date, find-place, overall length, length of cross, location of balance point, condition, and type, and a descriptive essay and bibliography. The examples are organized first by hilt type and then by blade type. The choice of examples is a good one, with selections being made from sites in Ireland, England, Holland, Norway, Denmark, and Finland. The catalogue is also valuable for its excellent, detailed photographs and its willingness to grapple with the question of the relationship between the later forms of the Viking sword and the earlier forms of the medieval longsword.

The book as a whole is therefore a most useful contribution (not least for its inclusion of the finds from Finland and its evaluation of the various hilt and blade typologies), but readers are strongly cautioned to ignore everything in the introduction except for the overview of hilt types (3–6). Oakeshott may know a lot about swords, but he is hilariously misinformed about the Vikings, the sagas, and the *Song of Roland*.

h. Vikings

The Scandinavians from the Vendel Period to the Tenth Century: An Ethnographic Perspective, ed. Judith Jesch (Woodbridge: Boydell) explores the continuities between pre-Viking-Age and Viking-Age Scandinavia and hence is primarily aimed at Scandinavianists, but two of its essays will be of interest to Anglo-Saxonists. David Dumville's "Vikings in the British Isles: A Question of Sources" is far more than an evaluation of the written sources for this period of history. Claiming that current historical approaches are in disarray, due to our allowing the separate national sources to create a fragmented view of the Vikings, Dumville calls for a broader vision on the part of scholars, accompanied by a rigorous assessment of the texts. He begins with a high-level survey of the sources, followed by a review of their major shortcomings. He then spells out the results of these limitations on the scholarship and hence some areas of research that have been neglected. Going on to examine what a composite picture of Viking activity across the British Isles might be like, Dumville assumes that the underlying intention of the Scandinavians there was to take control, an assumption he sees as justified by various developments in trade networks, patriotism, cultural hybridism, and political change. This assumption allows him to accept some research results and reject others. He concludes with still further questions suggested by Viking activity on the Continent but largely unexplored for the British Isles. This important essay ought to be read by any Anglo-Saxonist dealing with the Vikings, as should the transcript of the discussion that followed, which teases out some loose ends in Dumville's model, most importantly the relationship or overlap between the categories of "Viking" and "settler." Judith Jesch revisits the topic of "Eagles, Ravens and Wolves: Beasts of Battle, Symbols of Victory and Death" and finds that the poetic traditions of Old English and Old Norse make different uses of these animals, both functionally and symbolically. They constitute typescenes in Old English, where they evoke the grim expectation of slaughter, but they are simply motifs in Old Norse, where their significance may vary according to the genre of the source but where in general they glorify the victorious warrior who causes the slaughter. In early

Scandinavia, these symbolic animals are primarily associated with war-leaders, who are becoming more and more important elements of society; only secondarily do the beasts of battle have religious connotations. Just as Jesch finds herself in disagreement with Roberta Frank's "Did Anglo-Saxon Audiences Have a Skaldic Tooth?" (*Scandinavian Studies* 59 [1987]: 338–55), so too, in the discussion following the essay, do several scholars insist on extending this topic in ways contrary to Jesch's initial thinking. The remaining essays are "Dwellings and Settlements: Structure and Characteristics" (Bente Magnus), "Kinship and Social Relations in the Early Medieval Period in Svealand Elucidated by DNA" (Birgit Arrhenius), "Kinship and Marriage: The Family, Its Relationships and Renewal" (Elisabeth Vestergaard), "Law and Legal Customs in Viking Age Scandinavia" (Stefan Brink), "Rural Economy: Ecology, Hunting, Pastoralism, Agricultural and Nutritional Aspects" (Lise Bender Jørgensen), "Patterns of Settlement and Defence at the Proto-Town of Birka, Lake Mälar, Eastern Sweden" (Lena Holmquist Olausson), "Urban Economy in Southern Scandinavia in the Second Half of the First Millenium A.D." (Svend Nielsen), "The 'Ludwigslied' and the Battle of Saucourt" (Dennis H. Green), "Harald Bluetooth—A Saint Very Nearly Made by Adam of Bremen" (Niels Lund), and "Current Issues and Future Directions in the Study of the Scandinavians" (summary of discussions with comments by Giorgio Ausenda). Despite the dry titles, many of these essays are absolutely fascinating and thought-provoking, with the discussion transcriptions containing just as many ideas and important questions as the essays themselves. Given the importance of the Migration Age, the Vendel Age, and the Viking Age for various aspects of Anglo-Saxon studies, this collection is truly worth perusing.

i. The Norman Conquest and Settlement

Co-ordinating the literary sources with the charter evidence—and using the dating established by the most recent scholarship—David Bates puts "The Conqueror's Adolescence" (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 25: 1–18) as beginning around 1042. Despite his opening assertion that he will use medieval ideas about personal development instead of modern ones, this lecture simply gives a running commentary on the events of William the Conqueror's youth that corrects the errors of writers both medieval and modern. Orderic is frequently mistaken; William of Poitiers' condemnation of Count William of Arques should be seen as a *damnatio memoriae* of a defeated rebel instead of an objective assessment of an interesting career; it is rather bizarre to interpret the war of 1046–7 as a great conflict between the Scandinavian traditions of Lower Normandy and the

increasingly French ones of Upper Normandy; David Douglas's suggestion that the whole of Upper Normandy may have passed out of William's control for two years around the time of Val-ès-Dunes is much too extreme; it is highly unlikely that William was profoundly scarred by the events of his childhood and adolescence; Norman society was not brutalized at this time; and the dark shadows cast by David Douglas's *William the Conqueror* over most of the history of Normandy before 1066 can now be dispelled.

Continued popular as well as scholarly interest prompts another re-examination of the Battle of Hastings, its geographical and topographical contexts, and the sources which have told us so much, and yet so little, about the battle itself. M.K. Lawson, best known for his fine biography of King Cnut, brings an interdisciplinary approach to the study of the events of 1066 in this accessible, well-referenced, and richly illustrated volume of interest primarily to the general reader (*The Battle of Hastings, 1066*, Battles and Campaigns [Stroud: Tempus]. Specialists will find controversial his argument that both armies were considerably larger than once thought; otherwise the strength of this book lies in its breadth of coverage and lavish illustration rather than new insights. An interesting appendix on the Bayeux Tapestry decries the myth that Harold was killed with an arrow through the eye.

M.F.G., S.A.J., E.A.R.

[M.F.G. reviewed Abels, Barlow, Bassett, Bedingfield *Dramatic*, Blair "Minster," "Handlist," "Anglo-Saxon," Blanton "*Tota*", Campbell, Cox, Crick "St Albans," Crook, Cubitt, Dyer *Making*, "Small," Grassi, Jayakumar, Jolly, Keynes *Atlas*, Lapidge "Ælfric's," Lavelle, Lawson, Malpas, Preest, Rawcliffe, Rumble, Rushforth, Sharpe "Naming" "Martyrs," Squatriti, Thacker "Loca," "Making," Tiller, Williams. S.A.J. reviewed Crick "Liberty," Lees, Lendinara, Maddicott, Musson, Nelson, O'Brien, Oliver, Pollington. E.A.R. reviewed Bachrach, Bates, Bonner, Breeze "Kingdom," "Battle," Brooks, Carver, Christensen, Cumberledge, Cunliffe, DeVries, Drout, Dumville "Vikings," Ford, Fraser, Graham-Campbell, Hadley, Hamerow, Harbus, Herren, Higham *King*, Hines "Welsh," "Culture," Jesch, Keynes "Apocalypse," Lapidge "Byzantium," Offer, Owen-Crocker, Patterson, Peirce, Rippon, Rollason, Sermon]

Works not seen

Barrow, Julia, ed. *John le Neve. Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1066-1300. VIII. Hereford*. London: U of London, Institute for Historical Research. xxxiv, 184 pp.

Beuermann, Ian. "Metropolitan Ambitions and Politics: Kells-Mellifont and Man & the Isles." *Peritia* 16: 419–34.

Chapman, Norman. "Medieval Church Architecture in Herts." *Hertfordshire Countryside* 57: 28–30, ill.

Corcos, Nick. "Bourne and Burrington: A *Burnantun* Estate?" *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History* 144 (2002 for 2000): 117–38, ill.

Crossley-Holland, Kevin. *The Anglo-Saxon World*. New ed. Woodbridge and Rochester, NY: Boydell & Brewer. [xvii], 276 pp. + plates.

Crouch, David. "The Historian, Lineage and Heraldry 1050–1250." *Heraldry, Pageantry and Social Display in Medieval England*. Ed. Peter Coss and Maurice Keen. Woodbridge: Boydell. 17–37, ill.

Crowe, Chris. "Holywood, An Early Medieval Monastery: Problems and Possibilities." *Trans. of the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Soc.* 76: 13–17, ill.

Dumville, David N., ed. and trans. *Annales Cambriae, A.D. 682–954: Texts A–C in Parallel*. Basic Texts for Brittonic History 1. Cambridge: U of Cambridge Dept. of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic. xix, 24 pp.

Evans, G.R. *Fifty Key Medieval Thinkers*. Routledge Key Guides. London and New York: Routledge. xxxiv, 183 pp. ["Bede 672/3–735," pp. 39–43]

Glasswell, Samantha. *The Earliest English: Living & Dying in Early Anglo-Saxon England*. Stroud: Tempus. 160 pp. ill. + plates.

Heckman, Christina. "*Crux et transitus*: The Cross as Intersection in Early English Culture." Diss. Loyola Univ. Chicago. *DAI* 63A: 2235.

Higgins, David H. "The Anglo-Saxon Charters of Stoke Bishop: A Study of the Boundaries of *Bisceopes stoc*." *Trans. Of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Soc.* 120: 107–31, ill.

Holder, Timothy David. "Seven Kings, One Kingdom: England in 1066." Diss. Univ. of Kentucky. *DAI* 63A: 1076.

Keats-Rohan, K.S.B. *Domesday Descendants: A Prosopography of Persons Occurring in English Documents 1066–1166 II: Pipe Rolls to 'Cartae Baronum.'* Woodbridge: Boydell. 1169 pp.

Kent, G.H.R. *Victoria County History: East Riding of Yorkshire. VII: Holderness Wapentake; Middle and North Divisions.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001. xx, 455 pp. ill. + plates.

Keynes, Simon. "Queen's Gambits." *BBC History* 3.12: 18–20, ill. [Emma of Normandy]

Luxford, Julian M. "The Cerne Abbey Relic Lists." *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries* 35: 103–7.

Mursell, Gordon. *English Spirituality: From Earliest Times to 1700*. London: SPCK; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000. xii, 548 pp. [ch. 2, "The Seafarer: Anglo-Saxon Spirituality]

Newman, P. R. "The Domesday Inquest and the Norman Land Settlement in the Yorkshire Wapentake of Ainstry." *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 46: 1–24.

Ó'Broin, Brian Eanna. "*Rex christus ascendens*. The Christological Cult of the Ascension in Anglo-Saxon England." Diss. Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champagne. *DAI* 63A: 605.

Rose, Susan. *Medieval Naval Warfare, 1000–1500*. Warfare and History. London and New York: Routledge. xvi, 155 pp. ill. [ch. 2, "Invaders and Settlers: Operations in the Channel and the North Sea c. 1000–c. 1250," pp. 24–33]

Savelli, Mary. *Tastes of Anglo-Saxon England*. Norfolk: Anglo-Saxon Books. 74 pp.

Van Arsdall, Anne. *Medieval Herbal Remedies: The 'Old English Herbarium' and Anglo-Saxon Medicine*. New York: Routledge. xvi, 259 pp. ill.

Whetter, James. "St Michael's Mount in the Middle Ages." *The Cornish Banner* 110: 20–5, ill.

Deferred until next year

Barrow, G. W. S. "Companions of the Ætheling." *Anglo-Norman Studies* 25: 35–45.

Blanton, Virginia, "*Imagines Ætheldredae*: Mapping Hagiographic Representations of Abbatial Power and Religious Patronage." *Studies in Iconography* 23: 55–107.

Fletcher, Richard. *Bloodfeud: Murder and Revenge in Anglo-Saxon England*. London: Allen Lane. xiv, 231 pp. ill.

Grimmer, Martin. "Britons and Saxons in Pre-Viking Wessex: Reflections on the Law 77 of King Ine." *Parergon* 19: 1–17.

Hen, Yitzak. "Rome, Anglo-Saxon England and the Formation of the Frankish Liturgy." *RB* 112: 301–22.

Higham, Nick. "Bishop Wilfrid in Southern England: A Review of His Political Objectives." *Die Altsachsen im Spiegel der nationalen und internationalen Sachsenforschung: Neue Forschungsergebnisse*. Studien zur Sachsenforschung 13. Juni 1996. Oldenburg: Isensee, 1999. 207–17.

Hill, Joyce. "Provost and Prior in the *Regularis Concordia*." *ANQ* 15: 13–17.

Hubert, Étienne. "Les residences des étrangers à Rome." *Roma fra oriente e occidente*, 173–204. [Boniface; *scola saxonum*]

Kleinschmidt, Harald. "Space, Body, Action: The Significance of Perceptions in the Study of the Environmental History of Early Medieval Europe." *Medieval History Jnl* 3 (2000): 175–221. [Abbo of Fleury, *Life of St. Edmund*; OE *Orosius*; St. Wilfrid]

Matthews, S. "St John's Church and the Early History of Chester." *Jnl of the Chester Archaeological Soc.* 76 (2002 for 2000-01): 63–80.

Perry, Raymond. *Anglo-Saxon Herefordshire, 410 AD–1086 AD*. Gloucester: Oxengard. x, 152 pp. ill.

