

# **OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER**

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

Editor: R.M. Liuzza

Associate Editors: Daniel Donoghue  
Thomas Hall

VOLUME	39
NUMBER	2
WINTER	2006

ISSN 0030-1973



# OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER

Volume 39 Number 2

Winter 2006

## *Editor*

R. M. Liuzza  
Department of English  
The University of Tennessee  
301 McClung Tower  
Knoxville, TN 37996-0430

## *Publisher*

Paul E. Szarmach  
Medieval Institute  
Western Michigan University  
1903 W. Michigan Ave.  
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5432

## *Associate Editors*

### *Year's Work in Old English Studies*

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

### *Bibliography*

Thomas Hall  
Department of English  
356 O'Shaughnessy Hall  
University of Notre Dame  
Notre Dame, IN 46556

*Assistant to the Editor:* Jonathan Huffstutler

*Assistant to the Publisher:* David Clark

**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 subscribe for two volumes at one time at the discounted rate of \$25. A subscription form is online and may be downloaded from [http://www.oenewsletter.org/OEN/subscription\\_form.pdf](http://www.oenewsletter.org/OEN/subscription_form.pdf). All payments must be made in US dollars. Individual back issues can be ordered for \$5 US; supplies are limited.

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

**Submissions:** The *Old English Newsletter* is a refereed periodical. Solicited and unsolicited manuscripts (except for independent reports and news items) are reviewed by specialists in anonymous reports. Scholars can assist the work of *OEN* by sending offprints of articles, and notices of books or monographs, to the Editor.

*OEN* is published for the Old English Division of the Modern Language Association by the Richard Rawlinson Center for Anglo-Saxon Studies and Manuscript Research at the Medieval Institute, Western Michigan University. *OEN* receives no financial support from the MLA; the support of the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists and the Department of English at The University of Tennessee are gratefully acknowledged.

Copyright © 2006, The Board of the Medieval Institute, Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5432

## *Editorial Office*

*email:* editor@oenewsletter.org  
*fax:* 865-974-6926  
*phone:* 865-974-6970

## *Publishing Office*

*email:* mdvl\_oen@wmich.edu  
*fax:* 269-387-8750  
*phone:* 269-387-8832

<http://www.oenewsletter.org/OEN/index.php>



# **THE YEAR'S WORK IN OLD ENGLISH STUDIES**

---

**2004**

## **CONTRIBUTORS**

Frances Altvater	<i>University of Hartford</i>
Dabney Bankert	<i>James Madison University</i>
Mary Blockley	<i>University of Texas at Austin</i>
Elizabeth Coatsworth	<i>Manchester Metropolitan University</i>
John David Cormican	<i>Utica College</i>
Christopher Cain	<i>Towson University</i>
Craig R. Davis	<i>Smith College</i>
Glenn Davis	<i>St. Cloud State University</i>
Jeannette Denton	<i>Baylor University</i>
Nicole Guenther Discenza	<i>University of South Florida</i>
Michael Fox	<i>University of Alberta</i>
John Harkness	<i>Augsburg College</i>
David F. Johnson	<i>Florida State University</i>
Richard F. Johnson	<i>William Rainey Harper College</i>
Eileen A. Joy	<i>Southern Illinois U—Edwardsville</i>
Stefan Jurasinski	<i>State U of New York—Brockport</i>
Catherine A. Karkov	<i>University of Leeds</i>
Aaron Kleist	<i>Biola University</i>
Joseph P. McGowan	<i>University of San Diego</i>
Robin Norris	<i>Carleton College</i>
Andrew Rabin	<i>University of Louisville</i>
Mary K. Ramsey	<i>Georgia State University</i>
Elizabeth Rowe	<i>Somerville, MA</i>
Phillip G. Rusche	<i>University of Nevada, Las Vegas</i>
Andrew Scheil	<i>University of Minnesota</i>
Emily Thornbury	<i>Churchill College, Cambridge</i>
M. Jane Toswell	<i>University of Western Ontario</i>
Benjamin C. Withers	<i>University of Kentucky</i>

## **EDITOR**

Daniel Donoghue      *Harvard University*

# Contents

---

<b>Foreword</b> . . . . .	<b>5</b>
<b>1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects</b> . . . . .	<b>6</b>
a. Cultural History . . . . .	6
b. Research Resources, Print and Electronic. . . . .	6
c. Tolkien and Anglo-Saxon Studies . . . . .	6
d. Reports on Projects . . . . .	7
e. Varia . . . . .	7
<b>2. Memorials, Tributes, History of the Discipline</b> . . . . .	<b>9</b>
a. History of the Discipline . . . . .	9
b. Memorials and Tributes. . . . .	14
<b>3. Language</b> . . . . .	<b>14</b>
a. Lexicon . . . . .	14
b. Phonology. . . . .	45
c. Syntax . . . . .	54
<b>4. Literature</b> . . . . .	<b>63</b>
a. General and Miscellaneous . . . . .	63
b. Individual Poems. . . . .	90
c. <i>Beowulf</i> . . . . .	100
d. Prose. . . . .	114
<b>5. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works</b> . . . . .	<b>129</b>
a. Celtic Latin . . . . .	129
b. Aldhelm and Early Anglo-Latin . . . . .	130
c. Bede . . . . .	132
d. Alcuin and the Carolingian Period . . . . .	134
e. Ninth to Twelfth Centuries . . . . .	138
<b>6. Manuscripts, Illuminations, and Charters</b> . . . . .	<b>141</b>
<b>7. History and Culture.</b> . . . . .	<b>154</b>
a. General Sources and Reference Works . . . . .	154
b. Religion and the Church . . . . .	155
c. Ecclesiastical Culture . . . . .	160
d. Society and the Family . . . . .	166
e. Gender and Identity . . . . .	168
f. The Economy, Settlement and Landscape . . . . .	169
g. Law, Politics and Warfare . . . . .	171
h. Vikings . . . . .	178
i. The Norman Conquest and Settlement . . . . .	179
<b>8. Names</b> . . . . .	<b>183</b>
<b>9. Archaeology, Numismatics, Sculpture</b> . . . . .	<b>188</b>
a. Regional Studies and the Economy . . . . .	188
b. Excavations . . . . .	201
c. Death and Burial . . . . .	209
d. Artifacts and Iconography . . . . .	213
e. Inscriptions . . . . .	219
f. Numismatics . . . . .	220
g. Miscellaneous. . . . .	221
<b>Abbreviations</b> . . . . .	<b>226</b>

## Foreword

---

With every issue we face the bittersweet task of welcoming newcomers as we say farewell to veteran reviewers. This year is no different: four are leaving, but four are joining (and one returning to) our *duguð*. Since the 2001 *YWOES* Genevieve Fisher lived up to the folk-etymology of her nickname “Viva” by helping to revive the Archaeology section. We are fortunate that Catherine Karkov, whom long-time readers will recognize as a mainstay in that section for many years, was able to step in as her replacement for 2004. Catherine managed to produce her usual perceptive reviews even while she was busy moving from Miami University of Ohio to take up a professorship at the University of Leeds. We wish her every success in her new position.

Mary Frances Giandrea’s name first appears on the masthead for the 1999 issue, and more recently she has coordinated the growing History section, but she has decided that 2003 would be her last issue. In her place, we are delighted to welcome Andrew Rabin of the University of Louisville. Lisi Oliver’s name also first appears on the masthead for the 1999 issue, when she brought her wide-ranging interests to the reviews of Manuscripts. But it is time to say *auf Wiedersehen*; Emily Thornbury, who began her collaboration with the 2003 issue, remains, alongside Ben Withers of the University of Kentucky. David Porter’s name first appears on the masthead for the 1998 issue, when he taught at the University of Southern Florida. He later moved to Southern University in Louisiana, where he weathered Hurricane Katrina in August of 2005. But he is stepping down from Anglo-Latin, and in his place we welcome Michael Fox of the University of Alberta. Two additional reviewers are joining the team: Dabney Bankert of James Madison University is taking on Memorials, Tributes, History of the Discipline, which split off from the first section starting with the 2001 issue. And Andrew Scheil of the University of Minnesota is bringing his talents to the ever-growing Prose section.

We welcome our new reviewers as we bid adieu to the departing ones with our sincere thanks; with any luck, we haven’t seen the last of them. At the same time we are grateful to those who do not come and go but have remained, reliably contributing to their respective sections, such as Craig Davis in *Beowulf*, John David Cormican in Names, Rich Johnson in General and Miscellaneous Subject, Joe McGowan in Language, and Nicole Guenther Discenza in Prose. They provide the continuity, experience, and professional expertise that sustain this publication just as surely as the energy and enthusiasm of new reviewers enliven it.

The annual notice of departures and arrivals as we complete another issue of the *Year’s Work* offers a moment to pause and consider many things: the good fortune our field enjoys in having such a wealth of talented, accomplished, and generous scholars, both junior and senior, willing to lend their time and ability to this review; the pleasure (and sometimes the challenge) of working with such a large team of reviewers—this issue contains the work of twenty-six contributors—and trying to balance the needs of first-timers with those of more experienced hands; and above all the intensely collaborative nature of this on-going project, especially as we work to bring the publishing schedule up to date. We’re almost there, and it could not have happened without the efforts of dozens of reviewers, past and present.

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. Contributors work from the *OEN* bibliography for the year under review, occasionally adding items from the previous year’s list of “Works not seen.” Dissertations, redactions, summaries, and popular works are occasionally omitted, and their absence in no way constitutes negative judgment. Comments and suggestions, as well as review copies of articles and books, may be sent to Daniel Donoghue, Department of English, Barker Center, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138.

DD

Thanks to *OEN*’s complicated publishing schedule, this issue is also the last to be published by Western Michigan University, completing the transition of publishing operations to the English Department of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The Editors gratefully recognize the efforts of Patricia Hollahan, Managing Editor at Medieval Institute Publications at WMU, during this transition; without her help and hard work the past year’s worth of *OEN* would never have made it to press. Dr. Hollahan will continue as General Editor of the *OEN Subsidia* series, which will remain in Kalamazoo; we look forward to working with her in the years ahead.

RML

## 1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects

### a. Cultural History

In *Textual and Material Culture in Anglo-Saxon England: Thomas Northcote Toller and the Toller Memorial Lectures* (Publ. of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 1 [Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2003]), Donald Scragg collects eleven Toller Memorial lectures sponsored by the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies. Nine authors have added a Postscript to their essays, in several instances incorporating material that came to light since the original lecture was delivered. In addition to the Toller lectures, Scragg includes three new essays on Toller's life and work. Although many of the individual essays in this collection were reviewed in various sections of YWOES 2003, another of general interest deserves mention here. Alexander Rumble surveys the books and materials that Toller used in his revision and expansion of Bosworth's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* in "Items of Lexicographical Interest in the Toller Collection, John Rylands University Library of Manchester" (323–32).

### b. Research Resources, Print and Electronic

Two print resources of interest to Anglo-Saxonists appeared in 2004. Phyllis G. Jestice has edited *Holy People of the World: A Cross-Cultural Encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO). The three volumes include entries on Augustine of Canterbury, Æthelwold, Bede, Boniface, Chad, Dunstan, among others. On an even larger scale Colin Matthew and Brian Harrison have edited the prodigious 60-volume *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford UP), which includes entries on Anglo-Saxons such as Aldhelm, Byrhtferth, Ecgwine ("a figure of whom almost nothing is known"), and Frithegod, to mention only a few, and on Anglo-Saxonists such as Sir Robert Cotton, Elizabeth Elstob, and others.

Martin K. Foys performs a vital service to the field each year by collecting and annotating electronic resources in "Circolwyrde 2004: New Electronic Resources for Anglo-Saxon Studies" (*OEN* 38.1, 34–42). This year's annual feature is especially full, with some fifty annotated entries divided between fifteen subheadings.

### c. Tolkien and Anglo-Saxon Studies

Jane Chance has edited a collection of eighteen essays in *Tolkien and the Invention of Myth: A Reader* (Lexington: UP of Kentucky). Many of the essays grew out

of papers originally presented in Tolkien sessions at the annual International Congress on Medieval Studies hosted by Western Michigan University. The essays are divided into four sections, beginning with an introductory section on backgrounds and methodologies, "Backgrounds: Folklore, Religion, Magic, and Language." The subsequent three sections focus on Tolkien's use of earlier traditions: "Tolkien and Ancient Greek and Classical and Medieval Latin," "Tolkien and Old Norse," and "Tolkien and Old English." Together the essays in this volume attempt to chart "the vertical and horizontal genealogies of influence in [Tolkien's] mythology" (5). Several of the essays are treated elsewhere in YWOES 2004; but two essays in the section on "Tolkien and Old English" will be discussed here. In "A Mythology for Anglo-Saxon England" (229–47). Michael D.C. Drout carefully points out that, although Tolkien never actually used the phrase "a mythology for England," it is clear that such was his intention. Drout argues that in fulfilling this intention through his fiction, Tolkien necessarily also created a mythology of Anglo-Saxon England, "a prehistory for the Anglo-Saxons that described their (otherwise unrecorded, though archeologically reconstructed) doings before the fifth-century migration of the Angles, Saxons, Jutes from the continent to England" (229). Drout's essay demonstrates the extent to which this mythology of the Anglo-Saxons permeates Tolkien's entire *legendarium*, from *The Silmarillion* and *The History of Middle-Earth* to *The Lord of the Rings*. John R. Holmes explores Tolkien's use of the concepts of oath-making and oath-breaking in "Oaths and Oath Breaking: Analogues of Old English *Comitatus* in Tolkien's Myth" (249–61). Holmes begins his discussion of the centrality of oaths to Anglo-Saxon culture in a seemingly unlikely place, the *Sermo Lupi* of Archbishop Wulfstan of Ely. Wulfstan includes the *hapax legomenon* *aðbrice* 'oath-breach' in the list of heinous sins for which God has punished the English by sending the Viking marauders against them. Holmes discusses the socio-military contract between thegn and lord, which Tacitus dubbed *comitatus*, and analyzes the more common instances of oath-use in Old English tradition: *Beowulf*, *The Battle of Maldon*, and *The Battle of Brunanburh*. Turning to *The Lord of the Rings*, Holmes discusses various examples of oaths, both kept and broken, including those of Gandalf, Merry, Pippin, and Fangorn/Treebeard. Holmes closes with the suggestion that perhaps the most important affirmation of oaths is the central binding "oath" of the Fellowship of the Ring itself.



In *The Tolkien Fan's Medieval Reader* (Cold Spring Harbor, NY: Cold Spring Press), Turgon of TheOneRing.net [David E. Smith] has "selected" and collected in one volume translations of medieval texts relevant to the study of J.R.R. Tolkien's fiction. The translations are organized into five sections, each of which begins with a brief introduction: Old English, Middle English, Old Norse, Celtic, and Finnish. The Old English chapter (13–76) includes selections from *Beowulf*, *The Finnesburg Fragment*, *The Wanderer*, *The Seafarer*, and *The Battle of Maldon*. All of the translations in the book are from the public domain, and the poetic texts are represented by prose translations. Admittedly, Turgon states that his book is "intended as an introduction . . . , not as an endpoint in itself," and he encourages his readers to "seek out further translations, either ones more modern academically, or verse translations . . . which reproduce the original form and meter" (12). Although this volume will undoubtedly serve its purpose of bringing a variety of medieval literatures to a wider audience, it is perhaps to be lamented that Turgon or the Cold Spring Press did not secure copyrights for more modern translations of the texts. The market for Tolkieniana seems bullish, and Turgon may have underestimated his audience's willingness to overcome the unfamiliar verse forms and meters for the far richer reward of experiencing more compelling translations of these texts.

#### d. Reports on Projects

Full reports on the genesis, status, and future directions of three major projects are published this year. A.N. Doane provides an update on the "Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile" project (*OEN* 38.1: 23–28). In addition to a thumbnail history of the project, Doane prints a list of the volumes and manuscripts published through Volume 12. Kathryn Powell outlines the Rationale and the Methodology behind the creation of the "The MANCASS C11 Database: A Tool for Studying Script and Spelling in the Eleventh Century" (*OEN* 38.1: 29–34). A conscious by-product of a three-year project directed by Donald Scragg and Alex Rumble, the database aims "to provide users with a tool for studying the range of English spellings in use in the eleventh century and relating those spellings to the wide variety of scribes who used them" (29). Powell also provides a user-friendly approach to using the database. The project is available online at the Centre's website: <http://www.art.man.ac.uk/english/mancass/data/index.htm>. Daniel Paul O'Donnell reports on "The Digital Medievalist Project" (*OEN* 37.3: 19–21), a web-based resource for computer-savvy medievalists. At present,

the Project contains three components: a discussion list, an on-line resource center, and a refereed on-line journal. O'Donnell outlines the need for such a resource and describes each of the components in detail.

Annual progress reports on *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici* and the *Anglo-Saxon Plant Name Survey* (ASPNS) are also published this year. In his report on *Fontes* (*OEN* 37.3: 22–23), Peter Jackson reminds readers that the stand-alone CD-ROM version can be downloaded free of charge from the project web site: <http://www.fontes.english.ox.ac.uk>. C.P. Biggam welcomes three new members of the ASPNS team in her report (*OEN* 37.3: 23–24). Activities of the ASPNS in the past year included two lectures in Cambridge (one in the Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic and the other to the Women's Group at Clare Hall) and the publication by Editions Rodopi of the proceedings of the first ASPNS symposium, *From Earth to Art: The Many Aspects of the Plant-World in Anglo-Saxon England* (reviewed in *YWOES* 2003). The ASPNS publishes full reports of its projects on its website: <http://www2.arts.gla.ac.uk/SESSL/EngLang/ihs1/projects/plants.htm>.

#### e. Varia

In her dissertation, "The Comitatus in the Trenches: Reading the Poetry of World War I through the Lens of Anglo-Saxon Heroism" (Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of New Mexico), Mary Terese Blum examines the trench poetry of World War I in relation to Old English heroic verse. Her study focuses on the poetry of seven British World War I poets, Edmund Blunden, Robert Graves, Ivor Gurney, David Jones, Wilfred Owen, Siegfried Sassoon, and Edward Thomas. Using Tacitus's concept of *comitatus*, Blum delineates the similarities between the communal relationships of warriors, Anglo-Saxon and modern, bound together by the experience of combat. Blum argues that by reading the trench poetry alongside heroic poems, such as *Beowulf*, *The Fight at Finnesburg*, *The Wanderer*, and *The Battle of Maldon*, "[t]he beauty of the war-band is heightened . . . because the Old English heroic tradition reveals the elements of heroism hidden just beneath the muddy experience of the trench-warriors. And these are loyalty, selflessness, and most of all, greater love" (369).

The best-selling author of the Richard Sharpe series, Bernard Cornwell, has published the first volume of his Saxon Stories series, *The Last Kingdom* (HarperCollins). The Saxon Stories are set against the ravages of the Viking Age and tells the story of Alfred the Great and

his descendants. The novel opens in A.D. 866 in Northumbria where the narrator, Uhtred, a ten-year old boy and the son of a nobleman, is captured by the Viking chieftain, Ragnor, in the same battle in which his father is killed. The novel follows Uhtred who is taught in the Viking ways of battle and is expected to participate in raids and massacres against his fellow Northumbrians. Torn by his divided loyalties to Ragnor, whom he comes to love like a father, and the prince Alfred, whose inaction and hypocritical piety he scorns, Uhtred struggles to discover his true allegiance. Ultimately unsatisfying from a historical perspective, the novel does successfully evoke a certain fatalism and melancholy reminiscent of the great Old English elegies.

A number of essays of interest to Anglo-Saxonists appeared in the first issue of a new on-line journal, *Literature Compass*, published by Blackwell Publishing (<http://www.literature-compass.com>). Two of these will be discussed here. Michael D.C. Drout explores the use and alteration of medieval sources in contemporary fantasy literature, such as the works of T.H. White, Ursula K. LeGuin, and J.R.R. Tolkien, in "The Problem of Transformation: The Use of Medieval Sources in Fantasy Literature" (*Literature Compass* [October], n.p.). Drout identifies three varieties of "transformation." He designates as Type I when authors employ medieval source material without any acknowledgment, but also without any alteration or disguise. Type II denotes a self-conscious use of medieval sources, and Type III an unconscious or deliberately disguised use of source material. Drout argues that these "transformations" of medieval material ought to be studied since most students' first encounter with these sources is often through fantasy literature. In "Digitizing the Middle Ages" (*Literature Compass* [October], n.p.), David F. Johnson reviews a host of digital media which can be used by students and teachers of the Middle Ages. Johnson breaks what is available into subcategories and discusses how to navigate the bewildering number of materials. Focusing primarily on literature and manuscripts studies, Johnson also discusses practical ways one might engage in "digitization" oneself. Johnson's suggestions are indispensable for teachers for whom it may not be possible to travel to or acquire materials from distant collections of medieval manuscripts.

In "What Counts Is Not to Say, but to Say Again': A Response to Thomas A. Bredehoff, 'Anglo-Saxonists and eBay'" (*OEN* 37.3: 25–30), Eileen A. Joy takes issue with Bredehoff's central ethical anxiety about the market in Anglo-Saxon artifacts on eBay (Bredehoff's essay

appeared in *OEN* 37.1: 40–45 and was reviewed in *YWOES* 2003). As Joy sees it, Bredehoff's concern about the traffic in medieval artifacts is that they become "decontextualized" from their "original archaeological contexts" and, in the inexperienced hands of individuals who have neither an understanding of nor a respect for the artifact themselves, are thereby stripped of their cultural and historical significance and value. Joy, however, contends that "it is precisely the cultural artifact's free market circulation through the global *agora* that ensures the best possible forms of its future survival" by allowing it "to be freed from the traditional (and sometimes stifling) constraints of provincial, and even, nationalist 'boxes' that ultimately limit the fullest possible range of its cultural appropriation and reappropriation" (26). For Joy, the "signifying power of material culture has always resided in the ability of physical objects to iterate different meanings in different times and places" (29), and this process of appropriation and reappropriation through the "open market" provides us with a unique opportunity to understand an "artifact's true historical meaning and its staying power" (29).

In "Walking Hadrian's Wall: Learning, Teaching, and Pounding the Pavement" (*Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Learning* 11.2: 37–61), E.L. Ridsen recounts his experience of backpacking the length, or very nearly the length, of the wall from Wallsend to Burgh, just west of Carlisle. Ridsen sets out with his friend and mentor, Professor Tom Shippey, to "experience [the wall] as artifact, an aspect of the landscape, ... and partly to get a sense of boundaries and what they meant in the ancient world and to the Medieval world that followed" (39). Together they brave the weather (rain, of course, but even sleet) and unsympathetic drivers. Ridsen describes visiting the preserved fort at Chesters, noted for its bathhouse and mythological carvings; Carrawburgh, site of a famous Mithraeum; Birdoswald with its fort, large meeting hall and stunning view; Castlestead, where the remnants of wall and castle were dismantled to build a substantial estate house; and finally, the Church of St. Michael's at Burgh, built with stones from the wall. As a student and teacher of the literatures of the early periods, Ridsen asserts that his travels left him with a clear sense of what life must have been like for people who lived "on the edge" of this vast frontier and will ultimately make him a "better scholar, writer, and teacher" (59).

M.J. Toswell uncovers the Canadian poet Earle Birney's indebtedness to Anglo-Saxon poetic tradition in "Earle Birney as Anglo-Saxon Scop: A Canadian 'Shaper'

of Poetry?” (*Canadian Poetry* 54: 12–36). Birney trained as a medievalist at the University of Toronto and the University of California at Berkeley, taking courses in Germanic Philology, Gothic, Old Norse, Old French, and *Beowulf*. Despite a series of setbacks in his third year at UC Berkeley, Birney ultimately completed a thesis at the University of Toronto on the use of irony in Chaucer. Toswell traces the influence of Germanic philology and particularly his knowledge of Old English, on Birney’s poetic imagination and *oeuvre*. She concludes that “Birney strove to awaken his audience, to connect with individual human beings through his poetry, to fulfill a role as commentator upon the activities of society, to ‘make’ with his words not just an accurate record of human accomplishment but a ‘shaping’ that would inspire his auditors. Although he spoke to a different meadhall, Earle Birney was a *scop*” (33).

*Works not seen:*

Allan, K.L. “An Examination of Metaphor from Old English to Present Day English, Focusing on Notions

of Intelligence/Cleverness and Stupidity.” Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Glasgow, 2003.

Bueno Alonso, Jorge Luis. “Eothod’ Anglo-Saxons of the Plains: Rohan as the Old English Culture in J.R.R. Tolkien’s *The Lord of the Rings*.” *Asociación Nacional de Investigación de Literatura Infantil y Juvenil* (Cádiz, Spain) 2, 21-35.

Rouse, R.A. “The Survival of Anglo-Saxon England in Some Middle English Texts.” Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Bristol, 2003.

Turner, A. “Problems in Translating the Philological Elements in Tolkien’s *The Lord of the Rings*.” Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Newcastle upon Tyne, 2003.

Vallis, Donald Le Roy. “Beowulf in Hollywood: Popular Film as Folktale and Legend.” Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of California at Berkeley, 2003.

Vázquez González, Juan Gabriel. “How Many ‘Hits’ Have Cynewulf and Cyneheard on Their Website? On Teaching Old English Through Texts.” *Medieval English Literary and Cultural Studies*. Ed. Conde Silvestre and Vázquez González, 237-41; see section 4a.

RFJ

## 2. Memorials, Tributes, History of the Discipline

### a. History of the Discipline

A welcome addition to our growing collection of the letters of antiquarians is Sophie van Romburgh’s weighty edition of the correspondence of Franciscus Junius, the first volume, as she remarks, “to bring a substantial amount of Junius’s as yet unpublished legacy to the fore” (3). *For My Worthy Friend Mr Franciscus Junius: An Edition of the Correspondence of Franciscus Junius F.F. (1591–1677)* (Leiden: Brill) features a thorough introduction to Junius’s life and the correspondence, a list of correspondents and letters exchanged, an inventory of the corpus, an appendix of supplementary texts, a bibliography, and index. The edition proper prints the letters in the original English, Latin, and Dutch, with facing-page translations where necessary, and provides valuable commentary in footnotes. The letters, which date from 1602 when Junius was eleven to 1674 when he was eighty-three, offer

insight into the life and studies of Francis Junius (1591–1677), and of his extended family and friends, nearly all of whom were members of the foremost circles of scholars, aristocrats and dignitaries in the Low Countries and England. It presents contexts for the monumental

achievements of a scholar who may be called the father of both modern art theory and comparative Germanic philology, and may help to identify the continuum underlying these studies. Representative as it is of one of the major means of communication at the time, the correspondence makes a treasure trove of detail on the diverse issues which interested Junius and his Dutch and English circles, and reveals the routes by which friends and news items, books, and other materials found each other. (1)

Of the 226 extant letters by sixty-four correspondents, half are by Junius; internal evidence suggests that between eighty-four to ninety-nine letters once existed or remain undiscovered. Van Romburgh’s introduction summarizes and situates the letters, which, in their lists of books sent, manuscripts circulated for comment, and gifts of presentation copies of books Junius’s “diverse study interests and achievements” are reflected (20). Highlights of this rich introductory essay are discussions of the role of the correspondence in intellectual exchange, of the stylized nature of composition (one notable metaphor imagines “correspondents with their pens as gladiators in the arena”) (43), and of reasons for the modest size of a corpus that runs for

seventy-two years but contains only 226 letters. One would expect, van Romburgh points out, “a corpus of several thousands letters more” as is the case with some of Junius’s contemporaries and colleagues (49). He did not, it appears, write to those he saw regularly or to those he did not know, and he was often reproached by friends and relatives for being a tardy correspondent. The modest size of the corpus has, however, made possible this comprehensive edition of “all letters known to have survived either in manuscript or printed form” (53). The various formats of the letters necessitated an eclectic edition, but as van Romburgh explains, “the convenience of having all letters accessible and together in one body outweighs any inconsistencies that may result from this approach” (55). There are many features to admire in this very accessible edition; for example, a key designates letters that reply to unretrieved letters, sources are identified (autograph, draft, facsimile, edition), letters are numbered and the cross-referencing system is comprehensive and easy to use, paragraphs are distinguished by small letters that allow direct comparison between originals and translations (and detailed indexing of topics), folio or page changes are noted, variant readings are given, and annotations identify all topics of discussion. One does, however, lament the book’s price, which puts it out of reach of all but libraries.

“It has often been remarked that the increased interest in Anglo-Saxon antiquities during the Victorian era was part of a larger nationalist project in which antiquaries turned to the relics of medieval England to recover and define England’s national history” (109). This claim opens Pearl Ratonil’s essay, “A Letter from Benjamin Thorpe to George Oliver Concerning John Mitchell Kemble and *Beowulf*” (*N&Q* n.s. 51: 109–12). Indeed, this recently-discovered two-page letter dated 23 November 1832, which Ratonil transcribes and explicates, illustrates this national project at work. The letter, bound into a copy of Benjamin Thorpe’s 1830 translation of Rasmus Rask’s *Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Tongue, with a Praxis*, is now housed in the University of Illinois at Chicago’s Richard J. Daley Library. Addressed by Thorpe to fellow antiquarian, Reverend George Oliver, “a leading historian of Exeter” in the mid-nineteenth century (111), the letter makes reference to five antiquarians. These are Oliver himself, Mr. Pulton (possibly, but not certainly James Pulman); Francis George Coleridge (nephew of Samuel Taylor Coleridge); John Gage (director of the Society of Antiquaries from 1829–1842 and author of “an important article on the Benedictional of St. Æthelwold”; and John Kemble (who was

then preparing his edition of *Beowulf*) (111–12). At the time, Oliver was writing a history of the Exeter diocese and researching John de Grandisson, fourteenth-century Bishop of Exeter. The letter’s message to Oliver, via Coleridge and Pulton, suggests “the circuitous route by which Oliver first learned of the whereabouts of Grandisson’s will” at Lambeth (111). Thorpe’s letter “brings to life the series of exchanges through which Thorpe, Pulton, Oliver, and Coleridge connected with one another in their various antiquarian endeavours,” and “illustrates perfectly how such a web of communication and co-operation among antiquarian scholars worked” (111). It also “helps mark the inception of the long professional relationship between Thorpe and Kemble” by hinting “at the stir which the anticipated publication of Kemble’s *Beowulf* was rousing among English antiquarians in the closing months of 1832” (112).

Historians have typically concerned themselves with Matthew Parker’s later career as a prelate. In “Parker’s Purposes for His Manuscripts: Matthew Parker in the Context of His Early Career and Sixteenth-Century Church Reform,” (*Old English Literature in Its Manuscript Context*, ed. Joyce Tally Lionarons [Morgantown, WV: West Virginia UP], 217–41), Nancy Basler Bjorklund investigates the neglected thirty-year ecclesiastical career that preceded Parker’s appointment as Archbishop. She argues that his collection of manuscripts and his work with that collection were motivated by a desire “to defend the concepts of church reform that he had adopted before he became archbishop” (219). Bjorklund identifies a number of sources for Parker’s early career, including personal papers at Cambridge, which document this life-long and “serious intellectual interest in church reform” (220). These sources challenge assumptions that his manuscript interests were chiefly antiquarian rather than scholarly in nature. Most of his personal annotations relate to church reform and suggest, therefore, that his collection and study of early manuscripts, particularly Old English manuscripts, was intended “to reveal how far the church has wandered away from its earliest teachings” (223). Examples from the sources make evident that Parker’s support for certain doctrines (the right of clergy to be married, for example), began in his early career and that his work with the manuscripts was consistently directed toward his goal of a return to an earlier, less-corrupted church. He sought evidence for his reform agenda in the manuscripts, particularly early church history, which could provide “a guide for the present” by identifying and eliminating “non-scriptural and allegedly erroneous teachings that the church had



adopted over the centuries” (233, 232). Because Parker saw his texts as “vehicles for ecclesiastical reform,” Bjorklund argues, they needed to be readable and persuasive and this required rectification of textual problems, alterations we should judge by his goals rather than our own (238). By shedding new light on Parker’s early career and situating his work in the context of his goals as a reformer, Bjorklund’s essay provides a fuller picture of this important antiquarian, who “above all, ... wished to promote his reform agenda, especially the marriage of clergy, the use of vernacular scriptures, and the rejection of transubstantiation. His objective was a more enlightened church, free of corruption and adhering to scriptural standards” (240–41).

The “invisible” career of William Retchford, whose transcript of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 191 may have been the “relict of a plan to publish the bilingual *Rule of Chrodegang*” (347), is made visible in Peter J. Lucas’s “William Retchford, Pupil of Abraham Wheelock in Anglo-Saxon: ‘He Understands the Saxon as well as Myself’” (*Trans. of the Cambridge Bibliographical Soc.* 12.4 [2003]: 335–61). This seventeenth-century transcript (London, BL MS Harley 440), “the only surviving manuscript to contain the Anglo-Saxon version of the enlarged Rule of Chrodegang in full (minus one leaf),” was long considered the work of Abraham Wheelock (336). Lucas, however, identifies two hands “one for the main text and a few marginal variant readings, and another for the bulk of the marginal annotations” (337). The marginal hand is Wheelock’s, but the main hand, Lucas argues, almost certainly belongs to William Retchford, Wheelock’s pupil at Clare College from 1635–1643. Lucas’s identification is based on comparison of Harley 440 with a surviving letter by Retchford and a transcript of Corpus 190 (MS Harley 438), “a miscellany of ecclesiastical laws and customs,” or in Dorothy Bethurum’s words, “Archbishop Wulfstan’s commonplace book” (349). While Wheelock “does not name the young scholar who was as good at understanding Saxon as himself” in a letter to Sir Henry Spelman, Retchford is “an obvious candidate” by virtue of location, dating, various publications (specifically an Anglo-Saxon poetic contribution to *Irenodia Cantabrigiensis* [1641] (344). The Harley 440 transcript was initiated by Cornelius Bee, “leading London bookseller/publisher, who put up the funds for the printing (*impensis*) of Wheelock’s re-edition of the Anglo-Saxon Laws in 1644” (351), and for the transcript of Corpus 190, MS Harley 438 (in which Retchford’s hand appears), and to which a receipt dated 27 January 1657 is attached, signed by John Retchford, William Retchford, and Richard Richford. Bee

presumably knew Retchford “from his earlier work with Wheelock and perhaps from the transcript of the bilingual *Rule of Chrodegang* (Harley 440), which has ... the name ‘Richford’ written in a seventeenth-century hand at the beginning” (352). John and Richard appear to have been related to William. This transcript of Corpus 190, apparently made by three men named Retchford based in St. Albans and possibly with the assistance of Cambridge scholar Henry Soames, might well have been made at Cambridge. The transcripts represented in Harley 440 and 438, which span twelve years,

probably represent the heyday and Indian summer of William Retchford’s work on Anglo-Saxon. The first shows the diligent and enthusiastic young scholar, fully involved with his work for Wheelock, the second the middle-aged vicar who took a commission to do some more work on Anglo-Saxon, and delegated two thirds or more of it to members of his family. (356–357)

Lucas concludes with Retchford’s involvement in “Spelman’s plan, with Wheelock’s aid, following Parker’s lead” to produce an Anglo-Saxon dictionary and grammar. Their work on the dictionary survives in MS Harley 761 which, like Harley 440, is in two hands, the most frequent being that of Retchford, with additions by Wheelock and probably Sir Henry Spelman. “Had Wheelock finished the work,” Lucas points out, “Retchford’s contribution might have been even more difficult to unearth, and Retchford’s status would have been reduced to that of a ghost-writer” (359).

In “The Barrow Knight, the Bristol Bibliographer, and a Lost Old English Prayer” (*Trans. of the Cambridge Bibliographical Soc.* 12.4 [2003]: 372–92), Rebecca Rushforth traces the fortunes of the original manuscript which contained an Old English prayer now surviving only as a tracing in Cambridge University Library, Additional MS 4166, item no. 2. Two men appear to have been chiefly responsible for the preservation of the manuscript and for the tracing, Thomas Bateman and Thomas Kerlake. The letter-forms of the tracing, made by Thomas Bateman of Middleton Hall, Derby, in 1856, suggest a date for the original of between the late eleventh to the first half of the twelfth century. Bateman, an independently wealthy barrow excavator chiefly interested in Anglo-Saxon artifacts, also collected manuscripts. At his death in 1861, he was at work on “A Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library at Lomberdale [where Bateman’s museum and library were located]

with Palaeographic and Bibliographical Notices; in 1 Vol 4to., with numerous fac-similes of MSS. in various Languages, and their Illuminations; from the Seventh to the Thirteenth Century," now lost (374). In May 1893 the manuscript containing the tracing was sold to Samuel Sandars who later bequeathed it to Cambridge University Library. A pencil notation beneath the tracing reads "Fac Simile of a Creed in Anglo-Saxon in the possession of Mr Tho<sup>s</sup> Kerslake of Bristol, Bookseller in 1856" (376). Kerslake, who styled himself "The Bristol Bibliographer," was a bookseller, but he also collected and sold manuscripts, and one of his 1853 catalogues lists a single leaf described as an Anglo-Saxon private prayer and creed, dated 950, and transcribed, with some misreading errors. Rushforth suggests this leaf may have come from Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Lat. bib. d. 10, a gospel book missing several leaves which "passed through Kerslake's hands" (381). Evidence in the form of a purchase made of Kerslake by Bateman suggests the two men may have had other dealings. That the manuscript was destroyed in an 1860 warehouse fire that burned most of Kerslake's manuscript collection is suggested by correspondence between Kerslake and Sir Thomas Phillipps discussing the survivals; the leaf itself also appears to have been destroyed or remains lost. Rushforth provides an edition and translation of the prayer based on the tracing with variants from Kerslake's catalogue. She speculates on date (late eleventh to early twelfth century), and function (part of a service, private devotion, or personal statement of belief), and suggests that it may have served as an "*aide memoire* for a longer text," although its actual use remains conjectural (392). One notes a few unfortunate typographical errors in the footnotes.

Nicholas Grant has published a useful new edition of a lost list of "resting places of (usually) native saints" in England, copied by the "Tudor antiquary John Leland in the 1530s or early 1540s and included in his collected papers *De Rebus Britannicis Collectanea*," last published in the eighteenth century ("John Leland's List of 'Places Where Saints Rest in England' [*Analecta Bollandiana*, 122: 373–88]) (373). The edition includes the text (entries are helpfully numbered), a translation, and detailed commentary. In addition, the entry numbers are placed on a map of England to visually replicate the areas the list covers. In the introduction, Grant describes the "particular character of the list," elaborates on its sources, and posits a compilation date (374). Thus, for example, we learn that Hyeritha or Urith was a Chittlehampton, Devon saint with a "vigorous, but late and highly localized cult," that the earliest references to her

(a hymn and a prayer), date from "the late 15th and 16th centuries," that her lost Life records her death as 1172, "as reported by a later antiquary," and that the "Hyeritha" name form is first found here (379). While "the list has an overall topographical coherence lacking in the other lists," there are also surprising omissions both of areas of England and of particular saints (Durham's Cuthbert, for example), and information is included that is "not recorded in any other source, namely a record of the unknown saints 'Domnanuerdh' of Beckley, 'Herbertus' of Huntingdon, and 'Wolfritha' of Beverly," as well as some burial places (374–75). Therefore the sources could not have been "those other lists already known to us, but must have drawn on other lost lists or have been an original compilation" (375). Given the inclusion of saints "likely to post-date, perhaps by some considerable time, the production of relevant Lives in the medieval period," Grant argues for a fifteenth or early sixteenth century date, rather than previously suggested dates between 1086 and 1300 (376).

In "The Anglo-Saxons," Chapter 6 of her book *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London: Hambledon), 189–229, Rosemary Sweet reassesses eighteenth-century Anglo-Saxon scholarship. "The traditional view of the eighteenth century's contribution to Anglo-Saxon studies," she suggests,

has always been that Saxon scholarship flourished in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, with significant advances being made in the scholarly appreciation of language and literature and the publication of Anglo-Saxon texts. Thereafter little progress was made until the nineteenth century. The scholarship of George Hickes, Humfrey Wanley, Edward Thwaites and the 'Oxford' Saxonists was neglected rather than improved upon; the academic study of Anglo-Saxon virtually disappeared from the curricula of the universities. (192)

Sweet's thesis, which comes rather late in the chapter, is that "[t]he nineteenth-century rediscovery of Anglo-Saxon culture was only made possible through the research and activities of the eighteenth-century antiquaries" (192). The balance of the chapter traces the "research and activities" of the "considerable number" of antiquaries who resisted this trend of neglect and disinterest and who "continued to endeavour to develop and promote the study of the Anglo-Saxon

period" (192). Sweet first rehearses the religious and political issues behind seventeenth-century antiquarian interest in the Saxon period before turning to early eighteenth-century moves toward disassociating antiquarian research and "ideological motives" (194). Her discussion surveys a wide range of particular moments and individuals who figure in the transitional period between centuries. Taken as a whole, the chapter serves more to call into question what Sweet considers to be misconceptions about the contributions of eighteenth-century antiquarians to Anglo-Saxon scholarship than to present a definitive reassessment of the period.

Given the 2004 opening of the spectacular new Euston Road, London home of the Wellcome Trust with its extensive and valuable library, especially its collections on the history of medicine, Richard Scott Nokes's essay "Borroughs Wellcome & Co., the American Medical Association and *Anglo-Saxon Leechcraft*: Popular Study of Anglo-Saxon Remedies in the Early Twentieth Century" (*OEN* 37.3: 38–43), is timely. Nokes argues that the material circumstances of Borroughs Wellcome & Co.'s 1912 publication of *Anglo-Saxon Leechcraft* "demonstrates how rather ordinary scholarship can be employed in an extraordinary text for commercial use" (41). *Leechcraft* was the first section of a promotional booklet distributed at the 1912 Atlantic City meeting of the American Medical Association (38). "By implicitly placing Borroughs Wellcome & Co. in an Anglo-Saxon medical tradition," Nokes asserts, "*Anglo-Saxon Leechcraft* offers an opposing voice to early twentieth-century scholarly contempt for Anglo-Saxon medicine, while simultaneously co-opting that history for commercial purposes" (38). The emblem of this "scholarly contempt" was Charles Singer, who, in his publications on charms between 1917–1954, "held the Anglo-Saxons generally and the Old English charms particularly in contempt, and often used words like 'primitive' and 'disgusting' to describe the learning of the period" (38). "Wellcome's work, therefore, entered into a scholarly context in which little work was being done on Anglo-Saxon medicine, and that work generally denigrated the Anglo-Saxons and their texts" (38). The implied thesis of *Leechcraft*, however, "attempts to position Anglo-Saxon remedies as the forerunner of Borroughs Wellcome products" (39). The *Leechcraft* section, for example, concludes with a paragraph "which has the dual purpose of closing a treatise on Anglo-Saxon medicine and introducing the many Wellcome products for sale" (40). It states that "the remnants of the medicinal literature that have come down to us from the time of King Alfred [show that] Anglo-Saxon leeches also

had some training beyond simple experience, and that they believed in the efficacy of their native herbs, whose properties they so assiduously studied.... [To their observations] we owe much of our knowledge of vegetable drugs used in medical practice at the present day" (quoted by Nokes 40). Advertisements follow in two sections (one on the company's *Materia Medica* Farm and the other on Historical Medical Equipments), which demonstrate the company's "continuing interest in historical medicine" (40). While neither section establishes a direct link between "the contemporary" and the Anglo-Saxon, taken together and with the ensuing catalogue of products, the implication is that past "technologies" were not "primitive" but "pioneering." Past pharmacists were not "superstitious fools," the pamphlet implies, but "acute and learned men" (41). Thus Borroughs Wellcome's drugs are the reliable result of centuries of empirical study. "At a time when many other leading scholars held the Anglo-Saxons in contemptuous disdain," Nokes concludes, "Wellcome was in a distinct minority when he declared that the learning of the Anglo-Saxons was 'empirical'" (41).

In "When the Future is Present: Anglo-Saxon Studies in Hungary, 2004" (*OEN* 37.3: 31–33), Katalin Halacsy Scholz updates a Fall 1994 report in *OEN* on Anglo-Saxon studies in Eastern European countries. When Hungary joined the European Union in May 2004, it opened borders to its scholars, who can now attend foreign conferences, compete for grants, and shape their own research agendas. Curricula, too, have benefited. The first Hungarian dissertation on an Anglo-Saxon topic was defended in May 2004 at Eötvös Loránd University, and the English M.A. at major universities now includes medieval studies so that "students do not remain ignorant about the fact that 'things happened in English' before Shakespeare" (31). However, the Bologna Declaration, which Hungary signed in 1999, directs that the college and university system develop "easily readable and comparable degrees, a common credit system, and widespread student mobility" (33). Such changes "will basically upset the present Hungarian system" to the detriment of medieval studies (33). "I sadly suspect," Scholz laments, "that if this appetizing dish does not figure on the main menu [of this new curriculum], fewer students will develop a taste for the Middle Ages, and fewer still will want to have larger portions of it. We can advertize good medieval English M.A. programs, but who will know why those are interesting—even more interesting than business English?" (33). In short, medieval studies programs in Hungary are flourishing, but the future outlook is uncertain.

### b. Memorials and Tributes

Of the three tribute volumes published this year, Carol Braun Pasternack and Lisa M.C. Weston's collection *Sex and Sexuality in Anglo-Saxon England: Essays in Memory of Daniel Gillmore Calder* (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies), is topically cohesive, an exploration of "the cultural construction of sex, the sexes, and sexualities in Anglo-Saxon England" (xix). Its eight essays are divided into three sections: Same-Sex Acts and Desires: Systems of Meaning; Sexualities of the Virgin and the (Virgin) Mother; and Sex, Violence, and the Nation. A biographical sketch of Calder, a bibliography of his work, and a valuable historical survey of scholarship on sex and sexuality in medieval literature and culture precede the essays. The survey begins with John Boswell's 1980 study, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality* and concludes with Clare A. Lees and Gillian Overing's 2001 *Double Agents: Women and Clerical Culture in Anglo-Saxon England*. Pasternack and Weston offer a detailed review of the seminal studies which appeared during this twenty-year period, concluding that "the concept of discourses defining the body" has had limited impact on Anglo-Saxon studies (xxxiv). Michel Foucault's ground-breaking work on sexuality is the foundation on which most of the studies have been built, or in some cases, the foundation they have attempted to renovate or dismantle. The introduction then segues into their own collection, which they claim to be "[t]he first focusing entirely on sex and sexuality in Anglo-Saxon England. The essays are concerned with how texts of Anglo-Saxon provenance represent potentially reproductive and erotic elements of bodies whether masculine, feminine, or virginal, attracted to the same sex, another sex, or the divine" (xlii). The collection "is intended to demonstrate some of the Anglo-Saxon

cultural and social enactments of the sexual drive and, by way of those demonstrations, to show some of the ways that Anglo-Saxon enactments compare to present performances and how Anglo-Saxon systems for understanding this drive relate to contemporary Euro-American attempts to understand it" (xlix).

Two other and more typically eclectic tribute volumes were published this year. The first, *Nova de veteribus: Mittel- und neulateinische Studien für Paul Gerhard Schmidt* (Munich: K.G. Saur), edited by Andreas Bihrer and Elisabeth Stein is a massive collection of sixty-one essays that range widely in topic, length, and focus. Included is a complete chronological bibliography of Schmidt's publications. The second, *Slovo v perspektive literaturnoi evolyutsii: K 100-letiyu M.I. Steblin-Kamenskogo* [*The Word in the Context of Literary Evolution: For the 100th Birthday of M.I. Steblin-Kamenskii*] (*Studia philologica*. Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskoi kul'tury [Languages of Slavic Culture]), edited by O.A. Smirnit'skaya, contains a collection of essays on Old Norse/Icelandic, Old Irish, Old English, and early Modern literatures.

Memorials were published this year for Donald A. Bullough (which includes a 2000-2003 bibliography of his work), I Deug-Su, Robert T. Farrell, Vivien Anne Law, Elizabeth J.E. Pirie, John Michael Wallace-Hadrill, and Charles Patrick Wormald. Ian Wood's informative biographical essay on Wallace-Hadrill, who counted among his students both Wormald and Bullough, concludes: "[m]ore than any other scholar he insisted that the period be taken on its own terms: brutal, yet peopled with extraordinary individuals who thought differently from us, but whose minds we could know" (355).

DAB

## 3. Language

### a. Lexicon

Wolfgang Obst and Florian Schleburg's *Lehrbuch des Altenglischen, Sprachwissenschaftliche Senbücher* (Heidelberg: Winter) is a welcome addition to the sparse field of well-composed introductions to Old English. A translation into English would provide to the Anglophone world a needed graduate-level text to balance the reliable *Guide to Old English* by Mitchell and Robinson. The introduction to this book is as good a brief introduction to Proto-Indo-European, Germanic, and Early English linguistics as exists in any language, including

as it does translated and annotated sample texts from all the major languages and ample up-to-date bibliographies. The first chapter starts right out with a passage from the Old English prose translation of Genesis, complete with interlinear glosses and grammatical aids, notes, and a translation. The number of nominal, pronominal, and verbal paradigms introduced in the next few pages (35-42) would doubtless overwhelm most American undergraduates (and perhaps many graduate students). But the information here and throughout is clearly laid out, and a student needn't immediately master these tables since interlinear glosses and grammatical



aids continue to be provided through the next two chapters. These first three chapters, centered on readings and in-depth treatments of the phonology of the language, are followed by a chapter that has no reading passages and is focused on etymology and the lexicon. Parallel prose and verse passages from *Boethius* in chapter 5, now without the safety net of glosses, lead in to a detailed discussion of poetic meter—essentially Sievers’s system, but presented with a formalism that may be more confusing than enlightening to the beginning student. Chapter 6, like 4, skips the reading passage and looks again at words, but this time the focus is on their internal structures, derivational morphology and Indo-European background. The next three chapters and the appended exercises include reading from *Wanderer*, Bede, Gregory, and Ælfric, and they elaborate further on verbal and substantive morphology. The final chapter is a useful overview of other genres of Old English texts, from laws and other official documents, to inscriptions, riddles, magical formulas and glosses. A precocious undergraduate or dedicated grad student who worked through this rigorous introduction would be ready not only to read texts with intelligence, but also to understand and engage in serious scholarship in the field.

In “Old English *þīxl* / *þīsl* and the Origin of *thill*” (*N&Q* n.s. 51: 5–7), Alfred Bammesberger points out that these Old English words can be derived from a Germanic *\*þīhslo*. This would regularly yield not only Old English *þīxl* ‘wagon pole, shaft’, but also possibly *þīsl* given the loss of *-h-* before *-s-* seen in *wæstm* ‘growth’ beside *weaxan* ‘grow’ (< Germanic *\*wahstm-*) and similar developments in *wrixlan* ‘change’ and its rare variant form *wrislan*. Perhaps in the original paradigm, the nominative was *þīxl* but the oblique cases showed a root *þīsl-* with loss of *-h-* in these intervocalic contexts. It is also these cases, Bammesberger claims, with medial *-sl-* that likely gave rise to the modern form *thill*, given the development seen in *þyllic* ‘such’ from *þus* ‘thus’ plus *lic*. While such a development is certainly possible, it must be pointed out that a highly grammatical form such as *þyllic* is precisely where one would expect to find unusual weakenings, losses, and assimilations. And perhaps Bammesberger rejects too readily Wotherspoon’s suggestion that a metathesized form *þīls* was reanalyzed to yield the modern singular form. Even if Bammesberger is right that the final *-s* would have remained voiceless, such minor impediment has not in my experience stood in the way of the power of reanalysis: close relatives have defended vigorously to me their contention that the word *kudos* (though generally

pronounced with a voiceless final *-s*) is the plural of a putative singular *\*kudo* (with the further folk etymology that it is derived from some unknown word in Japanese rather than the actual origin in Greek).

In “Old English *lama* and its morphological analysis,” *N&Q* 51: 342–44, Alfred Bammesberger neatly resolves the two peculiarities of the paradigm of the Old English adjective *lama* ‘lame’—that it is weak in indefinite as well as definite contexts, and that all genders have the same form—with one explanation: “morphologically, Old English *lama* should be classified as a masculine *substantive* of the type *nama* ‘name’, *hana* ‘cock’, *bana* ‘murderer’ ...” (342; my emphasis). “A parallel instance of a substantive in *-a* referring to a female is provided by *healsgebedda*... (*Beowulf* line 63)” (343). Further parallels are found in *þearfa* ‘pauper’, *maga* ‘powerful one’, and *orwena* ‘despairing one’.

Rejecting Vennemann’s proposed derivation of Modern English *key* from Basque on phonological grounds, Alfred Bammesberger, in “Old English *cæg* ‘key’ and Frisian *kei* / *kai*,” *NOWELE* 44: 91–100, proceeds with a thorough grammatical analysis, concluding that there was both a feminine *ō*-stem *cæg* and a likely secondary feminine *n*-stem *cæge*, but no masculine form. Turning back to phonology, Bammesberger notes that the consistent attestation of *æ* across all dialects points to a “long monophthong *æ* resulting from the Germanic diphthong *ai* by *i*-umlaut” (93). This suggests a root form Germanic *\*kaig-ijō-* with a nominative singular *\*kaigī*, but no cognates can be found for such a root. So, to account for the Frisian evidence, the form *\*kai-j-* is instead proposed—compare Gothic *-waddjus*, ON *veggr*, OE *wæg* ‘wall’ from Germanic *\*wajj-*. Unfortunately, no further reliable etymological analysis can be suggested for this proposed Germanic stem *\*kai-j-*, though Holthausen’s proposed connection with the Germanic root *\*ki-* (Gothic *keinan* ‘sprout’) is a possibility, if the original meaning of *key* was something like ‘peg’.

C. Michael Driessen in “Towards an Indo-European Term for ‘felt’” *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 32: 25–41, rejects on phonological and morphological grounds any direct relationship between Greek *pilos* ‘felt’, Latin *pilleus* ‘canonical cap made of felt’ (which he concludes is of obscure origin), and the various Germanic words for felt: OE *felt*, MD *vilt*, and OHG *filz*. Instead, these latter are to be connected to the Proto-Slavic *\*pǫlstv* ‘felt’ and Albanian *plis* ‘felt’, which go back to the Proto-Indo-European root *\*peld-* meaning ‘to beat’ (a central

part of the felt-making process). The bulk of the article involves analysis of the non-Germanic material.

James T. McIlwain asks “Does Old English *ex* for ‘brain’ lie behind an instance of *eaxl* in *Leech Book III*?” *N&Q* 51: 339–341. In other words, might the odd occurrence of *eaxl* ‘shoulder’ in a context where a word for ‘brain’ is expected be a scribal mistake resulting from lack of understanding of a relatively rare Old English form *ex* ‘brain’? His answer is yes.

R.D. Fulk in “Old English *werg-*, *wyrg-* ‘accursed,’” *Historische Sprachforschung* 117: 315–22, after considering Sievers’s and others’ theories of the origin of this stem, comes to the following conclusion regarding its original semantics: “there is something fundamentally improbable about [Sievers’s] derivation of the sense ‘accursed’ from ‘weary’” especially since this word is only seen in verse and in Anglian prose (318). This distribution along with the forms’ complete absence from the vast corpus of West Saxon prose makes it likely that this is a dialect word. But Fulk’s analysis of the form yields a paradox: “Oddly enough, then, there is rather good evidence both for and against a long vowel in the root, and both for and against analyzing *-g-* in *werg-* as the adjective suffix *-ig*” (319). Fulk resolves this conflicting evidence by reconstructing *\*werge-* which explains: 1) why its uninflected forms scan as trochees; 2) why “the scribe of the Paris Psalter, at least, seems to have associated the adjective with the stem of the verb *wyrgan*” (320); and 3) why there appears to be a long root vowel “since most scribes may be assumed to have confused the word with *wērig*” (320). Furthermore “it provides a transparent etymology since *-ja-* stem adjectives are commonly formed from nouns” (321), and this satisfactorily connects the adjective *werg-* with *wearg-* and *wyrgan*.

In “Old English *weorc*: Where Does It Hurt? South of the Thames,” *ANQ* 17.2: 6–12, R.D. Fulk responds to Roberta Frank’s criticism of an earlier article of his by reasserting that “when the word *weorc* appears in Old English in the sense *pain*, it is a scribal substitution for Anglian *wærc*,” given its distribution and the improbability of other explanations (8). He then broadens the discussion to general editorial practices in the field, opining, “the conservatism that prevails in Old English textual criticism today does so more on the basis of faith than reason” (10). Such faith, he says, “tends to lead even reasonable scholars not just to defend nonsensical manuscript readings but to credit untenable hypotheses about language and poetic form” (10). But

since no names are named, we are left to guess to which scholars he is referring.

Hans Peters in “The Vocabulary of Pain” (in *New Perspectives on English Historical Linguistics: Selected Papers from 12 ICEHL, Glasgow, 21–26 August 2002; Volume I: Syntax and Morphology*, ed. Christian Kay, Simon Horobin, and Jeremy Smith; Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science: Series IV, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 251 [Amsterdam: John Benjamins], 193–220) begins a study of the history of words in English in the semantic field PAIN. He notes that, like *pain* itself, many words come into this semantic field from meanings related to ‘punishment’, including OE *wite*. Other sources of words meaning ‘pain’ come from meanings such as ‘oppression, work, trouble, and wounds’ (189). Note that all but the last of these do not fit neatly into the supposed “law” of semantic change which claims that meanings go from the concrete to the abstract—it is not clear that a meaning like ‘punishment’ that implies a potentially wide range of assumptions about social institutions and mores is less abstract than the concept of immediate physical pain. Yet this and other authors continue to call what is at best a tendency a “law” even when their own data do not support it. Of the eighty nouns meaning ‘pain, grief, or affliction’ collected from the *Thesaurus of Old English*, Peters creates the following groups according to semantic origin or metaphorical connection: 1) from meanings of ‘narrowness’ and ‘oppression’: *angnes*, *angsumnes*, *nearones*. As the author admits, “it is by no means clear that [the more concrete meaning of] ‘physical pain’ is the primary meaning here, or whether the feeling of [the more abstract] mental stress comes first. In German, the cognate *Angst* does not have the sense of ‘physical pain’, but may be seen as closely related to ‘mental pain’” (201); 2) from the meaning ‘work’: *earfoþe*, *earfoþnes*, *earfoþlicnes*, *gewinn*, *sorg*, *wærc/wræc*; 3) from ‘punishment’: *wite*, *pin*, *pinnes*; and 4) from ‘wounds’: *sar*, *sarnes*. The last three are analyzed as deriving from metonymic developments—“work/punishment/wounds are painful” (202). This leaves the central OE term for ‘pain’—*ece*. Here again, the connection with Greek *agos* ‘guilt’ suggests that the original meaning was the more abstract ‘mental pain’ (but the contradiction of the supposed semantic “law” goes unnoted by the author). Some of the Middle English vocabulary for ‘pain’ continues from OE: *pine*, *ache/eche*, *sore*, *sorwe* and *smert* (this last, not found in OE texts, shows exclusively physical meanings in its earliest attestations, only later developing the odd range of more abstract, mental meanings). But predictably many

new terms stem from Old French: *angwisshe*, *dol*, *dolour*, *grief*, and *pein* itself, which comes ready-made with a full range of meanings, from ‘punishment’ (still present in the idiomatic phrase “on pain of death”) to ‘torture’ and ‘hardship, care’ and ‘physical pain,’ all already present and taken over from the Old French (211–12). An important, if speculative, proposal of the paper is that *pein* came to take the prominent, central place in this semantic field that it still holds largely because of early confusion with the nearly homophonous *pine* (from OE), which “virtually ended its active life [as a noun] around 1600” (207).

Sara M. Pons-Sanz in “A Sociolinguistic Approach to the Norse-Derived Words in the Glosses to the Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels” in *New Perspectives on English Historical Linguistics*, ed. Kay *et al.*, 177–92, applies a sociological distinction between communities with strong inter-personal ties, which tend to be conservative, and those with comparatively weaker ties, where innovations—including linguistic innovations—spread more easily. Unfortunately, these sociological insights and the author’s careful filtering of Owen’s glosses to the Gospels lead to no clear conclusion—only that by “disregarding some of the problems, it has been possible to show that it may be misleading to present the Norse-derived words first recorded during the Old English period as a mere list of terms organized by semantic fields without any reference to their temporal and topographical distribution. The linguistic situation in Northern Northumbria *may* have been somewhat different from that in southern Northumbria during the second half of the tenth century” (189).

William Sayers’s “Middle English *wodewose* ‘Wilderness Being’: A Hybrid Etymology?” *ANQ* 17.3: 12–20 traces the meaning of this tantalizing and mysterious word back through the Elizabethan usage (wild man in pageantry) through medieval heraldic usage (apparently an authenticating role) to important early attestations in late OE and especially in the Middle English *Gawain and the Green Knight*. This latter context invites comparison with a similar Irish story *Fled Bricrend* (*The Feast of Bricriu*) of ritual mutual beheadings involving a prophetic figure Úath mac Imomain ‘Terror son of Great Fear,’ The first element *wode* in the sense ‘mad’ goes back to OE *wōd* ‘mad, raging’ and further to Indo-European \**uōt-*, *uāt-* whose reflexes include Latin *vates*, Irish *faith* ‘seer, prophet’ and ON *Óðinn*, patron of poets, as well as Breton *oez* ‘terror.’ These connections raise the possibility that the second element may also be connected to this IE root, perhaps through a

connection with a Celtic creature characterized by prophecy and fear, perhaps associated with the last-mentioned cognate, Breton *oez*. Such an origin, while speculative, cannot be ruled out completely, though the fact that the insular languages show an inter-dental fricative for the final rather than a sibilant makes even this a bit of a stretch, phonologically. Sayers really goes wrong when he claims a straightforward linguistic connection of this Indo-European root with Irish *úath*; in spite of the nice semantics and the apparent similarity between *úath* and \**uāt*, the connection as presented is far from convincing: the *-a-* in *úath* is not only not long, it does not even represent a vowel but rather marks that the following consonant has a neutral (rather than palatal or labial) quality; furthermore, the *ú-* from earlier Irish *ō-* goes back to \**eu-*, *ou*, or *au*. Of course Irish historical phonology is notoriously difficult, but if one is publishing a proposed etymology of an Irish word, one ought to feel obliged to at least check the basic reference work in the field, in this case Thurneysen’s *Old Irish Grammar*. As it turns out, this particular oversight is not particularly damning for the primary claims of the paper, which themselves are, by the author’s own admission, speculative.

William Sayers’s “Lexical and Literary Evidence for Medieval Trade in Precious Goods: Old French *rohal*, *roal*, Middle English *rouel* ‘Walrus (and Narwhal?) Ivory?” *NOWELE* 44: 101–19 covers certain words meaning ‘ivory,’ especially walrus tusks and narwhale teeth, from Old English, Old French and Middle English. Notable is the fact that the early attestations—from *æpele ban* in King Alfred’s *Orosius* to *ylpesban* in Ælfric’s *Colloquy*—are in contexts referring to tribute and commerce. The high value of this precious commodity is further reflected in early Norman French texts where *roal* ‘ivory of walrus tusks’ (< ON *hrosshvalr*) is used to describe unicorn horns. The latter, furthermore, were identified throughout the period with the teeth of narwhales, the etymology of which likely originates with an ON \**nalhval* ‘needle whale.’ After dissimilation, the first element was reanalyzed as *nar-* ‘corpse’ which led to a taboo against eating the flesh of this fish. Tent poles of *roal* in Old and Middle French literature in contexts of fantastic opulence doubtless also referred to these narwhale teeth. It is the Norman French form *rohal*, which by that time referred primarily to the material rather than the animal, which is the origin of Middle English *rouel* and its many variants.

William Sayers in “Fret ‘Sudden Squall, Gust of Wind; Swell,’ Sea Fret ‘Sea Fog,’ Haar ‘Cold Sea Fog,”

*N&Q* n.s. 51: 351–52, points out that *fret* in the senses noted in the title seems irreconcilable with the familiar verbal entry involving gnawing and gradual wearing away. Considering the term's local use along the north-east British coast, the proposed etymology—a metathesis of ON *fretr* 'fart'—looks fairly reasonable, squalls, gusts and inland sea fogs being merely other examples of an "exhalation ... or evacuation of air" (352). The further proposal that *haar* in the meaning 'cold sea fog' comes from ON *harr* 'grey-haired' joins the "other somatic terms—from bottom to top—in supplying the raw material of maritime metaphor, fog as the hoary locks of the sea" (352).

Charles Lock in "From Lidköping to Köpenhamn: Gone Shopping?" (*World of Words: A Tribute to Arne Zetterstein, Nordic Jnl of English Studies*) 3.1: 37–43 wishes to derive Modern English *shopping* from Old English *ceapian*. As lovely as this suggestion might be from a semantic point of view, the author seems to be completely untroubled by the fact that Old English /č/ does not yield Modern English /š/. In fact this gaping hole in his argument is neither acknowledged nor addressed.

Mark Balhorn's "The Rise of Epicene *They*," *Jnl of English Linguistics* 32: 79–104, traces the earliest origins of generic *they* to Middle English, since the loss of the Old English grammatical gender was a prerequisite for the need for such a form, and the earliest clear example of its use is from Chaucer's "Man of Law's Tale" 139–40, "That *every wight* hath deyntee to cheffare / with hem and eek to sellen hem *hir* ware" or in Balhorn's paraphrase, "That *everyone* wanted to buy from them and also to sell them *their* merchandise" (93).

Marion Matschi in "Color Terms in English: Onomasiological and Semasiological Aspects," *Onomasiology Online* 5: 56–139, reviews the semantic history of color terms in English. After a brief introduction—which incorrectly states that language determines how we see and observe colors (57)—the body of the article simply lays out the histories of each color term. It is not clear that any new information is provided in this list beyond what can be found in any good etymological dictionary. The conclusion notes that "[s]everal Old English expressions for lighter colors (e.g. *geolu*, *blac*, *græg*, *hwit*, *blæce*, *blanc*, *basu*, *brun*) can be traced back to Indo-European roots meaning 'gleaming, glittering, shining' (129). Names of darker colors (*fealu*, *salu*, *hasu*, *swært*) come from bases meaning 'fallow, dirty.' Adding this to the finding that "*Read* is the only basic

color category that goes back to an underlying Indo-European color term" leads to the reconstruction of a stage with only three hue-based color terms—light, dark and red. A rich array of hue-based terms comes into the language with French and later with imports from colonies, including metonymic extensions from names of minerals and plants. "The productivity of metonymy peaks in the 19th century, which is a result of industrialization, colonialization, and the expansion of articles and advertisements in newspapers and magazines, the first mass media" (130).

Elisabeth van Houts in "The Vocabulary of Exile and Outlawry in the North Sea Area around the First Millennium," *Exile in the Middle Ages: Selected Proceedings from the International Medieval Congress, University of Leeds, 8–11 July 2002*, ed. Laura Napran and Elisabeth van Houts, *International Medieval Research* 13 (Turnhout: Brepols), 13–28, traces the linguistic, social and political origins of the English word *outlaw*. While its ultimate Old Norse origins are undisputed, its use in Old English is somewhat odd, since a perfectly suitable term, *flyma*, was available—and this was by no means (as some have claimed) a purely Scandinavian concept. The crucial event in the early history of the term was the great rise in the use of Scandinavian mercenaries in the tenth and eleventh centuries, both in England and on the continent, and the consequent rise of AWOL paid soldiers. Since the majority of such AWOL soldiers were Old Norse speakers, the term used to describe them was from their own language—*utlah*—and from this regular usage it eventually became the unmarked, standard term to designate this concept. While this study nicely pulls together a wide range of interesting data from within and beyond England, it largely overlooks the fact that other Old Norse words, especially those of technical and legal use (such as *law* itself), were coming into common usage at the same time.

After reviewing the history of semantic field theories and establishing his own approach (which generally follows the methods of Eugenio Coseriu, Hans Geckeler, and Günter Kotzor), Heiner Bouwer, in his substantial *Studien zum Wortfeld um 'eald' und 'niwe' im Altenglischen*, Sprachwissenschaftliche Studienbücher (Heidelberg: Winter), tackles Old English *niwe*, for which he finds twelve sub-meanings. The major division within these is the distinction between the meaning "shortly before narrative *now*" (or in his formalism "+ kurz vor *nunc*") and "not before narrative *now*" (or "- vor *nunc*"). An example of the former class of meanings is Genesis A B 171b *niwe gesceafte* 'the new creation'.



The latter meaning is seen in Hrothgar's declaration in *Beowulf* 949a that the hero is his *niwe sibbe*, and since the word itself creates the reality, 'new' here is equivalent to the narrative *now*, rather than before *now*. In the semantic field Bouwer is exploring, there is an interesting asymmetry—*old* in modern English can refer both to non-living and to living things, but *new* is reserved for non-living things only, *young* being the term used for 'new' living things. This asymmetry holds generally for Old English, but Bouwer claims that there are meanings of *niwe* that apply to living things. One such case he presents is from *Phoenix* 266b *feorh biþ niwe*, but while this ultimately means that the bird is made anew, the immediate referent is *feorh* 'life' which is an abstract noun and cannot be considered itself a living thing. It is hard to fault a 554-page work for being too short, but it would have been valuable to have more discussion of more cases as they appear in texts and a list of all attested instances categorized into the various sub-meanings. Other words are treated with similar detail and formal rigor, including *eald* (with sixteen sub-meanings), *æðele*, *frod*, *fyrn*, *gamol*, *geong*, and *har*.