Potter, John F. "The London Basin's Gravel Churches: Indications of Geology, Medieval History and Geographical Distribution." *Landscape History* 23 (2001): 5–26.

Rusche, Philip G. "St Augustine's Abbey and the Tradition of Penance in Early Tenth-Century England." *Anglia* 120: 159–83.

Siewers, Alf. "Gildas and Glastonbury: Revisiting the Origins of Glastonbury Abbey." *Via Crucis: Essays on Early Medieval Sources and Ideas in Memory of J. E. Cross*. Ed. Thomas N. Hall. Medieval European Studies 1. Morgantown, WV: West Virginia UP. 423–32.

Strickland, Matthew J. "Killing or Clemency? Ransom, Chivalry and Changing Attitudes to Defeated Opponents in Britain and Northern France, 7–12th Centuries." *Krieg im Mittelalter*. Ed. Hans-Henning Kortüm. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001. 93–122.

Webb, Diana. "St Margaret in Kent: Two Eleventh-Century Anecdotes." *Archaeologia Cantiana* 122: 335–42.

Zaluckyj, Sarah; Marge Feryok, and John Zaluckyj. *Mercia: The Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Central England*. Woonton: Logaston, 2001. xii, 308 pp. ill.

8. Names

A Dictionary of County Durham Place-Names (Nottingham: EPNS) by V. Watts with contributions by J. Insley is the third volume in the English Place-Name Society's new Popular Series and is drawn from Watts's forthcoming survey of the place-names of County Durham and covers the pre-1974 county, rather than the current borders. Although written for a general audience, the "Introduction" can be read with profit by specialists. While the alphabetized entries for each of the place-names often give more scholarly information than one might expect for the general reader, the information is presented in a clearly understandable manner. The book concludes with a twenty-four page list of place-name elements that occur in Durham place-names as well as the place-names in which they occur.

A. Breeze has several articles this year dealing with multiple place-names. "The Celtic Names of Blencow and Blenkinsopp" (*Northern History* 39: 291–92) argues that the name *Blencow* in *Great Blencow* and *Little Blencow* in

Cumbria has its first element from a Brittonic *blain "end, summit" and as its second element the Cumbric equivalent of Welsh cau and Cornish cow meaning "hollow," so the name means "hollow of the summit." Breeze also derives Blenkinsopp in Northumbria from three elements: Cumbric *blain 'summit', Cumbric *cein 'ridge', and Old English hop 'small enclosed valley'. Thus, the name would mean "ridge-top valley." In "Brittonic Place-Names from South-West Scotland, Part 3: Vindogara, Elvan Water, 'Monedamdereg,' Troquhain and Tarelgin" (Trans. of the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History & Antiquarian Soc. 76: 107–112), Breeze derives Ptolemy's Vindogara from a British element cognate with Welsh gwyn 'white' and a Celtic form represented by Welsh gar 'leg, shank, thigh' so that Vindogara would mean "white shank" and by extension "white ridge of land," possibly the promontory at Troon. He suggests a Cumbric form resembling Middle Welsh halwyn 'salt' as the source for Elvan in Elvan Water 'salt river' which joins the Clyde in Clydesdale. He also interprets Monedamdereg mentioned in an inspection of 1367 of a charter of Alexander II near Ayr as "hill of the red stag" from the Gaelic elements monadh 'hill, mountain', damh 'ox, stag', and dearg 'red'. Breeze derives Tarelgin, a farm five miles east of Ayr, from Brittonic tre- 'homestead, settlement' and the Cumbric equivalent of Welsh helygen 'willow' so that Tarelgin would mean "willow-tree homestead." He also derives the first elements of Troquhain, a farm three miles east of New Galloway; Troquhain, a farm five miles east of Maypole in South Ayrshire; and Troughend in Northumberland from the same Brittonic tre- 'homestead, settlement' and the second element of each from the Cumbric equivalent of Welsh chwaen 'occurrence, event, chance, adventure, expedition, feat, exploit'. Thus all three names would mean "homestead of an exploit or a feat," probably a military one, so they are probably old battlefields. In "Chaceley, Meon, Prinknash, and Celtic Philology" (Trans. of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Soc. 120: 103–06), Breeze shows that Chaceley in Gloucestershire, recorded in 972 as Ceatewesleah, has as its first element a Briton personal name Cadui or Cadwy and refers to the wood or clearing belonging to that person, showing that Britons continued to occupy land by the Severn even after the English conquest. According to Breeze, Meon in Meon Hill, formerly in Gloucestershire but now in Warwickshire, comes from menai which was used for small streams in early Wales and means "flowing one" or "moving one". Prinknash, four miles south-east of Gloucester, derives from the equivalent of Welsh pren 'tree', kein 'ridge', and English ness 'cape, headland' or perhaps, as Ekwall suggested, the Old English form of ash. In any case, the first two elements clearly mean "tree ridge," and the last element may refer to ash trees or to the spurs of land that overlook Prinknash Abbey.

There are also several articles this year focusing on individual place names. In "Bourne and Burrington: A Burnantūn Estate?" (Somerset Archaeology & Natural History 144: 117–38), N. Corcos argues that earlier derivations of Burrington in Somerset from OE byrig and tūn with the meaning of "the settlement/farm/estate at the fortified place" are incorrect since the first element comes from OE burna "stream" so that the name means "the estate on or by the stream." He also suggests that Bourne, a hamlet a few hundred yards northeast of Barrington and which also comes from OE burna, was an early memorial site. S. Brendler, in "Hareslade: A Note on Robert Carpenter's Place of Abode" (N&Q 49: 12–13), notes that H. Kökeritz's The Place-Names of the Isle of Wight shows clearly that the Hareslade of Robert Carpenter of Hareslade is now Haslett in the parish of Shorewell on the Isle of Wight.

A. Breeze has another four articles this year that explain individual place-names. In "The Kingdom and Name of Elmet" (Northern History 39: 157–171), he derives the place-name Elmet mentioned by Bede from a first element corresponding to Welsh el- 'many' and as a second element a Celtic met- 'cut, harvest' and suggests that the name Elmet means "(those who) cut down many, the killers." While the boundaries of Elmet are unclear, it appears to be between the Vale of York and the Pennine watershed, probably between Warfe and Aire and includes Leeds. It appeared as a separate Celtic kingdom after the Roman period and lasted until Edwin conquered Elmet. Breeze sides with those who say that the Gwallog cited in two Welsh poems from the 580s as the king of Elmet was the son of Lleennog and the father of Ceredig who was defeated by Edwin in 617. In "Pennango near Hawick and Welsh angan 'death'" (Northern History 39: 126), Breeze suggests that the unidentified place-name Pennango referred to an area near the juncture of the Teviot and Allen Water four miles southwest of Hawick, and the Cumbric name contained a first element pen meaning "head" or "hill" while the second element corresponded to Welsh angan, Cornish ankow, and Old Breton ankou, all meaning "death." Thus, the name meant "death hill" and probably referred to a place frequented by criminals who attacked travelers. In "Is Ravenna's Lavobrinta the River Severn?" (Studia Celtica 36: 152–53), Breeze concludes that Lavobrinta in the Ravenna Cosmography is indeed the River Severn by emending the La- to Fl-. Contrary to Ekwall and Jackson who regarded Vyrnwy as a derivative of British Sabrina, Breeze argues the River Severn is related to British eburo- 'yew' and might mean, as Williams suggested, "river of a yew-goddess" but is not linked to Lavobrinta. In "VEB on Roman Lead Pigs from the Mendips" (Somerset and Dorset Notes & Queries 35: 97–98), Breeze derives the VEB found on seven first-

century Roman lead pigs (one found at Charterhouse on Mendip) from *Vebria* "amber-coloured one" referring to the river of the Chedder Gorge which Charterhouse stands next to. Breeze suggests that this river-name might also give a clue to the Roman name for Charterhouse.

Three essays in this year's bibliography focus on particular place-names elements. In "Rithes, Rifes, and Lakes: Another View of the Toponymy of the West Sussex Coastal Plains" (*West Sussex History* 67 [Spring 2001]: 16–17), J. Pile notes that Smith had identified *rife* as a common Sussex dialect form of OE *rið* 'a small stream', which arose during the post-medieval period due to a sound change. In " A Widespread and Perennial Problem: Dunstall(s) (N6.1.1)" (*Locus Focus*: *Forum of the Sussex Place-Names Net* 6.1: 7–8), R. Coates suggests, without a great deal of confidence, that the various *Dunstalls* and *Tunstalls* like the field-name *Dunstalls* in Sussex derive from the Latin *domus* "house" borrowed into Old English as *dum* with the resulting *dum-st(e)all* "site of a *dum*" which might have been understood as *tūn-st(e)all* "site of a farm." B. Coombes, in "Aberfal and Falmouth: Some Thoughts on Names in Cornish" (*The Cornish Banner* 104 [May 2001]: 11), presents scattered observations on various Cornish place-names including *Aberfal* in Cornish for *Falmouth*. He observes that *aber* is used to mean "river mouth" in this case, but that it also occurs in Wales, Scotland, and Brittany where it seems to have the meaning of "a violent meeting of water."

In answer to the question "Does *Corieltavi* Mean 'Army of Many Rivers'?" (*AntJ* 82: 307–09), A. Breeze argues "yes." He suggests that the name of the British people who lived in the Leicester, Nottingham, and Lincoln region who have been identified by Tomlin as the *Corieltauvi* is made up of three elements. The first is a British *corio-* 'host, army'. The second is *-el-* corresponding to Welsh *el-* 'many' and related to Old Irish *il* 'many, varied'. The third element *-tavi* has been said to derive from an original *Tauia* meaning "rivers," but Breeze suggests that the source read *-vv-* where Vulgar Latin *-v-* would have been expected because the author knew that the classical Latin *-vv-* often appeared as *-v-* in Vulgar Latin and was hypercorrecting.

Two essays in this year's bibliography deal with women's names. C. Hough, in "Women in English Place-Names" ('*Lastworda Betst*', ed. Hough and Lowe, 41–106), presents and discusses the corpus of place-names containing feminine personal names arranged by pre-1974 counties. The place-names are arranged alphabetically in separate lists for those with Old English feminine personal names and those with Old Norse feminine personal names, with minor and field-names grouped separately after the major

names for each county. She also provides indices of Old English feminine personal names, Old Norse feminine personal names, elements combined with Old English feminine personal names, and elements combined with Old Norse feminine personal names. In "Anglo-Saxon Women: The Art of Concealment" (*Leeds Studies in English* 33: 31–51), G. Owen-Crocker notes that when women's names do appear on Anglo-Saxon artifacts, which is not common, they are sometimes on the back of the artifact as is the case with the name of Ælfflæd, the second wife of King Edward the Elder, on the vestments of Bishop Frithestan, but men's names on such artifacts are usually placed where they can be easily seen. Similarly concealed women's names include *EAÐELSVIÐ REG[i]NA* "Queen Ethelsworth" (wife of King Burgred of Mercia) inscribed inside a gold and niello finger ring, *Ædvwen* on the back of a silver brooch from Sutton, and names like *Hildithryth*, *Hildigyth*, and *Berchtgyd* found on grave stones in the cemetery of the convent at Hartlepool, County Durham which were buried *in* the graves rather than appearing on the surface.

In "Die morphologishe Integration französischer Lehnwörter des Mittelenglischen im Spiegel der Anthroponymie" (*BN* 37: 1–43), K. Dietz shows that the morphological integration of French loan words in English personal names followed English word-formation rules and probably occurred in lower class speech first. He shows how hybrid surnames of occupation with French elements occurred from the late twelfth century while hybrid nicknames with French elements first occurred around 1200. Seventeen pages in the middle of the article provide examples of surnames with the first element borrowed from French, with the second element borrowed from French, or with various other types of compounding.

Two other essays deal with specific personal names. In "Elaphus the Briton, St Germanus, and Bede" (*JTS* 53: 554–57), A. Breeze concludes that the *Elaphus* mentioned in the life of St. Germanus written around 480 by Constantius of Lyon and mentioned by Bede as *Elafius* whose crippled son St. Germanus is supposed to have cured miraculously is likely to have been an official in the Roman tradition in Britain after the Roman withdrawal in 410 rather than a Celtic king. The name *Elaphus* itself is Greek from *elaphos* 'deer', but Greek names were not unusual throughout the Roman Empire. In "The Five Languages of Wales in Pre-Norman Inscriptions" (*CMCS* 44: 1–36), P. Sims-Williams examines the personal names in inscriptions in his (not Bede's) five languages of Wales: Latin, Irish, Norse, English, and British, now called Welsh. However, only the last two pages deal with the two Germanic languages. Sims-Williams identifies only the name *Iþfus* on the cross

at Corwen, Merionth as Norse from the Norse elements *ið-* and *fríss*. He suggests that the first word in a sixth century stone from Puncheston, Pembroke: CVNISCVS FILI NEMAGLI is OE *cyning* "king" used as a personal name. The only other names he grudgingly identifies as probably English is Pre-Norman inscriptions in Wales are *Elystan* from OE *Æthelstan*, *Edwin* from OE *Eadwine*, *Mariguelio* (a hypercorrected form of OE *Merewealh*, *Siuerd* from OE *Sigefrith*, *Siuuard* from OE *Sigeweard*, *Wlmer* from OE *Wulfmær*, and *Ælmon* from OE *Æthelmonn or *Ælfmonn.

R. Wilton, in "The Sword Excalibur: The Origins of that Name" (*Devon and Cornwall Notes & Queries* 39: 23–26), reports that King Arthur's sword, which is called *Caliburn* by both Geoffrey of Monmouth and Chretien de Trois, is first called *Excalibur* (actually *Excaliber*) in English in a late fourteenth-century *Le Morte Arthur* by an unknown author (not to be confused with Malory's fifteenth-century *Morte D'Arthur*). While Wilton accepts that the first element of *Caliburn* comes from *Chalyb* meaning "steel," the second element -*burn* is open to speculation. He prefers to derive -*burn* from Old French *burnier* "burnish" so that it would thus mean "bright and shining." The prefix "ex-" is interpreted as "from" as in "a sword made from steel" or is derived in a rather tortured fashion from an <X> spelling of the Greek *χ* transliterated as <ch> and then spelled *C* in *Caliburn*.

In "Old English *ēa* in Middle English Place-Names" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 38: 331–51), M.A. Martín Díaz concludes that OE *ēa* appears predominantly as *e* in both the first and second elements of Kentish place-names in the twelfth and fourteenth centuries and provides an appendix with four tables listing the Old English base form, the locality, and the place-name forms with *e*: in the first element in the twelfth century, in the second element in the twelfth century, in the first element in the fourteenth century, and in the second element in the fourteenth century respectively.

Works not seen

Martín, María Auxiliadora. "Old English *eo* in Middle Kentish Place-Names." *SELIM* 10 (2002 for 2000): 55–75.

J.C.

9. Archaeology, Numismatics, Sculpture

a. Regional Studies

The value of regional analysis is amply demonstrated by *The Field Archaeology of the Salisbury Plain Training Area*, by David McOmish, David Field, and Graham Brown (Swindon: English Heritage). Using ground, geophysical, and aerial surveys, the study embraced some 37,000 hectares of chalk downland. Charting the course of human activity from the Neolithic and early Bronze Age (*ca.* 4500–1500 B.C.) to the present, the authors provide a richness of detail that illuminates the unavoidable impoverishment that constrains many studies of isolated cemeteries or settlements. Located in Wiltshire, the chalk outcrop of the Salisbury Plain Training Area is cross-cut by riverine valleys. Unlike today, when the sparsely settled area is covered in rough pasture, the fossilized landscapes it contains recollect earlier agricultural and human activity. The heavy arable exploitation of the Roman period, supported by a network of settlements and villas, underwent a drastic contraction and displacement in the early Anglo-Saxon period. Although some Romano-British settlements may have continued into the early fifth century, pollen diagrams demonstrate a shift from arable to regenerating woodland. During the Anglo-Saxon period, settlement continued to be focused in the valleys while marginal land on the Higher Plain was abandoned. Nevertheless, the authors suggest that these ghost landscapes remained linked to the valley dwellers during the process of territorial formation, as valley settlements maintained detached holdings interspersed by largely unallocated land. Charter boundaries indicate these relationships between the valley and High Plain to have become established in the ninth and tenth centuries. The finger-like organization of land into rectangular units extending from the valleys onto the High Plain is evidence that the common chalkland division within medieval estates of valley meadow, arable, and downland pasture may date to the Anglo-Saxon period. The secondary use of barrows as Anglo-Saxon burial repositories may be associated with their significance in the landscape, perhaps as markers of tenurial or territorial arrangements. West of the Avon, these burials occur in long barrows, while they are inserted into round barrows to the east. The authors' suggestion of a relationship between these secondary barrow burials and the occupation of the High Plain is particularly intriguing within the context of sacred and ancestral landscapes.

Settlement analysis of the large green at Barrington (Cambs.) supports the hypothesis that early settlements, clustered around common pastures, were sited on the interface between arable and pastoral lands. During the fifth and sixth centuries, climatic and economic changes may have resulted in woodland regeneration and an increased dependency on pastoral farming fossilized as large common greens today. In "Ancient Greens in 'Midland' Landscapes: Barrington, South Cambridge" (*Medieval Archaeology* 46: 110–115), Susan Oosthuizen concludes that the ancient landscape at Barrington, incorporating the huge green and the adjacent early Anglo-Saxon cemetery, pre-dates the development of open field organization. Barrington, as well as the enormous greens elsewhere in Cambridgeshire, as at Bassingbourn, Whaddon, and Haslingfield, suggest pre-open field origins similar to the landscape of Norfolk and Suffolk.

G.F.

Dawn Hadley's "Invisible Vikings," *British Archaeology* 64 (April 2002): 16–21, is a brief re-working in a more popular format of some of the author's previously published work on the evidence for Viking settlement in England. She bluntly makes the point that the question of the scale of that settlement, for long the focus of studies in this area, is now regarded as unanswerable, because while the impact of the Vikings on language and place names can be shown to be considerable, direct evidence such as cremation burials with grave goods or tenth-century settlements with Scandinavian style artifacts are few and far between—though it has to be said that there are one or two new archaeological discoveries in these areas since this was published. However, she is right to point out that sculptures showing Viking influence can be found in places with English names. Her explanation is that the settlers adapted quickly to local ways, taking on literacy (treaties), coinage, stone sculpture and Christianity and its iconography—all unknown in their homelands. The blending of themes in sculpture she sees as evidence for an "easy mixing" of English and Scandinavian populations among whom status in society was more important than ethnicity. This question has been looked at from a number of different points of view, including Hadley's, in papers and books reviewed in this section in previous years: "Invisible Vikings" does not quite do justice to the nuanced arguments around this material in her own and others' work.

A new archaeological journal aimed at the interested public was launched in 2001, focused on Yorkshire, which will certainly be an important contribution to those who want to be kept abreast of developments in this region. The

first issue devoted itself even more narrowly to recent discoveries from Viking period York—Jorvik, celebrating a new interpretation replacing the old Jorvik Viking Centre—including a useful list of all the publications on the Coppergate site and others on the environmental material which formed the basis for the first paper to be considered. Allan Hall and Harry Kenward's "Making a Natural History for JORVIK," *Yorkshire Archaeology Today* 1 (May 2001): 12–13, is an interesting survey on the environmental evidence for, *inter alia*, beekeeping, intestinal parasites, food contamination from poisonous weed seeds, and the club moss imported from Scandinavia as a mordant (to make textile dyes more color-fast) which "has become a kind of 'marker' for the Anglo-Scandinavian period in York." Richard Hall, "Boom Time in JORVIK," 7–8, discusses the evidence for buildings running back from the street frontage on Coppergate, an area only developed after the Viking capture of York in 866. As well as property boundaries, a development from buildings with walls made of wattle withies to more substantial buildings with the lower parts at least built of oak post and planks. Hall discusses the development in interpretation of above ground appearance of these buildings. Three papers discuss the work and *raison d'etre* of the York Archaeological Trust, and the development of the new center. One is Andrew K.G. Jones, "JORVIK: Excavation, Interpretation, Education" (5–6); another is Richard Kemp, "Turning the Jorvik Viking Centre into JORVIK" (2–4). They insist that the new Jorvik will emphasize it as a city—as Kemp points out, visitors to the old center believed they had visited a "Viking village": a complaint I remember from my own days of taking first year University students to it as part of a study of the development of medieval York. The third is by Ailsa Mainman: "JORVIK is Working" (9–11), which briefly describes the completed and ongoing research on the artifacts discovered on the site, and how these have contributed to the new interpretation of Jorvik. Neil Macnab, in "The Clang of Iron in Medieval Halls: Excavations at 41–49 Walmgate, York" (14–16) is a more extended study of the development of one small area from the tenth century until the twentieth. The title refers to the fact that from the late fourteenth to at least the seventeenth century (if I have understood this aright), part of the property was used as a smithy and metalworking shop. The area has considerable research potential to uncover changing patterns in 900 years of urban development, and the end of the paper looks forward this prospect.

Ken Dark, in "Changing Places? 5th and 6th Century Culture in Britain and Ireland," *Minerva* 13.6: 38–39, relates to the same author's study, *Britain and the End of the Roman Empire*. It contrasts briefly the 'Roman-ness' of several regions of Britain and Ireland in the fifth and sixth

centuries, with the replacement of Romano-British by Anglo-Saxon culture in East Anglia at one extreme, and the survival of the former into the sixth century at Tintagel in Cornwall at the other. He explores the implications for the spread of 'Romano-British' culture into Ireland in the fifth century, and south-west Scotland in the sixth. His point is summed up in his final sentence, where he warns against "supposing that cultural change at the 'end of Roman Britain' was necessarily characterized by the abandonment of Roman ways of life or dominated by the Anglo-Saxons."

E.C.

Christopher Dyer's stated purpose in "Villages and Non-Villages in the Medieval Cotswolds," the 2002 presidential address to the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society (*Transactions of the Bristol & Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 52 [2001]: 113–126) is to "present a modern interpretation of the medieval Cotswold settlement pattern"; focusing on Gloucestershire to examine the correlation between modern and medieval settlement row and cluster plans, the development of these villages through the eleventh century, their growth in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and patterns of shrinkage between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries. Dyer's analysis is sensitive to possible misreadings or over-interpretations, as when he notes that the term *-tun* might not be attached to a specific central site and in his analysis of the limited documentary evidence of boundary descriptions. Noting that manor houses did not always provide a nucleus and archaeological evidence suggests that villages did not always respond to manorial control (as at Hawling and Roel), Dyer concentrates on four types of dispersed settlements: hamlets in the territories of nucleated villages, mills and mill hamlets, sheepcotes, and granges. The material on the sheepcote/grange settlement at Hazleton in Rodmarton is especially detailed and provides evidence for the layered interaction between manor holdings, the church (here the Cistercian Kingswood Abbey), other nearby settlements, and the larger economies (the leasing of the property to Florentine bankers in the fourteenth century). Dyer provides some interesting economic analysis of these settlements, suggesting that while rents in cash increased and more buildings had expensive stone foundations in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the apparent prosperity of the Cotswolds should be examined carefully, given low returns in the tax assessments.

b. Excavations

Jon Butler, "1600 Years of the City Defences at Aldersgate," *London Archaeologist* 9 (2001): 235–44, summarizes, and

Jonathan Butler, "The City Defences at Aldersgate," *Trans. of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Soc.* 52 (2001): 41–111, reports in full detail on an excavation in advance of development on the site of 1–6 Aldersgate Street in the City of London. The site includes three scheduled Ancient Monuments: a city wall bastion, part of the Roman, medieval, and post-medieval city wall, and the post-medieval city gate of Aldersgate. The excavation therefore was able to explore the complex history of London's defences from early Roman times to the seventeenth century. Evidence within this for Saxon London and its defences in the period of Viking attacks seems largely adduced from documentary sources. Slight evidence for the Saxon city ditch is, however, hailed as a "rare survival," while the evidence for the Saxo-Norman ditch appears more extensive. The account of the investigation is interesting, because excavation was allowed only where new building features such as drains would have destroyed evidence. No deposits were removed from other areas but were merely recorded in plan (and section where possible), before being preserved *in situ* under a protective layer of 'terram geotextile'. Helena Hamerow's paper, "Hamwic," *British Archaeology* 66: 21–24, is an excellent brief discussion of how the excavation of Anglo-Saxon Southampton (Hamwic) had changed historians' and archaeologists' views of trade and the development of the town in seventh- to eighth-century England. It appears that Hamwic possessed "from the outset, a planned system of well-maintained, graveled streets as well as defined plots and properties," important evidence that it was created by a centralized authority, possibly King Ine of Wessex. She takes us through the evidence, giving references to the original research, to show that the long-held views that long-distance trade had halted by 700, and that no significant steps towards urbanization happened until the reign of Alfred, are no longer tenable. The paper by Alan Hardy and David Petts, "Lake End, Dorney" (*Current Archaeology* 15: 427–30) describes an excavation of a much more mysterious site on the river Thames, in an area which was a disputed border between Mercia and Wessex in the seventh to eighth centuries. The site produced 130 pits spread over an area 500 x 200 metres in extent but with no trace of contemporary buildings or ditch, implying an improbably vast settlement if one could be shown to exist. The authors say that after analysis of the deposits in the pits, the archaeological team concluded that the site was "a focus for a gathering of many small groups of people" which may, however, have numbered hundreds at any one time and was constantly changing. This explanation opens up the possibility that the site was an open air meeting place—perhaps a market, or a social or political meeting place, or even a religious synod. It is so far unique as an example of such a gathering place. There is, however,