Elwys De Stefani's "Grammatica e Dintorni," *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 120: 128–35, has little to do with the Old English lexicon. It does, however, consider the use of *glam*, the modern truncated form of *glamour* (134), as in *glam-rock* and *GlamSlam* (the name of the now-closed nightclub owned by my old high school colleague, the artist formerly and once again known as Prince.) The article proposes an alternative etymology (or perhaps merely influence) for the English word *glamour*, proposing a connection with Middle English *glimeren* which goes back ultimately to an Indo-European \**ghlei-* (132–133). While an ablaut form \**ghloim-* could have yielded an Old English \*\**glām-*, the Middle English would be \*\**glom-* not *glam-*.

JUH

A quartet of studies from Andrew Breeze looks to "solution by comparison with the Celtic languages" (quoted from his "*Lid̥eri* 'Trickle,'" 16) for problematic etymologies in OE and ME. The first of these concerns the place-name of a West Saxon victory over Britons (Cornish-speaking Celts of the south-west meant here) in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* entry for 614; this occurred at the yet unidentified *Beandun*. Michael Swanton in his translation of *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (London, 1996) rendered it as "Bea's Mount," but Breeze, in "The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* for 614 and Brean Down, Somerset," *N&Q* n.s. 51: 234–35, rejects the hypothesized

personal-name element and argues for textual corruption. The *-dun* is not problematic (he cites Bredon and Hendon), and while *Bea* is not Celtic, *brea-* is (Welsh and Cornish *bre* 'hill'; so also, for purposes of comparison, Irish *brí*). As the *Chronicle* is recording the Saxon advances south-westwards, Selwood having been reached ca. 600, Breeze offers identification of a *B<r>eandun* with Brean Down in Somerset. Historical and archaeological work has shown the strategic importance of the ridge, though it has not yet shown that this is where the slaughter of more than two thousand Britons took place (the *Chronicle* states 2,065 "Welsh" killed). Breeze notes that the West Saxon victory does not have to have resulted in territorial acquisition (the "final advance on Somerset began about 660"; 234); he offers comparison with the Northumbrian victory at Chester 613 x 616, with its "countless Welsh killed ... including 200 priests" (235), which historians believe may have more to do with plunder or score-settling than territorial gain. The *Chronicle* entry for the Chester battle has incorrectly *Scrocmail* for *Brocmail* ('badger prince', which Bede had recorded correctly), and so, Breeze argues, "[i]f the scribes of the *Chronicle* could mangle one Celtic name, they could mangle another" (235). The form suggested, *Brean-dun*, is given somewhat less treatment than the historical argument: likely, as Breeze favors, is the interpretation of the *-an* of *Brean* as a Celtic plural rather than a diminutive; Breeze does not tease out the sense of the place-name any further, though the form seems tautological (here Celtic-English), which is not entirely uncommon nor jarring if the first element were no longer transparent to OE speakers.

In "Enke 'Villein' in the Red Book of Worcester," *Trans. of the Worcestershire Archaeological Soc.* 3rd ser. 18 (2002): 233–34, Breeze treats the form *enke*, referring to servants of the lowest class, which does not appear in either the *DOE* (it seems too late, as the 'Red Book' dates to ca. 1299) nor the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*. And so Breeze offers an explanation of the word from Celtic, plausibly enough, in the first instance, on historical grounds as slaves were most numerous in Anglo-Saxon England in counties bordering Wales, and Celts commonly in the ranks of slaves held by Anglo-Saxons. Breeze notes the social "peculiarity" of Worcestershire: the Domesday survey notes a high proportion of slaves (16%) and low proportion of "free tenants on diocesan and priory manors" (33%; 233). And so, on other grounds, the philological, Breeze turns to Celtic for an explanation of the loan (seemingly to early ME or "middle" Anglo-Latin) *enke*: Welsh *ieuanc* 'young; youth' (or, by comparison with *W iangwr*

< *iueuang* 'young' + *gwr* 'man'). Breeze notes a number of pejorative uses of *iangw(y)r* collocations, such that "*iangwr* shows a form meaning 'young' coming to be used of boors, yokels and villeins" (233).

Breeze's "*Liðeri* 'Trickle' and *eden* 'Kiln' in the AB Language," *N&Q* n.s. 51: 15–16, considers an alternate origin to the *liðeri* in the eME life of St. Juliana and the *liðerede* in the lives of Sts. Margaret and Katherine, both of which forms appear in collocations having to do, ostensibly, with the foaming up of blood (*þet hit liðeri o blode* [Juliana], *liðerede (al) o blode* [Margaret, Katherine]; 15). The interpretation 'to foam' was used by the *OED* in its entry for *lather*, but Breeze rejects the traditional Gmc. explanation (with recourse to Mðcel. *lōðrandi í blōði*, 'foaming with blood, dripping with blood') and line of descent from OE *leprian* 'to lather, foam', though he does admit that a reader for *N&Q* had noted that "ME *i* can derive from OE *e*" (16). Rather, Breeze sees here another Welsh loan in the eME AB language (along with *baban* 'baby', *cader* 'cradle', *keis* 'beadles') and enlists *W llithraw* 'trickle, flow, run', with ample citations from medieval Welsh literature. Breeze sees better sense in the posited Welsh loan: 'trickle' rather than the 'foam' of *lather* (and usually associated with horses). Next Breeze takes up the interpretation of *eden* as 'threshing ground' in the metaphorical *i godes guldene edene* ("in God's golden *edene*"; 16). As the image is of having already passed through the threshing to be allotted good portion after the winnowing (of judgment), Breeze sees the interpretation of 'threshing-floor' (as OE *ōden* or *oden*—Clark Hall-Meritt were not certain of the quantity of the initial vowel) as "illogical" (16); he notes that "[t]he sense 'kiln' becomes clear once we realize Old English *oden* means 'kiln' and is a loan from Brittonic, as shown by Old Cornish *Oden-colc* 'Limekiln' in a Devon charter of 846" (16); Herbert Meritt has corrected Clark Hall's form *ōdencole* to *ōden-colc* in his supplement; it is glossed 'hollow serving as a threshing-floor'). And so Breeze sees here the 'kiln' where the wheat was dried and offers for MS *edene* two possible explanations: "this may be MS Bodley 34's error for *odene*, the scribe perhaps being misled by the rhyme with *ledene*; alternatively, original *o* may have been raised by the following *e*" (16).

The identification of *Uuelesces aloð* with 'bragget' (Welsh *bragod*) is at the center of Breeze's "What Was 'Welsh Ale' in Anglo-Saxon England?" *Neophilologus* 88: 299–301, which, once it has made an initial speculative leap, is a model of concision and clarity. The 'Welsh ale' is mentioned in Ine's laws and a land-grant

at Westbury and Henbury dating to 793 x 796 that mentions 'a coomb full of Welsh ale' among food-rent stipulations. What follows, in Breeze's argument, is a fascinating bit of cultural history; the Welsh loan-form appears in Chaucer's *Miller's Tale* (CTI.3261): *Hir mouth was sweete as bragot or the meeth*. Prior to this, we have the references to the previously unidentified 'Welsh ale'. Breeze then surveys medieval Welsh literature for references to *bragod/bragawd*, which range from Aneurin to the *Mabinogion*'s "Culhwch and Olwen" and the *Dream of Rhonabwy*, "where warriors of Rhwawn bebyr 'have mead and bragget (*bragawt*) in honor'" (300). Besides their mellifluous praise of the drink, Welsh poets distinguished between bragget and mead, as in the bardic elegy for the king Gruffudd ap Cynan, "Before Cynan's sons went under earth, mead and bragget were had in his hall" (300). Among the instances Breeze marshalls is a gloss from "Latin dialogues from a Welsh monastic school" (299) in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 572; ostensibly, this would be the 'colloquium' *De rarioribus fabulis* given in Gneuss's entry for the manuscript (*Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts* [Tempe, AZ: ACMRS, 2001], item 583). Bodley 572 has the entries *mulsum: bracaüt* and *mellicatum: brachaut* (the lemma an emendation), and Breeze notes that "[t]he tenth-century glossators here may have misunderstood the text" (300) in associating the Old Welsh forms with 'honey-wine' (or 'mead', as *mulsum* is sometimes glossed). That some seeming imprecision occurred in the glossaries is borne out by the OE glossators too: compare Wright-Wülcker 128,15 *mulsum: beor* (from a Junius transcription of Ælfric's *Glossary* in a batch of entries with the rubric *De generibus potionum*) and 281,25 *mulsum: medo* (from a Cleopatra A.iii grouping *de mensa*). The Westbury and Henbury grant is precise in the quantities of 'pure ale', 'mild ale', and 'Welsh ale' called for, and Breeze notes evidence that 'Welsh ale' was a "luxury drink," a "prestige drink; it formed part of food-rent and foodgift" (299–300). And it would not be the only drink-type to have its drink-name follow along in the borrowing, as "there appears good reason to take bragget as the 'Welsh ale' of Anglo-Saxon records. Like the *scir wered* 'gleaming liquor' of *Beowulf* 496 (cf. Welsh *gwirod* 'liquor') or whisky in modern times, it seems to be a Celtic drink adopted by the English" (301). The *scir wered* at *Beowulf* 496a could also be interpreted as 'clear' or 'bright sweet drink' and it may be a poetic circumlocution for 'mead'; *wered/werod* occurs in nominal form only here in *Beowulf*, elsewhere as an adj. meaning 'sweet'. Klaeber glossed 'sweet drink' for *wered*, Clark Hall-Meritt 'sweet drink, mead'. Of interest to Breeze's argument is Bodley 572, a manuscript

with a complicated provenance: that given in Gneuss, “prov. all parts Wales, s. x ex. England (Glastonbury?), s. xi prob. Winchester N[ew] M[inster], s. xi ex. Canterbury St A[ugustine’s]” (item 583), is not entirely clear as parts seem to be of Cornwall (Ker, *Catalogue*, item 313, “The manuscript is of Cornish and Welsh origin,” which seems to be borne out by the Celtic glosses it contains). One of two ‘cryptograms’ in the manuscripts in OE employs what Meritt had called ‘secret letters’ (with consonants for vowels, *Is ðks frfgfn sflknc pkngc tp rædfnf*), and the occurrence of Welsh and Cornish glosses make Bodley 572 one of those manuscripts bearing witness to Celtic-English interaction: in linguistic border zones, or in houses with Celtic- and English-speaking monks (e.g., St. Gallen), or in books exchanged between houses in Celtic- and English-speaking areas. (A survey of such manuscripts, including the Bodley manuscript and others such as ninth-century Leiden, Rijksuniversiteit, Vossianus lat. 4° 69 with its OE and Breton glosses, is very much needed.) And if one accepts Breeze’s initial speculative leap that ‘Welsh ale’ is bragget, another piece to the puzzle is in hand.

In a collection of studies taking its title from a Wallace Stevens poem appears Jan Čermák’s “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. Čermák traces in this brief, programmatic survey “[t]he collapse of grammatical gender and its subsequent replacement by natural gender” following the “the explanatory framework of Prague School typology” (15); the use of the theory of “markedness” comes to mind, especially early work on phonological typology by linguists such as Nikolai Trubetzkoy and Roman Jakobson). Čermák begins with traditional reasons for the replacement: “phonological (levelling of vowels in the endings), morphological (analogical restructuring in the paradigm as the central organisational principle of inflectional morphology) and those often labelled ‘psychological’ (i.e. the conflict between gender and sex in nouns such as *wif*, ‘woman’, classified as of neuter gender)” (15). While the “category of grammatical gender has received only a passing comment” in the Prague School, Čermák focuses on precisely this matter for OE (excluding anaphora, such as in pronoun use; although there is also the matter of poetic anaphora, such as polyptoton), which, in the synchronic view, seems “to be merely a conventional terminological means to capture the inflectional variety in the noun morphology” and whose “original function appears to have been

primarily semantic (though it had nothing to do with natural gender)” (15). From the diachronic perspective, OE comes rather later in the IE “development in which considerations of form prevailed. From a typological point of view, this development is one of transition from agglutination to inflection in word-structure: from a three-part (root—stem-formative—affix/ending) to a two-part structure (stem—ending)” (16). In PIE there is generally viewed to have been animate and inanimate classes of nouns; at some point later but still in the proto-period the animate class broke into masculines and feminines in those IE languages with the masculine/feminine/neuter gender system, the masculine at first referring to particular or definite individuals the noun covered, the feminine used generically (15–16 n. 4). Čermák provides next a breakdown of surviving OE nominal forms (inflected) “traditionally based on stem-class and gender-class membership”: 14.29% being “gender-sensitive, 57.14% record number, and 28.57% “function as unambiguous signals of number/case membership” (16 and n. 6); for comparison, the figures for Gothic given are, respectively: 46.81%, 80.85%, 55.32%, and 29.79%—one understands the figures to refer to number, case, gender, and the combinative “unambiguous signals” (16 n. 6 directs the reader also to Čermák’s Prague diploma dissertation: *Tvaroslovná charakteristika staroanglického substantiva z hlediska proměny typu angličtiny* [“Typological Reshaping as Reflected in the Morphological Characteristics of the Old English Noun”], Charles University, 1985). The “re-structuring of OE declensional system in terms of stem- and gender-class membership can be seen in connection with the low degree of sensitivity in the OE noun to gender marking” (18); the variation that can be seen can occur “with grammatical gender functioning as typologically subordinate to stem-class” (17); as an example of “multiple or ambiguous gender-membership” Čermák cites OE *secg*, which when denoting ‘man’ (Clark Hall-Meritt ‘man, warrior, hero’, the latter two glosses especially in the poetry) is masc., denoting ‘sedge, reed, rush’ is neut. (though Clark Hall-Meritt brackets neuter, allowing that in this sense it can also be masc.), and meaning ‘sword’ is fem. There are difficulties in determining examples such as *secg* such as the “limited evidence” and the “likely interplay of factors such as morphological analogy, contextual analogy, cross-linguistic analogy (gender in Latin), inheritance of a double or confused gender-membership from Germanic” (17 and n. 8). Čermák finds enough evidence to note the “major manifestations of the restructuring among the noun declensions in pre-OE and OE,” the first two of which—that among the ‘minor’ declensions,

the *r*-stem nouns, the *nd*-stems, the *þ*-stems, one finds “a rise of analogical masculine *a*-stem formations linked to a gradual ousting of the original forms based on rich stem allomorphy”; that “athematic nouns re-model their *i*-mutated gen. sg. and (later) dat. sg. form on *a*-stems (masculine) or *o*-stems (feminine)” (17)—point already toward a decline in diversity of stem-forms. While the dialectal concerns are not the subject of this survey, Čermák does mention, in discussing “variation in concordial gender marking” (as with the “unhistorical congruence of noun with demonstrative or strong adjective”), “diatopic variation” (17) as in the Northumbrian glosses (the Lindisfarne Gospels, the *Durham Ritual*); this calls to mind Alistair Campbell’s observation that “[i]n the Late Northumbrian dialect of OE there is considerable confusion in the declensional system,” which is contrasted with the “comparatively well preserved” declensional system in the Rushworth glosses (the Mercian glosses to Matthew; *Old English Grammar* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1959], §§568–69), among which developments in later Northumbrian was the extension of gen. sing. *-es* beyond the *a*-stems (§569 n. 1). Appearing too late for Čermák’s study and relevant to his citation of such “correlative derivational pairs” (16) as *hana* (m.): *henn* (f.) was Alfred Bammesberger’s “The Entry *henna* in Dictionaries of Old English,” *N&Q* n.s. 50 (2003): 258, reviewed in this section of *YWOES* 2003. While factors were at work to enable restructuring of the category of grammatical gender in OE, others prevented its wholesale elimination, such as “the fact that the domain of marking for grammatical gender was the whole noun phrase, with congruent forms of demonstratives or strong adjectives functioning as prime carriers of gender distinctions” (18). Nonetheless, in historical and typological terms, there is “a decrease of inflectional properties in the system of noun declension” (18) and it is “[t]he category of gender, weakened by its covert patterning and obscured semantic motivation in nouns, [that] will be the first to go” (19). And a typological note (alluding to the classification of languages into isolating, agglutinative, synthetic, analytic “types”) ends the survey: “Given also the overall reduction in the number of declensional patterns, the nature of the ‘new’ endings in this peripheral and, as we know, transitory system makes them more closely resemble the affixes of agglutination (which, it is interesting to note, knows no gender)” (20).

In “ME *haterly* / *heterly*: Origin and Meaning,” *ES* 85: 17–21, William Cooke argues for removal of the sense ‘quickly’ to *heterly* while specifying senses of the adv. in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (as ‘shrilly’ at l. 1446,

and ‘suddenly’ at 2311) and in Trevisa (in the sense ‘distinctly’). In getting to these semantic distinctions, Cooke has to discuss the origin of the form. While the *OED* derives *haterly*/*heterly* from an adj. *heter*, and compares OE *hatian* (‘hate’) and *hete* (‘envy, malice, hostility’), the *MED* saw the adv. as a back-formation of *heterli* and, on Tolkien’s suggestion, “a blend of OE *hetelice* with an Anglo-Norse counterpart of Old Icelandic *hatrliga*” (17). Cooke follows the suggestion of S.R.T.O. d’Ardenne (in the EETS edition of *Pe Liflade ant te Passiun of Seinte Iulienne* [Oxford, 1961], O.S. 248) that “ME *haterly*/*heterly* represents a variant development of OE *\*hatollice*/*hetollice*, an adverb regularly formed from the attested adjective *hatol*/*hetol* meaning ‘hostile’ or ‘showing bitter hate’” (17). As the OE is fairly critical to Cooke’s argument, one would have liked to have seen more treatment of it than it gets. To start with, the collapsing of OE *hatol* and *hetol* is not necessarily a given: Clark Hall-Meritt glosses *hatol* ‘hostile, bitter; odious’ and *hetol* ‘hating, hostile, evil; savage, violent, severe’—all of which could have been brought to bear upon Cooke’s semantic discussion of the ME form(s). Soon we get to the statement “If the etymology just proposed is right ...” (18); but this is before it feels the OE has been satisfactorily mined for the ME adverb. The first matter to be dealt with is *-ll-* > *-rl-* or *-ll ~ -rl-*, with regard to which Cooke noted “as showing a variant development of *-ll-* to *-rl-* in words of this type by dissimilation” (18); that is, the geminate *-ll-* attributed to a reconstructed OE adv. *heatollice* later underwent dissimilation. This is used to support next: “we can explain *haterly*/*heterly* as showing the same development from parallel OE forms *\*hatollice* and *\*hetollice*, which we can legitimately infer from the attested adjectives *hatol* and *hetel* [*sic*]” (18). And this is used to explain the ‘variant’ form *heatterliche* in *Seinte Iulienne* (l. 155) “as a corresponding development of OE *\*heatollice* < *\*heatol*, showing Second Fronting followed by Back Mutation in Old Mercian like *eatol* for *atol* in *Beowulf* 2074 and 2478” (18). This seems, phonology-wise, a lot of freight for the OE to pull; presumably for the *Beowulf* instances (*eatol æfengrom* [2074a] and *eatolne inwitscear* [2478a]), the reference is to Klaeber’s language section §12, and presumably meant is the “*o/a*-umlaut” Klaeber lists as “Merc., partly E. Kent.” (*Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*, 3rd ed. [Boston: D.C. Heath, 1941], lxxviii). Although Cooke’s focus is solidly on ME, it might have helped his case to have cited a work on OE—Campbell’s *Old English Grammar* for one. Although Campbell notes that “Second fronting is not a general Merc. change” (§168), his sections §§164–69, 205–21, and 253–55 may have helped clarify Cooke’s proposed chronology.



It is probably best to start with the conclusion to Javier E. Díaz Vera's Functional-Lexematic Model-based study "Image Schemata and Light," *New Perspectives on English Historical Linguistics*, ed. Kay *et al.*, 65–77: "As previous studies on semantic change have shown, word meanings change from more concrete to less concrete, so that any deviation from the prototypical model of light described above implies an increase in the degree of abstractness of the predicate. The semantic changes described here respond thus to the well-known tendency of old words to acquire new meanings that are less tangible and more abstract, extending a schema from the physical to the non-physical world, a tendency that applies to both the intradomain and the extradomain level" (76). On surface, this is wholly unobjectionable as it simply re-validates the consensus view; Díaz Vera had begun, theoretically, seeking to "reconstruct an inventory of conceptual categories from a mainly diachronic perspective," the "lexical domain" in this FLM-based model "refer[ring] to the set of lexemes which together lexicalise all or part of a conceptual domain" with a "method of analysis [that] is bottom-up (or data-driven)" (65). And so in the Spanish-school "definitional analysis" method, fusing the "distinctive feature approach" (as of E.H. Bendix) and "semantic role assignment" (the work of Charles Fillmore), the observation that "defining a verb implies locating it in semantic space" (66) is first given some concrete form with "Table 1" concerning OE *scīnan*, whose "argument restrictions" include its referring to the shining of a heavenly body (*Seo sunne on hadrum heofone beorhtost scīnēð*), or the shining of a metallic or polished surface (*scean scir werod*, 'shone the shining company/troop', from *Exodus*), or the shining of a color or "human (positive qualities)" (a Christian commonplace: *Bonne scīnað ða rihtwisan swa swa sunne on hyra fæder rice* in the OE Gospel of Matthew). By the "lexical derivational principle" (that "[t]he greater the semantic coverage of a lexeme, the greater its number of derivational formations"; 66), "we can confidently give OE *scīnan* archilexematic status, and define it as 'to give off light, to shine'" (67)—that is, as *scīnan* can be seen as one of those "underived verbs that frequently serve as a basis for the creation of new derived words" (67), in this case other verbs such as *āscīnan*, *bescīnan*, *gescīnan*, *geondscīnan*, *oferscīnan*, *ymbscīnan*, the verb is the top of its class, "archilexematic"—something already known from traditional morphological and historical semantic study. OE *scīnan* is then examined by certain "semantic parameters," namely "stability and degree of intensity of light" (67). And here come the PowerPoint slides: one list of verbs with the

semantic parameter 'stability of light' appears under an "open folder" icon indicating TO SHINE and includes OE *beorhtian*, *blican*, *glōwan*, *lihtan*, *scīmian*, *scīnan*, *oferscīnan*, and the charming *twinclian*; the other "open folder" icon indicates TO SHINE UNSTEADILY and includes verbs such as *blicetan* (among others, 68). In the next section, concerning the parameter 'intensity of light', a particular difficulty comes up: the use of fairly rigid-looking tables and diagrams based upon relatively subjective, if learned data: the glosses from modern lexica—"we have used the translations given by Old English dictionaries [BT, Clark Hall-Meritt, and the *DOE* through 1996]. However, these lexicographic definitions must necessarily be validated through the detailed analysis of such different factors as etymology, collocations and Latin glosses" (68). This work has not been done here; the classification of OE *blican* as 'to shine fairly brightly' seems tentative if not tendentious (as the schema "'intensity of light' in verbs of STABLE LIGHT" is dependent upon drawing such distinctions of degree). The citation for this designation of degree 'to shine fairly brightly' is *ðæt ðu ðære gyldnan gesiehest Hierusalem weallas blican*; one would expect rather that Jerusalem's walls all golden would positively glow. Next considered, relatively briefly when diagrams and tables are deducted, are the "causative domain: To cause something to give off light" (70–73) and "Paths of semantic change" (73–75), which latter section concerns "the semantic changes that have affected this lexical domain in the later history of the English language" (73).

Colmán Etchingham and Catherine Swift begin their interdisciplinary study "English and Pictish Terms for Brooch in an 8th-century Irish Law-Text," *MA* 48: 31–49, with an appeal to "archaeologists and others ..." that they "will be inspired to acquire a grounding in early Irish language sufficient to allow them to explore the [Irish] legal texts" (31). A somewhat odd and modest appeal on surface, until one gets to citations of the medieval Irish legal texts themselves, many still unedited and untranslated; and, of particular concern here is the *Bretha Nemed Toisech* ("First Judgements concerning *Nemed*," that is 'privileged persons' or 'sacred or privileged person or place or thing ... a poet, noble or dignitary' [*Foclóir Gaedhilge agus Béarla (An Irish-English Dictionary)*, Rev. Patrick S. Dinneen (Dublin: Irish Texts Society, 1927/rpt. 1979)]), the Old Irish forms of which indicate an eighth-century origin to the text, perhaps even datable specifically to the reign of Cathal mac Finguine, King of Munster 721–42 (32). Of interest to OE specialists are a specific and a general point. In a discussion of sureties and pledges for the scholar-poet

class (the *ollamain*) the *Bretha Nemed Toisech* mentions a pledge of two brooches and a drinking-vessel (*bóige*); the terms used to refer to the brooches, each assessed the value of an ounce of gold, are the focus: Old Irish *briar*, believed to be a loan from OE (*brēr*; an origin for which Etchingham and Swift cite only the Royal Irish Academy's *Dictionary of the Irish Language* [Dublin, 1913–76]), and Pictish *cataid* (MS *cataigh* in the diplomatic text presented in D.A. Binchy's *Corpus Iuris Hibernici*, vol. 6 [Dublin, 1978]). The nature of the text suggests some fidelity in recording of the forms—the *Bretha Nemed Toisech* is an example of the *roscadh* (*rosc* 'rhetoric'; Dinneen glosses 'dithyramb' for *rosc* and *roscadh*) style, the rhetorical, alliterative prose of such legal texts committed to memory; the *rosc* form has been the subject of some attention from Celticists and Indo-Europeanists (its role in reconstructing early metrics)—in addition to the references in this present study under review but worthy of note are two studies from Calvert Watkins: "Indo-European Metrics and Archaic Irish Verse," *Celtica* 6 (1963): 194–249, and chapter 24, "Early Irish *rosc*" in his *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995), 255–64, in which Watkins cites Liam Breatnach's observation that "Old Irish texts appear in three forms: prose, rhyming syllabic verse, and *rosc*. The simplest definition of *rosc* is that it is neither of the other two" (255). The text, naturally, is highly formulaic, with its third part often "addressed to the mythical judge Neire" (33); thus, our passage begins with the formula *Mo Nere núallgnáith, diamba brithem* ("My eloquent Neire, if you be a judge"; Etchingham and Swift have offered a translation "tentative in some respects" [33 n. 9] to this difficult section of the text; just the form *diamba*, 2nd sing. conjunct [that is, conj. *dia* plus *is*] pres. subj. of *is*, 'if you be', is one of the grammatical complexities awaiting the interdisciplinary researcher), and the pledge stipulation reads: *Briar derg dleacc* [fort. *delg*] *n-uinge, uinge aile a cataigh cainbláth* ("A red *briar* is a brooch worth an ounce, another ounce consists of a *cataid*, fair and smooth [?]" (33). The difficulty with OIr. *briar* < OE *brēr* is not so much the form (Etchingham and Swift, despite the interdisciplinary appeal, quite forgivably focus on their particular interest, the material culture argument and its implications, and do not treat the phonology) as with the semantic extension that must be inferred. OE *brēr* is of course 'briar' (so the Toronto *DOE* glosses; Clark Hall-Meritt "'brier", 'bramble'), occurring mainly in glosses; as such it serves as the *interpretamentum* to Lat. *morus* ('mulberry'), *tribulus* (*tribolus*: 'spiny plant, caltrop' [OLD]), and *anguens* (this last lemma the *DOE* notes as a *crux*—more about

which elsewhere in this section's review of the *DOE A-F*). If the Aldhelm *De virginitate* gloss *anguens: breer* requires an associative interpretation, all the more so the OIr. adoption of *brēr* as *briar* in the sense of 'type of brooch', which occurs in OIr., too, mainly in the glossaries; and so Etchingham and Swift allude to a semantic extension at one end of the loan process or the other: "it is possible that the Irish glossators interpreted the loan-word *briar* simply as a direct parallel to the Irish word *delg*, a word that can mean both a thorn and a pin and, by extension, a brooch. Alternatively, could the meaning attached to the loan-word in Old Irish reveal a wider semantic range for the original Old English term and one that is no longer recoverable from surviving English texts? In other words, might Old English *brēr* itself have borne the connotation 'brooch' for English speakers?" (35). While intriguing, Etchingham and Swift admit that "[t]here is apparently no evidence that would support such a hypothesis" (35), but they open up other interesting avenues of investigation. And here is the point of general interest to OE researchers in their study; the authors note the "striking coincidence (if coincidence it be)" of association of the *Bretha Nemed Toisech* with Tulach Léis na Sacsan (Tullylease, Co. Cork: "Tullylease of the Saxons"), famous also for the carved and inscribed cross-slab, dated plausibly also to the eighth century, in memory of Berechtuine, that is, OE *Beorhtwine*. The *briar derg* of the OIr. legal tract offers another intriguing tidbit—that is, that the gold brooch was *derg*, 'red', which the authors take as perhaps being an allusion to *dergór*, 'red gold', and thus the brooches referred to were of gold rather than silver. The later O'Davoren's *Glossary* quotes the *Bretha Nemed Toisech* on *briar* and explains the 'red' as *derg fria bruith* (the authors, tentatively again, offer: 'red with respect to its melting/refining/heating [?]; something of the sort seems quite plausibly suggested by the *bruith*). What could be added to Etchingham and Swift's interdisciplinary Irish-English scope is that OE too refers to 'red gold'; compare, for example, the entry from Ælfric's *Glossary*: *aurum obrizum: read gold* (the lemma referring to 'pure [standard] gold', the OE interpretation to which has not been unproblematic). The authors then consider the appearance of *briar* in the *Dúil Dromma Cetta*, a late OIr. legal glossary, the gloss to which (*delg co tócbáil fora cinn .i. brí tulach*; 37) is interesting in the quasi-etymological reading of the OE loan (an attempt at breaking it down to include Irish *brí* 'hill') and the reference to *tulach* (*tulaig*, 'hills, mounds'), plausibly taken here as "'mound'-like protuberances or bosses" (37), and which is parlayed into a discussion of just what types of brooch are the *briar* and *cataigh* (the

Pictish form appears in an entry from Cormac's *Glossary*: *Catit nó Cartait .i. delg .i. bérla Cruithnech .i. delg ara-cuirit[h]er a chos*; 38). The appearance of the form in Pictish (*bérla Cruithnech*), valuable in and of itself as a rare attestation of that language, and its explanation in Cormac's *Glossary* (the authors follow his spellings *catit nó cartait* ["*catit* or *cartait*"]) lead the authors to accept the potential translation of Cormac's gloss on the Pictish as referring to a brooch having a pin that 'turns back, turns away' (39–40). And so matters come to a head, an archaeological one at least: the *briar* may refer, with its *tulach*, to the "Anglo-Saxon type of composite disc-brooch of the 7th (and early 8th?) centuries" (37) and the Pictish *catit* or *cartait*, with its pin that 'turns back', may be of the sort of "Pictish-style penannular brooches of 8th- or earlier 9th-century date [that] have turned up in Ireland" (48). And so a words-and-things (*Wörter und Sachen*) approach: Etchingham and Swift examine Irish, Pictish, and Anglo-Saxon brooch types on the further basis of the passage from the *Bretha Nemed Toísech* and in doing so call attention to texts such as the foregoing, with its citation, in a single line, of Old Irish, Old English apparently in OIr. garb, and Pictish, and Cormac's *Glossary* (with its wide-ranging linguistic interests, extending to Greek, Hebrew even). All of which points to greatly needed comparative work on these cultures known to have interacted and the difficult linguistic work, in particular also, that awaits.

"Non olet": Euphemisms We Live By," *New perspectives on English Historical Linguistics II*, ed. Kay, 91–107, is Andreas Fischer's contribution to this collection of conference papers, some revised for publication more than others, and it concerns the matter of "the vocabulary for 'toilet' in the history of English" and the larger problem with regard to, in Swiftian terms, the "at stool"-vocabulary: "why it is so much larger than appears to be necessary from a purely functional point of view" (91). The answer is simple enough: "However, even though people may have been less squeamish in earlier periods than in the hygiene- and privacy-oriented present, the words and categories discussed in this paper show that euphemisation has been at work throughout: it must be regarded as the principal reason why the 'toilet' vocabulary of English is so rich. Words that 'do not smell,' it appears, have always been and still are, popular currency" (106). Ample evidence of this "jakes vocabulary" is provided, first from the data collected by the *HTE*—of whatever interest it may be, terms for women's "rooms" outnumber men's 6:4. Along the way, very, very briefly mentioned are OE terms such as *gangern*, *gangpytt*, and other *gang-* and *-gang* compounds.

Matters of metonymy, taboo, euphemism, and dysphemism are also briefly addressed. The infamous Thomas Crapper puts in an appearance but is treated mainly in a note (103 n. 29)—one really needs more on Crapper, and whether we are really dealing with a folk etymology here or not.

Difficult to place, in terms of interest to OE specialists, is Marta González Orta's "The Old English Verbs of *Smell Perception* and *Emission*: Analysis of the Interface of Their Semantic and Syntactic Representation," *SELIM* 12 (2003–04): 33–48. Theoretically, González Orta's study employs the "Lexical Grammar Model," following particularly the work of Ricardo Mairal, and its expansions upon the Role and Reference Grammar developed in the 1980s by William Foley and Robert Van Valin, to the extent that the author employs "a *lexical template* [that] encodes the semantic description of a lexical (sub-)class in a formal system representation which will allow us to explain the syntactic and morphological phenomena within a given lexical (sub-)class" (33). The RRG approach is essentially a communicative one, looking to what communicative needs there are to be served and what grammatical means or devices can be called upon to serve them—in other words, a system designed and much better adapted to explaining living speech varieties with native informants. Following the schemata of Robert Van Valin and Randy J. LaPolla's *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997), González Orta first tabulates the "logical structures ... based on the classification of predicates attending to their *Aktionsart*" (34, table 1; or, one supposes, *Aktionsarten*) and their "lexical representations": "state, activity, achievement, accomplishment, active accomplishment, causative" (35). The OE evidence, when it is turned to (39ff.), is derived from the *TOE*, *The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*, and Bosworth-Toller (and Campbell supplement); but the OE does not have a starring role in this production. As "[t]his paper is part of the research projects EX2003–0118 and BFF2002–00659" (33 n.1), it has all of the telltale markings of a postmodern linguistic progress report: jargon-heavy, promising developments of varying degrees of departure from an established theoretical program, with plenty of pseudo-scientific turns of phrase; the welter of competing, often partially overlapping systems seems to have an amplification proportionate to granting agency and university administration gullibility. To wit, this study essentially examines the difference between *She smells roses* and *She smells* (the latter, in MdE, primarily pejorative [= *She stinks*, *She smells bad*], and being seemingly as likely stative as reflexively

perceptual [e.g., a native speaker of MðE knows what *Man, I stink* means]). It is an important subject nonetheless; the “Lexical Template Modeling Process” forces González Orta to parse uses and meanings of OE verbs of “smell perception and emission” very literally—e.g., the logical structure “... CAUSE [have.air.in.lungs (x)]” (39), or the “instrument construction” (40), that is, to smell by or through the nose (citations list OE forms *gestincað, geswæccan, tostincaþ*). One example, pertaining to “unspecified object construction” (41–2), highlights again the difficulties that ensue from a reliance upon the data of corpora or lexica exclusively: González Orta cites Ps 113 *Habbap̃ opene nose, ne magon eðian* from Bosworth-Toller, who give it as glossing Lat. *nares habent et non odorabunt* (s.v. *eðian*). BT was paraphrasing the relevant passage from Benjamin Thorpe’s edition of the “Paris Psalter” (that is, Paris, BNF lat. 8824, with OE prose paraphrase of Pss 1–50 and metrical version of Pss 51–150.3, and given the siglum ç in Philip Pulsiano, *Old English Glossed Psalters Psalms 1–50* [Toronto: U Toronto P, 2001]). Thorpe actually prints: *Earan habbað swylce, and opene nose; ne magon eþian, awyht gehýran (Aures habent, et non audient; nares habent, et non odorabunt; in his Libri Psalmorum versio antiqua Latina; [Oxford, 1835], 329)*. The caveat with BT is that it is not a concordance (one of the signal advances of the *DOE* in progress is that a concordance was drawn up in advance of the lexicographic work proper). A number of interesting points arise out of this brief (mis)quotation; González Orta uses the Ps 113 passage as an example of OE *eðian* participating in the “unspecified object construction” in which the object of the verb is considered “typical” for that verb, and “in this constructional *template* there will be only a macrorole Actor corresponding to the variable (x) and taking Nominative case” (42): in other words, the Psalter passage reads “They have noses, but do not smell” (nominative subject, transitive use), which translators of Scripture into English have known for over a thousand years. Minus the jargon, the results are underwhelming; more problematic is the working from corpora. BT noted that OE *eðian* could also be used as equivalent to Lat. *halare, spirare, inspirare*; the sense ‘to breathe, inspire’ is given first, that ‘to smell’ second (with only the Psalter passage as attestation): *eðian* considered semantically, on the whole, would require a more complex logical structure scheme. The nature of the evidence adduced—a translation from the Latin—also raises further matters for consideration. Though Paris BNF 8824 offers a metrical ‘paraphrase’ of the relevant psalm, other glossed psalters would allow for a consideration of how *odorabunt* was rendered; for

example, the Vespasian Psalter glosses *nesðyrel habbað 7 ne weorðiað*, the somewhat later Salisbury Psalter *nosan habbað 7 na gestuncan*. The variants could be multiplied, though the lemma is essentially constant. As *eðian* is but one of the verbs used to render the Psalter lemma, it seems the sole occurrence of the verb with this secondary sense has less force in terms of the linguistic argument; the *DOE* glossed the usage rather cautiously: “rendering *odorare* ‘to smell’ but here referring to nostrils that take in no breath” (s.v. *eþian*), rendering this “unspecified object construction” essentially without object. One comes away empty from González Orta’s conclusion: “our proposal of a general *lexical template* for these two verbal subclasses and a set of linking mechanisms between the constructional *templates* and the morphological and syntactic patterning exhibited by their members implies a way to capture the interrelation of the semantic and syntactic structure of *smell verbs*” (45).

Joachim Grzega has published part of his Habilitationsschrift (University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, 2003) in “A Qualitative and Quantitative Presentation of the Forces for Lexemic Change in the History of English,” *Onomasiology Online* 5: 15–55, an electronic publishing venture run by Grzega. It is unclear whether this portion of the dissertation will appear again in the announced publication by Carl Winter: *Bezeichnungswandel: Wie, Warum, Wozu?—Ein Beitrag zur englischen und allgemeinem Onomasiologie*. What one gets here, somewhat inexplicably, is a brief introduction to the “(Proposed) Catalog of Forces for Lexemic Change” (15–16), a spectrum indicating types of change subconscious-conscious (17), and then sample concepts from the “JGKUE Corpus”—that is, concepts or lemmas, collected from Carl Darling Buck’s eminently usable *Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages: A Contribution to the History of Ideas* (Chicago: U Chicago P, 1949; given thus correctly in Grzega’s bibliography [53], but here in the text with *Principle* for *Principal*; there are many other typos and infelicities throughout). Then comes the body of the study, lemmas E–U (from ‘easy, not difficult’ to ‘use, make use of’; 22–50). Even though such an oddly selected “random corpus of the lexical changes in the history of formal English” (18) had to be, well, so *random*, the source text, a dictionary of IE cognates, presents some problems for the study of “the history of formal English” (not least of which is what part of the stock of PIE concepts English shares in). Thus we have lumped together ‘edge of a forest,’ ‘elephant,’ ‘excrement,’ ‘glory,’ ‘goat (female) (domesticated),’ ‘jaw,’ ‘jewel,’ and



‘urine.’ OE is only mentioned in the giving of relevant OE forms under each lemmatized concept heading. The ranking of forces comes at the end, and without any surprises: ‘fashion/prestige’ is the strongest (‘prestige’ is the term in North American linguistic circles), then ‘anthropological salience’ (‘anthropological given emotionality of a concept’ is Grzego’s clarification), then ‘desire for plasticity’, ‘social reasons’, ‘logical-formal reasons’. We are told that such factors as ‘decrease in salience’, ‘reading errors’ (explained with the elementally Saussurean “this will only trigger off changes in the *parole* without consequences in the *langue*”; 16), and ‘laziness’ (better now to call it ‘optimality’) are not valid. That the ‘prestige factor’ should be the most powerful has been argued for by modern sociolinguistics too. Two perils of electronic publishing present themselves here: one, the relative freedom granted from space limitations—much here could have been usefully condensed; two, the tendency not to revise thoroughly material existing only or primarily in electronic format. Perhaps the Carl Winter printed volume will explain more fully the work presented in the electronic sample.

The oft-disputed origin to ‘viking’ is the subject of Ottar Grønvik’s “Ordet norr. *vikingr* m—et tidlig lån fra anglo-frisisk område,” *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 119: 5–15, a great value of which is its particular focus on Scandinavian dialect evidence and examinations of the Scandinavian-language literature on the disputed etymology. Grønvik begins with a survey of the previous proposals (one weakness to the study is the scant consideration of English-language proposals, a number of which have been reviewed in recent years in this section of *YWOES*), such as the proposal ‘(sjø)menn fra Viken (Skagerrak og Oslofjorden), ‘sailors from Vik’, and that of OE *wicing*, “muligheten av at det kan være et lånord fra gammelengelsk” (5–6), the possibility that the ON form was a loan from OE. This Grønvik will answer negatively, and with some elaboration, beginning with the critical observation that “Som simplex er ordet *viking* f. ganske godt belagt i norrøne tekster” (6), and in addition to these references occurring solely in ON texts Grønvik considers the epigraphic occurrences (“en vestgøtsk og to skånske runesteiner fra omkring år 1000”), namely the Runic “uttrykket” (‘expression’) “(død) <i>vikiku>” (= ON *í vikingu*), which when expanded, “(død) på vikingeferd” (“death on a Viking raid”), has also seemed a possible source for the form in the sense ‘pirate, raider’. And the semantics and dating of any proposed loan from OE or Anglo-Frisian are taken up by Grønvik in sections 2–3 and 7–11 in his twelve-part word-history. In building from his assertion made

early on that *vikingr*, m., is an “opprinnelig nordiske ord” (an original ON word) to his ultimate conclusion that the ON form comes from neither OE nor Frisian, and that “Selve verbet geng. *wician*, *wicode* er ikke noe arveord i gammelengelsk” (13; that *wician* is not native to OE either, but, as has been suggested before, derives from Lat. *vīcus*) Grønvik considers the famous passage from the OE *Widsith* in which *ond mid wicingum* occurs among the catalogue of Germanic peoples (ll. 57ff.). The difficulty has been in taking *mid wicingum* as referring to ‘sea-borne raiders’; Grønvik sees instead a contextual sense suggesting fixed abode(s) (“bestemt sted eller på flere bestemte steder”; 7). And there is also the matter of whether *wicing* functioned as, or also as, an ethnic epithet or name (Wendish?), as in *Widsith* l. 47 *wicinga cynn*. The semantic problem is that earlier uses of OE *wīc* and *wīcing* seem, in Grønvik’s view, to favor an association with the senses of Lat. *vīcus* (‘house, farm-house’), and more particularly with a temporary dwelling-place (“midlertidig bosted”; 13). The latter sense Grønvik supports further with citation of “Ottars reise” (“Ohthere’s Voyage” in King Alfred’s *Orosius*): *buton on feawum stowum styccemælum wiciað Finnas, on huntode on wintra, ond on sumera on fiscaþe be þære sæ* (9). And if there are semantic problems with the OE *wīcing* > ON *vikingr* (or the f. *viking*, “hærferd (til sjøs),” ‘sea-raid’), so “[a]v kulturhistoriske grunner”; namely, the cultural-historical ground that the OE form likely dates to the pre-Viking period, whether this “fredelige perioden” really was peaceful or not (11). And here Grønvik’s sparing use of English-language sources has him covering some points already made; for example, Alistair Campbell in his *Old English Grammar*—a work that does not appear in Grønvik’s bibliography—had included *wīcing* ‘pirate’ in his section “Scandinavian Loan-words” (§566) and noted: “The word is early [e.g., the Corpus *Glossary* entry *piraticam: wicincsceadan*; Wright-Wülcker 39,23] and may well be native, but its established use for the Scandinavian rovers is due to the fact that these called themselves *vikingar*” (§566 n.1). By and large Grønvik’s argument rests on these chronological and cultural-historical grounds, and the philological argument is given less play, especially the phonology (though he does treat the change [k] > [ts] in OFris. *wizing*, *witsing*; 11). The one grumble with the “kulturhistoriske grunner” of the argument is that some of the sources are dated; surely something more recent could be had than Philipp Gosse’s 1932 *History of Piracy* (London: Longman, Green and Co.). And so in the end we wind up not at the “anglo-frisisk område” alluded to in Grønvik’s title, instead “Nordsjøområdet” (13). And, also, by Grønvik’s concluding twelfth part to

his argument, we are told that OE *wicing* is neither the source to ON *vikingr* nor a native English word, but a loan dating to the Merovingian period, ca. 600 or a little later (“fra omkring 600 eller litt senere”; 13). There is much of value in Grønvik’s study of the problematic word origin, especially valuable his extensive coverage of Scandinavian work on the matter, and it would be helpful, as in the end we learn more about OE *wicing* than ON *vikingr* in the study, for it to be reprinted in an English translation.

Two important publications of the *Dictionary of Old English*, the latest individual fascicle *DOE: F* and the first CD-ROM published to date, the *DOE: A–F*, ed. Antonette DiPaolo Healey, Joan Holland, David McDougall, Ian McDougall, Nancy Speirs, and Pauline Thompson—and incorporating the work of other scholars too, from Angus Cameron to Roberta Frank—(Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2003–2004) will be reviewed here together. The CD-ROM version of the *DOE: A–F* can certainly be regarded as a landmark publication in OE studies and, more broadly, as a significant advancement to the work of other English lexicographical enterprises (the in-progress *OED3*, the *HTE*, among others) and a service to lexicography in general. Had the *DOE* project simply stopped after producing the *Microfiche Concordance to Old English* (Toronto, 1985), one would still have much to be grateful for. Perhaps future medievalists will some day no longer know how dreadful it is to have to work with microfiche (which is perhaps an improvement over the tortures of microfilm), for which they may offer *deo gratias*. The CD-ROM publication of fascicles A–F is remarkably easy to use and a genuinely valuable research tool. An immense amount of work has gone into producing this developing new lexicon of OE, which will remain the statement on the language from 500–1100 for some time to come.

That said, there is room for further improvement. While the OE font is pleasing and clear, all the more so in comparison with, say, printed volumes of the *MED*, there could be some minor improvements: the single quotation marks are decidedly ugly (they are pointings rather than quotes); a single space could probably be used between grammatical abbreviations, examples of which such as “m.acc.pl.” seem cumbersome (perhaps either collapse it fully as many grammars do, “m.a.p.” or expand to “masc. acc. pl.”). It is too late to change the system of abbreviation the *DOE* employs, which, for laws, charters, glosses, and homilies can be maddeningly cryptic, but now the reader can click on the short

title reference to have the fuller text citation appear in a small window below the main rightside window displaying the headword entry. And no matter how easy it is to use this CD-ROM, reading a computer screen is only a slight improvement over looking at a fiche reader—it is prettier, but just as tedious and physically unpleasant. Fortunately for the serious application of the fruits of the *DOE* to research on Old English language and literature, the application allows for easy printing. The overall layout of the entries has much to do with how the *DOE* has been disseminated to date: in fiche or electronic versions. The great blank spaces of entries may ease reading by such media as fiche reader or computer screen, but it also induces a kind of sloppiness in presentation. The *DOE* would not be the only lexicon grappling with how to present attestations. The *OED* should serve as a model as could other Oxford lexica, such as the *OLD* and *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, both offering eminently more readable entry formats. The introductory section “The Content and Form of the Entries” seems rather diffident given the immense amount of work that has gone into the project and the relatively high-level of self-examination and boosterism large government- and foundation-supported projects entail: that is, having to make the rounds of the major conferences to promote the “usefulness” of the project (there is no question of that with the *DOE*) and tedious annual progress reports (where the *DOE* has made admirable use of sample entries). And so in the explanation of “Headword” when one reads that “We define in separate entries words of different etymologies, such as *fyrmp̃*, *feormp̃* ‘harbouring of wrongdoers’ and *fyrmp̃* ‘washing, cleaning.’ We define in the same entry words with identical etymologies and semantic fields, even if they have small morphological or grammatical differences,” one knows that there is much more to the lexicographical praxis of the *DOE*. And how could there not be after two decades of publishing fascicles? It is especially disappointing that “Definition,” which beyond assembling the corpus must have been the greatest task facing the *DOE* (and on occasion marks its greatest advances over BT, BTS, CHM), comes across as entirely too apologetic, as if there were something wrong with a lexicographer defining a word. This has probably less to do with the abhorrence of prescriptivism—after all, the *DOE* bluntly states that “We use late West Saxon or Ælfrician spellings for the headword if the headword is attested in late West-Saxon”—and more to do with the high number of words of dubious meaning and origin in OE. For example: “The great *OED* catalogued and defined English vocabulary with an accuracy, care, and scope

that have given it a well-deserved reputation as the finest historical dictionary of any language”—a harmless appeal to authority, but the delimiter “historical” to “finest historical dictionary” is telling. It continues: “It might have been useful to model our entries on those of the OED, but the corpora, the degree of coverage, and the characteristics of the languages treated by the two dictionaries are different enough that this is not always advantageous.” One can read between the lines here, perhaps, some tenderness still over one of the critical differences between the *OED* and *DOE*: the “word origin” information. Its absence and the *DOE*’s decision not to treat it (though this is not absolute) have serious implications for the ultimate usefulness and durability of the *DOE*. And some serious limitations are evident already, as Claus-Dieter Wetzel’s review of the first fascicle issued, letter *D*, signaled. His is one of the most thorough and detailed reviews of the *DOE*’s actual work rather than its theoretical underpinnings (“Bemerkungen zur ersten Lieferung des *Dictionary of Old English*,” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 96 [1991]: 218–37). Lucia Kornexl has noted that the *DOE*’s statements “of purpose” over the years could be clearer: “... one would at times wish for a more detailed and precise description of editorial policies and practices than has hitherto been given in the prefaces to the four fascicles already published [as of 1994], especially the one attached to fascicle *D*, which may be regarded as a preliminary introduction to the *DOE*” (“Progress in Historical Lexicography: The *Dictionary of Old English*,” *Anglia* 112 [1994]: 421–453 at 425). Kornexl’s long appraisal covers theoretical concerns as expansively as Wetzel’s covered concisely hard philological detail; both had some stern words for the *DOE*. Kornexl methodically reviewed the layout of *DOE* entries; as she rightly notes, there are serious consequences to their “idiosyncratic numbering ... imposed upon the text.” Kornexl’s example is of “Conf 4,” the *DOE* siglum, a “Late Old English Handbook for the Use of a Confessor” edited by Roger Fowler (*Anglia* 83 [1965]: 1–34), for which the *DOE* came up with its own line-numbering in place of that the editor gave in his edition (cf. Kornexl 427 and n. 13). Kornexl’s plea for clarity and consistency extended also to the use the *DOE* made of its chief asset, its corpus: “There are no firm rules for the sequence of citations within a sense, but the more illuminating examples usually come first” (439). Kornexl opined that “[s]urely, the Toronto lexicographers can never err on the side of explicitness” (452); thus while hewing to that desire for maximal clarity and “explicitness” in entries, her agreement with the editors’ decision over etymological detail is surprising: “Etymologies are the one and only type of

lexicographical information that has deliberately, and rightly, been excluded from the *Dictionary*, for their proper treatment would require more space and expertise than the *DOE* could reasonably offer. Besides, questions of Old English word origins will be competently and exhaustively dealt with by Professor Alfred Bammesberger in his forthcoming etymological dictionary of the Old English language” (432). Perhaps some territorial defensiveness is operant here—while indeed German scholars have been dominant in etymological study, and Toronto may not be as known for etymological work as for textual editing and medieval studies in general, the Toronto *project* could certainly still have drawn on expertise there and abroad enough and more to have included “word origin” material (the “expert readers” list includes a number of scholars who could have supplied the requisite expertise, many of them Germans). And that Professor Bammesberger has promised a new Holthausen (*Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*) is no reason to abandon etymological information in the *DOE* entries: one would not have said the same thing to the editors of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* despite the appearance of an excellent German etymological dictionary of Latin. So why leave the whole enterprise, the etymology of Old English, to one hand? The risk of further taxing an already burdened editorial staff—and one notes how productive the Toronto team has been despite being considerably smaller than the *MED* staff—would be offset by the often invaluable light cast by the etymologies. While etymological studies are often as controversial as they are methodical, argumentation over proposed etymologies is often quite productive. The ultimate usefulness of the *DOE* would be increased by the inclusion of etymological information. What *is* included in the *DOE*, however, and how it improves over other lexica, is the ultimate basis for judgment. Despite his criticisms of entries in fascicle *D*, Wetzel had thought the enterprise, which in fifteen years has invested so much more effort, in a state of promise: “Nur wenn den Herausgebern für die Bewältigung ihrer gigantischen Aufgabe mehr Zeit, als bisher vorgesehen, eingeräumt wird, kann das *DOE* die Qualität erreichen, die es zu einem Jahrhundertwerk machen würde” (237). That, upon completion, the *DOE* might stand as a *Jahrhundertwerk* is what one would wish for the project.

The examination of just a handful of entries follows alphabetically by headword, with comparison to Clark Hall-Meritt (CHM). Herbert Meritt’s revisions to *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (4th ed.; Toronto: U Toronto P, 1960/rpt. 1984) established it as a kind of

“state of the art” on the lexicon of OE in the wake of BT. **bæzere**, masc. *ja*-stem: though the form in *-ere* is shared in common with many other *nomina agentis* in OE, the *bæz-* root would likely strike some readers as odd. CHM use this form as their headword (they do make, under *bæcere* and after the sense ‘baker’ with the phoneme [k], reference to *bæcere* = *bæzere* with [ts]); Campbell, *OEG*, directed the reader to *bæcere*. The *DOE*’s list of attested spellings is especially helpful here: *bæstere* (Lindisfarne Gospel gloss; Northumbrian); *bæzere* (the Rushworth Matthew glosses in Mercian, where it appears also as *bezere*, with and without *e* caudata); *bædzere* (Rushworth Matthew gloss again); *bæðcere* (Lindisfarne heading to Mt; Northumbrian); *bæcere* (twice in Durham Ritual glosses; Northumbrian). Of interest is that the fourteen recorded attestations are all from glosses, all but one from Northumbrian dialects. The source is usually given as Lat. *baptista* (though one wonders if there was some influence early on also from *baptizāre*), which occurs too as a loan (*DOE*, s.v. *baptista*), a weak masc. noun. The *DOE* has a policy of obliquely noting, as with Latin loans, etymological information with “cf.”; though “<” may not be their policy, “cf.” has other uses in the dictionary and this tends to bury the significance of when “cf.” = “<”. With *bæzere*, a little more information could have been given the reader, even a reference to relevant sections of Campbell, *OEG*, would be of use, e.g., the use of *z* in OE renderings of Biblical names (e.g., *Baldazar*) “with the value [ts],” the pre-form \**bæpsere*, the metathesis of [ts] > [st] (§§ 53, 460.5). A larger point to hand with **bæzere** is the exclusion of dialectal information. The *DOE* normally follows the “West-Saxon” or “Ælfrician” forms for headwords, somewhat prescriptively (as dictionaries do), where they exist; here of course, there is no W-S form—and that is of interest to the history of this loan-formation. Broad dialectal tags are sometimes applied (“Northumbrian” sometimes as a catch-all); other times there appears an evasiveness in dealing with dialectal information, as if this too, along with etymology, was to be placed beyond the lexicon’s purview. To *B* might be added the onomatopoeic form *bloeig*: it appears as a scratched gloss to Felix’s *Vita sancti Guthlaci* in London, BL, MS Royal 13.A.xv at fol. 18v l. 8. The otherwise unrecorded form—though it has possible support in later dialectal *blea* and earlier in Gmc. cognates such as MHG *blæjan*—comes in a passage from Felix in which Guthlac is tormented one night at prayer by a herd of beasts, each making its distinctive cry; the stag bells or bleats its cry: the scratched gloss *bloeig* renders the lemma *axatum* (cf. McGowan, “More Glosses in early Medieval English Manuscripts,” *N&Q* 243.2 [June 1998]: 166–68).

**frēols**, adj. and n.: The introductory note to the entry for the noun form offers that “[t]he noun is often indistinguishable from the adjective, especially when uninflected; the uninflected plural has been regarded as neuter.” It might have helped here for some examples to be given; when one goes through the entry for the adj. form, only one use in particular seems suggestive of such tentativeness: perhaps the hymn gloss from the Durham Hymnal *festiva saeculis colitur dies sanctorum omnium: freols woruldum is gewurðod dæg halgena ealra*, which the *DOE* takes to be an elliptical compound *freolsdæg* (on elliptical compounds, see Herbert Dean Meritt, “Possible Elliptical Compounds in Old English Glosses,” *AJP* 59 [1938]: 209–17, and McGowan, “Elliptical Glossing and Elliptical Compounds in Old English,” in *Beatus vir: Studies in Early English and Norse Manuscripts In Memory of Phillip Pulsiano*, ed. A. N. Doane and Kirsten Wolf [Tempe, AZ: MRTS, 2006]: 359–81)—an interpretation not necessary to understanding *freols* here as an adj. Ostensibly, confusion between the adj. and uninflected n. led to the estimate of “ca. 40 occurrences” for the adj.; as the *DOE* entry lists twenty-five attestations for the adj., perhaps the more confusing occurrences were not among them (a hyperlink to one such passage would have sufficed). The twenty-five attestations given, nonetheless, usefully show the clear influence of Latin on OE: in the *Regularis concordia* gloss, under sense 3.b “in the phrases *butan hit freols se / beo, oþþe gif dæg freols biþ* ‘unless it be a holy day’” one finds *dies festus* rendered as *dæg freols*. Now whether the four attestations offered in support of sense 3.b really constitute a particular usage—such instances can drown in the mass of other citations in the concordance—is highly debatable: perhaps the gloss should begin “in phrases such as *butan hit freols se...*” At any rate, one notices, in OE translations of the Latin, an increase in use of the postpositive modifier: thus, under sense 3 of the adj. *freols* “of holy days: feast-, festive, holy; free (from obligations and duties of working days)” —a good definition that last bit, with an etymological rightness—one finds *dagas freolses* (rendering *dies festos* in Lambeth Psalter 73, 8; but compare Lambeth Psalter 75, 11 *freolsne dæg for diem festum*), and *dæg freolsne* (for *diem festum* in the Durham monastic *cantica*). The tag to nominal *freols* (not including apparently those occurrences of *freols*, adj., in sense 3.a “used as substantive”) notes “ca. 130 occ. (freq. in legal texts)” with the general first sense “1. freedom, privilege” first specified further as sense “1.a.i with genitive of the beneficiary of the privilege” (exs.: *Cristes cyrcean freols*, *Ciltancumbes freols*); it is only with “1.b of a person: freedom, exemption or release from slavery; *freols*



*gyfan* ‘to grant freedom, manumit’ that we actually get to the historical, etymological sense of *freols*, which, literally, is ‘free-neck’. The historical form *\*frī-hals* involves loss of *h* in composition with vowel contraction; Holthausen (*AEW* s.v. *frīols*) glossed ‘Freiheit, Vorrecht; Festtag; frei,’ which the *DOE* follows nearly exactly. But here again we see the disadvantages to the *DOE*’s decision to abandon etymological detail with its entries; Holthausen had ended his brief etymological entry “eig[en]tl[ich] ‘freier Hals’” and, despite the desire to avoid work overlapping Professor Bammesberger’s announced new Holthausen, *\*frī-hals* is exactly the information a reader should have here, and *h(e)als* could be added to the cross-references to the *freols* entry. Additionally, one wonders if some of the uses of *freols* involve the objective genitive (as with the post-positive modifying *freols*, the influence of Latin?). This etymological sense of ‘freedom’ (of one’s neck literally freed, as from a slave’s collar) one does find mentioned in the sense added by Meritt in his supplement to Clark Hall’s lexicon: ‘charter of freedom,’ citing Florence E. Harmer’s *Anglo-Saxon Writs* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1952), which appears as *DOE* sense “2. charter of freedom or privilege” with a cross-reference to **frēols-bōc** (given the same gloss with the tag “15 occ. (in charters, mainly s.xii and later”). Which sense is further strengthened by entries for **frēols-gyfa** (‘manumittor’), **frēolsiend** (five instances all from Eadwine’s Canterbury Psalter, glossed by the *DOE* ‘deliverer,’ though it renders Lat. *liberator* in the psalter and CHM’s ‘liberator’ follows what is its closest sense), though CHM’s *frēols-mann* ‘freedman’ (based on John Kemble’s *Codex Diplomaticus Aevi Saxonici* [1839–48]) does not appear. Curious is the reversal in primacy of senses for **frēolsian**; the *DOE* gives ‘to keep as a holy day, celebrate; to celebrate the feast; to set free, deliver (someone)’ (condensing somewhat the interpretations), while CHM has ‘to deliver, liberate; to keep a feast or holy day, celebrate’; now the two seem, in wording, as near the one the other, but the order is telling. Why the primacy of keeping a feast or holy day (of obligation?)? The *DOE* records twenty-nine occurrences, “freq. in Ælfric,” and the instances for their sense 2 ‘to set free, deliver (someone)’ come primarily, again, from Eadwine’s Canterbury Psalter (the one other attestation given is from the Blickling Homilies). Perhaps this is a function of the *DOE*’s stated avoidance of handling etymological detail; thus we do not get the ‘historical’ sense first. But if we are instead getting a ‘contemporary usage’ first approach, the dating does not work: the Blickling Homilies are late, the Canterbury Psalter even later (ca. 1155–1160). This is balanced, somewhat, by the treatment of

**ge-frēolsian**, for which there are “ca. 60 occ. (disproportionately freq. in PsGIE [Canterbury Psalter])” and which is glossed “to set free, deliver (someone/someone’s soul); *gefreolsian fram/of/be* ‘to set free (someone) from (something)’; in collocation with (*a*)*lysan* ‘to deliver, redeem’”; as the attestations to the second sense include such passages as *from mænnum unrihtum gefrilsæ me* (rendering the Canterbury Psalter’s *ab hominibus iniquis libera me*) perhaps the gloss should more properly read ‘to set free, deliver (someone) from (something/someone)’. But then for **ge-frēolsod** one has to get to sense 2 ‘set free, liberated,’ with sense 2.a ‘freed from servitude/labour; also of spiritual bondage’ with these two passages from a *manumission* (emphasis added): *Ælfred lareow hæfeð gefreolsad VII men* and *þas seofun Ælfrid hæfeð gefreolsad* (from records of the See of Durham, Congregation of St. Cuthbert). The point much belabored here is that though the *literary* uses pertaining to specifically spiritual liberation (as from sin, from bad people or words, from death, and so forth) are often Ælfrician, throughout the recorded corpus Anglo-Saxon writers knowingly used the word in its core, etymological sense: ‘to free from servitude/slavery/bondage’. The power of a figure such as Ælfric can, with the weight of a corpus behind it, actually deform a lexicographic entry. So too the frequency of occurrence in the metaphorical sense of (spiritual) freedom. In the dialectally interesting Durham records, the slaves freed by Ælfred *knew* the real meaning of (*ge*)*freolsian*. And here, despite what the numbers the corpus generates might be, one relies upon that ‘mother wit’ Housman thought textual critics must possess. And so with the fem. abstract noun **frēolsung** CHM’s ‘celebration of a feast’ seems generic next to the *DOE*’s sense ‘holy day, feast’ with 1.a ‘of a specific named festival (incl. Sunday)’ (for which only one attestation, from a *regula Benedicti* gloss, does not involve Sunday), one can sense an embarrassment of riches of sorts—here perhaps the specific gloss could be given as ‘of a specific named festival; Sunday’. Interesting, linguistically, is that adj. **frēolslic** means ‘in ecclesiastical contexts: festal, appropriate to a (church) festival’ (which seems accurate given the one citation from Ælfric’s *Homilies* and the three from *Regularis concordia* glosses, if overwritten again), while the adv. **frēolslice** is glossed ‘1. freely, unhindered; 2. in a manner befitting a festival, solemnly, festively’—and here the etymological sense order is restored, very close to what CHM have: ‘freely : solemnly,’ which in its pith seems preferable to the overdrawn (and not entirely semantically coherent) ‘in a manner befitting a festival, solemnly, festively’. The six attestations to this adv. are given in the *DOE* entry: four

to the first sense, to the 'solemnly, festively' sense the two come from the *Regularis concordia* interlinear gloss (as an interpretation to *sollemniter*) and the other from Ælfric's homily *Feria VI in prima ebdomada Quadragesimae*, in which the homilist closely follows Augustine's *In Ioannis evangelium tractatus CXXIV* so that we can pair up, a little less closely here, *cum laetitia uero, tamquam accepta mercede, quinquagesimam post pascha* with Ælfric's *and we freolslice syþþan fiftig daga lybbað, oþ þa halga Pentecosten*, which use does not allow for easy interpretation (did the *cum laetitia* trigger the *DOE*'s 'festively'?). Given the doggedly ecclesiastical interpretation of *freols-* forms, it is curious that **frēols-niht** should be glossed 'vigil (of a feast)' and **frēols-tīd** 'festive season, feast-tide (1.a the feast is specified; 1.b. in collocation with fasting (in texts by or associated with Wulfstan); but **frēols-stōw** should be glossed 'festival place'—which seems a neutral designation, and out of keeping with the *DOE*'s pattern as the two citations, from the laws of Cnut (*man sceal freolstidan & fæstentidan & on freolsstowan geornlicost beorgan*) and a late confessor's handbook (with the same passage), both seem to refer to an ecclesiastical sense. So why not the more explicit 'feast day place' or the like? Compare **frēols-bryce** 'violation of a festival (in collocation with violation of a fast)' in four instances "in texts by or associated with Wulfstan," which seems rather specifically defined. This is of interest not just in that the etymological sense has been adjudged secondary (which may come to pass in terms of frequency of use, though continued use of the forms with the, or some vestige of the, historical sense qualify this judgment), but in that other forms suggest senses not strictly ecclesiastical: **frēols-dōm** is glossed 'freedom (from taxation)' (and improves upon CHM's cross-reference *frēolsdōm=frēodōm*); **sundor-frēols** is among the cross-references to **frēols** and was glossed by CHM 'privilege' (s.v. *sunder-frēodōm, -frēols*); **hrýper-frēols** was glossed by CHM 'sacrifice of a bull' (s.v. *hrīðer-frēols*): it derives from an Aldhelm *De laude virginitatis* gloss in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 146 *taurilia: hryperfreolsas*, and was taken from the entry in Arthur S. Napier's *Old English Glosses, Chiefly Unpublished* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1900; entries 1.4718–19). Napier had noted that the MS *siue taurilia* should "more correctly" be *suovetaurilia* ('a sacrifice consisting of a swine, a sheep, and a bull'). This sheds light on interpreting the *-frēols* of the Digby Aldhelm gloss *hryperfreolsas*: that, at least in this instance, the *freols* could be a pre-Christian feast. While one awaits the form's treatment in the announced fascicle G, one wonders what they have made of **gāl-frēols**, for which CHM has 'revel, "lupercalia"', which also appears, twice,

in the Digby Aldhelm glosses: *lupercalia: galfreolsas* (Napier, *OEG* 1.4715) and *lupercalibus, .i. idolatriis: galfreolsum* (1.4861). Aldhelm at least thought that *freols* could be pagan, perhaps more specifically, given that *lupercalia* triggered the gloss, 'licentious': so BT's gloss of *gālfrēols* as 'licentious festivals', for which there is abundant support to the *gal-* being the 'licentious' part: *gālian* ('to be wanton'), *gālnes* ('wantonness, lust'), *gālsere* ('licentious person').