a short discussion about its possible relationship to the so-called "productive sites" in East Anglia which have also been considered as possible markets or animal fairs. Earlier evidence for an outdoor trading place is found in "Bantham: A Dark Age Puzzle," *Current Archaeology* 15: 420–22. Jeffrey May and Peter Weddell record an excavation made in advance of a rebuilding of the Bantham Life Saving Club's club house on Bantham Sands, South Devon. There is evidence for imported luxury Mediterranean pottery, and several well-constructed hearths of the fifth or early sixth century in date, as well as numerous fragments of meat bones and shellfish. The authors conclude that "[t]he imported pottery together with the alfresco venue suggests Mediterranean traders perhaps drawing up their ships on this favourable beach to meet and do business with the local elite." It suggests that there may be a seat of Dark Age kings in the area, which did not come under Anglo-Saxon control until the early eighth century. Richard Heawood, and Christine Howard-Davis in "Two Early Medieval Settlement Sites in Eastern Cumbria?" (*Trans. of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian & Archaeological Soc.* 3rd ser. 2: 145–69) considers evidence from two sites at the other end excavated in advance of modern development. The first at Parke's Croft, Shap, is from an area where evidence for the post-Roman period, particularly for rural settlement, is very sparse. The buildings could be Romano-British or Anglo-Saxon, and in the absence of other datable finds the site is seen as Anglo-Saxon on the evidence of loom-weights of seventh- to eighth-century type. The second site, at Whinfill, Brougham, is in an area of fertile agricultural land where far more archaeological sites are concentrated. Here was evidence for rectangular buildings but an almost complete evidence of artifactual evidence, on the basis of which silence it is suggested that this site too is early medieval rather than Roman or later medieval. Both are slight, but the authors modestly see them as "some evidence for a settled rural hinterland around the foci at Dacre and Penrith in the early medieval period." Julie Lovell, in "Excavations on a Medieval Site at Little High Street, Worthing, West Sussex, 1997," *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 139 (2001): 133–45, found no evidence for Roman or Middle Saxon features, but did find some evidence for Saxo-Norman activity, indicating growth of the earlier settlement (mentioned in Domesday Book) probably in the Norman period. Alistair Douglas, in "Saxo-Norman Buildings in Kensington," *Trans. of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Soc.* 52 (2001): 113–26, considers the discovery of Saxo-Norman buildings from a farmstead or perhaps part of larger complex to be of regional importance. The buildings are described in detail and a suggested reconstruction is provided for one of them. The lack of hearths and drains imply they were barns or store-rooms rather than humble dwellings or byres. Chris Moore, "Late Bronze Age, Romano-British and Early/Middle Saxon Features at Hoo St Werburgh," *Archaeologia Cantiana* 122: 259–74, recounts the discovery of early and middle Saxon activity at what is obviously a potentially very interesting site. Land here was granted to a monastery at Peterborough in 664, where subsequently Werburgh (d. 700), daughter of Wulfhere, king of Mercia founded a nunnery. Her cousin and successor to Wulfhere, King Ethelbald, annexed Kent *ca.* 741 and founded a church dedicated to St. Werburgh on the site of her nunnery. Subsequently Hoo became the center of "Werburgh Wic," both a royal residence and a prosperous town, probably destroyed by Viking raiders who wintered nearby in the ninth century. The excavation, which was restricted in area as it was confined to the site of a new pipeline for a waste water treatment works, uncovered substantial evidence for Bronze Age activity (1100–700 B.C.); some evidence for the Late Iron Age and the Roman period, and a post-built structure dated by pottery evidence to the period 410–850. The pottery included imported continental wares of the mid-sixth to the seventh centuries. Evidence from this period included charred grains indicative of domestic activity, and for iron working. Part of the importance of the discoveries is that they show an early focus of settlement close to the present St. Werburgh's church (twelfth century). Also of interest is the evidence from environmental sampling techniques for both food grains and the type of woodland in the surrounding area.

E.C.

In "An Archaeological Investigation at East Lane and South Lane, Kingston upon Thames, 1996-8" (*Surrey Archaeological Collections* 89: 185–210), Duncan Hawkins, Alison Kain, and Kevin Wooldridge detail evidence for an early Anglo-Saxon farmstead. Located on a narrow gravel ridge flanking the east bank of the River Thames, the settlement included a possible post-and-stake building and, based on the presence of ceramic loomweights and an antler tine, may have supported textile and other craft production. No floors layers, working surfaces, or hearth were recovered. The associated early Saxon pottery indicates and late fifth-century date for occupation.

On a sandy ridge some 200 m to the south of the East Lane and South Lane site, excavations in 2000 revealed a scatter of stakeholes and postholes, according to Barry Bishop, "Excavations at 17–23 Woodbines Avenue, Kingston upon Thames," *Surrey Archaeological Collections* 89: 237–244. In the absence of any obvious plan or construction debris, these structures most likely represent fence lines, storage areas, or animal pens. The discovery of a

small amount of early Saxon pottery, perhaps from manuring, suggests that activities at this site may have been connected with the settlement to the north.

The discovery at Sherborne House, Gloucestershire, of a complex of six sunken-featured buildings, three posthole buildings, and linear ditches is reported in "Lechlade: an early Anglo-Saxon settlement in the Cotswolds" ([Anon.] *Current Archaeology* 15: 397). While these structures may be related to the nearby sixth- to seventh-century cemetery at Butler's Field, the absence of closely datable artifactual evidence necessitates a critical assessment of the author's interpretation. In "Lower Slaughter: a Middle Saxon manor in the Cotwolds," ([Anon.] *Current Archaeology* 15: 398), the excavation of a series of recut curving concentric ditches is associated with the change in settlement pattern from Anglo-Saxon hamlets, such as that at Lechlade, to medieval villages. Radiocarbon dating of the ditches at Lower Slaughter to the seventh to tenth centuries indicates that the manorial center may have been in existence from Middle Saxon times. However, the location of the manor, whose existence is recorded in the Domesday Book, has not been established.

The continuing reassessment of Richard Hodges's "gateway community" model of Anglo-Saxon trade, as presented in *Dark Age Economics: The Origins of Towns and Trade AD 600–1000* (London, 1982), is accelerated by the publication of the Middle Saxon site at *Sandtun* in Kent. The settlement, located near the mouth of the Hythe inlet, produced archaeological evidence for fishing, spindle whorl manufacture, and bone working; salt-making is additionally recorded in an eighth-century charter. The ceramic assemblage contained not only local wares but also a significant percentage of imported and non-local sherds. In "Continental Trade and Non-Urban Ports in Mid-Anglo-Saxon Excavations at Sandtun, West Hythe, Kent," *ArchJ* 158 (2001): 161–290, Mark Gardiner, Richard Cross, Nigel Macpherson-Grant, and Ian Riddler interpret *Sandtun* as a landing place for maritime trade. This settlement implies an economic structure of dispersed small scale trading activity at odds with the "gateway community" model of a limited number of elite-controlled centers or *wics* through which prestige goods were channeled. Coin and ceramic evidence at *Sandtun* indicate a chronological span paralleling that at the larger *wic* sites: generally, activity at both commenced in the late seventh or early eighth century and declined during the second half of the ninth century.

The discovery of a well-preserved waterwheel is reported in "Ebbsfleet Saxon Mill" ([Anon.], *Current Archaeology* 183: 93). Two oak water chutes, dated *ca.* A.D. 700, led

to a wheelhouse, most of which was missing. Regrettably, this brief account fails to indicate the significance of the Ebbsfleet discovery, focusing instead on the administrative details of excavation and preservation. Although early Anglo-Saxon vertical mills have been identified at Old Windsor (Berkshire) and Wellington (Herefordshire), the Ebbsfleet example joins about a half dozen horizontal watermills.

G.F.

In "Contextualizing Previous Excavation: The Implications of Applying GPS Survey and GIS Modelling Techniques to Watton Priory, East Yorkshire" (*Medieval Archaelogy* 46: 81–89), Henry P. Chapman and Helen Fenwick argue that the traditional approach of "wall-chasing" to reveal the boundaries of a site can limit the understanding of the site by possibly missing geographic and architectural idiosyncrasies. The authors hope to extend what is known about a site, particularly its relationship to textual descriptions or architectural expectations of a monastic order, through these modern technologies of the Global Positioning System and Geographical Information System. Watton Priory, a Gilbertine priory founded in the twelfth century as a double house, serves as a case study for the application, chosen in part because the openness of the site from interfering tree cover. The original excavations (1893–1898), working from a Reformation survey of the site, are enhanced by the application of satellite high-resolution digital modeling of the landscape, which reveals material below the ground level. The results note a close correlation with W.H. St. John Hope's plan in the area of the nuns' cloister and surrounding buildings but also that St. John Hope's plan is limited, excluding many additional structures particularly on the western survey area (the precinct boundaries, the fifteenth-century wall extension as well as other wall features, the post-1150 use of the site). Chapman and Fenwick argue that these techniques can be used both to confirm excavations and to open up new possibilities for re-surveying and understanding the medieval sites.

F.A.

c. Death and Burial

Dawn Hadley's *Death in Medieval England: An Archaeology* (Stroud: Tempus, 2001) is both less and more than its title promises. On the one hand, Hadley's discussion covers not all of England—only the counties of Derbyshire, Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, and Yorkshire are detailed—nor are the entire Middle Ages discussed, as the early Anglo-Saxon period is presented in a cursory manner at best. These limitations appear to reflect the author's areas of interest rather than to derive from a coherent and

logically circumscribed research focus. More troubling are both the lack of contextualization within a regional cultural-historical framework and the absence of an interpretative theory that together would structure a philosophical viewpoint from which to examine the diversity of medieval burial practices. Although Hadley draws on sources of information beyond archaeology, including documents, wall paintings, window glass, manuscript illustrations, and funerary monuments, she limits her discussion of those most immediate to physical evidence—human remains—to later medieval hospital and battlefield sites. While advanced undergraduates, the audience to whom this book is apparently targeted, may find some utility as a secondary source, the absence of footnotes poses a challenge for readers seeking the source for information cited.

With acute vision, Tania M. Dickinson examines methodological, theoretical, chronological, and interpretive issues in mortuary archaeology through the lens of five publications from the late 1990s ("Review Article: What's New in Early Medieval Burial Archaeology?" *EME* 11: 71–87). Two of these volumes derive from symposia held earlier in the same decade (*The Pace of Change: Studies in Early-Medieval Chronology*, ed. John Hines, Karen Høilund Nielsen, and Frank Siegmund [Oxford, 1999]; *Spaces of the Living and the Dead: An Archaeological Dialogue*, ed. Catherine E. Karkov, Kelley M. Wickham-Crowley, and Bailey K. Young, American Early Medieval Studies 3, [Oxford, 1999]) and three are based on doctorial dissertations (Sam Lucy, *The Early Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries of East Yorkshire: An Analysis and Reinterpretation*, British Archaeological Reports, British Series 272 [1998]; Nick Stoodley, *The Spindle and the Spear: A Critical Inquiry into the Construction and Meaning of Gender in the Early Anglo-Saxon Burial Rite*, British Archaeological Reports, British Series 288 [1999]; Elizabeth O'Brien, *Post-Roman Britain to Anglo-Saxon England: Burial Practices Reviewed*, British Archaeological Reports, British Series 289 [1999]). The theoretical positions of the dissertation authors span from traditional culture-history approaches (O'Brien) to those that develop from post-processual concepts of structuration and contextualization (Lucy and Stoodley). These three publications are based on burial samples ranging in size from 243 to 3401 interments. Dickinson argues that in order to discover meaningful patterning in such large and often geographical diffuse data sets, it is necessary, following the approach of Stoodley and the contributors to Hines, Nielsen, and Siegmund, to summarize groupings through artificial constructs and to focus on regional samples. Such summarization is the foundation for correspondence analysis, a seriation program used to order burials on the presence of overlapping gravegoods. While correspondence analysis "averages" dates of artifact

production, use, and deposition, thereby prohibiting the precise dating of individual graves, this limitation is obviated by the application of radiocarbon dating of late fourth to early fifth century and late sixth to early eighth century inhumations. In the final section of her article, Dickinson identifies two major interpretive themes that arise from the five publications reviewed. The first is the relationship of age and gender to burial practice. Both Stoodley and Lucy distinguish five principal groupings of gravegoods, only two of which, weapons and dress accessories/jewelry, can be correlated with gender. Despite acknowledging that many burials do not evidence any gendered furnishings, Dickinson follows Stoodley's contention that gender was an important structuring principle for the Anglo-Saxons. Males were buried with a gendered grave kit by the fifth century, while the female kit developed more slowly. However, both kits were in their most extensive and normalized usage by the sixth century. With the polarization of grave wealth during the early seventh century, male kits were reserved for adults who were often interred in or near barrows, while female kits furnished both children and adults buried in communal cemeteries. Stoodley frames this patterning within a context of power, authority, and control. According to his interpretation, the gendered burials of the fifth and sixth centuries "arose from an ideology which combined concepts of military role, familial position, and actual or aspiration, communal origin, thus ethnogenesis" (84). Emerging kindreds elevated the central role of women as wives and mothers. However, competition among males for dominance within families during the late sixth and seventh centuries resulted in an emphasis in burials on expressions of social stratification and political authority. Dickinson notes that Stoodley's association of military ideals and gender relations articulates the importance of the mortuary ritual within the community generally (and implicitly ascribes agency to its female, as well as male, members). Although less well developed in the five volumes reviewed, Dickinson identifies the construction of the burial landscape as the second emerging theme in early medieval archaeology. The physical location of the dead in relation to liturgical space, existing monuments, settlements, roads, and boundaries may have signaled (or, I would argue, have created, maintained, and legitimized) relationships, both fictive and real, with ancestors and descendents.

The discovery of an early Anglo-Saxon cemetery outside the Roman fort at Little Chester, Derbyshire, recalls a similar juxtaposition at Catterick, Yorkshire. Whether representing the final *floruit* of a late or sub-Roman roadside cemetery or the repository of a diminished community living within the decommissioned fort, the Little Chester

cemetery was established after the vicus had been abandoned, as Anglo-Saxon graves cut through Roman buildings, roads, and features. In "The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery," (In Christopher Sparey-Green, "Excavations on the South-Eastern Defences and Extramural Settlements of Little Chester, Derby 1971–2," *Derbyshire Archaeological Jnl* 122: 1–328 at 82–121), Gavin Kinsley reports on the excavation of seventeen partly-preserved burials. Among these was a female interred in a prone position. Kinsley rightly steers wide of some of the more sensationalistic interpretations of prone burials, yet implies that the Little Chester example may represent a live burial. Although the limits of the cemetery were not identified and body orientations varied around the western range of the compass, some degree of internal organization is suggested by the one apparent row of graves. The dress accessories furnishing female burials at Little Chester correspond to a traditional "Anglian" fashion. However, atypical or unusual variants of small-long brooches, form C4 wrist-clasps, and pins were incorporated into this costume. None of the graves could be more closely dated from their furnishings than to the period from the late fifth to early seventh century. The clear and detailed presentation of the grave inventories and osteological data by Kinsley and his collaborators insures that this cemetery will be of greater value to Anglo-Saxon studies than its few burials might indicate.