Carole Hough's "New Light on the Verb 'Understand,'" *New Perspectives on English Historical Linguistics II*, ed. Kay *et al.*, 139–49, takes up this time not the place-names and onomastics one expects from Hough but the titular connection suggested between 'to understand' (OE *understandan*) and 'light', proceeding on the basis that "the semantic weight is borne not by the prefix but by the stem" (139), and so we should be looking at *-standan* to understand this verb rather than to prefixes such as *for-* (OE *forstandan*) and *under-* as being determinative semantically. Hough mentions in passing John Newman's suggestion of the semantic link being *-standan* as 'stand (upright)' ("How to Understand *understand*," *NM* 102 [2001]: 185–99, which was reviewed in this section of *YWOES* 2001); as Newman's treatment was based upon a Cognitive perspective, particularly drawing on a study by Raymond W. Gibbs *et al.* that involved American undergraduates in a polysemous understanding of *stand* ("Taking a Stand on the Meanings of Stand: Bodily Experience as Motivation for Polysemy," *Jnl of Semantics* 11 [1994]: 231–51), Hough queries the usefulness to an understanding of the OE and Gmc. forms on such a basis as in the source study "the American undergraduates recruited by Gibbs *et al.* for their experiment may not share the same mental landscape as the Anglo-Saxons or early Indo-Europeans" (140)—of course any contrast in this regard depends upon what perspective these earlier peoples held, which we largely reconstruct from vocabulary and interpretive semantic work. More promising in Hough's view is a semantic link "understanding is light," that is, "the metaphorical use of words from the field of vision to refer to cognition already appears in Old English ... one of the uses of the verb *standan* in Old English is in connection with light, apparently with the meaning 'appear, shine'" (140). As the closest Clark Hall-Meritt got to this sense was their gloss 'appear, flash out: arise, come' (s.v. *standan*; this particular sense is marked with the obelus, which indicates: 'occurs only or mainly in poetical texts'), one has to turn to Hough's assembly of citations (141–45) for the reasoning. Indeed, many of the passages she brings to

bear are poetic (*Beowulf*, *Battle of Finnsburh*, *Christ and Satan*, *Dream of the Rood*), and all of these, arguably, seem to have a ‘heroic’ context (whether Christian or not). Of course there is the famous description of the light from Grendel’s eyes: *him of eagum stod / ligge gelicost leoht unfæger*, in which ‘shone’ is a good translation though the very literal sense is “(as to) him from the eyes stood most like flame a light unfair/hideous.” It will be brought up again in a moment. And other ‘lights’ stand: *leoht inne stod* (*Beowulf* 1570b); *byrneleoma stod* (*Beowulf* 2313b); *leoma stod* (*Beowulf* 2669b); *swurdleoma stod* (*Finnsburh* 35b); *fyrleoma stod* (*Christ and Satan* 127b); *blace stodon ... scire leoman* (*Exodus* 111b–112b). Here one sees perhaps a poetic (and metrical, in b-verses) commonplace involving ‘light’ + *stod*. A little less certain is the interpretation, based in part on Michael Swanton’s suggested translation, that *Dream of the Rood* 6b–7a *Gimmas stodon / fægre æt foldan sceatum*, in which the *gimmas* are literally ‘fixed’, may actually involve “the sense ‘to gleam or shine in a beam’” (143). Hough does bring this back to at least a celestial sense of ‘fixed’ with reference to the OE *Lapidary’s* *Opær is saphyrus, se is sunnan gelic, 7 on him standað swilce gildene steorran* (143). If the *Rood* example might not be added to the total, nonetheless, Hough feels, “there are two possible ways in which a development of meaning from ‘stand, remain’ to ‘shine, gleam’ may have occurred” (143): by referring to such things as do shine (gems, heavenly bodies such as the sun or stars); a semantic shift from the directional—from an earlier sense of “something emanating from one place to another” (144)—to the cognitive. “There remains,” Hough admits, “a grammatical hurdle to overcome in postulating a further development to the cognitive sense of *understand*, since the latter is usually a transitive verb, whereas *standan* (in any of its attested senses) is usually intransitive. Perhaps relevant in this connection is the verbal prefix *under-/for-* ... its semantic weight appears to be negligible. It may therefore be appropriate to suggest that it fulfils a grammatical function by giving the verb a transitive form” (146). Here a number of difficulties in the argument come to a head: as alluded to earlier, nothing bars good sense being made in taking the *stod* in the poetic examples above (Grendel’s eyes and so forth) as ‘stood’—it would have been interesting to investigate not so much a shift from ‘light standing forth (from something)’ shifting to ‘shine, gleam’ as the conceptual notion of light ‘standing’, as in beam form (or as in early theories of ocular functioning and ocular perception [or even emission] of light). It seems rather more convenient than convincing that the *under-* of OE *understandan* might be

taken as a semantically empty transitivizer—this leaves standing the value of *for-* in *forstandan* (‘to defend, protect; withstand, resist, oppose’), which prefix does not seem to be semantically empty (not to mention the *wið-* in *wiðstandan*). And Hough herself admits other difficulties: “an explanation of *understand* as a transferred use of terminology from the field of vision is of course only plausible if the sense ‘shine’ had already developed for the stem in Primitive Germanic” (146); and here the evidence is slim, not so much because “[a]part from Old Saxon and Old High German, none of the languages in question [i.e., other than OE] has written records prior to the ninth century” (146), as that we do not find corroborating support from ON. Hough does turn to the modern Scandinavian languages, mainly Danish. And here the metaphorical uses are intriguing rather than probative: Danish *stå* in expressions such as *solen står op* (‘the sun rises’, but literally, and conceptually the more interesting, ‘the sun stands up’), *stå i brand* (‘be on fire’), and so forth. To which could be added Norwegian expressions with *stå(r)*: *stå klart for en* (‘be clear to somebody, dawn on somebody’; others are on offer in Einar Haugen’s *Norwegian-English Dictionary* [Oslo: Universitetsforlaget/Madison, WI: U Wisconsin P, 1965/rpt. 1974]). These examples are especially interesting not in the ‘light’ it shines on the metaphorical scheme “understanding is light” as on the connection between ‘stand’ and ‘understand’ (is this rather a matter of something standing out, therefore prominent, egregious, and so cognitively discrete, tangible even?). Hough may well be onto something in proposing that OE *standan* could mean ‘shine’ and that this might be traceable back to PGmc. (the difficulty being that OE would be prime evidence in any such reconstruction). But the evidence assembled does not seem the sort to clinch the argument that with OE *understandan* the cognitive sense is to be attributed to the metaphorical scheme “understanding is light.” If Gmc. offers little comparative data for this link, non-Gmc. evidence could have been adduced, with interesting results. The whole IE complex indicated by forms such as Sanskrit verbal root *vid*, *vetti*, *veda* (‘know, understand, perceive, notice’), with, as in Greek *οἶδα*, the root sense “I have seen, therefore I know,” would seem to offer a perfect parallel to Hough’s semantic musings—to which could be added the OE reflex of this etymological complex: *wītan*, ‘be aware of, conscious of, know, understand, observe, perceive’ (and, once again, a matter of “having seen I know”).

In “The Old English Equivalents for *factum esse* and the Salisbury Psalter,” *Jinbun Gakuho* (*The Journal of*

*Social Sciences and Humanities* [Tokyo Metropolitan University]) 321 (2001): 371–408, Mitsu Ide finds the highest frequency of the OE constructions *wesan gewordan* (e.g., *wæs geworden*) to be found in the glossed psalters—to be expected as Ide sees such p.p. constructions in OE as under the influence of Lat. *factum esse*. Here Ide focuses intensively upon the Salisbury Psalter (siglum: K) as it leans instead toward the rendering *wesan gedon*. A series of tables helps to classify the 1,461 occurrences of *wesan geworden* (“with more than 30 variant spellings of *geworden*”; 371–72) listed in the *DOE* concordance. Of the occurrences in glosses, 14% are to be found to the Gospels (Ide notes further that in the Rushworth glosses *wesan geworden* predominates as the interpretation of *factum esse*, while in Lindisfarne the Lat. construction “is often glossed with the periphrastic forms of *aweorðan*”; 378–80); but 76% are to be found in the Psalter glosses (573 occurrences in all), with another 35 instances in Canticle glosses. What is made clear by Table I-1-4 (the distribution of *wesan geworden* in the individual psalters) is that the Salisbury Psalter is different: having only 6 (or 7 in the count at 381–83) occurrences of *wesan geworden* rendering *factum esse*—by comparison the Eadwine Psalter has 54, the Vespasian Psalter 62 (379). By and large the Salisbury Psalter employs *wesan gedon*, which Ide attributes not to any nuance in meaning, nor to any grammatical distinction (at first one notices that most of what occurrences there are in K of *wesan geworden* involve first-person constructions such as *factus sum: geworden eom*), nor does it seem a dialectal matter, nor one of date; the matter is curious too in that Ide notes that “it is difficult to find the tradition of glossing *factum = gedon*” (391). Instead, Ide parlays the evidence assembled into a discussion of “The Uniqueness of PsGLK” (391ff.). Other evidence is used (e.g., renderings of Lat. *salui facti sunt* or *factus est mihi in salutem* generally involve *geworden* except for five instances in K: 3 in the psalter proper, two in the Canticles glosses) to suggest some independence in the Salisbury Psalter gloss, particularly from the D[Regius]-type tradition. Ultimately, the solution offered echoes to some extent observations made by the Sisams in their edition of the psalter in that use of *wesan gedon* “seems to have been partly an adjustment by the scribe to the speech of his own day and partly a mechanically extended application of *wesan gedon* to *factum esse* in the sense ‘to become’” (400).

Nils-Lennart Johannesson’s “The Etymology of ‘Rime’ in the ‘Ormulum,’” *World of Words: A Tribute to Arne Zettersten*, *Nordic Jnl of English Studies* 3.1: 61–73,

begins with a simple statement of the case: “Standard reference works have regarded the word *rime* in the Middle English *Ormulum* as a French loanword meaning ‘metre’... [This] is based on a misunderstanding of Orm’s methods as a homilist ... the word is not borrowed from Old French but derived from Old English; its sense in the *Ormulum* is ‘story’ or ‘text’” (61). As Johannesson mentions, Augustinian canon Orm’s text is valuable on a number of counts: “The work is written in a metrically bound form known as the *septenarius*: a long verse made up of seven feet (fifteen syllables), with a caesura after the eighth syllable splitting the long verse into two short verses. The extant text comprises over 20,000 short verses (roughly 125,000 words) and is invaluable for the light it sheds on the properties of the English language in the late twelfth century, partly because the text remains as its author wrote (and subsequently corrected) it, partly because of Orm’s consistent use of the orthographic system he had developed” (61). And the *solus codex* is the author’s holograph: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 1. The form *rime* is found thrice in the text; once it is used “in the sense of OE *gerim*, ‘number’” (62). But the other two occurrences, in its preliminary “Dedication,” involve, according to Johannesson, other senses: *Be rime swa to fillenn* (line 44, for which Johannesson partially translates: “in order thus to fill the *rime*”; 62); and *Wiþþ all swillc rime alls her iss sett* (line 101; “with all such *rime* as is written here”; 62). The passages from the “Dedication,” Johannesson observes, have been taken as the author’s apology for his plumping out the verse with function words to fill the meter: “Its literary merits are few: tedious repetitions, cumbersome conjunctions and otiose adverbs characterize Orm’s style, and the monotony of the language is equalled by the regularity of the verse line, which, as Orm says in the dedication to his brother Walter, an Augustinian canon, is often padded” (63; Johannesson citing the appraisal of J.A.W. Bennett and G.V. Smithers in their *Early Middle English Verse and Prose* [Oxford: Oxford UP, 1966], 174. Johannesson believes this view may have produced the *Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*’s explanation of Orm’s word deriving from OFr. *rime* and Med. Lat. *rithmus*, hence ‘meter’). And one anticipates, at this point, that forthcoming is a reversal of Orm’s fortunes, that his verse is neither so tediously repetitive or dull as previously thought. And this is indeed what happens, though Johannesson makes a strong case that there are two types of addition to Orm’s *ferris* (‘verse’): that which plumps out the verse *metri causa*, and that which “serves an exegetical or explanatory purpose” (64). Orm’s verse-making, in Johannesson’s account, “aims at



a narrative style that is considerably more explicit and requires considerably less inference on the part of listeners and readers. It seems reasonable to assume that this greater explicitness was part of the effort to make the Gospel text easy to understand” (65)—which calls to mind, as does Orm’s verse, the *amplificatio* of medieval sermon-makers. As the insertions and additions Johannesson sees as explicatory or exegetical are very often too long to serve any purpose *metri causa*, all the more so *rīme* must mean more than ‘meter’: he sees it as native, from OE (*ge*)*rīm*, and, on the basis of citations of OE uses of verbs *ge-rīman* and *a-rīman* and working from the basic senses ‘enumerate’, ‘count’, with the additional sense ‘narration, story’, with the disclaimer that: “Whether the ‘narration,’ ‘story’ sense existed in Old English and is simply unattested, or whether it is a twelfth century innovation, cannot be determined on the basis of the available evidence” (71). Johannesson’s proposal seems entirely reasonable, though the initial problem seems a little overstated: in 1891 Francis Henry Stratmann had glossed *rīm* as ‘rhyme, number, song’ and also saw a native derivation (citing in support of the OE form cognates in OFris., ON, OHG; *A Middle-English Dictionary* [Oxford: Oxford UP, rpt. 1992]). And the glosses and citations in Bosworth-Toller pertaining to the sense ‘number, reckoning’ for the OE form already, with the latter sense, allow one to see some semantic extension beyond the strictly numerical (as essential as the former sense nonetheless is: ‘arithmetic’ in OE is *gerīmcraft*). And the ‘telling of numbers’, that is, the craft of metrical verse, is already in its terminology richly associative in linking ‘numbering’ and ‘telling’ (in verse) such that Johannesson’s tentative linking of sense of OE *arīman* ‘to reckon, enumerate’ with ‘to narrate’ is rather more a commonplace than speculative leap. The connection between ‘the numbers’ and metrical verse is found throughout Latin literature: adv. *numerōsē* can mean ‘rhythmically’ and adj. *numerōsus* ‘harmonious, rhythmical’ (*OLD*, s.vv.), while *numerus* had among its senses ‘A poetic measure, metre; metrical lines, lines of verse; a metrical foot’—the extension from ‘(numerical) method of composition’ to the composition itself is not that great a semantic leap: let Ovid’s *cum placuit numeris condere festa tuis* suffice (*Fasti* VI.24). One could assume a vector in Anglo-Latin, that the connection between ‘numbering, reckoning’ and ‘narration, story’ was by *metrum*, as Johannesson began with mention of Orm’s use of *septenarius*, which form in Orm (“a long verse made up of seven feet (fifteen syllables), with a caesura after the eighth syllable”; 61) is very nearly what it was in Latin poetry (*OLD*: ‘a verse containing seven feet’).

Ágnes Kiricsi surveys the OE and ME vocabulary of *mind* in “From *mod* to *minde*—Report from a Semantic Battlefield,” in ‘*What Does It Mean?*’, ed. Dubs, 217–39. Kiricsi’s analysis begins with philosophical and semantic musings: “What is an ‘apple’? How can we define it? Is it impossible that when someone utters this word, everyone pictures the same Platonic idea of the apple? Do we all imagine a round, red, edible and juicy fruit? Can it be stated that this is the ‘prototype?’” (217). After such preliminaries, on to the specifics of the attempt to “take the word *mind* and put it under the microscope of semantics” and examine “the linguistic data of the Old and Middle English periods that might serve as a mirror image or imprint of the underlying processes that influenced the semantic change of ‘mind’” (218–19) taken from the *Helsinki Corpus*. And while any study of such a broad and ‘intellectual’ subject such as that of ‘mind’ in the history of English (even if only up to 1500) will inevitably venture into the diffuse, one nonetheless looks to what is done with the specifics—and here the reader is given some pause: the data from the Helsinki project is presented in table 1 of “The subperiods and wordcounts” for such terms as *mod* and *gemynd*. On the surface, one sees an increase in such terms as one moves through the ‘periods’ assigned to OE and ME by the Helsinki group: and so the number logged for earliest OE (to AD 850) is 2,190 forms; 850–950 offers 92,050 forms; 950–1050 the richest with 251,630, then apparently 1050–1150 was a period of serious retraction: 67,380 forms. Kiricsi then notes that “[t]he first difficulty I had to face while collecting the examples from the *Helsinki Corpus* was not only that there are several inflected forms of the nouns that had to be found, but the large number of spelling variants I came across” (221). But this is not the first problem: the first difficulty in *interpreting* the data is that one does not have here a simple count of forms. If it were so, one would be tempted to assume an increasing intellectual sophistication to OE texts and lexis, interrupted by the traumatic Norman changeover, with a near recovery only to be had in the late ME period 1420–1500. And so one could interpret, based on a count of forms, that later OE, 950–1050, was the intellectually richest period of them all—perhaps the fruits of the Benedictine reform? Except that this is not what the data say, which is not to say that the Benedictine reform did not produce its crop of riches but that there are other factors not considered in Kiricsi’s study: manuscript production and the survival rates of the manuscripts produced or believed produced (whether from the hard data of booklists or the less secure tabulations of stemmatics), texts in multiple copies (the glossed psalters come to mind),

tautological use, among others. And there are still other difficulties, such as the later role of loan words to the 'mental vocabulary': "From ME2 [1250–1350] and ME3 [1350–1420] two other words were included in the table. These are *memorie* (ME2) and *remembraunce* (ME3). It is essential to mention them, as we will later see that the appearance of these French loanwords must have contributed to the gradual disappearance of *minde* with the meaning 'memory'" (222). One should probably read "gradual displacement" for "gradual disappearance" as *mind* for the MDE speaker can certainly involve short-term memory—"keep in mind", 'be mindful of', 'call to mind', 'with that in mind', and so forth—and an expression such as 'when I cast my mind back' clearly involves long-term memory, not to mention the function of such derivatives as *reminder*. When the focus turns then to some actual samples of the OE data the tables collapse, the results give pause too: *Beowulf* 549–553a are translated by Kiricsi: "The *anger* of the sea-fishes was aroused; there my mailshirt, the one linked fast by hand, helped me, furnished me against the hostile one. The woven battle-garment adorned with gold covered my breast" (223 n. 8). The point being made here is that *mod* can be taken as 'anger' in *Beowulf*'s sea-fight recounting (interesting as this episode is a function of memory); and one can find support beyond the Helsinki interpretation in that Klaeber glossed this instance of *mod* as '(temper)' (s.v. *mōd*). But the translations from OE poetry and prose (at 223–224) are not only very literal and unidiomatic—the *Paris Psalter's* *minre tungan* falls flat with "in my tongue" and would work better quite literally "on my tongue"—but are also at times inaccurate: in the *Beowulf* passage above "against the hostile one" does not take into account that *lādum* is dat. pl. masc. And while Kiricsi concludes on the basis of such analysis of the OE and ME terms as is gotten to that "[t]he *terra incognita* of this linguistic battle has thus become *terra cognita*; or at least a partially explored territory, which is already familiar enough to find the way out of the linguistic labyrinth" (239), one observes here some of the perennial problems of the corpus linguistics approach: the need to check the computer-generated or -assisted data against the editions they are drawn from (the editor's commentary and textual apparatus needed now more than ever), and the perils of rushing toward the seductive big ideas when the foundational details upon which they rest are not given fully securely.

Michael Korhammer's "Old English Terminology for Ships and Parts of Ships: Archaeology and Language History," is actually his review of Katrin Thier's

published form of her dissertation *Altenglische Terminologie für Schiffe und Schiffsteile: Archäologie und Sprachgeschichte 500–1100* (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2002), which appears without title in *NOWELE* 45 (October 2004): 97–100. (Thier's monograph was reviewed in this section of *YWOES* last year). The substantive points in Korhammer's review involve: the suggestion that in Thier's 'Lexikon' the German glosses to OE *ancer-setl* and *steor-setl* read 'Vorschiff' and 'Achterschiff' instead of 'Bug' and 'Heck'; that "[t]he book was published in England but regrettably not in English; the reason is probably that the University of Münster accepts doctoral theses only in German (and Latin?)" (98)—though anyone who has had to slog through München dissertations published by Wilhelm Fink or Peter Lang in their German originals could hardly be put off by one from Münster; and that Thier failed to include Korhammer's 1992 study that established the meaning 'deck' for OE *bolca*. There are also some corrections of typographical errors and mismatched or missing tags for plates (in a volume amply illustrated). Probably more significant are two other points Korhammer makes in passing: one is that "all that glitters is not gold" (99) with respect to electronic corpora such as the *DOE Corpus*, here involving the identification of which glossaries printed in Wright-Wülcker and attributed to Ælfric are actually his; and, most interesting if very briefly noted, the observation that "[i]t will probably come as news even to authorities on *Beowulf* that *wudu bundenne* (216[b]) and *bundenstefna* (1910[a]) could indeed refer to ship-planks not connected by rivets but bound or sewn together with ropes of bast, an early method of construction mainly used in Scandinavia but not found in England, and that this would rule out a late origin for *Beowulf*" (100).

The name of the '(bald) coot' (*Fulica atra* in the Old World, *Fulica americana* in the New) and other forms in Albanian and Germanic deriving from PIE *\*bhel-* are examined in great detail in Patrizia Lendinara's "Il nome della folaga e altri vocaboli dalla radice ie. *\*bhel-* in albanese e in germanico," her contribution to *Studi in onore di Antonino Guzzetta*, ed. Francesca Di Miceli and 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. The study has also been published translated into Albanian: "Fjala bajzë dhe disa fjalë të tjera nga rrënja ie. *\*bhel-* në shquipe dhe në gjuhët gjermanike," *Studime Filologjike* LVII (XL) (2003): 63–80. Lendinara offers detailed confirmation from Albanian, and a number of dialects of

Albanian (at 230–32), that the references to the *folaga* refer to the bright patch on its head (the light-colored plate-like extension back from its beak), rather than to any bare patch, and that such designation is in keeping with a larger conceptual pattern of describing such marks on the foreheads of horses, sheep, oxen, or the beaks or crests of birds (thus the ‘bald eagle’ and ‘bald coot’ are so for their white markings—and as the MdG term for the coot, *Bläßshuhn* also indicates). As Lendinara’s conclusion notes, concerning the matter of which sense of ME *balled(e)* survives in MdE *bald coot*, and having examined so many instances of white markings and patches (such as those star-shaped, in the section ‘animali stellati’, 228–30), “La ricchezza dei vocaboli con questo significato attestati in tutti i dialetti dell’albanese parla indubbiamente a favore di questa ipotesi” (234). The “wealth of forms” begins with forms that can be traced back to PIE *\*bhel-* ‘shining’, particularly abundant in Albanian and Germanic, which groupings seem to share too a similar semantic development (from ‘bright, shining’ to the *macchia bianca* ‘white spot/marking’ with reference to animals—such as that below the horse’s forelock). The fairly widespread terms in IE languages denoting this ‘brightness’ in some form or other—OE *bæl* (‘fire, flame, pyre’), OIr. *oíbell* (‘burning coal’) and PCelt. *\*belo-* ‘shining, white’—do share in general the distinction that it is not so much “la qualità del colore ma, piuttosto, la gradazione e l’intensità della luce” (223): an example given of this specification of intensity of light rather than particular color is Grk λευκός (‘white, bright; light-colored’). A number of other IE forms denoting ‘white, bright’ exhibit this pattern too, “in particolare quelle baltiche e slave” (224; with Grk φαλιός ‘shining’ attesting to the development to come) for which Lendinara gives forms such as Armenian *bal*, Old Church Slavonic *bělb*, Lithuanian *báltas* (one can add MdRuss. *белый* ‘white, fair’, which can be applied to everything from the polar bear to the silver birch). The semantic unit ‘white, bright, shining’ continues in Gmc. with the reflexes of *\*k<sup>e</sup>eid-*, such as Gothic *hveits* and OE *hwit*; there is also the intriguing mention in Procopius of Belisarius’s horse in the battle between the East Goths and imperial forces at the Milvian Bridge: τούτων “Ἕλληνες μὲν φαλιόν, βάρβαροι δὲ βάλαν καλοῦσι—that Belisarius as he charged into battle with his front-line troops was conspicuous because his horse had a white mark along its head from the top down to the nostrils. Procopius adds the βάρβαροι gloss *balan* (which has been taken as presumably Gothic), which is found elsewhere, as in the epigram by the Christian Latin poet Magnus Felix Ennodius *De equo badio et balane* (“On the chestnut horse *et balane*”: the

meaning of the latter epithet will be returned to below), and which Lendinara relates may be referring to a type of horse mantle (“tipo dei mantelli equini”; 225). Derivatives of PIE *\*bhel-* with sense equivalent to Lat. *caluus* (‘bald, bare’) are turned to next, and then the ‘macchia bianca’ and ‘animali stellati’ sections (226–30), which narrow the focus to those bright, sometimes star-like, markings found on the foreheads or crests of animals and birds—for which Lendinara again provides a wealth of detail—including a reference to an advertisement in the *London Gazette* of 1690 of ‘a mare with three feet, and a bald face’, which Lendinara takes as another reference to the ‘macchia bianca’, which she extends to birds such as the *bald coot* interpreting that the “macchia bianca” rappresentata dallo scudo frontale bianco sulla testa dell’uccello altrimenti nero” (228; the white spot on the frontal plate on a bird’s head otherwise black—as on the *Fulica atra*, a marine bird with black plumage set off by its white or light-colored beak and the plate that runs up from the top of the beak toward the forehead). And so with the *folaga* ‘coot’ Lendinara brings things to a conclusion; new to the argument is the Albanian evidence: *bajzë* and a variety of other variant and dialectal Albanian forms for ‘coot’ are discussed as is their proposed ultimate connection to PIE *\*bhel-*, as with the intriguing Albanian *balushë* ‘macchia luminoso formata dall’ingresso di un raggio di sole in un luogo chiuso e buio’ (‘the shining spot produced by the entrance of a ray of the sun into a place shut and darkened’). The reader is taken on a philological journey in “Il nome della folaga,” its eighty-eight footnotes laden with still more fascinating philological discussions. So much is covered, and with such depth, that one can hardly quibble that one item is not in the notes—and it further corroborates Lendinara’s interpretation of the bird-name and other derivatives of *\*bhel-*: Otto Springer’s “Greek φαλιός, Latin *\*balan*, Old High German *bal* (?) ‘marked with a blaze’: a horse fancier’s multilingual symposium,” in *Festschrift for Henry Hoeningwald: On the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. George Cardona and Norman H. Zide (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1987), 375–83, in which Springer, one of the founding editors of the *Althochdeutsches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, discusses the Procopius passage cited above and, rather than a type of mantle—and doubly interesting for Lendinara’s hypothesis—suggests that the deserting Roman mercenaries shouted to the Goths to target Belisarius by his horse: the distinctive *balan* meaning ‘marked with a blaze (on the forehead)’ (378).

A proposed etymology and a lesson in the history of etymological praxis is in store for the reader of Anatoly

Lieberman's "The Etymology of 'Brain' and Cognates," in *World of Words: A Tribute to Arne Zettersten*, in a special issue of the *Nordic Jnl of English Studies* 3.1: 47–59. As with others of Lieberman's recent studies, this examination of 'brain' (OE *brægen*) concerns too the history of English etymology, the work of previous etymologists, and an assessment of what constitutes real work and real advancement in the discipline as Lieberman himself works toward his announced "Feist" for English. And so one finds reference to an early proposal by John Minshew in his 1617 *Ductor in linguas* of a possible link between Grk. φρήν and *brain*; or that suggesting Grk. βρέγμα 'wet, moisten' as akin via a semantic link through the 'moist' fontanel of infants (and likely a folk etymology; 45). Hermann Grassmann, better known to Indological students for "Grassmann's Law," refined the semantic link between the latter Greek form and implied cognates (such as ON *hjarni*, G *(Ge)hirn*) with reference to Gothic *bairga-* (as in *\*bairgahei*, 'mountainous region') in the sense 'to enclose, cover', and so a semantic extension from skull to what it covers and protects. In tracing the many false leads and dead ends in pursuit of 'brain' Lieberman mentions that "several of [Karl F.] Johansson's predecessors believed that Greek and even Germanic *br-* could go back to *\*mr*" (48); actually, so did some of his successors, as Holthausen, in his *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (3rd ed.; Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1974) connects OE *brægen* with Greek βρεχμός, βρέγμα and adds "< *\*mr-*." Lieberman notes that only Edgar Polomé had objected that "no examples testify to the change *\*mr-* or *\*mb-* to *\*br-* in Early Germanic" (49). This is of some import to what Lieberman will propose as it draws in again the OE form. OE place-names seem to offer an element *\*bragen-* meaning 'hill' (*Bragenfeld* and so forth), which was then used to suggest that *brain* has an original sense 'the crown of the head'—a suggestion Lieberman flatly rejects as the proto-form of the place-name element *\*Bragna-*, a word that must have existed before the Anglo-Saxon colonization of Britain, had no currency outside the northern German-Frisian area" (50). Lieberman then turns the seemingly unrelated study by Yuri Otkupshchikov (in his Leningrad University journal article "K etimologii irlandского *brán*") on OIr. *brán* ('chaff, bran'), namely, that the Irish form 'bran' was unrelated to OFr. and MdFr. *bran* 'refuse, excrement', to purpose in suggesting that the two forms actually are related and that the PGmc. etymon *\*bragna-* behind *brain* is to be identified with the proto-Celtic *\*bragna-* meaning 'refuse, rubbish', perhaps also 'excrement'. And so: "Its expressive character made it popular among the Celts' Germanic and Romance neighbors. Those who

borrowed *\*bragna-* had often seen heads split with a sword and the brain, the refuse of the skull, as it were, oozing out. They had also seen the inside of animals' heads and got the same impression: an unpleasant looking gray mass, whose function in the organism did not bother them" (51). As "[g]lossing the etymon of *brain* as 'refuse' will seem to most people bizarre" (51; and who knew that the crude AmE expression "shit for brains" may have an etymological rightness?), Lieberman turns to etymologies of other "brain" terms to show that such an association is not exceptional: and so behind G *(Ge)hirn*, usually connected with "apparently unshakable cognates L *cerebrum* 'brain' and Gk κρανίον 'skull, cranium', may be an etymological connection that extends to G *Harn* 'urine' and MHG *hurmen* 'fertilize, spread manure over a field', which Lieberman sees etymologically to "form a perfect triad" (52). OE *mearg*, 'marrow', might be relatable to Proto-Slavic *\*mozgo-*, a reflex of which was *\*mozgu-* 'brain'. That 'brain' could be associated with "low" substance is further amplified: "In Russian, only the plural (*mozgi*, stress on the second syllable) denotes the dish brains, which is also the case in English. In German, the situation is different: the dish is *Hirn*, while the organ is more often *Gehirn*, a collective noun" (53). That the dish is as unappealing-sounding as it looks is apparently the point. And to the G expression "Er hat keine Grütze im Kopfe" ("He has no porridge in his head" 53), one could add vernacular English "mush for brains." Of general interest, at this point, is the observation: "No common Indo-European name of the head and no common Germanic name of the brain existed" (53). Along the way Lieberman brings up the curious OE form *ex(e)* for brain, "the origin of which is unknown" [53]; and so Holthausen in his *AEW*: "unbek[annt]e Herk[unft]," s.v. *exe*), though Lieberman tentatively proffers "from *axe*, a variant of *asce* 'ashes'—'ash-colored substance'?" (53–4). For the curious, the form *exe* is to be found in the *Harley Glossary* (*cerebrum: brægen, uel exe*). And so we come, after some discursive turns, back to Celtic: "early in their history, speakers of northern German and Frisian seem to have borrowed a 'low' Celtic word that with time lost its slangy character. In Frisian and Dutch, it edged out the inherited name of the brain, whereas in Standard English it ousted the cognates of *harsens* ~ *hersens*. The doublets OE *brægen* ~ *bragen* may owe their origin not to some vagaries of the dialectal phonetics of Old English but to the existence of a similar pair in the lending language. To sum up, if my reconstruction has any merit, *brægen* and *bragen* were taken over from the Celts with the humorous meaning '\*refuse, rubbish, waste matter', acquired the meaning 'brain', competed with *\*harn-*,



and eventually won out, but they never meant ‘elevated place, hill’ (54). One wonders if the *\*br-* > *\*mr-* change that seemed to have no support in (at least) Germanic is to be revisited with this Celtic > Germanic loan (the sound shift can occur in Celtic, notably in Irish). Interesting too the potential siting of the loan to a northern German or Frisian domain, as there has been recent interesting work in Low Countries Celtic (such as preserved in Dutch and Frisian place-names; the work of the late Dirk Boutkan at times addressed the Celtic element in regional place-names). At any rate, however one adjudges Liberman’s somewhat more speculative work here, his proposal fills a gap in the scholarship as “no one has offered new ideas on the etymology of *brain* since 1890” (48).