Early Anglo-Saxon Isle of Wight is known largely through eleven cemeteries, about which our understanding is compromised by the standards of their nineteenth century excavation. According to Elaine L. Morris and Tania M. Dickinson, the tantalizingly elusive evidence of these burial sites is redressed to some extent by the discovery of three burials on the hill-top at Carisbrooke Castle (C.J. Young, *Excavations at Carisbrooke Castle, Isle of Wight, 1921–1996*, Wessex Archaeology Report 18 [Salisbury: Trust for Wessex Archaeology, 2000], 86–97). Most notable among these was an elite male burial dated, on the basis of the Visigothic *tremissis* (*ca.* 509–520) held in his mouth, to the second quarter of the sixth century. Furnishing this burial were prestige accoutrements, including glass and ivory gaming pieces and four feasting vessels: a glass bowl, drinking horn with silver and copper alloy fittings, copper-alloy bound stave-built wooden bucket, and a copper alloy beaded rim bowl. The other two graves, one outfitted with possible box fittings, a belt buckle, and a glass bowl, and the other with an iron knife, pin, and bar, were identified with varying degrees of certainty as those of females. The Continental glass vessels from these graves speak to the late fifth- and early sixth-century political and economic relationships underlying coastal Channel connections. These burials may have been part of a larger cemetery destroyed by later buildings. Despite the discovery of Early and Middle Saxon sherds across the hill-top, a series of tenth- and eleventh-century timber buildings represents the earliest firm occupation evidence. The construction of a defensive enclosure may have occurred around the same time in response to Viking raids. The existence and siting of these defenses may have influenced the location selected for the Norman castle.

In "An Anglo-Saxon Quadruple Weapon Burial at Tidworth: A Battle-Site on Salisbury Plain," (*Proc. of the Hampshire Field Club Archaeol. Soc.* 57: 38–52), Heinrich Härke and Roy Entwistle report on the 1992 excavation of a mid-sixth century multiple burial. The grave site, located on a spur of land overlooking the valley of the river Bourne, appears to have been isolated from any larger community cemetery. The internal stratigraphy of the grave pit indicates that the bodies of four males, ranging in age from eighteen to over forty-five years of age, were first placed in grave before most if not all of the weapons were deposited. The unhealed trauma wound evidenced by one of the skeletons may have resulted from a weapon thrust. The authors position this burial within the context of renewed hostilities resulting from local Saxon expansion in the later sixth century.

The perception that settlement patterns were consistent from the middle Anglo-Saxon period into medieval times is challenged by excavation results from a late Anglo-Saxon cemetery and a section of an early to middle Anglo-Saxon ditch at Fillingham (Lincolnshire). As authors J.L. Buckberry and D.M. Hadley detail in "Fieldwork at Chapel Road, Fillingham," *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 36 (2001): 11–18, while settlement might have broadly continued within an area, land-use was not consistent as specific locations moved in and out of usage over time.

The late Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Fillingham, which had been previously identified by skeletal finds in 1953 and 1982, was excavated in 2000 by the Department of Archaeology and Prehistory at the University of Sheffield. Six east-west aligned, extended, supine burials were arrayed in two parallel rows. The presence of pillow stones in most graves, residual early to middle Anglo-Saxon pottery in several grave fills, and radio carbon dates suggest a late Anglo-Saxon date for the cemetery. Human remains from the excavated burials, as well as fragmentary bone from grave fills and trenches, represent a minimum number of eighteen adults and eight sub-adults. The cemetery may have been associated with a local church, though none has to be been identified.

G.F.

The second volume of the new Yorkshire archaeology journal produced two papers relevant to the pre-Conquest period in this county. The first, by Richard Hall, "Blood of the Vikings—The Riddle at Riccall," *Yorkshire Archaeology Today* 2 (January 2002): 5 discusses the remains from a cemetery first discovered in 1956, and also partly excavated in 1985, from which fifty-two skeletons were recovered, the majority of them men. As there appears to be no nearby settlement, the original excavator, Peter Wenham, suggested that they were the dead from the battle of Stamford Bridge (the battle in which Harold and the English defeated Harald Hardraada from Norway before heading south to his own defeat at Hastings). Hardraada had his base camp at Riccall. Hall contributes the information that when samples from the tooth enamel of these skeletons were tested, using oxygen isotope analysis to find out where they came from, it was shown that they did indeed come a zone around the Baltic Sea including Norway. A paper not included in the *OEN* bibliography for 2002 but relevant to students of the period is "Off the Back of a lorry—in Ripon," *Yorkshire Archaeology Today* 2 (January 2002): 11 by Mark Johnson. A County Highways Department program of pavement replacement on St. Marygate, Ripon, provided further evidence a cemetery associated with the small Viking Age church in the area. In this case the evidence was only uncovered when the Department's lorry was stopped from carting the bone remains off to a dump. The finds included bone objects, such as decorated handles and combs, as well as human remains.

E.C.

In "From Pots to People: Two Hundred Years of Anglo-Saxon Archaeology" ('*Lastworda Betst*', 144–169), Sam Lucy presents a detailed historiographic analysis of shifts in the discipline of Anglo-Saxon archaeology, largely as a result of new excavations and techniques which open up evidence from funerary sites to expansive settlements and everyday life. Beginning with a section on studies done in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with their goals of establishing the overwhelming dominance of Germanic elements over Celtic and native English forms, Lucy traces the development of settlement archaeology and demographic studies in the twentieth century. He is savvy at pointing out methodological and interpretive biases such as assumptions of linear stylistic "evolution," the incompleteness of the extant record, and anti-feminism in the examination of female graves. Lucy's examination of the field suggests a field moving from an impression of fifth and sixth century England as a decisive break with its Roman cultural past under the Angles and Saxons to an impression of cultural coexistence, more complicated and

mutually responsive than previously imagined. It provides a useful perspective on the discipline's intellectual development and has useful notes for tracing its primary trends.

Alison Taylor's *Burial Practice in Early England* (Stroud: Tempus, 2001) is an extremely readable introduction for students just beginning to investigate funerary circumstances from the Neolithic to the Anglo-Saxon periods. To preserve this flow, the text lacks footnotes but is supplemented by a comprehensive bibliography for further reading. Taylor's "Introduction" reveals her perspective that the funerary site reveals the collective experience of a community to its dead in the preparation and interment of the dead and their grave goods and that that relationship is one which can exist over time and different groups; she asks some provocative questions about burial customs, particularly around the death of children. The book is arranged in chapters by period: Neolithic, Bronze Age, Iron Age, Roman burial in the first and second centuries, Roman burial in the third and fourth centuries (an important and useful distinction for burial customs and finds), the early Anglo-Saxon period (the most detailed section showing sensitivity to the variety of detail of Anglo-Saxon burials reflecting the very real tribal/cultural variations in Anglo-Saxon England), and the late Anglo-Saxon period (a less complete chapter). One of the greatest strengths is her organization of chapters to include material relationships between earlier and later sites. The work includes many short individual studies (including Deeping St. Nicholas, Lincs. for the Bronze Age, King Harry Lane Verulamium (St. Albans) for the Iron Age, Cirencester for late Roman, Barrington for Early Anglo-Saxon) which help to exemplify the ideas expressed in the chapters more generally. The strength of this work is in its needed general survey of grave practices, providing an examination grounded in solid fieldwork and analysis for a generalist audience.

F.A.

d. Artifacts and Iconography

Volume 18 of *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* is a special issue entitled *Medieval Animals*, edited by Aleks Pluskowski. Several articles (see below) explicitly address the role of animals in Anglo-Saxon England while others, whose geographic and temporal scope fall beyond the scope of this review, offer relevant concepts and approaches. For example, "The Role of Archaeology in the Interpretation of Socioeconomic Status: A Discussion with Reference to medieval Europe" by Steve Ashby (37–59) emphasizes some of the ways in which social differences are articulated in foodways. Likewise, in a closing

essay (153–82) which might have more appropriately intro-duced the volume, Aleks Pluskowski proposes a frame-work for assessing the social roles of animals. Advocating an interdisciplinary approach, Pluskowski argues that the evidence of documents, iconography, and faunal remains must be integrated in order to assess issues of utility, ecol-ogy, and cosmology in understanding medieval human-animal relations. In the same volume Anna Gannon's essay, "King of All beasts—Beasts of All Kings: Lions in Anglo-Saxon Coinage and Art" (22–36), positions the animal art of Anglo-Saxon coinage within the wider context of met-alwork and Gospel books. Noting that the classical ante-cedents of the lions that grace early eighth-century sceattas would have been known to the Anglo-Saxons through the legacy of Roman and Roman-British art, Gannon illus-trates their importance as a model of royal prestige. The triple-tufted tail and open snout of the active lion struck on the first Northumbrian silver coinage of Aldfrith (685–704) suggests a prototype among classical textiles. Likewise, sources in the textiles or other portable goods originating in the Christian East are proposed for the rigid and badge-like leonine beasts found on later Northumbrian Series Y coinage of Alchred (765–74). However, the influence of new models is becomes evident on the coins of Eadberht of Series Y, Class A, and certain coins of Class Q charac-terized by lions with "lolling tongues." Coins of Series K, carrying a profile lion's head, recall Anglo-Saxon metal-work and manuscripts. The forward-facing lion's head that appears on the eighth-century Anglo-Saxon "animal mask" coinage may be associated with a Christian reading of vigi-lance and protector and anticipate the art of the Carolin-gian Renaissance.

Hanging bowls, such as those found at Sutton Hoo, are renowned not only for their aethestic achievement but also for the controversy generated regarding their antecedants, production sites, function, date, stylistic parallels, and ico-nography. In "A New Interpretation of the Witham Bowl and Its Animal Imagery" (*Medieval Animals*, 60–79), Paul Sorrell combines art historical and literary analyses to examine the Anglo-Saxon world-view articulated in one example. The Witham Bowl was discovered in 1816 during river work east of Lincoln. After its exhibition at Leeds in 1868, the silver bowl disappeared, leaving documentation in a series of drawings now in the collection of the Society of Antiquaries of London. Drawing on stylistic analogies between the Witham Bowl and late eight- and ninth-cen-tury metalwork such as Ormside Bowl, Ardagh Chalice, St. Ninian's Isle hoard, and Derrynaflan Chalice, and Kirko-swald silver, and citing a literary parallel to Anglo-Saxon animal-decorated silver bowls in the *Liber Pontificalis*, Sor-rell suggests that the vessel was most likely manufactured

in Anglo-Saxon England around 800. The cast silver ani-mal figure at the base of the Witham bowl is compared with the revolving fish figure mounted in the late sixth- or early seventh-century bronze hanging bowl from Sutton Hoo, Mound 1, and the fragmentary center mount from the late seventh- or early eighth-century silver hanging bowl from the St. Ninian Isle's hoard. Sorrell argues that, as with the Sutton Hoo bowl, the Witham Bowl was con-cocted as a playful conceit that placed a moveable model animal—in this case an otter—within a microcosm of its watery natural environment.

Although bird and animal stamps, along with freehand drawings and zoomorphic bosses, constitute the only ani-mal decoration found on early Anglo-Saxon ceramics, they remain unusual among the massive corpus of recorded stamps. In "Animal and Bird Stamps on Early Anglo-Saxon Pottery in England," (*Die Altsachsen im Spiegel der natio-nalen und internationalen Sachsenforschung*, ed. Hans-Jurgen Häßler, 99–111), Bruce Eagles and Diana Briscoe discuss the distribution, typology, and date of thirty-eight bird and animal stamps discovered at eight sites in east-ern England. Although these stamps, along with freehand drawings and zoomorphic bosses, constitute the only ani-mal decoration found on early Anglo-Saxon ceramics, they are unusual among the approximately 23,000 stamps recorded in the Archives of Anglo-Saxon Pottery Stamps. Most of the animals are interpreted as horses, although deer, hares, dogs, waterfowl, and doves are also identified. This design preference is dated to the late fifth and early sixth centuries on the evidence of four bird- and animal-stamped vessels containing grave-goods from mixed rite cemetery at Spong Hill (Norfolk). While the authors derive their reading of the elite status of the deceased largely from the scabbard bindings found in one of the Spong Hill urns, perhaps more compelling are the miniature toilet tools that furnished the all four cremations, including the three infants and juveniles whose remains were contained in the other vessels.

In 1998, a small gilded silver male figure was found by an authorized metal detectorist at the later sixth and sev-enth century cemetery and settlement at Bloodmoor Hill, Carlton Colville, Suffolk. Leslie Webster, in "Face to Face with an Anglo-Saxon Pagan Deity" (*Minerva* 2002: 15), sit-uates this recent find among a group of similarly scaled three dimensional bronze figures from eastern Eng-land. Although Webster elsewhere suggests an association between the Bloodmoor Hill figure and the god Woden (Treasure Annual Report 2000, no. 62; http://www.culture.gov.uk/global/publications/archive_2002), in this publi-cation she conjectures that the treatment of the man's cap,

hand, and genitalia evokes a connection with Scandinavian fertility gods. Developing this interpretation, Webster further proposes that the male and female figures from England may represent the Anglo-Saxon cognates of the Scandinavian god Freyr and his sister Freyja.

In "An Anglo-Saxon Inscribed Fossil Echinoid from Exeter Street, London? An Alternative Interpretation" (*MA* 46: 107–10), David Notton questions the recent attribution of human agency to a putative inscription identified on a flint fossil sea urchin. The fossil in question, found in a rubbish pit, carried indented lines read as amuletic text (G. Brown, E. Okasha, R. Page, and C. Pickard, "A Middle Anglo-Saxon runic inscription from the National Portrait Gallery and an inscribed fossil echnoid from Exeter Street," *MA* 45 [2001]: 203–10). Comparing the Exeter Street fossil with more than twenty similar examples in the Reading Museum Service collection, Notton notes the prevalence of similar naturally caused indentations. Because the hardness of the flint fossil would have challenged Anglo-Saxon steel tools and because the Exeter Street fossil lacks any evidence of alternative techniques, such as chipping or grinding with another flint, Notton argues against human fabrication. Moreover, the ambiguity of the putative runic inscription renders it vulnerable to over-interpretation. Fossil echinoids are common in many soils around London, leading Notton to conclude that the Exeter Street example was merely a natural constituent of its deposit.

G.F.

Elizabeth Coatsworth and Michael Pinder present an engaging and thorough discussion, in *The Art of the Anglo-Saxon Goldsmith: Fine Metalwork in Anglo-Saxon England: Its Practice and Practitioners*, Anglo-Saxon Studies 2 (Woodbridge: Press, 2001). The combination of figures, black and white photographs, and eight color plates whets the appetite for more illustration, especially given the excellent text. In addition to a notably up-to-date bibliography, three unusual and useful supplementary materials here deserve mention: a glossary of technical terms for those newly approaching the material; an appendix of Anglo-Saxon vocabulary on metalworking, which out the richness of the contemporary language around both technical and social contexts; and a catalogue of the principal objects discussed, providing researchers with basic formal details and useful source references. In a careful introduction, the authors consider some of the methodological problems connected to this material and the state of research in the field. Limited to some degree by the quantity of extant material, solved here by the careful inclusion of partial and damaged material as well as complete works, Coatsworth

and Pinder provide a detailed assessment of the facture of Anglo-Saxon metal work. Moreover, their inclusion of textual sources and contemporary images allows them to discuss the social positioning of both goldsmiths and their art over the period. Issues of facture begin with Chapter 2, the archaeological evidence for goldsmiths and their tools, which provides a look at refining practices, tool types (especially as found in grave goods), and evidence of workshops; they raise and carefully balance competing evidence such as the social position of goldsmiths and the suggestion of itinerancy. Chapter 3 focuses on technical processes by stressing the importance of casting in the Anglo-Saxon approach and the valuable evidence gained from examination of crucibles themselves. Chapters 4 and 5 address decorative techniques, with rich analysis of the pressblech technique (a die technique for creating plaques of thin sheet metals), drawing on physical evidence such as the back of a buckle from Sarre (Kent) to show die marks and consider the parallels to bone dies as well. Niello, used to emphasize designs by filling them with black and seen in Anglo-Saxon pieces such as the seventh-century Sutton Hoo gold buckle and the ninth-century Fuller Brooch, is particularly interesting since it lacks an Old English term (just one example of Coatsworth's and Pinder's multi-disciplinary research). Chapter 6 is an analysis of construction and design, made most interesting by the authors' movement beyond the conventional analysis of Anglo-Saxon as simply characterized by resplendent materials, radial symmetry, and geometry to consider the period's visual sources from Celtic, Anglo-Saxon, Roman and Mediterranean, and Viking forms and the ways in which metal arts respond to work in other media. Chapters 7 and 8 take the work from its more direct archaeological/art historical analysis of this production to a consideration of a wide range of source material such as Biblical passages, Weland legends, Anglo-Saxon poems, illuminations from the 820–830 Stuttgart Psalter and the 820–823 Utrecht Psalter, wills, charters, and laws to develop the social history of the material and the artists. Coatsworth and Pinder have pulled together all of the fractional parts of the available evidence to create a conscientious and critical examination of the material, technique, forms and iconography, social place and valuation of the goldsmith's work between the fifth and the eleventh centuries in England.

James Graham-Campbell's *Pictish Silver: status and symbol*, H. M. Chadwick Memorial Lectures 13 (Cambridge: U of Cambridge, Dept. of Anglo-Saxon, Norse, and Celtic) publishes a 2002 talk given by him as the thirteenth H.M. Chadwick Memorial Lecture at Cambridge University's Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse, and Celtic, which accounts for its less formal style. While grounded in

current scholarship on Pictish art, it too often returns to a refutation of material presented by Lloyd Laing on both the finds at Norrie's Law and Aberlemno. The lecture covers primarily the material on the St. Ninian's hoard, twenty-eight pieces of silver, weighing 1918.4 g. in total, and including eight bowls, twelve penannular brooches, three cone shaped mounts, a spoon and a claw instrument, two scabbard chapes, and a sword pommel. His analysis draws from the limited finds which help to situate this find but is strongest in its source criticism of the incomplete and anecdotal archaeological accounts for the hoard to raise questions about its find spot, placement and packing at the time of its burial. The format of this piece, as transcribed lecture, does not serve the larger interesting questions or highlight Graham-Campbell's interest in establishing the visual connections between Anglo-Saxon and Pictish styles, the social connections between these cultures and European Christendom, and the interaction between Pictish secular and ecclesiastical cultures.

Charles and Nancy Hollinrake introduce a 1997 find in "A Late-Saxon Comb Handle from Bawdrip" (*Somerset Archaeology and Natural History* 144: 213–214). The carved antler object is about 2 inches (53–60 mm) long and about .75 inches (18–20 mm) wide. It is placed in the context of the few other similar finds as possibly Frisian, dated to the ninth to tenth century.

Illustrated with lovely color photos but written for a general audience with no footnotes, John Moreland's "The Bradbourne Cross" (*Current Archaeology* 15: 456–60) presents a short "biography" of the eighth or ninth century cross, focusing on its life after the Reformation iconoclasm of the mid-sixteenth century. Probably broken up by the 1580s, a large piece was buried under the west wall of the late sixteenth to mid seventeenth century porch. In 1793, antiquarian interest in its carvings caused its identification as a Roman fertility image; in 1886, though rescued by the Rev. George Forrest Browne as a medieval cross, the Bradbourne Cross acquires a misread reputation as an example of Roman Catholic ecclesiastical corruption of the native pre-Augustinian church.

Craft, Industry, and Everyday Life: Finds from Medieval York, The Archaeology of York: The Small Finds 17/15 (York: Council for British Archaeology), 2673–3183, by Patrick Ottaway and Nicola Rogers is part of a series on small finds, but the book itself is a very large and lavish. This is a discussion and catalogue of medieval artifacts from numerous small sites and four major sites (Coppergate, Fishergate, Bedern Foundry, and the College of the Vicars Choral of York Minster at Bedern) in York. Extending into

the fourteenth century, the materials here reflect objects of craft, meaning small scale manufacturing activity with non-specialist equipment, industry (large scale, fixed equipment), and mundane articles (from locks and keys to jewelry to medical items like tweezers). It begins with archaeological introductions to the sites, including histories of the site, text and table summaries, and excavation histories. There is a separate conservation report of work by the York Archaeological Trust Conservation Laboratory between 1973 and 1997; it is most detailed in the assessment of some 2,000 ironwork objects which were all x-rayed and the 500 which were conserved to clean them for recording, to arrest corrosion, and to reveal non-ferrous inlays. The catalogue is well illustrated by photos (a few in color) and drawings of many objects and by relevant medieval illuminations and sculpture which provide secondary use illustrations. Short analysis appears before the classes of objects but few are highlighted in detail; a listing of all of the objects appears in the back. After the catalogue is a scholarly analysis attempting to reconstruct some sense of these objects across the period; there is also an examination of the correlation between objects and the details of the sites spatially (where finds are distributed, what kinds). These are done with great sensitivity to the lack of information and the attempt to correlate diverse samples. A section on what these objects suggest about economy and culture in medieval York presents interesting material on the interaction between craft items and larger manufacturing tools and regarding the life practices of medieval people. There is a short section on Anglo-Saxon items from Coppergate and Piccadilly, primarily of objects like knives, which also reveal information about the stratigraphy of the sites.

In "The Venerable Bede, Druidic Tonsure and Archaeology" (*Antiquity* 76: 458–471), Natalie Venclová, excavator of the site of Mšecké Žehrovice, discusses the La Tène head dated to the third century B.C. and asks if the distinctive band hair style of the figure might not be a representation of a druidic tonsure. Arguing that the figure is unlikely to be a deity based on other Iron Age representations and the domestic, as opposed to sacral, site it was found in, she suggests that the hair is carefully and deliberately represented in a way that is not necessarily typical of La Tène figures who more generally exhibit hair combed back to front. Venclová is aware of the conjectural difficulties of her argument; the connection between Early Christian insular monks and pre-Christian insular druids is more secure than her suggestion here of a connection between druids on the British Isles and those in Central Europe. She presents some interesting material as possibilities. The article is hampered some by her use of older Latin translations of Bede, and hampered considerably by fewer photos

than desirable and computer drawings that are not of high quality.

F.A.

All the metal artifacts to be discussed in the following reviews have come from metal detector finds, a development which brings both a mass of new information and in some cases uncertainty as to its evidential value. B.J.N. Edwards in "A Group of Pre-Conquest Metal-work from Asby Winderwath Common." *Trans. of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Soc.* 3rd ser. 2: 111–43, discusses the discovery by metal detector in 1993 of a hoard of 115 objects, ten of copper-alloy, the rest iron. Because of the circumstances of the find, there is no absolute certainty that these objects were associated with one another, but the author concludes that the fact that all were found within a small dry-stone building partly walled by a limestone scarp still *in situ* supports the belief that they were indeed a group, perhaps brought together for recycling during the period of Viking activity in the ninth to tenth centuries. The iron objects are tools and objects of everyday life, including an auger or spoonbit, "scythe" blades, bells, knives, nails, staples and hinge fittings, rings, ferrules (tips of wooden shafts), keys, buckles, binding strips, and a flesh fork. Most of these could come from a wide range of dates, although the "scythe" blades and hinge fittings fit most comfortably within the proposed date range 800–1000 A.D., partly supported by some of the copper-alloy objects. Most notable among these is a plaque with vine scroll and animal ornament dated by Susan Youngs of the British Museum to Northumbrian work of *ca.* 800, which had clearly been removed with force from its original setting. The same author reports on another metal detector find in B.J.N. Edwards, "A Viking Scabbard Chape from Chatburn, Lancashire," *AntJ* 82: 321–28. Chapes from the Viking period are relatively uncommon, and Edwards cites only one other example, from York. His dating to the tenth century is based on a parallel to the zoomorphic decoration from a chieftain's burial in Norway: the chape is therefore evidence for the Norse presence in the region of its discovery at that time. Gabor Thomas has contributed two notices of additions to the corpus of pre-Conquest metalwork discovered through metal detecting. In "Hamsey near Lewes, East Sussex: The Implications of Recent Finds of Late Anglo-Saxon Metalwork for Its Importance in the Pre-Conquest Period," *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 139 (2001): 123–32, he catalogs in detail six copper-alloy items, including three strap ends (ninth century), tweezers (mid- to late-Saxon), and two fragments of horse trappings (Anglo-Scandinavian). All were found close to the parish church of St. Peter, Hamsey, and he suggests that

they may be associated with a precursor to the later medieval curia of *Hamme* (Hamsey), where the parish church is adjacent to the site of a medieval manorial residence. He is most concerned to show that metal detector finds are a neglected source of evidence that nevertheless has considerable potential to advance our understanding of settlement and regional economy in the mid- to late-Saxon period—in this case in Sussex. However, from the number of papers with metal detector finds now coming through, it seems that this evidence is no longer neglected, if indeed it ever was. In "Vikings in the City: A *Ringerike*-Style Buckle and Related Artefacts from London," *London Archaeologist* 9 (2001): 228–30, Thomas discusses a Ringerike-style buckle, found by metal detector on the spoil heap of an excavation in London on the Thames Exchange site in Upper Thames Street, sadly unstratified because missed by the archaeologists in the first instance. He places the find in the context of the period of rule of Cnut and his sons Harald and Harthacnut (1016–42), when the style is found associated with both England and Denmark. He notes that there are now some fourteen artifacts (including sculpture) in this style from the City of London, reflecting its cultural and economic importance under Danish rule; and that there is beginning to accumulate evidence for a workshop specializing in the production of Ringerike-style metalwork in the area. David Williams produces further evidence for late Danish influence, again in the form of horse trappings, this time spur fragments, discovered by metal detector. In "Two Late Saxon Spur Fragments from Sussex and Hampshire," *MA* 46: 115–18, he records that both are of a type not previously recorded, perhaps a sub-type as he later adduces parallels from Hampshire, Denmark, and Germany. He relates the ornament to the late Urnes style, so dating will depend on when this style is believed to develop and when introduced into England. It is possible that these belong to the late eleventh century, rather than to the late Saxon period as suggested.