Melinda Menzer takes up a very important subject in her “Multilingual Glosses, Bilingual Text: English, Anglo-Norman, and Latin in Three Manuscripts of Ælfric’s *Grammar*,” in *Old English Literature in Its Manuscript Context*, ed. Lionarons, 95–119. The study is one of several deriving from a 1997 NEH Summer Seminar on “Old English Literature in its Manuscript Context” conducted at the Parker Library, Corpus Christi College, University of Cambridge. The collection addresses a subject seemingly with its own publishing arm of late: of a “return to the manuscripts,” of placing works often edited separately back into the context in which they occur in individual manuscripts. This can nonetheless involve some highly speculative interpretive work—consider the case of the *Beowulf* manuscript and attempts to see it as some sort of “teratological” codex or the like—that makes the conjectural work of textual critics of a century ago seem downright conservative. These critics, presumably the implied target of advocates of the “return,” become a straw man because conjectural textual criticism never was nor possibly could be employed in medieval studies as it was in classical. Joyce Tally Lionarons’s introduction to the collection, “Manuscript Context and Materialist Philology,” 1–9, sets out the argument with some zeal. Just one abbreviated example: Lionarons notes that “any attempt to reconstruct the way a text was or could have been read by its medieval audience(s) inevitably involves the modern scholar in a double act of mediation ... second because a medieval codex does not participate in textuality as it is conceived of in the modern world.” And, quoting Ralph Hanna III, manuscript books “represent defiantly individual impulses—appropriations of works for the use of particular persons in particular situations” (3). The appeal of relevance to departmental colleagues can have a professional cachet, but here “textuality” can

also seem a cipher. Some manuscripts of course do bear a highly individualistic imprint, some even are named accordingly (such as “St. Dunstan’s Classbook”). But a reader of medieval manuscripts and manuscript catalogues cannot help but notice how many other manuscripts are generic (that is, the manuscript as the *means* of transmitting what matters: the text as what the author wrote or spoke), unilluminated and un glossed, some seemingly untouched and unread for ages, or simply not as self-conscious as the works of later fabricators. The vast majority of medieval manuscripts are anonymous, their authors/copyists relegated to such designations as “Scribe A,” “Hand 1,” “the Tremulous Hand of Worcester”. And so to Ælfric’s *Grammar* and *Glossary*, a work transmitted in more than a dozen surviving witnesses (Zupitza employs fifteen sigla in his edition of 1880). Here Menzer examines just three—Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.9.17 (Zupitza’s T); Cambridge, CUL, MS Hh.1.10 (Zupitza’s U); and London, British Library, MS Cotton Faustina A.x (F)—because these show evidence of “multilingual glossing,” or perhaps just “trilingual,” as problematic as the designation “Anglo-Norman” might be linguistically. Menzer presents a selection of passages in transcribed form from the three manuscripts with a view toward examining Ælfric’s *Grammar*, “showing how it functions as a grammar of both Latin and English; then I will look at glosses on each of the three manuscripts, discussing how they used English, Latin, and Anglo-Norman French in their work with the text. The glosses show that the boundaries between the languages were fluid: some scribes and glossators easily moved among the languages, and others gave both vernaculars the kind of scholarly attention usually accorded to Latin” (96). As Menzer notes, working backward from Ker’s index as one has to, “Ælfric’s *Grammar* attracted glosses like no other Old English text”—some sixteen manuscripts in Ker contain French (Anglo-Norman, Old French), and “[n]o other English-language text has French glosses” (96). Though the three manuscripts containing glossing in French to Ælfric’s *Grammar* do not make a majority of the sixteen extant (or perhaps seventeen: one could add to the total the trilingual glossary in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Norfolk Rolls 81), they are perhaps the most significant example. Less secure are the other two points: 1) that the evidence points toward glossators moving “easily ... among the languages”—the French glossing is so comparatively spare that it seems a matter of rather more interpretive effort than the evidence may warrant— and 2) that other glosses “gave both vernaculars the kind of scholarly attention usually accorded to Latin” (96)—an arguing for a want, as Ælfric, one is

sorry to find out (for all the linguistic information it could have offered), did not write a grammar of OE in Latin. In formulating an argument that Ælfric was indeed also teaching OE while explicating Latin (the stated purpose to her study), Menzer departs to an extent from the view espoused by the late Vivien Law, who adhered to Ælfric's own words that the OE was to make clearer the Latin: "Law's argument, however, is based on an incomplete picture of what an English grammar would look like, a picture drawn from analogies to what we know about teaching Latin. Law focuses on the paradigms of conjugations and declensions, seeing those as the important part of the *Grammar*. But English speakers reading the *Grammar* do not need to memorize paradigms; they already know how to speak their language. What they need—and what Ælfric provides—is an understanding of how English can be analyzed systematically, using the tools of the Latin grammarians" (99–100). The basis to this assertion is made clearer by Menzer's following analogy: "I do not teach my Modern English Grammar students how to conjugate verbs in English—they already know how. Instead, I make them aware that there is a category of words in English called verbs, and verbs do particular things and behave in particular ways. Ælfric's *Grammar* teaches English grammar in the same way" (100). But to say that one could learn something about Old English grammar from Ælfric's *Grammar* is not the same thing as saying that this is one of its purposes, in the same way that, because an Anglo-Saxon reader could learn rarer OE forms from a bilingual glossary, that therefore is the point of the *Corpus Glossary*: it is not. Law, in her particular contribution, situated the insular study of Latin grammar within the wider European context of the teaching and learning of Latin: the scriptural, liturgical, exegetical language of western Christendom. And the modern analogy, while well-intended, is largely meaningless: we do not know how OE was taught, and as OE was more synthetic than MðE it might well have involved some sort of paradigmatic modelling (whether entirely oral or not). And with his *Grammar* Ælfric is, at least in part, likely preparing novitiates for their L2, as he is, lexically speaking, with his *Colloquy*. Menzer cites Law's important "The Study of Latin Grammar in Eighth-Century Southumbria" (*ASE* 12 [1983]) and observes: "But, as Law explains, Donatus does not need to conjugate verbs since his fifth-century audience, native speakers of Latin, already know how to conjugate verbs in Latin" (101). Of course, there were other purposes to such paradigms, whether complete or not, such as the understanding of forms and vocabulary by mnemonic schemes (Menzer will

cite a later example from Ælfric's *Grammar* itself: *eall swa gað þas ...* [113]), and, certainly among Donatus's aims, the avoidance of barbarisms and solecisms. Menzer employs a good many rhetorical or quasi-rhetorical questions throughout: "Why would one person gloss this text in three different languages? Or, to consider this question from another direction, why does Ælfric's *Grammar* evoke this trilingual response?" (105)—which one knows she will answer as they are the point of the study. Other times Menzer puzzles over a matter that does not seem particularly troubling: "Most interesting, the trilingual glossator [of Cambridge CUL Hh.1.10] glosses the name *Eadgarus* (used as an example of a proper noun) with the Latin term *proprium nomen* twice, on fol[s]. 3v and 4v. Ælfric never uses the term *proprium nomen* in his *Grammar*, choosing only to use his English term, *agene naman*. The glossator must have known the term from other grammatical texts or teachings and added it into the *Grammar*" (109). A more interesting question is why our French-speaking glossator had to so gloss *Eadgarus*—did it seem an exotic, or at least foreign, name to a Frenchman? If Menzer's points sometimes seem too basic, at other times the leaps from what the manuscripts do present seem highly speculative. For example, in Menzer's extended treatment of glossing by Hands 1–2 in the Cotton manuscript (F), she notes that the French glossing by Hand 2 seems less properly translational than involving "gallicization," that is, "instead of translating the words into French equivalents, the glossator assimilates them into French vocabulary by making them look French. For example, *imperativo modo* is transformed into *par la imperatif mot* [or *met* on fol. 44r as at 116 n. 48]" (117). Following the questions, "Why, then, does this glossator bother glossing the Latin terms in this way? Why create terminology that no one who does not already know Latin can understand?", we get the answer: "I believe the only possible answer is that Hand 2 creates French-language terminology because he is creating a French grammar" (117). Or did the Frenchman so gloss because Ælfric's English equivalent, *on bebeodendlicum gemete*, made far less sense to him than the quite obviously more closely related Latin and his native tongue? Such evidence could lead to another speculative statement: "Hand 1's pattern of glossing leads us to a very unusual conclusion: his glosses seem to indicate that he is a speaker of Anglo-Norman who is actually teaching himself English verbs" (114). Or that, "Both Hand 1 and Hand 2 saw that Ælfric's *Grammar* is a work about English as well as about Latin" (118). Both very attractive musings, but it seems troubling that the relatively silent witness of the (occasional)

glossators could be used to support such large claims on the text, and it might be a little less speculative to say not that the French-speaking glossators “saw” Ælfric’s grammar of Latin in such a way, but very occasionally may have *used* it so (which makes no claims then on the author’s intentions). As vital as forms and functions and constructions are to the matter of Ælfric’s *Grammar*, the infelicities with some of the details are disconcerting. The OE citations seem to have been proofread uniformly with care; but not so the Latin, which undermines one’s confidence in observations about a *Latin* grammar. In citing Zupitza there is some occasional inconsistency in citing Latin *v/u*, as between texts in caps (or manuscript majuscules) and lower-case type; and so in Ælfric’s citation of Virgil’s opening line read, with Zupitza, *uirumque* (98). The translation “there still remains five years” seems to follow neither the Vulgate citation nor Ælfric’s OE (which have *restant, synd ... to lafe*; 105 n. 24; in the same note read “Accusative” for “Accustive”). Ælfric perhaps meant with *aliquando feci sic: hwilon ic dide swa* not “while I did so” as much as “Once I did thus” (108). With Ælfric’s *naman habbað fif DECLENSIONES, and word habbað feower CONIVGATIONES* (110), *declensiones* seems to have been substituted in text and translation (110 n. 32) for *declinationes* (so Zupitza, and he records no relevant variant readings for the passage in his apparatus; also read *quattuor* for *quattor* in n. 32). And there are others, largely minor, though a separate difficulty is that Menzer seems to be writing for an audience unfamiliar with how to read an *apparatus criticus*. The transcriptions place in context the glosses that are indeed in Zupitza anyway, though perhaps plates could have done so better; useful, though not always noted, are variants in the French glosses themselves, for which the reader can consult Zupitza (e.g., U, the Cambridge CUL manuscript, has *iu aim* for *io aim* in F; 111). Such cavils as are made here are in part because with so interesting and complicated a subject one expects more; and, as Menzer here only gets to just a few examples from the many the manuscripts of Ælfric’s *Grammar* offer, one expects there will be more said on the matter in the future.

Handsomely produced—and suitably using as cover art one of the insular manuscripts once owned by Pierre Dubrowsky—and impressively detailed is the anniversary collection *Слово в перспективе литературной эволюции*, ed. O. A. Smirnitskaya (Moscow). The volume celebrates the occasion of a century since the birth of the Russian philologist and Indo-Europeanist Mikhail Ivanovich Steblin-Kamenskii (1903-1981), and includes a number of chapters of interest to OE

specialists. Two will be reviewed in this section (by Pimenova and Ruseckiene), but one other language study not in the annual bibliography may be worth noting too: Natalia Ganina’s “Нибелунги: к этимологии и орфографии” (“Nibelungen: Etymology and Orthography.” Studies in the collection are given either “résumés” in German or “summaries” in English, and Ganina’s is in German: “Die Etymologie des Namens ‘Nibelungen’”), 388–407. It takes, in explaining the long puzzled over name Nibelung(s)/Nibelung(en), a different turn from recent German work pointing toward PGmc. *\*nebula-* ‘Nebel’ (‘fog, mist’; though missing from her bibliography is the study by Stefan Schaffner, “Altenglisch *nif(e)*, althochdeutsch *firnibulit*, altisländisch *nifl-*, altfriesisch *niuen* und die Etymologie des Nibelungen-Namens,” *Die Sprache* 40 [1998]: 179–201, reviewed in this section in *YWOES* 2002), and argues rather for PGmc. *\*Kniba/\*Hniba* ‘Faust; Schwert’ (‘fist; sword’), going back to PIE *\*knabh-* ‘kneifen, zersplittern, kratzen’ (‘pinch, splinter, scratch’); discussion of the name Hnæf in OE poetry comes at 395–96. Ganina notes the many Gmc. names with the *-ila* element (from ‘Attila’ to ‘Vulfila’; 399)—one sees here an argument toward *\*Nibil(a-)*—and she considers Burgundian names with the *-ings* suffix, so that we find her arguing for a hypothetical ‘Burgundian’ form: “бургундского *\*Nibilings, \*Nibilingos*” (404). Natalja Borisovna Pimenova’s “Два древнегерманских «поэтических архаизма» (предметность и стилистичность слова в историко-типологической перспективе)” (Pimenova translates “Die Funktionen und Typologie der altgermanischen poetischen Archaismen *\*guman* und *\*weraz* ‘Mann, Krieger’”; more literally, “Two ancient/proto-Germanic ‘poetic archaisms’ (the materiality/objectification and stylisticity of the word in historico-typological perspective)”), 408–23, considers these PGmc. forms for ‘man, warrior’ (OE *guma* and *wer*), beginning first with the semantic ‘weight’ or value of the terms in poetry and prose, especially in OE (410–14; a number of references to *Beowulf*, and also to OE biblical translations). Overall, Pimenova works toward a semantic ‘Wertsystem’-complex: the heroic value system, that of a warrior’s high standing being based upon collocational associations in early Gmc. texts of his fortitude and “hervorragende persönliche Eigenschaften” (423), can be seen paralleled, with certain differences, in biblical translation references such as OE *rihtwisra wera* (413).

Rasa Ruseckiene’s contribution to the volume, “Лексика, обозначающая «смерть», в контексте древнеанглийской поэзии” (“Vocabulary denoting ‘death’ in the context of Old English poetry,” 272–82), considers briefly three

OE words for death—*dēað*, *cwealm*, *morðor*—in the “different genres of Old English poetry: from epic texts that go back to the depth of Germanic past to Christian poems in which certain old cultural categories undergo considerable transformation” (to quote the English summary). “The analysis reveals that these three words may denote different aspects of death: physical death of a human, heroic death in battle, death as personal fate, sinful death, murder, pestilence, etc.” (282). Perhaps four words could have been considered as OE *morð* is often glossed ‘death, destruction’, then ‘homicide, murder’, while *morðor* is more immediately glossed ‘murder, homicide, death by violence’. Ruseckienė’s contribution briefly analyzes twenty-one passages from OE poetry (*Beowulf*, *Maxims*, *Christ*, *Genesis*, *Guthlac*) in terms of the ‘type’ of death the OE forms refer to—the semantic examination of which requires one to, in turn, depend upon how the passages are translated into Russian. As *смерть*, *smert’* (‘death’), is used to translate every OE form pertaining to death, the Russian versions do not always seem easily decipherable in terms of any nuances in OE usage: e.g., “или меня смерть возьмет!” (“or death capture/seize me!”) for *oþðe mec dēað nimeð!* (*Beowulf* 1491b) seems literally enough true, and we are told then that such a формулы (‘formula’) is very characteristic in ‘epic monuments’, в особенности «Беовульфа» (“especially *Beowulf*”; 273). But the discussions between the many passages cited are too brief; here is one case where one wishes the author had been more prolix.

Elisa Jane Pollack’s dissertation “A Natural History of the German Verb *sein* ‘To Be’ + Participle to 1545” (Univ. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; dir. by Paul T. Roberge) studies the history of formations such as *die Tür ist geöffnet* (the use of a form of the verb ‘to be’ + a participle) through to the early MdG period. Her sample corpus consists of NT translations into German from the Monsee fragments (800) and Tatian’s OHG version (830) to Martin Luther’s version (1545); comparative data from Gothic, ON, OS, OE, and OHG show that the constructions studied appeared in all of these dialects and so likely derive from Common Gmc. The PGmc. Forms are traced back to PIE proto-forms that will be familiar to a student of OE: PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>es-* ‘be’ (OE *bēon*; with suppletion by forms from PIE *\*bhueh<sub>2</sub>-* ‘become, grow’ and *\*h<sub>3</sub>er-* ‘rise, start to move’ in the present indicative in pre-OE) and *\*h<sub>2</sub>ues-* ‘stay (the night)’ (*wesan*).

David W. Porter argues for the excision of a “ghost word” on the grounds of the semantic development

of the lemma the form is paired to in “An Old English Ghost Word from the Antwerp-London Glossaries: *oferbebeode*,” *N&Q* n.s. 51: 344–45. The entry concerned comes from the largest of the class-list glossaries contained in Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum 16.2 + London, British Library Add. 32246 (Wright-Wülcker editing from Junius’s transcript of this particular glossary, now Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 71) and reads: *Imperito: ic wealde uel o..bebeode*, for which second interpretation Wright-Wülcker printed *oferbebeode*. Porter suggests reading *oft bebeode* in place of *oferbebeode* on the basis that the lemma *imperito* (*imperitāre*) “entered common use in the late Latin period as a frequentative verb originally meaning ‘to govern often or habitually’ or ‘to command often or habitually’, with the idiomatic meaning ‘to rule absolutely’ being a later semantic development” (344). To which Porter adds citation of Ælfric’s discussion of frequentative verbs (*Sume word synd gecwedene frequentativa, þæt synd gelomlæcende...*).

Ana Laura Rodríguez and Eugenio Contreras present “*Ongitan*: A Case Study of Evidentiality in Old English Perception Verbs,” *SELIM* 11 (2004 for 2001-02): 97–115, which is another example of what could be termed a “proleptic” approach to treating a contemporary linguistic matter. The OE evidence is rather more a prop in the concern with evidentiality, here “the different linguistic resources speakers use to qualify the information rendered in a proposition,” which evidentiality “overlaps with other grammatical categories such as epistemic modality”; but, “due to the type of texts and data available for the study of Old English, as well as to the fact that there have been quite few studies on the topic ... it is important to first deal with evidentiality itself” (97), saving for some other day the connection to modality. Rodríguez and Contreras employ the corpora of the *DOE* and Helsinki project and examine “more than 500 contexts related to *ONGITAN*” from texts, “mainly narrative,” in which “the speaker or narrator does not reflect his own attitudes nor does he give direct justification for the information presented in the proposition, not even in those texts written in the first person such as the Dialogues of Boethius” (98). The study follows in large part the “Cognitive Grammar” model of University of California-San Diego linguist Ronald Langacker (*Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, 2 vols. [Stanford: Stanford UP, 1987–91]), one which differs very significantly from Chomskyan models dominant in North American linguistic circles since the 1970s. In short, this involves at least two major sets of assumptions: that language is not an autonomous part of mind



(as the Chomskyan approach is usually seen as espousing) but integrally embedded in cognition; and that there is an overlapping, in Langacker's terms, of lexical and constructional, of meaning and grammar, or, "that language is essentially a means for relating phonological structures (that is, language in its perceptible form) with semantic structures (that is, meanings, or conceptualizations)" (John R. Taylor, *Cognitive Grammar* [Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002], 592). For Rodríguez and Contreras this entails, in "studying Old English texts for evidentiality," their referring not to the "speaker" but the "conceptualizer" (98) of OE. The relation of *ongi(e)tan* to other "verbs of mental perception" is looked at (e.g., a sense of mental perception 'hear of' rendered in OE with *hyran/hieran*), as is the means to "knowing" by "intellective process": "This intellective process can be closer to the conceptualizer's experience or to the conceptualizer's stored knowledge as far as it is the outcome of the perception process, that is, the final 'knowing' situation" (99). Perhaps such awkward phrasing is inevitable in the deployment of the particular theory's terminology, but the failure to consult previous scholarship was entirely avoidable. In their alarmingly brief bibliography, Rodríguez and Contreras cite only one source on the OE evidence beyond the two electronic corpora: Bosworth-Toller. This will be of import below. Rodríguez and Contreras elaborate "criteria for evidential/non-evidential usage" (100) of *ongi(e)tan*, which, in briefest form, they distinguish with Mde examples: "*I perceive your fear* [non-evidential] and *I perceive you are afraid* [evidential]" (100). They list only three occurrences of non-evidential *ongi(e)tan*: *Exodus* 452 (*fær ongeton*), *Beowulf* 1431b *bearhtm ongeaton* (by Klaeber's numbering; they list it as 1425) and 1911 (they give 1907) *þæt hie Geata clifu ongitan meahton* (they gloss: "they could PERCEIVE [=see] the cliffs of the Gauts"; Heaney offered: "until finally the Geats caught sight of coastline / and familiar cliffs"). A peril of reliance upon electronic corpora for the data—corpora designed to permit studies otherwise too laborious to have been undertaken by hand within reasonable time limits—surfaces here: relying upon the data of an electronic resource without consulting the editions used to create the corpus not only marginalizes the value of editorial work but limits the assistance normally provided by the critical apparatus and commentary (all the more valuable when one investigates the syntactic and stylistic). Nonetheless, the evidential uses of *ongi(e)tan* "can be classified according to the way the information was acquired" (101); e.g., direct/attested evidence versus indirect, or "inferred from direct perception of evidence" (103). And here a problem alluded to earlier

emerges; as Rodríguez and Contreras examine with the evidential uses many collocations with *ongi(e)tan* they wind up re-doing some work done well enough already. Their section on "grammatical markers" for "inferential *ongitan*" and "for the introduction of the evidence" (110–13) the reader can find cogent and clear treatment of in Bruce Mitchell's *Old English Syntax* (Oxford, 1985; see, for instance, §§ 955, 1082, 1953, 2056, 3743); and the authors would have also found time saved by consulting Morgan Callaway, Jr.'s *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon* (Washington, 1913). As the authors admitted having to modify their theoretical considerations in treating of OE, it comes as no surprise that the fit between the theory and the evidence is a rough one at best; statements on matters vital to the cognitive approach such as that "mental construction ... is characterized as the outcome of the conceptualizer's mental process" (103) call to mind Bruce Mitchell's warning that "the techniques of various forms of linguistics fashionable today ... depend on a knowledge of intonation patterns and a supply of native informants, neither of which is available [for OE]" (*Old English Syntax*, vol. 1, p. lxii). Being bound to a particular theoretical stance also seemed to preclude consideration of *-gietan* and *forgietan*, and the etymology of the complex (< PIE \**ghend-*), and restricts their conclusion to a self-referential theoretical micro-universe: "In the range of evidential uses of *ONGITAN* presented in this paper, the inferential process seems to acquire a special relevance. This relevance is mainly due to a flexibility inherent to the semantic space of our verb, derived from the oscillation between a more experiential and a more intellective pole" (114). OE verbs of "mental perception" have of late received increased attention, and it is apparent that the subject has not been exhausted; Rodríguez and Contreras's study is of interest in its attempt to review the matter through a different theoretical perspective and will no doubt be cited in future investigations. But their study seems a case, once again, of a theory in search of evidence by which to test it; the theoretical preoccupations as a result impede clarity of formulation and hamper the utility of the study's observations.

William Rothwell offers an impressively detailed study of *keuil* in the 1313 Anglo-French passage *Tot nostre dreit pende sour un petit keuil* ("All our right hangs on a mere quibble"; 177) from a lawyer named Denham in the Year Books of Edward II in "A Mere Quibble? Multilingualism and English Etymology," *ES* 85: 177–88. Though OE *cæfl* ('halter, muzzle') only puts in an appearance in a discussion of the *MED* entry for *kevel* ('gag; a bit for a horse or mule'), Rothwell takes us

through the multilingual turns in the history of *kevil* 'quibble', from the relationship to Fr. *cheville*—medieval continental French usually used *hoquet* in the sense 'quibble, sophistry' (and we get too the Croket, Hoket, and Loket "duping the poor" from Bozon's *Contes moralisés*, 179–80)—and to Med. Lat. *cavilla* (including the interesting glossary entry: *cavilla gallice kevyll appellatur et anglice a weuge*; 187), and the relationships among and between these forms for 'hammer', 'wedge', 'quibble': "This same *cheville* in modern French is the padding of the unskilled writer, which is a 'bung, a filler of holes in a text', and, finally, in English it lies behind the 'kevel' or 'quibble' of the law courts, the cavilling used to block the progression of a case" (188).

Philip G. Rusche's "Play-Shields and Play-Ships in Old English," *N&Q* n.s. 51: 225–28 offers a pragmatic restoration of sense to the OE compounds *plegscylde* and *plegscip*. The form *plegscylde* occurs among the Aldhelm glosses, to the lemma *pelta* from the *De virginitate*. BT had glossed 'a small shield', likely on the basis of Isidore's explanation of *peltum* in the *Etymologiae*, in which one finds *peltum scutum brevissimum in modum lunae mediae* (XVIII.xii.4, in the section *De clypeis*). Clark Hall-Meritt also "adds the more etymological definition 'play-shield'" (226), and Meritt would treat the compound in his *Some of the Hardest Glosses in Old English* (Stanford, 1968; and here if even Meritt nods for a moment, revisiting his philological studies shows how, as Housman had said of Bentley, one can at times learn more from him wrong than from many another right). Meritt had argued that the Aldhelmian context suggests that the spiritual strife described suggests such a 'play-shield' (i.e., not a real one for combat). Rusche takes up also the next entry in BT, *plegscip*, and the Isidorean contexts to suggest that likely the 'play' involved has to do rather less with diminutive forms of the shield and ship and more to do with 'contesting', such as in battle or exercises for battle. The summoning of glossing with other *pleg-* compounds in senses having to do with 'contests' martial or athletic (e.g., Aldhelm's *olimpiaci agonis triumphum* with its adjective rendered *pleglices*) seems convincing. And quite plausible is the path from Isidore's discussion of *parunculus*, which gave rise to *plegscip*, to the 'small ship' rather than 'play-ship'; *Etymologiae* XIX.i.20 had noted: *Paro navigium piratarum aptum, et ex his ita vocatum. Cicero: Tunc se fluctigero tradit mandatque paroni. Et alibi: Parunculis ad litus ludit celeribus*. The *ludere* > *pleg-* glossarial association had been used to bolster Meritt's suggested 'play-shield' interpretation, but points equally, as Rusche traces it, to the sense of 'contests'. Though Lindsay's *loci citati* often

go rarely consulted, Isidore's two citations seem rather to help Rusche's view: the line *Parunculis ad litus ludit celeribus*, from a *fabula palliata* fragment, that is Latin comedies with Greek characters (edited in Otto Ribbeck's *Scaenicae romanorum poesis fragmenta*, 2 vols. [Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1871–73; rpt. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1962]), suggests, despite the comic source, a seaborne exercise or contest; the citation by Isidore from Cicero's poetic *Marius* is martial too. More too is to be had from *ludere* and *ludus*: the *ludi* were, besides plays, 'the games', the *ludus* also a place for training, exercise, even the school for gladiators. The Isidorean context for the *plegscip* lemma offers an apposite connection; the Etymologist cites, intriguingly, the *Historia* of an *incertus historicus*, who had written that *Gens Saxonum mioparonibus, non viribus nituntur, fugae potius quam bello parati*—which prompted Rusche to observe: "In other words, these are small quick ships with which pirates may move quickly to escape their enemies. This characteristic explains the line that Isidore quotes concerning the *parunculus*: *Parunculis ad litus ludit celeribus*. The 'playing' that is taking place here are contests of speed and agility. By glossing a *parunculus* as a *plegscip* the glossator was saying that these are the types of ships that one uses in naval contests and games" (227–28). And so the element of 'play' may never have been appropriate to the OE compounds, which seem rather to "denote objects that are used in contests or combat against others" (228).

N. A. Steinberg's "Compound Verb Forms in Old English: Pragmatics as a Bridge to the Paradigm." *Англистика в XXI веке (Anglistika v XXI veke = English Studies in the 21st Century)*; St. Petersburg: Univ. of St. Petersburg, 2002), 241–44, considers very briefly the "two synthetic forms" of the OE verbal paradigm that "as predicates ... functioned together with a whole set of two component verbal formations" (241). Essentially, under analysis is the pattern of Vfinite + Vnon-finite (infinitive or participle), which would later become analytical forms. The first of these compound verb forms, *bēon* + participle (e.g., *wæron ... þrowiende*), Steinberg finds functioning "in 70% of cases with durative verbs" (241), while the second compound form, "*habban/bēon* = Part. II... shows a predilection for terminative verbs (90%)" (241; an example helps with this formulation: *beseton hæfde*, from the OE Orosius). The use of these compound past tense formations Steinberg sees as having a "pragmatic" function, for "expressiveness." There are some infelicities in the prose and some misprints (read "Thorpe" for "Thorp" in the notes); Steinberg's brief offering here seems part of a larger study to come.

A sound enough caveat is issued in Juan Gabriel Vázquez González's "On the Limits of Lexical Reconstruction: Old English *yrfan*," *Voices on the Past*, ed. Rodríguez Álvarez and Alonso Almeida, 139–47: "we have proved that corpus-based studies of semantic scope cannot do without lexicographical tradition. The results obtained by these studies should always be verified (or modified) in traditional works.... We have also proposed a methodology that is grounded in the old *Wortsippe* approach (quotations, glosses and lexical family or *sibb*) but that reinterprets the results thus obtained from the tenets of sociocultural pragmatics. The reconstruction of the cultural institutions lying behind a particular lexeme takes the lead, in an attempt to overcome the conciseness and incompleteness of many of today's definitions" (146). Vázquez González had taken issue to an extent with the approach of the *TOE* to the lexeme *yrfan*: *leaving the patrimony to the heir*, and worried that (unnamed) "linguists who are primarily interested in mapping out the Anglo-Saxon conceptual categories ... too readily tend to accept the overall arrangement that is proposed by the editors of the *TOE*" particularly in cases where the arrangement of units "were only acknowledged by one dictionary and rarely provided with nothing [*recte* anything] more than a glossarial definition" (139). Who these linguists are with their misplaced trust is not made known as Vázquez González cites no studies later than the first edition of the *TOE* (1994). But the advice that "the ideal methodological standpoint lies in a combined approach in which traditional dictionaries must still check contemporary ones" (139; one assumes this means checking *TOE* against BT, BTS, Clark Hall-Meritt) seems eminently reasonable. Too hastily assembled is Vázquez González's exposition of how the *yrfan* complex would benefit from such a retrospective checking; while he employs a modified *Wortsippe* approach, and turns to Émile Benveniste for the 'cultural reconstruction' part (*Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes* [Paris: Minuit, 1969]), Vázquez González does not push the contextual analysis far enough, or with enough checking of details. And so the attribution to Clark Hall-Meritt of the additional sense 'honor with a funeral feast' (beyond the conventional 'to inherit, leave (by will)') does not note that Clark Hall-Meritt attributes this more particular sense to "BTac," that is, the additions and corrections with the Supplement to BT. The diagram of "*yrfan*'s *sibb*" would seem to require more recent information than in Benveniste (1969), and more recent information on Roman inheritance law (cited is J. Iglesias, *Derecho Romano; Instituciones de Derecho Privado* [Barcelona: Ariel, 1985]), and

the section "The Recovery of Latin Glosses" (143–44) needs some more checking of the entries cited from Wright-Wülcker. Furthermore, the Isidorean link is not recovered here: the entry from the Cleopatra Glossaries *legaturius: gewriten yrfeward* is a bit clearer when one looks to the preceding entries: *lex: folcrædenne, siue ealles folces gesetnes*, and *legatum: gewriten yrfe* (WW 439, 16–18). The citation of Cleopatra *olagraphum, testamentum est: eall writene yrfebec* (WW 463,28) could have added to it the entry from Ælfric's *Glossary ruptum testamentum: uncwedenne yrfebec* (WW 114,45), occurring in a section with the rubric *Nomina omnium hominum communiter*, which would be another strand to this Isidorean skein: all of the entries concerned derive from Isidore, *Etymologiae* V.xxiv *de instrumentis legalibus: Holographum testamentum est manu auctoris totum conscriptum atque subscriptum ...* (V.xxiv.7); **ruptum testamentum inde vocatur, eo quod nascente postumo, neque exheredato nominatim, neque herede instituto, dirumpitur** (V.xxiv.10). And so, indeed, the contemporary lexica and thesauri need to be checked against the traditional dictionaries, which too need checking, as against the glossaries, and, in turn, their sources.

JMcG

## b. Phonology

Fran Colman once again confronts the difficulties of distinguishing phonological from orthographic phenomena in "Kentish Old English <b> / <B>: Orthographic 'Archaism' or Evidence of Kentish Phonology?" (*English Language and Linguistics* 8: 171–205). Colman takes issue with the characterization of <b>-spellings in some ninth-century Kentish charters as archaic, suggesting that "[t]he term [archaism] in relation to early Old English graphs is the last resort of the flummoxed" (172). In doing so, Colman also addresses the inevitable confusion between diachronic and diatopic variation in the study of Old English dialects. This impressive, lengthy essay brings a fresh perspective to bear on Old English dialectology, and it brings together ninth-century Kentish charter and onomastic evidence (from coinage) while proposing a very focused analysis of a new phonological dialect criterion for Kentish. <b>-spellings in Kentish texts have occasioned different interpretations in the handbooks, and Colman carefully compares these statements with each other and against the Proto-Indo-European and Germanic backgrounds for the phonemic and allophonic levels of representation that have been linked with the graph. Following an earlier account by John Anderson, Colman points out

that the medial voiced allophone [v] as a submember of /f/ is not only in complementary distribution with [f] but also with [b], since /b/ had the allophones [b] and [β], and the voiced bilabial fricative merged with [v]. Thus, Colman suggests that this pattern of /f/ ≠ /b/ is neutralized in intersonorant, foot-medial position. The handbooks and various other sources treat medial <f>- and <b>-spellings rather gingerly: most deny that the distinction primarily marks voicing, while, at the same time, the sources are also reluctant to assume that the distinction was between labio-dental and bilabial places of articulation. Consequently, <b>-spellings are frequently identified as orthographic archaisms. Colman's analysis instead hinges on the possibility of the free variation of subphonemic alternates. The author suggests that with the merger of [v] from /f/ and [v] from /β/ ~ /b/ Old English scribes could have elected to represent this new [v] with <b>, as in \*<ober> for <ofer>; Colman reasons, however, that since [v]/[β] devoiced in final position and merged with [f] (and came to be spelled <f>), maintenance of <b>-spellings would have produced paradigmatic anomalies in inflected forms with the retained medial voiced consonant, as in nom. sg. <sealf> but inflected \*<sealbe> (and the same would be true if [v] from /f/ were spelled with <b>). Therefore, Colman sees the adoption of <f> as evidence for final devoicing and medial voicing. This leads to the discussion of the <b>-spellings in the ninth-century Kentish charters, which the author augments with personal names from ninth-century Anglo-Saxon coinage. In short, Colman believes that <B>-spellings on coins make clear that <b>-spellings in the Kentish charter materials are not mere orthographic archaisms but represent non-neutralization of the contrast of /f/ and /b/ in Kentish Old English (i.e., medial /f/ does not voice and final [β] does not devoice). In other words, the alternation between <b>/<B> and <f>/<F> is explained as a set of free variants available to speakers of the Kentish dialect of Old English. Colman suggests further that the speaker of Old English who did not neutralize /f/ and /b/ was probably self-consciously identifying himself as Kentish, "with a Kentish medial voiceless fricative, and a Kentish final voiced one" (189). This sort of sociolinguistic self-identification, Colman posits, was an act of Kentish defiance of the political hegemony of Mercia, and the author identifies several sources that point to Kentish resentment of Mercian power. So, in the end, it is not the spelling that is archaic, but <b>-spellings are reflections of linguistically conservative Kentish speakers who chose to differentiate themselves, in part, with a conservative non-neutralization. While this essay calls for some rather daring speculation about paths of

sociolinguistic variables that cannot be traced, Colman synthesizes arguments from such a broad range of facts that one cannot but (upon a first reading, anyway) be persuaded by this substantial contribution to the study of Old English dialects.

In "On the Nongemination of /r/ in West Germanic Twenty-One Years Later" (*Folia Linguistica Historica* 25.1–2: 211–234) T.A. Hall assembles cross-linguistic evidence from articulatory phonetics into a (mostly) constraint-based account of the only consonant that fails to geminate before palatal /j/ in the West Germanic languages. The statement "twenty-one years later" in the title refers to the intervening period between the publication of Robert Murray and Theo Vennemann's 1983 article on "Sound Change and Syllable Structure: Problems in Germanic Phonology" (*Language* 59: 514–528), which, in some important ways, anticipates the Optimality Theoretic treatment of West Germanic gemination that Hall advances and which serves as a foundation to Hall's work. Hall proposes that the interaction of the SYLLABLE CONTACT LAW (the preference for A to be more sonorous than B in the heterosyllabic sequence A.B), and STRESSED SYLLABLE LAW (stressed syllables must be bimoraic), and the formal constraint NOGEMINATES (no tautomorphemic geminates) explains the general operation of West Germanic gemination. The author then suggests that the failure of /r/ to geminate resulted from an undominated constraint that banned syllable-initial /rj/ (or \*<sub>o</sub>[rj]). The evidence for such a constraint derives from a cross-linguistic generalization that indicates that certain onset clusters that can appear in word-initial position are normally heterosyllabic in intervocalic position. Furthermore, articulatory phonetics strongly suggests that the instability of the sequence /rj/ effectively blocks gemination, and Hall brings much cross-linguistic and typological evidence to bear on this point. The author then employs his theory to explain several reflexes of /rj/ sequences in the later west Germanic dialects. While it is not always easy to see how so many disparate pieces of Hall's argumentation form a coherent whole (for example, the phonetically motivated patterning for the markedness of /rj/ sequences in section 3 seems to subsume entirely the OT account proposed in section 2) and the direct implications for OE are nominal—such as when he dubitably links -eg- and -ig- spellings in Old English for Germanic /j/ after a short vowel and /r/ with a repair strategy for handling the impermissible sequence /r.j/ (-eg- and -ig-, of course, occur in many contexts)—the article nevertheless makes a contribution to the broader field of current linguistic theory.



In “The Spread of Negative Contraction in Early English” (*Studies in the History of the English Language II: Unfolding Conversations*, ed. Anne Curzan and Kimberly Emmons [Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter], 459–82), Richard M. Hogg examines pre-verbal negative contraction in Old English (e.g., *nille* for *ne + wille*, ‘will not’) as a dialect criterion, and suggests some ways that this phonologically conditioned morphosyntactic feature’s diffusion can be traced using evidence from OE and ME. The article is noteworthy for its attempt to incorporate the diachronic dimension in a dialectal study of early English; as conspicuous a feature as negative contraction is in Old English, very little has been written about its dialectal determination. As Hogg points out, the evidence from Old English appears straightforward enough: uncontracted forms are almost entirely limited to Anglian texts. Hogg then compares the Old English distribution with that indicated in the *Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English* and finds that a transverse distribution obtains by the late Middle English period—in other words, where a distinct south-north split marks negative contraction in Old English, late Middle English shows a clear east-west division. The explanations for this puzzle are necessarily speculative, as Hogg admits, but the effort is nonetheless instructive in that it points to another example of the difficulty of linking diachronic and diatopic variables and of the vacuousness of strictly synchronic approaches to historical dialectology. Hogg examines the frequency of negative contraction in some texts not included in earlier studies (notably *The Salisbury Psalter* gloss), which reveals a rather more complex image of negative contraction than a simple southern vs. Anglian split. Hogg argues that the focal point of negative contraction as a linguistic innovation is Gloucestershire and that its quick spread throughout Wessex and much of the south-east (as compared to its relatively slow spread to the west midlands) can be attributed to the survival of the Mercian literary tradition. And whereas negative contraction was a categorical structural innovation in Wessex alone, elsewhere it obtained as a free variant with uncontracted forms. This distinction, therefore, provides a possible explanation for the unexpected later distribution as some areas eventually adopt negative contraction as a categorical change (like the west and north-west midlands) and other areas (like the north-east) abandon negative contraction altogether.

Donka Minkova examines the history of the original <hw-> cluster throughout the language while attempting something of a rapprochement in demonstrating the inseparability of philology and linguistics in “Philology,

Linguistics, and the History of [hw]~[w]” (*Studies*, ed. Curzan and Emmons, 7–46). The first part of this thoughtful essay considers the twin histories of philology and linguistics and the methodological and contextual differences that create a seemingly unbridgeable gap between the two disciplines. This disciplinary gap has occasioned a lot of commentary—so much, in fact, that one must wonder whether this breach is as severe as usually described in the literature, or if it is partly fomented, rather, by the sometimes frothy vituperation that characterizes the scholarly rhetoric on both sides. After all, linguists who work with ancient languages cannot but engage the philological, while philologists, whether they are aware of it or not, must employ the theoretical in their own investigations. The disagreement is certainly partly over the ownership of terminology, and in this, “philology” has fared poorly: linguists typically view the term as referring to an early stage in the development of modern linguistics, while for literary and cultural scholars it is wholly a term of opprobrium for a completely outmoded and reductive way of dealing with texts, reserved for sardonic descriptions of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century scholarly techniques. The argument is also reducible to a set of false choices, as if philology and linguistics were apples and oranges. Recognizing this false dichotomy, Minkova coins the term “linguistic philology” to capture what it is that most scholars are doing who investigate the historical stages of a language. And she demonstrates how linguistic philology works through her analysis of the merger of /hw-/ and /w-/ in the history of English. The author employs evidence from alliterative verse through the fourteenth century, which suggests that some form of the merger obtained in the south from the late Old English period onward. Minkova goes on to suggest that from the fifteenth century forward, the merger is socially conditioned, and she uses spelling evidence from “everyday” language in sources like Henry Machyn’s *Journal*; contrary to the usual interpretation, she suggests that “southern speakers in the sixteenth and seventeenth century rejected a socially neutral merged pronunciation in favor of a prestigious one” and identifies “spelling, word frequency, and ... a shift in the sociolinguistic status of the northern pronunciation” (28) (which remained /m/ throughout) as possibilities for external conditioning. The author then proposes a linguistic analysis of her data that positions the history of /hw-/ ~ /w/ within the emerging paradigm of gradient phonological phenomena. The redevelopment of the contrast for some southern speakers, then, can be explained by external motivations (like those she imagines here), since the universal

directionality of phonological change predicts /hw-/ > /w-/. The use of the alliterative data in Minkova's analysis is the "philology" in this work of "linguistic philology," since evidence from verse is sometimes thought to be exceedingly poor evidence for language. Minkova shows quite the opposite to be true.

The distinguished sociolinguist Lesley Milroy responds directly to Donka Minkova's contribution in the same volume (see above) in "An Essay in Historical Sociolinguistics?: On Donka Minkova's 'Philology, Linguistics, and the History of [hw]~[w]'" (*Studies*, 47–53). The question mark in Milroy's title is deceptive: she thoroughly characterizes and endorses Minkova's essay as a model of the emerging field of historical sociolinguistics. This is conspicuous, since Minkova nowhere refers to her own work as "historical sociolinguistics" but rather as "linguistic philology." True enough, Minkova is making a separate point with her coinage, but it is a point that Milroy does not take up in her brief response paper. Rather, Milroy is content to support Minkova's analysis of the sixteenth-century redevelopment of the /hw-/ ~ /w-/ contrast by pointing out that a number of morphosyntactic changes in Early Modern English involve the spread of northern features to London and other parts of the south. She suggests that the social conditions tentatively pointed to by Minkova that could have affected all of these changes deserve full elaboration. Most important in Milroy's response is the point that the problems associated with the usual assumption of a sixteenth-century "un-merger" (a dubious phonological concept if ever there were one) completely dissolves with the realization that the merger was never categorical, that the variability of the merger allowed for shifting frequencies and distributions of merged and unmerged variants over time. Thus, what may appear to be an "un-merger" is simply the re-emergence of a previous minority form. This is, in fact, the real contribution that sociolinguistics can make to historical linguistics: the work of sociolinguists gives historical linguists permission to accept gradient phenomena in their data and, finally, in their conclusions about the data. Socially-conditioned explanations of gradient phenomena in historical linguistics, however, remain a tough nut to crack. And Minkova's rightfully tentative suggestions for /hw-/ ~ /w-/ variability find no censure in Milroy's commentary.

Young-Kook Kwon studies the complex set of diphthongizations generally known as "breaking" in *Vowel Phonology of Old and Middle English: An Optimality-Theoretic Account* (Ph.D. Diss., NYU). One wonders

how much longer such subtitles will really be necessary, since Optimality Theory is rapidly becoming the default theoretical paradigm in phonology. The author justifiably takes as a point of departure the fact that breaking in Old English has never achieved a unitary explanation that accounts for the triggers /x, r, l/ or for any of the very many exceptions to the sound change. The project of this dissertation is to persuade readers that the explanatory power of Optimality Theory can provide such a unitary expression. The traditional explanation of breaking—the insertion of a transitional [u] between the front monophthongs /æ, e, i/ as a form of assimilation to the backness of /x, r, l/—is indeed problematic, since /r, l/ are not self-evidently back environments. Kwon's analysis follows Seiichi Suzuki's earlier syllable-based formulation of Old English breaking and combines with it a constriction-based feature geometry that parses the gestural ambiguity of the sequence V + /x, r, l/, and Kwon argues that this basic gestural ambiguity is the cause of the sound change, not a simple assimilatory process. Crucially, Kwon follows a number of recent scholars when he suggests that the most regular breaking results from the weakened consonantality of /x/ in the coda of stressed syllables, while he advances the novel view that /r, l/ become velarized in the coda as a result of temporal reordering of Obligatory Contour Principle (OCP) effects on V-place nodes. Kwon's study is comprehensive, addressing dialectal variations and Anglian retraction. Accordingly, this sound change can be viewed as a parsing strategy in response to the OCP effects of the weakening of /x, r, l/, and Kwon posits six faithfulness and markedness constraints whose ordered permutations can account for the changes under discussion. Asymmetries between the three consonant triggers are the result of reranked constraints in response to differing OCP effects for each consonant.

Roger Lass comes apart at the seams and abnegates much of his own significant contribution to the history of the English language in "Texts as Linguistic Objects" (*Categorization in the History of English*, ed. Christian J. Kay and Jeremy J. Smith [Amsterdam: John Benjamins], 147–57). After a long and highly distinguished career as a scholar of the English language (with especially important explorations of Old English), Lass seems rather dismayed to consider the possibility that the language of a medieval text "is really not safely taken in itself as an 'utterance', because its sources are composite" (155). It is hard to imagine how the point escaped Lass's attention until now, although he states that medieval textual transmission was a matter "I had been paying no attention to (though I knew it perfectly well)" (155).

It is a stunning statement from a scholar as esteemed as Lass, but by no means does he stand alone among historical linguists in his practice of methodologies that typically ignore extra-linguistic explanations for variation in medieval texts. Textual scholars will find the come-to-Jesus earnestness of Lass's new vision puzzling, since the complicated project of medieval textual studies has always been to establish and apply protocols that can process the stemmatic phenomena inherent to the vast majority of surviving medieval texts—one scholar's revelation is another's patently obvious fact, and with regard to the gulf that separates linguistic from textual-literary scholarship, one can point to many failures of recognition on both sides. Overall, the failure of many linguists to recognize the literary, cultural, and historical reflexes of their "data" is mirrored by many textual-literary scholars' misapprehensions of the value of linguistic evidence relative to literary, cultural, and historical evidence. Lass acknowledges this divide (150), and he acknowledges the general failure of historical linguistics to account for the "contingencies of transmission" (156). But in his "Hierarchy of Badness" for ranking texts as linguistic objects, he falls back to an entrenched position: the less textual-literary scholars have tracked mud through a text the better, and only holographs (of which precious few survive) are reliable linguistic objects. What Lass misses is that the *apparatus critici* of the same modern editions of medieval texts that he condemns are often the best repositories for the principled negotiation of linguistic and extra-linguistic factors (though dated, Klaeber's *Beowulf*, for one, comes to mind). But what makes this short article worth reading anyway (in addition to the author's customary delightful sense of humor) is its succinctly and clearly formulated discussion of the data problem in English historical linguistics. Though these problems have been recognized by historical linguists and literary scholars alike for a long time, few on either side seem willing to risk the intellectual conciliation that Lass gestures toward.

Arjen P. Versloot persuasively explains "Why Old Frisian Is Still Quite Old" (*Folia Linguistica Historica* 25.1–2: 253–98). The general point this long article makes is that questions about the periodization of the oldest surviving records of Frisian as "Old" are misplaced, since it is inappropriate to compare Old Frisian with other continental Germanic dialects. The oldest substantial extant Old Frisian dates from the early thirteenth century, and so recent suggestions that the language of these texts be relabeled as "Middle Frisian" receive vigorous criticism from Versloot. The point seems a rather

obvious one for a forty-five page article: does anyone really assume that "old" in the labels "Old Frisian," "Old Dutch," "Old English," "Old High German," and "Old Norse" (to name just a few) means that all of these languages are contemporaneous? But as Versloot says, "as it comes to comparative studies it is important to know to what the object of study should be compared" (254). As transparent as this may seem, Versloot's paper is nevertheless highly instructive. For one, it is certainly true that nineteenth-century *Stammbaumtheorie*, which at least implicitly endorses a drastically over-simplified view of periodization, still exerts a certain influence on comparative studies of the older Germanic languages, and Versloot's laborious comparison of linguistic forms and features certainly demonstrates that the terminology is relative and not absolute. Furthermore, Versloot examines a prodigious amount of evidence from Old Frisian and makes detailed comparisons with other ancient and modern Germanic languages: the vowels of unstressed syllables, vowel lengthening and consonant degemination, verbal inflections, nominal inflections, various phonological and phonetic features, 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular masculine pronouns, morphological processes, and various syntactic phenomena. All of this adds up to a persuasive explanation of why Old Frisian is indeed old. Still, as the author demonstrates, a more useful kind of periodization can be devised from the evidence collected and analyzed here: "Old Frisian" properly describes the language of a few manuscripts, while the language of others clearly includes a much higher degree of linguistic innovation and so may be properly called "Middle Frisian" and "early Modern Frisian."

Martina Häcker contributes a wide-ranging diachronic study in "Intrusive [h] in Present-Day English Accents and <h>-Insertion in Medieval Manuscripts: Hypercorrection or Functionally-Motivated Language Use?" (*New Perspectives on English Historical Linguistics II*, ed. Christian Kay, Simon Horobin, Jeremy Smith, Carole Hough, and Irene Wotherspoon [Amsterdam: John Benjamins], 109–23). Despite the title, Häcker also considers /h/-lessness in the history of English, but the project of this paper is to identify the contexts for orthographic <h>-insertions in order to determine if a pattern suggests a phonetic or phonological correlate. This has been attempted many times before, but Häcker believes prior investigations fall short of adequate explanations. She rightly points out, for example, that earlier studies identifying the origin of /h/-lessness in later English as a result of contact with French cannot explain the instability of <h> in Old English or in other Germanic

languages that exhibit <h>-variability. The author also insists that <h>-omission and -insertion are partly distinct phenomena, though they are regarded as more-or-less correlative in the literature. Häcker argues that unetymological <h>-insertions in Old English cannot represent a glottal stop marking hiatus (as suggested by one frequently cited earlier study), since such a designation does not seem to fit in the orthographic system of early English where <h> nowhere represents a plosive. Since most of the unetymological <h>-insertions in Old English occur between vowels (although it seems that Häcker is including word-initial unetymological <h> after a word ending in a vowel, which presents some unresolved difficulties for her analysis), the author posits that such insertions may well represent a voiced fricative [ʃ] in the same manner that Anglo-Saxon scribes used <ƿ> to represent [f] in voiceless environments and [v] in voiced environments. The problem with this suggestion should be immediately clear: allophonic [f] and [v] are conditioned variants of etymological segments in Old English. Häcker seems to want to have it both ways, though, when she suggests, contrary to general opinion, that Anglo-Saxon scribes copying verse may have “perceived [h] as a breathy vowel onset and may therefore have permitted alliteration with vowels” (114). The article then goes on to link these questionable suppositions about <h>-variability in Old English texts to the hypothesis that <h>-insertion in some Middle English, Early Modern English, and Present-Day English dialects (especially some non-standard British English dialects) show reflexes of an Old English /ʃ/ which could have been used as a “linking” sound between vowels.

CC

Amanda Pounder investigates “Haplology in English Adverb-Formation” (*New Perspectives on English Historical Linguistics II*, ed. Christian Kay, Simon Horobin, Jeremy Smith, Carole Hough, and Irene Wotherspoon [Amsterdam: John Benjamins], 193–211). Addressing the zero-formation of English adverbs from adjectives seen in such forms as (adj.) *daily* and *friendly* → (adv.) *daily* and *friendly*, the author questions whether such examples constitute true instances of haplology, and she presents evidence suggesting that such forms do not undergo haplology, but rather are formed through an alternate operation of conversion, which a speaker may select on lexico-semantic, stylistic, or phonological grounds. Only a brief section of this paper (section 3) touches on Old English. Pounder analyzes morphological haplology in the avoidance of /li/-syllables and the derivational suffix *-ly* in Modern English both

word-internally and in syntactic constructions, and, to that end, she employs her own Process and Paradigm framework, where the “morphological paradigm is defined as the set of possible paths departing from a base to produce correct word-forms (for inflections) or lexemes (for word-formation)” (198). Readers unfamiliar with Pounder’s 2000 book that elaborates this theory of morphology may struggle to grasp the complexities of this short article. Crucially, the paradigm exists to negotiate the form-meaning relationships of synonymy and polysemy, which the author defines as the “commonality of semantic function and form rule respectively” (198). With respect to Old English, the author argues that the original adverbial suffix *-e* reaches a point of full synonymy with the innovative *-lic* suffix, and the ongoing weakening of unstressed final vowels resulted in the full reanalysis of *-lic* as the deadjectival adverb-forming process. In Pounder’s analysis, subsequent avoidance of /li/-syllables is only partly driven by haplology; paradigmatic selection, instead, accounts for most forms, and she demonstrates how adverb formation rules would have developed from the early Old English suffixation of *-e* through a Middle English reanalysis of previously adjectival *-lic* suffixes, to Modern English stylistically, semantically, and phonologically motivated process selection. Pounder also suggests that the system has remained stable since Middle English, while standardization explains significant changes in speaker-motivations for paradigmatic selection.

JMD and CC

Yudhijit Bhattacharjee introduces casual readers to the task facing historical and socio-linguists in their effort to understand how language change spreads through multilingual populations in ‘From heofonum to heavens: ancient texts and computer simulations help linguists explore how words and grammar evolve over the time scale of centuries (*Science* 303.5662: 1326[3]). While the author surveys several scholars of historical and socio-linguistics about how computational modeling could inform their research, the focus of the article is the research of computational linguist Partha Niyogi and computer scientist Robert Berwick, who have designed a model of generational transfer of grammatical variation. Their findings suggest that over time the grammatical variant that wins out will be the least ambiguous one rather than the simplest or the one spoken by the largest number of speakers.

As introductions to medieval languages go, Joseph Biddulph’s *The Mercian Language: An Introduction to*



*the English Midlands Dialect of Late Anglo-Saxon and Early Middle English* (Pontypridd: Joseph Biddulph) presents only the briefest outline of the structure of the late Old Mercian dialect in its fifty-six pages. Linguistic precision—both historical and explanatory—is often sacrificed in favor of what amounts to a sketch of a grammar. The pronunciation guide eschews the International Phonetic Alphabet and an all-caps font can make understanding the quality indicated by “A” or “E” difficult. At times both articulatory and grammatical descriptions can be unclear, imprecise, and even misleading and the paucity of illustrative examples contributes to this lack of clarity. Variants of pronouns and verb forms are generally omitted in favor of what are presumably deemed to be the most common forms. The largest section of the text is devoted to verbs with nine pages of sample paradigms in which strong and weak verbs of all classes are intermixed in the list of sixty, though preterite-presents and anomalous verbs are presented separately. The book finishes with a handful of very short Mercian texts, “A Hymn of Praise,” two brief excerpts from *Lazamon’s Brut*, an excerpt from the *Legend of St. Kenelm*, and the Mercian “Magnificat.” All but the latter are followed by a page or two of glosses and grammatical notes. The book’s final few pages are dedicated to a brief and somewhat dated reading list of grammatical handbooks of other early Germanic and insular Celtic languages. Despite the word “Introduction” in the title, this book’s primary appeal would be to those who already have a solid understanding of Old English language structures. Its brevity renders it a quick and handy reference of the most common Mercian forms for students who don’t require much grammatical detail, explanation, or help in understanding the older Midlands dialect.

Carole Hough highlights the seemingly unmetathesized variant of OE *ærn* (from earlier *\*rænn* by metathesis) ‘building, house’ in *-ren* forms of *Waldron* in Sussex (‘forest house’), *Stonerenne* (‘stone building’) in Kent, and the boundary marker *meteren* (‘refectory’) in a Kentish land grant in “A Possible Glide Vowel in Two Southeastern Place-Names (*N&Q* 51: 1–2). Rather than assume that metathesis failed in these variants, the author follows Jeremy Smith (“The origins of Old English breaking,” *And gladly wolde he lerne and gladly teche: Essays on Medieval English*, ed. Y. Iyeiri and M. Connolly [Tokyo, 2002], 39–59) in assuming that because metathesized forms such as *ærn* failed to undergo breaking, it is possible that the /r/ in these forms was realized differently than that which triggered breaking and that it may have spurred a transitional

glide vowel between itself and the following /n/. Hough suggests that the presence of these variants in southeastern place-names and a charter may be indicative of a regional pronunciation. Hough’s “A Reflex of Old English /a:/ in *Dame Sirith and the Weeping Bitch*” (*N&Q* 51: 118–19) is spurred by an apparent oversight by Bennett and Smithers in their 1968 edition of the poem (*Early Middle English Verse and Prose* [Oxford]) that there were no reflexes of Old English /a:/ in this work. Hough points out that the place-name *boltolfs-ton* in line 77 contains the Old English morpheme *stān* ‘stone’ rather than OE *tūn* ‘farmstead, village’, the latter being a common etymon in many other place names in *-ton*. This fact is supported by variant spellings of the name in which the *-stan* element is clear. *Boltolfs-ton* therefore contains a reflex of Old English /a:/ where it is spelled <o> before a nasal and as such provides further evidence of a Midlands origin for the text.

In “The First Push: A Prelude to the Great Vowel Shift” (*Anglia* 122: 209–24), Angelika Lutz begins from the assumptions that the sounds affected by the Great Vowel Shift were characterized primarily by tenseness rather than length, that the corresponding short vowels were characterized primarily by laxness, and that the Great Vowel Shift was a push chain rather than a drag chain. The author argues that Old English /æ:/ and /a:/ were simultaneously raised to /ɛ:/ and /ɔ:/, respectively, during the Middle English period, constituting the “first push” in the Great Vowel Shift. At the same time, Lutz suggests, the short, lax vowels fell slightly, resulting in a new aperture correspondence between the lax vowels, which had three degrees of aperture, e.g., /ɪ/, /ɛ/ and /a/, and the tense vowels with four degrees, /i:/, /e:/, /ɛ:/ and /a:/. Old English short /e/ and /o/ now corresponded in height to long /ɛ:/ and /a:/. In support of the tense/lax distinction at the heart of her argument, Lutz points to recent accounts of late Old English and Middle English vowel quantity changes that posit a shift from a system of syllable quantity to one of syllable cuts. While the articulatory difficulty of maintaining tenseness in (long) low vowels is presumed to have prompted the rise of the low vowels, it is the increased openness of vowels lengthened through open syllable lengthening (e.g., OE *wicu* and *wudu* appear as ME *weke* /e:/ and *wode* /o:/), that are believed to reveal the shifted aperture correspondence between the historically long and short vowels. Lutz claims that her arguments for the Middle English changes are based largely on spelling evidence, though what she presents is mainly summarizing statements of the most common spelling variants without either examples of such spellings or reference

to the source(s) of information concerning such orthographic variation. Another point of her argument is based on the controversial assumption that Old English short [æ, a, ɔ] were allophones of a single short, open vowel phoneme. Lutz neither explains her own assumption of their lack of phonemic status nor recognizes the controversy surrounding such an analysis.

Tobias Scheer raises the question of how many intermediate (unattested) stages of a diachronic linguistic change one should reconstruct and on what bases these intermediate phonetic entities should be chosen in "How Minimal is Phonological Change?" (*Folia Linguistica Historica* 25: 69–114). While synchronic analyses have aimed to answer how changes affect the phonological system and have therefore favored shorter derivations, diachronic linguistics has traditionally assumed that change is phonetically gradual and has therefore favored phonetic atomism. Scheer asks whether and how the two approaches may be reconciled and whether arguments such as evidence from neighboring dialects, typology and universals, and systemic and functional pressures permit an evaluation of competing diachronic analyses. To illustrate the problem, he examines the intermediate stages that have been posited for the changes that constitute Grimm's Law and the High German (2nd) Consonant Shift. He concludes that negative dialectal evidence may be as important as positive evidence and that internal reconstruction should account for the phonetic developments of a sound change without evidence of a more sudden, strictly phonological change. Nevertheless, he proposes that there may be reason to accept a non-minimal analysis in some situations.

In "Compensatory Lengthening in Old English" (*Folia Linguistica Historica* 25: 235–251) Monika Opalińska employs Optimality Theory (OT) and Derivational Optimality Theory (DOT) to account for the Old English compensatory lengthening of vowels which accompanied the loss of medial  $x \sim h$  as seen in the genitive singular of *feoh* 'money' and *feorh* 'life', which appear as *fēos* < *feox+es* and *fēores* < *feor+xes*, respectively. The author bases her account in moraic theory, which generally allows only two moras in each syllable and assigns no mora to onsets. Since compensatory lengthening is thought to be a mora-preserving change, it cannot be triggered unless the consonant that is lost is underlyingly moraic; that is, it must fall in the syllable coda following a (moraic) short vowel. Thus Opalińska argues that the compensatory lengthening is triggered by the loss of following moraic segments rather than

directly by the loss of the voiceless fricative  $h/x$  (irrespective of position). What has therefore traditionally been seen as a single process of fricative loss with compensatory lengthening is analyzed as two independent mechanisms that interact with other well-formedness constraints such as the sonority sequencing generalization, a constraint on [x] occurring in the onset of syllables and on complex codas. The first mechanism is lengthening by contraction of a vowel in the following syllable. The second mechanism is lengthening by the loss of a (moraic) coda consonant. While the loss of [x] from the underlying structure of these words is not directly responsible for compensatory lengthening (since it is not moraic), its interaction with the loss of other segments creates a resyllabification and mora reassignment, which then leads to the lengthening of the root vowel.

In "The role of perceptual contrast in Verner's Law" (*Studies in the History of the English Language II: Unfolding Conversations*, ed. Curzan and Emmons, 371–408) Olga Petrova argues that the Germanic accent shift to the root syllable induced Verner's Law rather than followed it. Drawing on the overlap of laryngeal gestures involved in high pitch and voicelessness (requiring relatively stiff vocal folds) and low pitch and voicing (requiring relatively slack vocal folds), the author proposes a perceptual reanalysis of the stress shift as pitch perturbation caused by fricative voicing. Petrova briefly summarizes existing literature on Verner's Law and documented interactions between obstruent voicing and tonogenesis before providing an Optimality Theory (OT) account of her proposed perceptual reanalysis. This reanalysis was partially motivated by a requirement to maintain a perceptual contrast between the original HL and LH pitch contours, a constraint which dominated certain faithfulness and markedness constraints. The author then draws parallels between Verner's Law and the seventeenth century English process of fricative voicing in words such as *exile*, *diverse*, and *possess*, which, she claims, accompanied a stress shift from a typical Romance pattern to the native Germanic root accent.

David White points to the heavy influence of Irish missionary linguists on the Old English spelling system as he explains "Why we should not believe in short diphthongs in Old English" (*Studies in the History of the English Language II: Unfolding Conversations*, ed. Curzan and Emmons, 57–84.) What appears graphically as a short diphthong in Irish, e.g. <ui>, is phonemically a short vowel plus a marking of palatalization on the

following consonant. Since it was the Irish, White suggests, who were primarily responsible for the spread of literacy among the Anglo-Saxons, we should look to the Irish relationship between grapheme and phoneme in interpreting the quality of what appear to be the short diphthongs of Old English. The focus of this article is the lack of evidence of phonemically short diphthongs in any living language and the argument that even in dead languages the existence of short diphthongs is dubious. The author first reviews some of the phonetic and descriptive literature that suggests that two monomoraic or phonologically unitary phones must be homorganic. Such a constraint would necessarily exclude the Old English short diphthongs. He then proposes that the coexistence of short diphthongs and secondary consonantal articulations, such as palatalization, could only lead to confusion regarding how the vowels should be interpreted, thereby suggesting a further reason why short diphthongs are not likely to exist. The author concludes by resurrecting Daunt's (1939) hypothesis that the second (back) element of Old English short diphthongs indicated velarization of the following consonant as perceived by Irish missionaries. While velarization was not phonemic in Old English, White proposes that spelling conventions could have preserved this non-native graphic representation.

Jeremy J. Smith suggests that it is time to design a new and updated historical phonology of the English language that makes phonological generalizations based on detailed dialect study. In "Classifying the Vowels of Middle English" (*Categorization in the History of English*, ed. Kay and Smith, 221–36) he asks how the sound units could be classified to facilitate both discussion of their role within a phonological system and their rough phonetic realization. Smith envisions replacing the classificatory system in Richard Jordan's *Handbuch der mitttelenglischen Grammatik* (Heidelberg, 1925) with one similar to that in A.J. Aitken's *The Older Scots Vowels* (Edinburgh, 2002). Rather than classifying each vowel in phonetic terms regardless of its provenance, dialectal realization, or future development, e.g., "long tense ē," Aitken numbered the vowels in the Scots system and then referred to them solely by their numbers. Such a classification facilitates a discussion of multiple, even non-native, sources of a phoneme and its phonetic variation over time and space. Smith demonstrates how this type of classification could be adapted to the inventories of Southumbrian Middle English vowels, focusing on the long low vowels with realizations of /a:/ and /ɔ:/. He concludes that such a classificatory system is feasible within a handbook that includes both detailed

information on dialectal variants and the generalizing principles that place these variants within individual phonological systems.

*I*-loss in Old Saxon *i*-stem nouns, Old High German *jan*-stem verbal preterits, and 2nd sg. imperatives are the focus of Laura Catharine Smith's "Cross-Level Interactions in West Germanic Phonology and Morphology" (Ph.D. Diss. [Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison] *DAI* 65A, 1348). The author employs a combination of foot-structure and prosodic stem templates to account for these patterns of *i*-loss. Exceptions to the general patterns she attributes to the interactions of the prosodic structures with dialectally determined segmental and phonotactic constraints, morphological transparency, and paradigm leveling. Smith begins with previous accounts of the fundamental Germanic (moraic) trochaic foot-structure and aligns the right edge of the stressed foot with the right edge of the first heavy syllable or the second light syllable of a resolved foot. When short *i* stem-vowels remain unfooted, they are subject to loss. Where the author's account differs significantly from previous work is in her explanation of the loss versus retention of the connecting *i*-vowel of the first class (*jan*-stem) weak verbs. Where previous process-oriented accounts ran into difficulties explaining the loss of *i* following polysyllabic stems, Smith proposes an output-oriented stem template that restricts the footing of the post-syncope stem to no more than two syllables. When the *i*-vowel cannot be footed as part of this template, e.g., following both heavy and polysyllabic stems, it tended to be lost unless the result was a phonotactically difficult consonant cluster. The author provides brief overviews of how the *i*-vowel was treated in these morphological classes in Old English as well as in some of the (text-based) dialects of Old High German for purposes of comparison. Old English parasiting (or anaptyxis) is also discussed in terms of foot structure and stem templates. The penultimate chapter is devoted to an illustration of how similar mechanisms (e.g., a syllabic trochee template instead of a moraic trochee) account for the workings of diminutive and plural formations in Modern Dutch and some of its dialects.

Jerzy Welna attempts to establish when and where [d] was spirantized to [ð] in the history of English and [ð] was despirantized to [d] in "Spirantisation and despirantisation" (*New Perspectives on English Historical Linguistics II*, ed. Kay *et al.*, 251–65). The author breaks each process down into two groups of words. The first group consists of words in which both early spellings from the *Oxford English Dictionary* and *Middle English*

*Dictionary* and Present Day English spellings indicate that the process was completed successfully. The second group contains words for which Present Day English spellings, in conjunction with earlier spelling variation between fricative and stop realizations, suggests a sporadic process in which the original realizations eventually won out. The author tracks the dialects and time periods in which both the sporadic and completed processes seem to have been most active, identifying individual texts which document each type of process most abundantly.

JMD

### c. Syntax

In "A Note on 'Elliptical,' 'Absolute,' and 'Independent' Genitives in Earlier English," (*English Language and Linguistics* 8: 351–54), Cynthia L. Allen argues that an inexact use of terminology to describe "absolute" or "elliptical" constructions (i.e. those with no expressed heads) has falsely perpetuated the idea that all such constructions occur only after ca. 1280. Allen traces the problem back to W. van der Graff's 1932 "The Absolute Genitive," in which the author identifies these genitives as having only a locative function (e.g. *he was at seint poules*; *South Eng. Leg.* 109.91), essentially ignoring other possible functions (e.g. *This is Mary's*; *Mary's is red* [351]). Following van der Graff, other critics including K. Brunner (1950), O. Fischer (1992), and most recently, A. Rosenbach (2002), have similarly equated absolute genitives with locativity, resulting in the oversight of OE constructions like *hit is eal Godes* and *þæt seo eorþe is Godes*. By recognizing this lack of terminological consistency, Allen challenges the commonly held notion that all three types of absolute genitive appeared simultaneously in Middle English.

Concha Castillo examines the distribution of *wh*-elements in relative clauses in "English *to*-Infinitive Relative Clauses" (*Folia Linguistica Historica* 25: 135–53), noting how, from the Middle English period onwards, distribution is more restricted in infinitival relatives. Her conclusion is that like the *to*-element, the *wh*-element also moves to C° position, not [Spec, CP], as most other critics argue. The resulting clash is responsible for the restricted distribution of *wh*-elements she and others have identified. Of particular interest to Anglo-Saxonists is Section 3 of Castillo's article, which addresses the ongoing controversy surrounding *wh*-movement in OE: whether *wh*-movement "characterise[s] all types of OE relative clauses generally speaking" or only *se*-relatives and not *þe*-relatives or *to*-infinitive relatives (143). Castillo makes a case for

the latter analysis based on the evidence of preposition stranding, which only occurs in those constructions with *þe*-relatives or *to*-infinitive relatives. She argues that since *to*-infinitive relatives do not undergo *wh*-movement, they cannot cause a conflict in the head of the Complementizer Phrase. Such a movement is not possible until the Middle English period.

The first half of the title to Teresa Fanego's article, "On Reanalysis and Actualization in Syntactic Change: The Rise and Development of English Verbal Gerunds" (*Diachronica* 21: 5–55), refers to the 1997 work of Alan Timberlake, who makes a distinction between two varieties of syntactic change: reanalysis ("the formulation of a novel set of underlying relationships and rules") and actualization ("the gradual mapping out of the consequences of the reanalysis"; cited in Timberlake: 145). The subject of Fanego's study is the abstract deverbal noun, which she argues exhibits sufficient syntactic ambiguity by the eME period—notably in its co-occurrence with locative and temporal adverbs and particles—to be recognized, and therefore potentially reanalyzed, as part of the verbal system. Actualization of these new verbal gerunds, Fanego suggests, takes place over several centuries, during which intraference and lexical diffusion are the primary agents of linguistic change. Fanego's work on OE verbal gerunds is mostly confined to sections appearing early in the paper, which trace existing theories concerning the origins and development of the construction, including the "merger of the *-ing* noun with the present participle," "the resistance of the infinitive to use following prepositions," and influence from French (12). To this mix, Fanego adds an analysis of her own: she identifies a distinction between two types of the *-ing* gerund that developed verbal characteristics at different rates: ones that function "as prepositional objects and [lack] overt determiners" (Type I) and ones that have explicit determiners (Type II). Type I gerunds, she argues, developed verbal characteristics approximately two centuries before Type II gerunds. Acknowledging this distinction allows Fanego to account more satisfactorily for their actualization in later periods of the history of English.

In "The Difficulty of Prepositional Stranding and Relative Obliqueness in Old English" (*ES* 85: 481–97), Gwang-Yoon Goh identifies three constructions that license P-Stranding in OE: in four types of relative clauses (*þe*-relative clauses, zero relative clauses, free relative clauses, and infinitival relatives); in the complement object deletion construction; and in comparative constructions. But for Goh's study, the more interesting



constructions are those that do not license P-Stranding, including *wh*-questions, topicalizations, and prepositional passives. One common element of these prohibited constructions is that all require DPO, which Goh defines as the “displacement of the [prepositional object] from PP and its occurrence in a non-canonical position” (481). The constraint on DPO constructions stems from a need for maximum obliqueness: they could bring about a serious problem in maintaining “the grammatical and semantic relationships by altering or confusing relative obliqueness among NP arguments or at least by eliminating the absolute obliqueness of the prepositional arguments” (494).

Carmen Guarddon Anelo’s “The Locative Uses of the Preposition *at* in the Old English Version of Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History of the English People: A Cognitive Approach*” (*SELIM* 11 [2004 for 2001-02]: 117–45) begins with the premise that the OE preposition *at* should be analyzed from a cognitive perspective that recognizes how the *trajector* (or subject of the preposition), which is generally [+human], interacts with the *landmark* (or object of the preposition) in a way that requires “physical coincidence” (132). It should be noted here that the author is concerned only with spatial (i.e. locative) uses of *at*, not with its temporal or abstract functions. The scope of her study includes “a wide range of spatial categories: large geographic entities, small geographic entities, general geographic designations, buildings, containers, body parts, means of transport and imaginary places” (125). Guarddon Anelo concludes that OE *at* anticipates its function in PDE, where it implies a remoteness on behalf of the speaker or narrator. This is opposed to the function of *in* or *on*, both of which suggest a more intimate knowledge with the location of the trajector in relation to the landmark, and further, that “[v]isual perceptual access to a scene or situation is a relevant factor modulating the presence of *at* versus *in*, since visual perception allows the speaker to verify that enclosure within a space actually takes place” (136).