In *The Sandbach Crosses: Sign and Significance in Anglo-Saxon Sculpture* (Dublin: Four Courts), Jane Hawkes discusses in detail the sculptured remains at Sandbach in Cheshire. A complete description of the crosses still standing in the market place and the less well-known fragments in the churchyard is provided in three useful appendices (149–80). The existence of at least two large-scale crosses, and four smaller ones plus a coped tombstone, is an impressive collection from one Anglo-Saxon site which suggests that Sandbach was a place of some considerable importance in the pre-Conquest period. Its only documentary acknowledgement, however, is in Domesday Book, from which all we know is that it had a church and a priest in the eleventh century. The study begins with a full modern

history of all the fragments. A detailed description and discussion of the iconography of the two major crosses follows, with a discussion of the significance of each scene (illuminated by reference to early medieval documentary sources, homiletic literature, and biblical exegesis), as well as its sources and stylistic parallels. A most interesting section is on the identification of one scene on the North Cross as a "*Traditio Legis cum Clavis,*" in which Christ hands the keys of heaven to St. Peter and the scroll or book of the New Law to Paul. Hawkes considers this reference to the foundation of the church on earth is part of the larger significance of this monument. Her conclusions as to dating and cultural context based on her analysis are summed up on pp. 128–48. An important aspect of these is her discussion of the openness of the Sandbach sculptors to a wide range of influences, including Ireland and Scotland as well as existing works from earlier Northumbrian and Mediterranean sources, and later work from southern England and Carolingian Europe. She places all the monuments in the very early ninth century, when Mercia was still flourishing and independent, and suggests a possible connection to the continuing aspirations of senior clergy of the region in the years immediately after Lichfield lost its status as an archdiocese. This is a very tight and specific dating, and I would myself still argue for a rather later date, but this is a most important study which sets an admirable standard for the study of individual monuments and their contexts. There are excellent illustrations, drawings as well as photographs, and a full bibliography.

E.C.

e. Numismatics

Elizabeth J. E. Pirie's *Thrymsas, Sceattas and Stycas of Northumbria*, Northumbrian Numismatic Studies 2 (Llanfyllin: Gallata, 2000) provides a useful register of coin-finds struck for Northumbria's seventh to ninth century kings and archbishops. Details of the place and date of discovery, particular issue, disposition, and publication are presented by geographical location. Additionally, appendices summarize relationships with Carolingian issues and detail a series of lead weights that incorporate Northumbrian stycas. An understanding of the organization of minting in the kingdom remains elusive for a number of reasons, including the absence of moneyers' names from thrymsas and sceattas and our lack of scholarly knowledge concerning die details. Although southern coin issues were largely excluded from circulation in Northumbria, the monetary borders were not impermeable. A small number of Carolingian deniers appear to have circulated with Northumbrian stycas. Moreover, the volume of Northumbrian

coins recovered from South Yorkshire and North Lincolnshire may represent not casual losses but small-change currency.

In "A Remarkable Decade of Manx Coin Hoards, 1972–1982," (*Proceedings of the Isle of Man Natural History and Antiquarian Society* 11: 29–50), Marshall Cubbon reports on five (possibly six) hoards, three of which are of chronological relevance here. The composition of a group of six tenth-century Anglo-Saxon pence, sixteen eleventh-century Anglo-Saxon pence, fourteen eleventh-century Normandy deniers (and three fragments), twenty-one eleventh-century Hiberno-Norse pence, twenty-one eleventh-century Hiberno-Manx pence, and two small silver eleventh-century currency rings found at Kirk Michael churchyard in 1972 is reconstructed from various sources. An Edward the Confessor Hammer-cross and Hiberno-Norse Dolley Phase V pence date the deposition after 1059. Based on nineteenth-century maps and construction phases of the churchyard, Cubbon suggests that the hoard had been hidden in or below the sod-built boundary enclosing the eleventh-century cemetery. Likewise, a preference for concealing hoards in or near religious structures (keeill sites) is amplified by the discoveries in 1981 of a tenth- or early eleventh-century plaited gold finger-ring at the site of a ploughed-out keeill at Eary Lhane, Greba, and the excavation in 1982–83 of forty-two eleventh-century Hiberno-Norse silver pennies under the floor of a chapel at Peel Castle. These coins, struck by the Norse Viking kings of Dublin between *ca.* 1020 and *ca.* 1055, provide a *terminus post quem* in the mid-eleventh century for the Peel Castle hoard. Cubbon proposes that while the Peel hoard reflects the unsettled situation in the Irish Sea area following the local predations of Earl Thorfinn, the Kirk Michael hoard may have been a distant echo of the Norse defeat at Stamford Bridge. The close connection between Norse interests in Dublin and those on the Isle of Man, perhaps secured on the Island by a puppet ruler, is suggested by the influx of Hiberno-Norse coins from Dublin even after the establishment of a Manx mint in *ca.* 1025 and the contemporaneous circulation of both Hiberno-Norse and Hiberno-Manx coins.

G.F.

Craig Barclay provides four short find notices in "Four Coin Hoards from North Yorkshire" (*Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 74: 151–153). The largest of these finds—Northallerton—was a hoard of thirty-nine largely local Saxon pennies, without container, from King Eadmund (939–46), Eadred (946–55) (three coins), Eadwig (955–957) (seven coins), and Eadger (959–75) (twenty-eight coins). All are

of similar design with the royal name on the obverse and the moneyer's name in two lines on the reverse. The other finds concern Constantinian coins *ca.* 324–326 (Deighton), Henry VI silver *ca.* 1430 (Bedale), and mid- to late-sixteenth century coins (Brompton on Swale).

Mark Blackburn's short article, "Metheltun not Medeshamstede: An Anglo-Saxon Mint at Melton Mowbray rather than at Peterborough Abbey," (*The British Numismatic Journal* 70 [2001]: 143–145) examines a 1999 find of a First Hand coin of Æthelred II by Hilde (now in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge). Struck on the same Midlands style dies as the fragmentary example in Stockholm, it has complete inscriptions (reverse: + HILDE M-O ME Ð ELTV) which help to clarify the minting location. Blackburn counters Michael Dolley's 1954 attribution to Peterborough Abbey, arguing that linguistic evidence combined with the die type, suggest Melton Mowbray, twenty miles from Stamford and a place of importance as the center of the four sokes of Leicestershire with a large church and parish and a market of consequence. Blackburn's argument has implications for the minting history of Peterborough and its abbey as his argument removes these coins from their early history and stresses the inconclusive nature of the remaining attributions.

"An Edgar Reform Penny of Axbridge" by Stewart Lyon and Michael Sharp (*British Numismatic Journal* 71 [2002 for 2001]: 161) introduces a rare find from Winchester of an Anglo-Saxon coin from the burgh of Axbridge in North Somerset. The attribution to Axbridge is based on the inscription reading ÆLFSIG M-O AXAN and the connection to a moneyer recorded at Ilchester. Close to the Cheddar Anglo-Saxon palace, Axbridge might have been required occasionally to coin silver and shows Axbridge's part in coinage of the Reform type *ca.* 973.

The title of D.M. Metcalf's article, "'As Easy as A, B, C': The Mint-Places of Early Sceatta Types in the South-East," (*British Numismatic Journal* 71 [2002 for 2001]: 34–48) is intended as a joke: the mint-places of these coins is anything but simple. Taking the 1960–1 work of Stuart Ringold on sceatta classification, Metcalf's analysis suggests that regression analysis, which presumes uniform distribution of coinage, in fact hides the primary distribution path along the Dover/Folkestone-Canterbury-London trade route. He argues for a mint place of Kent for the sceatta series PA-A-C, possibly in a *wic* in the Canterbury area rather than in west Kent. Æthiliræd porcupines are part of Metcalf's attribution to east Kent, based on their distribution patterns; he suggests that they may be part of a joint coinage issued by the archbishop of Canterbury, along the same lines as

those issued by Archbishop Ecgberht and King Eadberht of Northumbria. He adds that series B is likely to come from the London area but grapples with the inconclusive distribution to support that attribution.

D.M. Metcalf also wrote "Determining the Mint-Attribution of East Anglian Sceattas through Regression Analysis" (*British Numismatic Journal* 70 [2001 for 2000]: 1–11) which centers on the series R sceattas and whether they should all be attributed to a single mint or multiple locations of concurrent types. One must appreciate his careful explanation of his methodology, making it easier to follow his study of their circulation and localization from their primary and secondary phases. He suggests that series R3-12 are bounded by the borders of East Anglia, making it almost certainly a royal coinage, but that its even distribution makes mint-place location difficult to determine; he suggests Ipswich but is careful that this is not necessarily supported by find-evidence. Series QI-III is localized and minted in west Norfolk but Metcalf is interested in the circulation between Norfolk and East Anglia, along a "monetary corridor" between Ipswich and Thetford. In the distribution of these series, and their precedents like series BZ, Metcalf is aware to the possibilities of political and ecclesiastic exchange between these areas in the early eighth century.

An outgrowth of electron probe microanalysis and wavelength dispersive spectrometry results published in 1986, D.M. Metcalf's and J.P. Northover's article, "Sporadic Debasement in English Coinage c. 1009–1052" (*Numismatic Chronicle* 162: 217–236) examines the currency reform beginning with Eadger in 973 to 1066, which replaced debased coins with high silver content (between *ca.* 90-96%) and small variations from one mint-place to another. The authors draw from their comprehensive scientific analysis to suggest the importance of brass in the production of money, and the likely correspondence between these coins and the political difficulties against the Danes in the early eleventh century and between Edward and Godwine in 1050–1051. The article is designed to raise questions about the connection between moneyers and the coins they produced. Scholars interested in this material should also see the next article for a companion study.

Robin Eaglen and Robert Grayburn, in the thorough scientific analysis of "Gouged Reverse Dies in the Quatrefoil Issue of Cnut" (*British Numismatic Journal* 70 [2001 for 2000]: 12–37), are specifically concerned with coins that are peck-marked or otherwise scored before acceptance or through mutilations, possibly official, of the dies. The article contains several very useful appendices on the

coins' die information, style, weight, etc.; readers will also appreciate the purity analysis charts in the text. Eaglen and Grayburn first put these coins in the context of other defaced coins and then provide extensive descriptive analysis. A high number (thirteen out of nineteen) of moneyers at Stamford used these gouged dies in the Quatrefoil type. Arguing that the gouges are deliberate and meant to be seen, the authors discuss weight and purity issues, strongly suggesting that the gouging in the die is meant to indicate debasement over the range of the issue. The analysis here is exclusively technical but the authors extend their findings to suggest social historical implications that these gouged dies should be connected to an emergency necessity for more coin, from possibly unassayed bullion under royal rather than franchisal authority, thus possibly linking these coins to later mintings associated with the levy of Cnut in 1018. Scholars interested in this material should also see D.M. Metcalf and J.P. Northover's article, "Sporadic Debasement in English Coinage c. 1009–1052" (previous paragraph) which provides a companion study.

In the short notice, "A Northumbrian 'Styca' from Wiltshire: The Problem with Southern Provenances of 'Stycas'" (*British Numismatic Journal* 71 [2002 for 2001]: 160–161) Paul Robinson assesses the inaccuracy of field spot reporting with regard to a 1914 finding of a Northumbrian 'styca' of Wigmund, Archbishop of York from 837–854 by the moneyer Hunlaf. The possibility that this is in fact a local find is presented; other Northumbrian "stycas" from Southern Britain, especially the recent London hoard and a "styca" of Redwulf from Lambeth, provide comparative material for what seems to be a notable find of this coin in Wessex.

"The Six O'Clock Farthings of Edward I" (*British Numismatic Journal* 70 [2001 for 2000]: 146) is a one paragraph note by Michael Sharp, illustrating an example of the unusual engraving error mentioned in more detail by Jeffrey North in the *J.J. North Collection, Edwardian English Silver coins 1279-1351* (Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles, London: Spink, 1989).

Veronica Smart's "Aldates, Gadutels, and Badigils: Identification of Moneyers in the Northumbrian Coinage" (*British Numismatic Journal* 70 [2001 for 2000]: 141–143) is a short linguistic examination of obscure names associated with moneyers on Northumbrian stycas, taking GADVTELS as the starting point and illustrating the nuances in the lettering. Her reading examines regional variations in name execution for the coins of Northumbria; plausibly she suggests that the two previously difficult names of Aldates and Gadutels, examined graphically and in the

context of the linguistic trends of the period (to explain -*gils* for -*gisel*), might in fact be representations of Badigils, a known moneyer from the reign of Eanred. Smart argues that the names Aldates and Gadutels should be considered within the rarity of the Badigils name as part of the same moneyer's production.

Two recent finds (from Great Bedwyn, Wiltshire, and from near Winchester) of brooches made of coins with pins attached to the backs so that their fronts show crosses sparked a review of eighteen examples, all from the third quarter of the eleventh century (early 1050s–1070s), by Gareth Williams in "Coin Brooches of Edward the Confessor and William I" (*British Numismatic Journal* 71 [2002 for 2001]: 60–70). Coin brooches of similar type exist from the ninth century onward. Williams presents a thorough catalogue listing for each example with type, mint, moneyer, and extensive comments; each has a listing for where illustrations can be found as only a small selection are reproduced on an accompanying plate. Fourteen of the examples were gilded, generally on the display side only; the brooches are made with simple pins and curved catchplates. The small size and light weight suggests that these are more decorative than functional and nothing inherently suggests that they were particularly worn by men or women. Williams holds that it is unlikely that the coins used for these brooches were in active circulation at the time of their conversion to jewelry, given the frequent recoinage of the late Anglo-Saxon and Norman periods. They tend to reflect the Expanding Cross, Pointed Helmet, and Sovereign types but Williams is appropriately cautious about extrapolating from his small sample. Williams also looks at the correlation between mints and provenances, finding that as an overall pattern, most are coming from major mints and that there is also a correlation between local mints and local finds. Finally, Williams addresses the cross iconography, finding any correlation between the imagery and either contemporary ecclesiastical or political changes difficult to support definitively.

Gareth Williams, in "An Enigmatic Coin from Eighth-Century Northumbria" (*British Numismatic Journal* 71 [2002 for 2001]: 158–160) writes an overview to the discussion surrounding the Northumbrian coin (British Museum CM 1999, 6–2, 1) from near Malton in North Yorkshire. Made of high-content silver, probably eighth and certainly no later than the very early ninth century, the inscriptions are both slightly incorrect and more suitable for the obverse. Correcting for inverted and reversed letters, they read +RAEDILRED, interpreted as a misspelling of Æthelred I of Northumbria (774–9 and 790–6), and +ELVALDREVD (+ELVALDREAD), a moneyer's name

used not under Æthelred but under Ælfwald (779–88) suggesting a mule between the two dies. Williams discusses carefully the alternate readings of the second inscription and counters the interpretation that the coin belongs to the reign of Æthelwald Moll (758–65).

f. Inscriptions

Alfred Bammesberger's "The *Brandon Antler* Runic Inscription," *Neophilologus* 86: 129–31, is a footnote on an inscription already well known from the work of Ray Page, David Parsons, René Derolez, and others. The first twelve letters of this inscription are completely legible, the next two are more difficult to read but are generally accepted and the last is a ligature. Bammesburger's contribution is to suggest that the ligature includes three letters instead of the two usually accepted, making the inscription more grammatical in a form appropriate to the early stage of Old English represented (late-seventh to early-eighth century). All readings translate the inscription to read "grew on a wild beast," and Bammesburger accepts Parsons's suggestion that the phrase is a link with the Anglo-Saxon riddle tradition. "Reply to John Hines's Review of *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture, Volume V: Lincolnshire* (published in *EME* 10.1, pp. 127–30)," *EME* 11: 105–06, is a riposte by Paul Everson, John Higgitt, David Parsons, and David Stocker to what they felt was an inaccurate and therefore unfair section in an otherwise favorable review of a volume in this major series, written by Everson and Stocker: the criticisms were directed at apparent evidence for carelessness in the contributions on the inscriptions by Higgitt and Parsons. The authors acknowledge one "regrettable but perhaps not major error" (and point to one no more serious on the part of the reviewer) but refute the arguments put forward in the other cases. The discussion is helpful to the knowledgeable reader and illuminating for the non-specialist reader wishing to understand how readings based on fragmentary inscriptions are developed. The article by Helen McKee and James McKee, "Counter Arguments and Numerical Patterns in Early Celtic Inscriptions: A Re-examination of *Christian Celts: Messages and Images*," *MA* 46: 29–40, is fascinating not only for its conclusion "that there is no reason to suppose that [the mathematical patterns in Celtic inscribed stones of western Britain identified by Professor Charles Thomas] are anything other than coincidences" but also because of its carefully constructed arguments. For example there is a detailed and useful discussion of the very slight evidence for Celtic interest in cryptograms and Letters as Numbers, betraying an insufficient level of sophistication, even among the best educated, for the sort of elaborate construction required by Thomas. The authors further show how easy it is to find numerical patterns in inscriptions while the number of different methods evoked by Thomas for finding such patterns implies that there was in fact no systematic method for embedding numbers in text.

E.C.

g. Miscellaneous

In "Roman Britons after 410" (*British Archaeology* 68: 8–11), intended for a general audience, Martin Henig argues for the survival of Roman culture through the Anglo-Saxon period. However, Henig's selection of the Latin language, Christianity, and decorative metalwork motifs as indicative of a continued Roman cultural presence fails to address why some Anglo-Saxons sought a remembrance of Roman things past. An agent-centered examination of this question could more insightfully consider the cultural setting that privileged these spiritual, linguistic, and artistic traditions and the motivations of the elites who trafficked in such survivals.

Also intended for a general audience is a brief note describing the visitor center at Sutton Hoo (Suffolk) by Andrew Curry, "Lives of the Proto-English," *Archaeology* 55.4 (July/August 2002): 61. The center, which opened in March 2002, houses a reproduction of the Mound 1 burial chamber and well as original finds from the site.

G.F.

Angela Care Evans's article, "The Sutton Hoo Visitor Centre" (*Minerva* 13.6: 40–42) has a twofold focus, but it serves merely as an enticing introduction to both. First, it aims to introduce readers to the new Sutton Hoo Visitors' facilities by discussing planning concerns of siting and the incorporation of a trail and a viewing platform over the cemetery; it briefly discusses the two low timber buildings on site, one housing the permanent exhibition and the second the temporary exhibition hall with materials on loan from the British Museum. The questions of museology and the choices made here are ripe for fuller examination. The second element discussed here is the findings made during the legally-required excavation of the site. They revealed a Bronze Age ring ditch and cremation and an early Anglo-Saxon mixed rite cemetery with seventeen cremations and nineteen inhumations. Twelve of these inhumations included weapons as grave goods; two had complete sets of sword, shield, and spear. Four of the burials were of women and one of these held two annular brooches, glass beads, a knife, and a buckle. Of special note are two cast copper alloy mounts embellished with sheet silver showing a bird

of prey and a pike. Care Evans raises, but is constrained by space, some of the issues raised in Alison Taylor's *Burial Practice in Early England* (Stroud: Tempus, 2001), particularly in wondering what the relationship is between these sites and the mid-sixth century royal mounds at Sutton Hoo.

   A half-page note by Kristin M. Romey, "Vintage Footage" (*Archaeology* 54/4 [July/August 2001]: 16), nevertheless announces an interesting "archaeological" find. A copy of the film that was made by Harold Phillips in conjunction with his brother Charles Phillips of the London Science Museum's cleaning and documentation of the Sutton Hoo excavations has been found by Harold Phillips's grandson. The London Science Museum's copy was destroyed in the Blitz; excerpts from the film are planned to be shown at the new exhibition center (see Angela Care Evans, "The Sutton Hoo Visitor Centre," above).

                                                                                          F.A.

Sutton Hoo and its environs along the Deben estuary continue to provide a wealth of information about early Anglo-Saxon England. As discussed in John Newman's "Sutton Hoo before Rædwald" (*Current Archaeology* 15: 498–505), the discovery in 1986 on a spur of land one kilometer north of the barrow cemetery of the "Bromeswell bucket," a bronze bowl probably produced in a sixth-century Antioch workshop, was followed by the excavation in 2000 of an adjacent mixed rite cemetery. This work at the Tranmer House site yielded nineteen inhumations and seventeen cremations. Nine cremations were associated with ring-ditches. One cremation, around which four others clustered, was interred in a Celtic-style hanging bowl, reminiscent of the example furnishing the Mound 1 burial in the barrow cemetery to the south. The Tranmer House site, as well as Bromeswell bucket, indicate an elite presence along the Deben estuary as early as 525–550.

                                                                                          G.F.

"The Sutton Hoo Hanging Bowl," (*Current Archaeology* 15: 50) is a response, with two stellar photographs of the object, by Susan Youngs, a curator of Medieval and Modern European Collections at the British Museum, to an earlier piece in the same issue of the journal (John Newman, "Sutton Hoo before Rædwald," 498–505; see above). While generally applauding that piece, she holds that the hanging bowl from Sutton Hoo should be seen alongside the "Coptic" vessels as luxury items made for rich patrons and imported into these Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. Calling attention to the patch on the rim, Youngs suggests a date for this piece as no later than the end of the sixth century.

"The Tradition of Detached Bell Towers at Cathedral and Monastic Churches in Medieval England and Scotland (1066–1539)" (*The British Archaeological Association* 154 [2001]: 54–83) by J. Philip McAleer is an examination of this architectural feature, more commonly known in Italian examples. The article focuses on their presence in Southern England, as, indeed, there is only the single Scottish example at the Augustinian abbey of Cambuskenneth (Stirlingshire); McAleer begins with a useful catalogue of campanile examples at St. Augustine's Abbey and the Cathedral in Canterbury, Glastonbury Abbey, Worcester Cathedral, Rochester Cathedral, St. Paul's Cathedral in London, Salisbury Cathedral, Westminster Abbey, Norwich Cathedral, Tewkesbury Abbey, Lichfield Cathedral, Chichester Cathedral, Romsey Abbey, Elstow Abbey, Evesham Abbey, and the partially attached version at King's College Chapel in Cambridge. He concludes with substantive analysis, suggesting that there was no standardization of placement, which is further puzzling because a detached campanile was an additional tower to locations which already had other bell towers as part of their fabric. Compared to their Italian counterparts, these towers lack the standard appearance of a lower story of the height of the eaves of the church and three to six stages of increasing numbers of openings as they reach their height. In England, their material construction (and reconstruction by McAleer) suggests a wooden building tradition as well as one in stone; he describes their varied forms as plain, rather graceless, massive constructions. McAleer suggests that in some cases the detached bell tower housed bells of unusual size, a possible reason for their construction; he adds that the hanging pattern of the bells may also explain the lack of vaulting inside these towers. He suggests the detached bell tower as an insular form separate from the Continental traditions.

                                                                                          F.A.

S.A.J. Bradley, in *Orm Gamalson's Sundial: The Lily's Blossom and the Roses' Fragrance*, The 1997 Kirkdale Lecture (Kirkdale: Trustees of the Friends of St. Gregory's Minster, Kirkdale), centers on the famous sundial and its inscription (which is transcribed in full, but uses it to demonstrates the "philosophy of time—of history and of the temporal progression through which we pass—which characterizes the early medieval church" on which this printed lecture is an extended meditation. Thus it ranges over Anglo-Saxon poetry in a study of *The Seafarer* with its expression of time, season, and destiny; contemporary history and social conditions (including the rootedness of the sundial and its inscription, with its Scandinavian names, in contemporary Anglo-Saxon learning); the importance for the

development of the computus and in particular works such as Byrthferth of Ramsey's *Enchiridion* (from which comes the quotation in the title) and much more. In "Timeless Thoroughbred," *Archaeology* 54.5 (September/October 2001): 40–43, Christine Finn briefly recounts documentary sources for the existence of the chalk-cut White Horse going back to the ninth century, but her feature and photograph spread is mainly concerned with a clean-up exercise of the monument carried out by local people under the supervision of the Oxford Archaeological Unit in 1990. The exercise was part of an investigation which concluded that the shape of the horse had in fact changed little over 3000 years. Graham Gower's "A Suggested Anglo-Saxon Signaling System between Chichester and London," *London Archaeologist* 10: 59–63, is a surprisingly interesting discussion of the possibility of a signaling system along the Roman road, Stane Street, the most direct route between Chichester and London, large parts of which are still incorporated into the modern road system. In the post-Roman as in the Roman period, the road would have been useful for the speedy movement of troops, the Viking enemy as well as for the defending Anglo-Saxons. The argument is based partly on the Anglo-Saxons' known use of warning beacons and their designation, apparently of Stane Street, as *here path* (army road), but mainly on the incidence of place names on the route containing Old English *tot* (look out place). This element is usually associated with areas of high ground commanding views of the surrounding countryside. Gower takes us along the road, showing how such a system could have worked: a speculative but interesting use of place name and topographical evidence.

E.C.

Works not seen

Ludlow, N.D., R.S.F. Ramsey, and D.E. Schlee. "Pill Priory, 1996–1999: Recent Work at a Tironian House in Pembrokeshire." *MA* 46 (2002): 41–80.

Hunter-Mann, Kurt. "The View from the Wolds: Excavations at Kilham, 2000–1." *Yorkshire Archaeology Today* 3 (May 2002): 2–3, ill.

Smith, Caroline. "A Barbarised Coinage? Copper Alloy in Pre-Viking Northumbrian Coinage." *Quaestio* 3: 59–75.

Syrett, Martin. *The Vikings in England: The Evidence of Runic Inscriptions*. ASNC Guides, Texts, and Studies 4. Cambridge: Univ. of Cambridge Dept. of Anglo-Saxon, Norse, and Celtic, 2002. iv, 159 pp. ill. + plates.

YWOES Abbreviations 2002

AB   *Analecta Bollandiana*
ANQ   [formerly] *American Notes & Queries*
AntJ   *Antiquaries Journal*
ArchJ   *Archaeological Journal*
ASE   *Anglo-Saxon England*
ASSAH   *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History*
BGDSL   *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und
            Literatur*
BN   *Beiträge zur Namenforschung*
CCM   *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*
CSASE   *Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England*
DAEM   *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*
DAI   *Dissertation Abstracts International*
EHR   *English Historical Review*
ELN   *English Language Notes*
EME   *Early Medieval Europe*
ES   *English Studies*
FS   *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*
JEGP   *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*
JEH   *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*
JTS   *Journal of Theological Studies*
MA   *Medieval Archaeology*
MÆ   *Medium Ævum*
MESN   *Medieval English Studies Newsletter*
MLR   *Modern Language Review*
MP   *Modern Philology*
MS   *Mediaeval Studies*
N&Q   *Notes & Queries*
NM   *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*
NOWELE *North-Western European Language Evolution*
OEN   *Old English Newsletter*
PQ   *Philological Quarterly*
RB   *Revue Bénédictine*
RES   *Review of English Studies*
SELIM   *Revista de la Sociedad Española de Lengua y Lit-
            eratura Inglesa Medieval*
SMART *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching*
SN   *Studia Neophilologica*
SP   *Studies in Philology*
YES   *Yearbook of English Studies*

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER

Research in Progress Report

Each year, the editors of the *Old English Newsletter* solicit information concerning current research, work completed, and forthcoming publications. The Research in Progress reports are an important collaborative enterprise, recording information of common interest to our colleagues. Please complete the form below (type or print clearly) and return it to Heide Estes, Department of English, Monmouth University, West Long Branch, NJ 07764 (or via email to hestes@monmouth.edu). If the subject of your project is not obvious from the title, please add a note indicating its best classification. For dissertations, please provide the name of the director.

Name _____

Address _____

Academic Affiliation (if not given above) _____

a=article, b=book or monograph, d=dissertation; IP=in progress, C=completed, TBP=to be published in/by.

1. Research in progress (aIP, bIP, dIP):

2. Research completed (aC, bC, dC):

3. Research forthcoming (TBP):

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 49008-5432
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:

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. MICHGAN AVE.
KALAMAZOO, MI 49008-5432