At the beginning of Susumu Hiyami’s “Old English Verbal-Auxiliary Clusters: Some Notes” (*Neophilologus* 88: 121–29), the author states the widely accepted premise that the verbal-auxiliary pattern in OE forms a cluster (Vv) into which only *ne* can intervene. In this essay, Hiyama first identifies three possible exceptions (V...v) to this pattern in *The Vercelli Homilies* and then attempts to reconcile them using syntactic or editorial means. The first possible exception is XVI.88, a dependent clause with an adverbial element occurring between the verbal and the auxiliary (VAv): *for ðan þe*

*heo ær gehæfte on hire hæfde*. Hiyama suggests restoring the MS reading of this clause, which has a Tironian sign that splits the VAv cluster into two separate clauses, resulting in a reinterpretation of *gehæfte* as a finite verb, not as a past participle. XXII.74 is the second possible exception, where a pronominal subject occurs between the verbal and auxiliary (Vsv): *wepan he sceal*. Hiyama is unable to reanalyze this phrase through either syntactic or editorial means, and thus leaves it to stand as an exception to the rule, identifying the possible influence of a Latin source as the reason for this nonce construction. The final exception is found at I.278, an independent *ond* clause where the verbal and auxiliary are divided by an adverb and pronominal subject (VASv): *& geworhte efne swa hit wære hundteontig punda gewæge*. Instead of analyzing *geworhte* as a past participle whose auxiliary is *wære*, Hiyami suggests reading it as a past tense verb that shares an unexpressed subject with *brohte*, which appears in the preceding clause. In the end, Hiyami’s results “confirm the rarity of the pattern V...v,” with exceptions made for the influence of Latin and “stylistic prominence” (124).

Two essays in *Up and Down the Cline: Papers Presented at the New Reflections on Grammaticalization II Conference Held at the University of Amsterdam on April 4–6, 2002* (eds. Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde, and Harry Perridon; *Typological Studies in Language* 59 [Amsterdam: John Benjamins]) touch briefly on questions of OE syntax. In “Rescuing Traditional (Historical) Linguistics from Grammaticalization Theory” (45–71), Brian D. Joseph argues that there is no reason to abandon traditional historical linguistics in favor of grammaticalization theory, which over the past thirty or so years has become a full-fledged movement with perhaps over-enthusiastic followers. Some linguists, he notes, have gone so far as to equate grammaticalization theory with language change, and even with the theory of language itself. Joseph disagrees, and questions the usefulness of grammaticalization theory, which he describes as often both ahistorical and asynchronic, as a model for describing language change over time. To make his claim, Joseph compares grammaticalization theory to a variety of theories used by the Neogrammarians, including the Comparative Method and Internal Reconstruction. Ultimately, the author finds that while some changes, such as the development of the Modern Greek *tos* from earlier Greek *a(u)tos* might appear to be “textbook cases of grammaticalization,” regular sound change and analogy—elements of the traditional theory—can also account for the change. How many other changes that have been ascribed to

grammaticalization might be likewise explained? Later in the article Joseph challenges the usefulness of another major aspect of grammaticalization theory: the principle of unidirectionality, which states that “movement involving grammatical elements is never in the direction of a given element developing a less grammatical status” (58). Where traditional approaches to historical linguistics remain silent on the question, allowing for lateral moves and occasional counter-directionality, grammaticalization theory does not, resulting in a constraint that can make the analysis of historical change phenomena difficult. In the end, to avoid the traps of identifying false-positives and patterns non-directional that can occur with an ahistorical, asynchronic approach, Joseph recommends staying off the grammaticalization bandwagon. Jim Miller’s “Perfect and Resultative Constructions in Spoken and Non-Standard English” (229–46) traces the historical development of the Resultative-Possessive constructions into the Perfect, and invokes OE twice. The first time concerns the use of the experiential past, in which the author draws upon the historical database work of Johan Elsness (1997). In that study, Elsness describes the functional narrowing of the OE preterit as a consequence of the rise of the present perfect; one function left to the preterit in later stages of English, including Scottish English, is the experiential meaning, with “ever”: as in *Did you ever try to give up smoking*. OE is also mentioned in Note 2, which reviews David Denison’s discussion of auxiliary use in his *English Historical Syntax* (1993).

The focus of Leena Kahlas-Tarkka’s “A ‘Two-Way Relationship in English’ Revisited: On Reciprocal Expressions in Early English, with a Digression into Modern English Uses” (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 40: 121–34) is the development of PDE *each other* and *one another*. These reciprocal expressions, Kahlas-Tarkka argues, follow three rules: syntactic (they cannot hold a subject position), semantic (they must have plural antecedents and display symmetry), and stylistic (they generally follow subtle cues that are suggested by the “level of the text”) (125). She further defines these two reciprocal expressions in PDE as *compound units*, though she argues that this unity is a fairly recent development. In OE such expressions were discontinuous; examples include *ægþer ... oþer*, *an ... oþer*, *gehwa ... oþer* and *ælc ... oþer*. The movement towards unity, which Kahlas-Tarkka characterizes as “a grammaticalization process in which grammaticalized elements have become even more grammaticalized,” took place throughout the ME period, with the first compound forms appearing after 1620 (132).

As the title of Mieko Ogura’s essay, “Evolution of Word Order” (*Folia Linguistica Historica* 25: 21–39), suggests, Ogura’s rather ambitious goal is to “explore the evolution of word order from the emergence of protolanguage to modern languages” (21). The author hypothesizes that the avoidance of center-embedded relative clauses, which can lead to perceptual ambiguity, motivates this evolution; the result is the development of postnominal relative clauses. Ogura recognizes the change from OV to VO during the OE period as one of the turning points of the change in word order. Using data from the *Peterborough Chronicle*, Ogura shows how OV structures with relative clauses promoted center-embedding, whereas VO structures with relative clauses did not. By the late eleventh century, center-embedded clauses where a relative clause intervenes between O and V were much less common than in earlier stages of English, and indeed of older languages like Hittite, which Ogura invokes as evidence of a more general move from OV to VO order.

In “Objects in Old English: Why and How Early English is Not Icelandic” (*York Papers in Linguistics* 2: 193–220), Susan Pintzuk and Ann Taylor challenge William van der Wurff (1999), who argues that before the fifteenth century all OV word order developed uniformly, regardless of whether the object in question was negative, positive, or quantified. After ca. 1500, when movement to Spec, AgrOP was prohibited, van der Wurff suggests that there was a grammatical reanalysis that resulted in a split between the behavior of negative and quantified objects on the one hand and positive objects on the other. Pintzuk and Taylor argue that the three objects behave differently; therefore, instead of a reanalysis beginning in the fifteenth century, there was a loss of “whatever mechanism derived pre-verbal positive objects” (139). The authors use quantitative data to test their hypothesis that the three objects pattern independently from one another, even though they share surface similarities. Some of their criteria for testing the independent behavior of each object type include the frequency of pre-verbal objects in OE, the length of the object in words, clause type, and date of composition. Pintzuk and Taylor find that there are sufficient (and significant) quantitative differences to support their claim. The authors then show how the constraints on Old English that govern object distribution differ from those on Modern Icelandic, especially regarding the occurrence of negative objects in pre-verbal positions.

At the beginning of “The HAVE-‘Perfect’ in Old English” (*New Perspectives on English Historical Linguistics*

*I: Selected Papers from 12 ICEHL, Glasgow, 21–26 August 2002; Volume I: Syntax and Morphology*, ed. Christian Kay, Simon Horobin, and Jeremy Smith, Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science: Series IV, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 251 [Amsterdam: John Benjamins], 243–55), Ilse Wischer acknowledges the lack of agreement among linguists concerning the status of HAVE-participle constructions in OE. Are they the precursor of Modern English periphrastic verb constructions? Perfects? Do they represent a perfective aspect? Are they a resultative construction? To determine the various syntactic and semantic contexts and grammatical functions of the OE HAVE-participle construction, Wischer examines all of its occurrences in the Helsinki Corpus. As for its syntactic contexts, Wischer finds that since 23% of its occurrences display a Modern English constituent structure (e.g. *hafað butu gedon, ealle gemanode and eac getogen*), that grammaticalization is already well underway. The semantic contexts of the construction also indicate a move toward the modern periphrastic, especially regarding their tendency toward isolation: “a particular word order develops to distinguish the periphrastic construction from the lexical (possessive) verb construction” (247). Finally, Wischer’s extensive study confirms the work of earlier scholars regarding grammatical function, reinforcing the belief that the OE HAVE-participle construction acts primarily as “a marker of resultative anteriority,” but also as a perfective and a marker of the simple past (253–4).

Rebecca Stephenson’s dissertation, “Deliberate Obfuscation: The Purpose of Hard Words and Difficult Syntax in the Literature of Anglo-Saxon England,” aims to identify the various functions performed by the hermeneutic style found in many Anglo-Latin works and in some vernacular ones as well, especially those translated from Latin (or those, Stephenson suggests, whose authors might have wanted to effect the appearance of a Latin translation). The dissertation’s three main sections cover the late seventh century, especially the work of Aldhelm; the late ninth century, with a focus on the *Old English Orosius*; and the tenth-century monastic reform. Throughout the study, Stephenson argues that syntactic complexity and obfuscatory words associated with the hermeneutic style, which “emphasizes form rather than content,” help authors construct authority (113). Thus, the convoluted (though impeccable) style of Aldhelm’s *Prosa de virginitate* mark him as an expert Latin user and grants him “unquestionable authority” (194); and Alfred’s vernacular translation of the *Old English Orosius*, with its use of outdated syntactic

constructions like the periphrastic verb form, may be “an attempt to appropriate the authority of a Latin text by imitating Latin grammar” (69). The third chapter focuses on Byrhtferth’s *Enchiridion*, and demonstrates how the hermeneutic style served as “the dominant discourse” of the Benedictine Reform, which helped to create and maintain an elite class of reformed monks that excluded other clerics. In her last chapter, Stephenson undertakes a thorough analysis of Ælfric’s syntax that reveals a blind spot in modern scholarship on Ælfrician prose. She argues that Ælfric’s ostensibly simple Latin prose style is anything but: while his choice of vocabulary may indicate a departure from practitioners of the hermeneutic style, his syntax displays a measured complexity that suggests its grounding in that tradition.

GD

In “On the Structure and Function of V1 Constructions in Old English” (*English Studies* 85: 2–16), Masayuki Ohkado sets out to analyze verb-initial declarative clauses in the first series of Ælfric’s *Catholic Homilies*. To accomplish this task, Ohkado must first address an on-going controversy surrounding the analysis of OE clause structure in generative grammar: some argue that the finite verb moves to C in main clauses, while others claim that the finite verb moves to the I position in both main and subordinate clauses. Based on evidence of clauses with pronominal subjects and the types of intervening elements between the verb and the subject, the author concludes that for the V1 constructions that are the focus of this piece, the V-to-C analysis is the more satisfactory. After examining the structure of the V1 constructions, Ohkado moves to their function, taking a comparative approach that includes the study of similar constructions in Dutch and Icelandic. V1 constructions occur in narrative inversion constructions and topic drop constructions in Dutch, and in narrative inversion constructions and “moving” constructions (i.e. those that convey drama or pathos) in Icelandic. While there is some evidence of narrative inversion with V1 constructions in OE, the author does not name the other functions found in Dutch and Icelandic. In his discussion of Ælfric’s *Catholic Homilies*, Ohkado identifies several other possible functions of verb-initial main clauses including summation; the introduction of “a type of something distinct from the types presented in the preceding sentence(s)”; the introduction of a sentence that contrasts with previous sentences; the introduction of a new chapter; and the opening of a new paragraph (12). Ohkado also offers a list of functional correlates for V1 intended to enlarge

and therefore improve on that in Ogawa 2000 but it is undermined by two factors that he seems not to recognize. One is that the functions he attributes to word order are in fact met wholly by lexical items in the sentence—the sentence would carry the meanings he attributes to the verb's position even if the verb were in second position. For example, the example given for function "(d) introduce a sentence different from or adversative or in contrast to the preceding one(s)" contains the contrastive *hwæþere*:

Is hwæþere se sunu ana geflæschamod and  
geboren to men of þam halgan mædene  
marian.

'However, the Son alone was incarnated and  
born to man from the holy maiden.' (*ÆCHom*  
I, 284. 21–23)

Similarly, the contribution of the semantics of the verb itself is not considered outside its initial position. Whether or not the verb *be* is sentence-initial, sentences in which it is the main verb do frequently and unsurprisingly offer a definition. Most puzzlingly, Ohkado makes reference to V1 clauses that open a paragraph in Thorpe's edition as though Thorpe's paragraphing has linguistic authority for Old English. In an earlier article, "On Object Fronting In Old English" (reviewed in *YWOES* 2002: 63), the author had similarly broadened the application of Ward's idea of Modern English information structure to look again at Kohonen and to embrace as an analogue Yiddish movement as illustrating the discourse relations of FORWARD-LOOKING CENTER and BACKWARD-LOOKING CENTER, to which he claims Old English adds THREAD-CLARIFYING TOPICALIZATION and VAGUELY LINKED TOPICALIZATION. The danger is that such broadening is all too encompassing an explanation. Statements like "This type of object fronting can start a parable" are likewise so tentative a diagnostic of a posited discourse type as to be unfalsifiable.

GD & MB

One of the few linguists whose work can be met with in a chain bookstore, David Crystal publishes a book every six months, increasingly devoted to world English but never less than readable and data-rich. *The Stories of English* (Woodstock, NY: Overlook) is a spirited response to the McCrum and MacNeil *Story of English*, now in its third edition (2002), as is clear from its title, but also to N. F. Blake's *A History of the English*

*Language* (1996). Much of its central material, which focuses on standardization, will be familiar at least in part to Anglo-Saxonists, but two points merit special attention. One is a Crystal-clear phonetic just-so story concerning the Scandinavian influence upon the development of the present tense inflection *-s* (218–21). Though now confined to the third person singular of regular verbs, this *-s*, according to Crystal, can be hypothesized to have appeared throughout the Northumbrian present tense paradigm of some speakers as early as 800, save in the first person singular. Whence this sibilance? The Danish verb paradigm had no *-s*, but it also had no *-ð*, and a series of mistakes, with the immigrant Danes producing *-s* for *-ð* and the polite English giving it back, can account for it better than the English taking the *-s* from the Old Norse middle voice's second and third person endings *-sk* and *-zk*. If it didn't happen this way, then perhaps it should have—*se non é vero, é ben trovato*. In earlier pages Crystal considers the puzzling evidence of the Celtic loanwords that are not there, re-telling the Saxon *adventus* in a militantly survivalist Celtic key. Welsh names such as Chad are adduced as collateral evidence that the Saxons knew and respected the quality of the language they displaced if they did not draw on it in quantity, and the section winds up triumphantly with Cædmon. Other topics are less controversial—the dialect variation that followed the loss of Old English the long vowel *y* that could have given us \**mirry* instead of *merry*, the vowels of West Saxon, Northumbrian, and Mercian, illustrated in the different texts of the Lord's Prayer, and Anglian words in Old English that got replaced, a category as significant as those that survive. Under "stylistic variation" Crystal briefly considers element order in the poetry and the prose.

And so from the overview to the smallest of syntactic elements. In "Subject Clitics in English: A Case of Degrammaticalization?" (*Corpus Approaches to Grammaticalization in English*, ed. Hans Lindquist and Christian Mair, *Studies in Corpus Linguistics* 13 [Amsterdam: John Benjamins] 227–56), Laurel J. Brinton takes on a major theoretical issue, that of the unidirectionality of grammaticalization, through a consideration of just what the source and behavior of the second element of Middle English forms like *wiltou* 'wilt thou' tells us about the nature of what has been termed "clitic loss." A clitic is a sentence element intermediate between an independent word and a wholly dependent affix. Brinton argues that *-tou* is not a clitic at all, but merely a reduced form, and that this reduced form, rather than decliticizing and upgrading itself to a *thou*, is suddenly



lost with the loss of assimilation of the interdental fricative (here called “thorn”) to a preceding dental. Old English has enclisis indubitably in dozens of written forms like *wylttu*. Britton also reviews the idea that the *-t* in the second person singular, not part of common proto-Germanic, is itself the result of proto-OE reanalysis of *\*rides þu* as *ridest*, with Mossé’s observation of an analogy with the preterite-present verb’s ending from the weak conjugation (*wast, scealt*) and verbs with the *mi-* stem, anomalous high-frequency forms (*bist, dest*), and Hogg’s contrasting idea that the *t* was a “rather odd” sort of epenthesis.

The index of *Up and Down the Cline* (ed. Fischer et al.) records the presence of Old English in dozens of pages, but these, when consulted, prove to be footnotes and passing references in broadly comparative projects. Analysis of interest to OE studies appears at all significantly only in Annette Rosenbach, “The English *s*-Genitive: A case of degrammaticalization?” (73–96 at 79 and 83–5), which summarizes and interprets anew the Old English data on case-marking in the possessor NP as in *þæs cyninges þegnas* and the inflectional features of the Old English possessive that indicate that it was not yet “categorically connected to the definiteness of the whole possessive NP” before the late twelfth century, even though the postnominal position for the genitive-marked word as in *sume wæstmas godra weorca* remained grammatical into the fourteenth century.

Old English doesn’t make the index of Lindquist and Mair’s collection of essays deriving from a 2001 conference, but besides Brinton’s article there is news for Anglo-Saxonists in Matti Rissanen’s “Grammaticalisation from Side to Side: On the Development of *beside(s)*” (151–70). This graceful account of *beside(s)*’s semantics completes the sketch of the development of concrete meanings offered in Heine and Kuteva’s *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization* (2002). Rissanen concludes from his study of over 250 examples in the DOE corpus that “there are no Old English instances of the use of *side* in clearly abstract contexts,” such as addition, exception, or denial, and indeed over 80% of these instances refer to the human body. Unsurprisingly then, the OED’s etymological derivation of modern *beside(s)* from an Old English prepositional locution, though plausible, has astonishingly little early support from what Rissanen rightly terms “the uncommon Old English construction *be + sidan*”: there is just one example, and that in a poem (*Christ and Satan* 543a). The Old English Biblical translations show that where Early Modern English translators used *beside*, Æfric uses

*gehende* or *butan*. Other poems and glosses occasionally immediately precede *sidan* with other prepositions, such as *on* and *fram*. But after *be*, a noun or pronoun inflected in the genitive intervenes, as in *be heora sidan*. The fascinating instance of how the now-common locution was the odd phrase out leads one to wonder about the Anglo-Saxon antecedents of prepositions like *before* and *until*.

Another deceptively modest word study is Aimo Seppänen’s “The Old English Relative *þe*,” *English Language and Linguistics* 8: 71–102. A searching discussion founded on more than fifteen years of the author’s published research on relative pronouns and their relatives, this article rehabilitates with minimal-pair analyses the traditional view of this non-inflecting word as a relative pronoun, a view from which many philologists, such as Bruce Mitchell, have never departed. The consequences are not trivial, and the history has an interest of its own. Seppänen traces back to Jespersen early arguments by Cynthia Allen and other generativists that the word *þe* is, as Modern English non-relative *that* certainly is, the alternative to a relative—a complementizer, a subordinating conjunction or particle. Seppänen retains the generative framework of Allen while arguing that *þe* had become a pronoun. Seppänen’s evidence includes the ability of *þe* to appear as the object of verbs taking the genitive like *tweon*, as the complement of adjectives like *full* that take the genitive, and as postmodified by a partitive genitive, as in *hie mosten þa deadan bebyrgan þe heora folces ofslægen wæron* (the quotation is from *Orosius*, but the reference is not to Bately’s edition), as well as with coreferential personal pronouns. In doing so, *þe* is more pronoun-like than is pronominal *mon*, which cannot appear in the genitive case. As his strongest evidence that *þe* is no longer a conjunction, as it was historically in Proto-Germanic, the presence of *þe* in free as well as bound Old English relative clauses shows that the *þe* is a necessary relativizer. Seppänen finds a structural contrast between pronoun *þe* and the temporal and locative adverb *þe* that is restricted to restrictive clauses. The pronoun accordingly belongs in the Spec-C position taken by fronted relative nominals, where it is distinguished from the adverbial *þe* that remains in the nonreferential node of C(omplementizer). He explains the *ðe ðe* sequence that appears in the Northern Gospels and other late texts, a new form of the compound relative *se þe*, as not dittography or a confusion of forms, but as a crucial example of analogical reformation to bring invariable pronoun *þe* into line with the other pronoun-complementizer pairs.

The stylist Ælfric provides the syntactic base material for a loosely connected number of statistically buttressed studies by Masayuki Ohkado. In “Coordinate Clauses in Old English, with Special Reference to Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies” (*Folia Linguistica Historica* 25: 155–76), the final part of a series on the significance of element order for grammatical function that has since become a book (*Clause Structure in Old English*, 2005) the author seeks to elucidate the category of “coordinate subordinate clauses.” These are clauses that Kohonen (1978) termed “ambiguous” because the coordinators *and*, *ac*, *ne*, and *oððe* are preceded by a subordinating conjunction, so that one may ask if the second and any subsequent clauses are part of a compound subordination or stand, complexly, outside, non-restricted and non-restrictively apposed to the initial conjunct. Thus the repetition of *gif* in the embedded clauses of *þurh ða fandunge we sceolon geðeon, gif we æfre wiðsacað deofle and eallum his larum; and gif we genealæcað urum Drihtne mid geleafan and lufe and godum weorcum* (ÆCHom I, 170, 15–18) calls into question whether the subordinating conjunction is implied in the second clause of *Gif ðu ðonne þone arleasan gewarnast, and he nele fram his arleasnyse gecyrran* (ÆCHom I, 6, 27–29). The *nele ... gecyrran* clause thus illustrates the coordinate subordinate clause. Ohkado provides Modern English examples from *The Tale of Peter Rabbit*, and then turns to Ælfric’s first series of *Catholic Homilies* in Thorpe’s edition, which he cites for ease of comparison with the results of his predecessors. Fully 473 of the 1791 coordinated clauses in the data are coordinate subordinate. Ohkado finds only one example of “subject-verb” inversion among these, *Na swilce on eastdæle synderlice sy his wunung, and forlæte westdæl, oððe oþre dælas, se þe æghwær is andweard* (ÆCHom I, 262, 74–75), which he plausibly explains as an instance of a postposed heavy subject, if *na* here is equivalent to subordinating conjunction *ne + a*. Ohkado then concludes from the 32 examples of “subject-verb” inversion in the 816 coordinated main clauses that “coordinate main clauses are essentially main clauses and should be treated separately from coordinate subordinate clauses.” Ohkado also considers object topicalization, unaccusative verbs, and other factors that cause deviation from head-initial order; head-initial here being the order in which the finite verb precedes other predicate elements such as objects, prepositional adverbials, infinitives, or participles. Ohkado’s view of coordinated clauses as essentially main clauses is complicated by the great majority (97.7% by his count) of coordinated main clauses being head-final. He proposes, following a hint in Mitchell *OES* §2525, that an unspecified number of these

apparently head-final clauses are really Ælfric’s use of the rhetorical figure of chiasmus. One might wonder if chiasmus solves one problem to create another, in its implication that element order sufficiently identifies a clause as being main, coordinate, or subordinate, except when rhetoric overrides it. Ohkado also observes that “adverbial” clauses typically have unexpressed subjects that continue the subject of the preceding clause. This definition of subordinate clauses variously by form or by function offers several conclusions, ending with “the presence of embedded main clauses” as “potentially relevant in coordinate subordinate clauses.”

It is striking for a database to supply information that confounds the analysis of its own architects, but Ohkado, in “On Verb Movement in Old English Subordinate Clauses,” (*English Corpora under Japanese Eyes*, ed. Junsaku Nakamura, Nagayuki Inoue, and Timoji Tabata; *Language and Computers: Studies in Practical Linguistics* 51 (Amsterdam: Rodopi), 151–68) draws on the Brooklyn-Geneva-Amsterdam-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English to argue against Pintzuk’s claims that movement of the finite verb to the left takes place in subordinate clauses as well as main clauses. Ohkado observes that the verb-initial order in some *for ðan þe* clauses indicates that these are embedded main clauses, rather than subordinate, citing *for ðan þe swa lange swa he hylt ðone sweartan nið on his heortan, ne mæg he mid nanum ðinge þone mildheortan God gegladian*. [ÆCHom I, 54, 13–15], and generally “the higher frequencies of (S)VO patterns in subordinate clauses with finite main verbs may be attributed to the presence of embedded main clauses.” From this, Ohkado argues that the tagging of adverbial clauses in the corpus requires refining. These patterns of VO tend to increase over time, as is illustrated from a search on (S)OV/(S)VO patterns in the four Old English sub-periods distinguished by the older Helsinki Corpus. Optional movement rules allow for verb-final order while preserving “Kayne’s idea that SVO is the only possible underlying structure” in language.

Psych-verbs are a well-known universal category of verbs that express experienced emotion or psychological states, such as “please” or “desire,” and Dorota Klimek and Bożena Rozwadowska do discuss “OE verbs” in “From Psych Adjectives to Psych Verbs,” *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 39: 59–72. OE here though is not Old English, but rather Object Experiencer verbs (for example, “the book pleased John”) and the argument is specifically about these verbs and adjectives in Polish.

Gabriella Mazzon's *History of English Negation*, Longman Linguistics Library (Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.) is a guide to everything syntactically negative that meets the high standard of a wonderful series in linguistics which published Vivien Law's last book and Clive Holes's *Modern Arabic*. An introductory discursive overview (1–17) introduces readers of any of the diachronic sections to terms and concepts like Neg-First, the three-part Jespersen negative cycle, and the Principle of End-Weight. Mazzon starts Chapter 2 with a cautionary, broad, and fair-minded survey of a century of the various interpretations of word-order and negation's effect on it that have energized Old English syntactic studies increasingly for the past forty years. The first of five tables summarizes the most-studied patterns of negative particles in combination with the finite verb with data taken from the entire Old English Corpus. In an admittedly crude first sort, the interlinear translations and glosses of Latin texts of the OE Corpus are set apart to show how these Latin-derived texts tend to have the negative element early in the clause and not adjacent to the verb. The evidence from more independent vernacular texts shows more clause-final verbs with negation, and more negative concord, the descriptive linguistic term for what is now stigmatized in the standard language as "double negation." The section on variation indicates how many clauses have single negation or as many as five negative elements (p. 42 notes that there are 351 examples of the latter). Multiple negation, which here and in the index is treated as synonymous with negative concord as explained on pp. 17 and 36, appears in about 40% of the clauses, which Mazzon takes as evidence that the additional elements are not reserved for emphasis or for strengthening a weakened first negative element. A section on "diversity" directs attention to *na*, *nal(l)es*, and *næfre* as common adverbs often neglected by linguists who focus on *ne*. It also treats common quantifiers like *naht*, *nænig*, and *nan* that in 4% of the examples appear independently, perhaps as early examples of NO-negation, the modern purely verbal negation that in northern Middle English and later forms (Einenkel 1912) comes to replace the earlier distinction between sentential and constituent negation. Much of this lexemic diversity comes about through the contraction of the particle *ne* with a wide variety of adverbs, indefinites, quantifiers and even some common verbs, a process of word-formation that linguists generally term Incorporation. Mazzon shows with a table and examples that this negative incorporation was not always lexicalized; that is, texts contain uncontracted forms like *ne is* as well as the contracted *nis*. She observes (section 2.2.2) that "it is also

a not irrelevant factor that edited texts, however careful the editing may be, are not always totally reliable," with the example of the elbow-jogging translation of *naht* in a passage of the *Blickling Homilies* [*forðon þe he naht elles buton his anfealde gegyrelan*] as the quantifier with an unexpressed finite verb, though taking it as *nabban* makes better sense. She notes that poetry has more Avoided Negation (Neg-Concord foregone) than does prose, that even a text closely modeled on Latin does not always forestall negative concord, and promises a forthcoming study of negation in individual texts. With an eye to presenting contrasts with prescriptive Modern English, Mazzon briefly surveys illustrations of the somewhat unruly, non-obligatory Old English tendencies towards negative concord, negative attraction, and the argument about whether Negative Raising applies as it does in Middle English and later, with the negative element understood in a subordinate clause but fronted to the embedding main clause. The variety of coordination and disjunction is surveyed. A section on rhetoric looks at so-called "expletive" negation where a negative particle reinforces rather than alters a privative verb, as in Latin *Timeo ne veniat* meaning "I fear that he comes," along with litotes and Negative Polarity items like *an hæer* in a negated predicate. The difficulties of defining constituent negation and the significance of grammaticalized negators in contrastive situations amply justifies the conclusion that "the basic syntax of OE is particularly complex." Appendix II (152–57) is an impressive list of negative forms in OE and the later historical forms. Especially useful is the list of negative forms in the Old English Corpus that do not have entries of their own in *DOE*. The chapter, though dense, is a pleasure to read. There are a very few places where the prose is not limpid; for example "These discussions are usually simplistic" which in context means something like "over-simplified." The chapter is not entirely independent and self-contained; for example, the reference to "reversed merger" (29) will be clear only to phonologists and those who track down the citation to Labov. A book of this nature probably cannot be sufficiently proof-read, cross-referenced, and indexed. Nonetheless, the author deserves commendation for daring to be a splitter in a field of lumpers, and for providing a rewarding and essential overview of this complex topic.

Richard M. Hogg's paper on negation ("The Spread of Negative Contraction in Early English," *Studies in the History of the English Language II: Unfolding Conversations*, ed. Anne Curzan and Kimberly Emmons, *Topics in English Linguistics* 45 [Berlin: Mouton de

Gruyter], 459–82) looks chiefly at contraction in Middle English. Relying heavily on the research of Samuel Levin and Yoko Ieyri, Hogg speculates that contraction (forms like *næs* < *ne wæs*) was known throughout Anglo-Saxon England, urging the inclusion of the Kentish texts *St. Chad* and *Kentish Sermons* as evidence, even though they include only a handful of examples and were therefore set aside by Levin. In Wessex, contraction first became what Hogg terms “canonical”: usual, if not quite lexicalized. From there contraction spread east along the Thames to London. The West Midlands resisted contraction in Anglo-Saxon times, presumably because writing centers with the prestige of Mercia did not accept it. The evidence for contraction from the north is chiefly glosses, which may not be problematic but is asserted rather than investigated. The migration of speakers as a means of carrying contraction seems to be more of a factor for Middle than for Old English. The paper is copiously illustrated with dot maps from the *Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English*.

Also more concerned with Middle than Old English is Hiroyuki Nawata’s “Grammatical Change at PF: *For to* Infinitives in English and Distributed Morphology,” *English Linguistics: Jnl of the English Linguistic Soc. of Japan* 21: 85–117. The text receiving the most attention is the *Ormulum* but the author briefly reviews OE *to*-infinitives (110–113), siding against Kageyama’s 1992 interpretation of them as prepositional phrases with dative *-enne* in the inflected infinitive and with Los 1999 on them as fully clausal, because of two things, one a pair of passages in Gregory’s *Dialogues* where *gewilnode* takes a *that*-clause complement in the Cotton manuscript but an inflected infinitive in the Hatton manuscript and the inability of predicate inflected infinitives to appear before their main (matrix) verb. Nawata recasts this evidence in terms of D(istributed) M(orphology), which accepts both, and a gesture to a “category” of “Vocabulary,” in accord with the economy condition of the Minimalist Program.

Other formalisms continue to engage Old English scholarship in the Old World in two articles by Marta María González Orta. In “Argument-Marking and Argument-Adjunct Prepositions within the Lexical Domain of Speech in Old English” (*Atlantis* 26: 11–22), the author writes from within the framework of Mingo-rance’s 1998 Functional Lexematic Model, and follows up on previous work (see below) on verbs, here proposing to distinguish between argument-marking and argument-adjunct prepositions. This article was easily found online in a convenient PDF that is handsomely

formatted. Unfortunately, its reductive conclusions do little to advance the understanding of Old English locutions for speech. The author draws on the *DOE* corpus for verbs of speaking and their complements, though claims about the prepositional objects of these verbs are not exhaustively keyed to the texts. This is a curious paper, one that seems to be part of a project to trace the forms of verbs for speech as much across individual languages as through history; that is, the author assumes a steady state for the semantics of these verbs within Old English.

Similar difficulties beset González Orta’s “Focus Structure Motivating Old English Speech Verbs Syntactic Behaviour” (*Voices on the Past: Studies in Old and Middle English Language and Literature*, ed. Alicia Rodríguez Álvarez and Francisco Alonso Almeida [A Coruña (Spain): Netbiblo, S.L.], 149–54). This essay is unfortunately poorly edited, with occasionally impenetrable syntax such as “Therefore in Old English in addition to a flexible word order it appears also to exist a flexible focus structure being supported by the inflexions.” We are invited to contemplate the force of the cognitive semanticist Anna Wierzbicka’s intriguing 1987 aphorism, that “if the addressee is treated as a direct object, the (implied) effect of the action on the addressee is always greater and more direct than in the otherwise comparable cases where the addressee phrase is treated as an indirect object.” By such indices, focal structure appears to have been managed differently in Old English.

Intimidating formalism characterizes more than the title alone of a study of abstract element order in late Old English, Brady Z. Clark’s “Early English Clause Structure Change in a Stochastic Optimality Theory Setting,” *Studies in the History of the English Language II: Unfolding Conversations*, ed. Curzan and Emmons, 343–69. Clark argues that the variety of the positions of subject, object, and the two parts of the periphrastic verb relative to each other indicates not two different formal grammars in competition (notably as presented in Pintzuk 1999) but rather one clause structure, and moreover, one within what Clark argues is a non-projective category, that of S(entence) rather than I(nflectional). Clark’s chief claim on the attention of Anglo-Saxonists is to give a principled explanation for the absence of the “reverse brace” construction order in Old English, though he acknowledges possible counterexamples in Linda van Bergen’s *Pronouns and Word Order* (2003: 56–7). Clark’s illustration of the missing “reverse brace” is *you keep God’s commandment will*, a



re-arrangement of his own translation of an example from *Ancrene Riwe* taken from data in Kroch and Taylor (2001), more concisely expressed as SVO<sub>v</sub>, though Clark does not use this notation. Through the Optimality Theory concepts of alignment and markedness, Clark motivates the change from the various Old English subordinate clause orders, with a majority of right-headed, verb-final and the “brace” construction of SvOV to the left-headed “all-medial” construction of Modern English SvVO. The author’s academic website announces that Chapter Three of his 2004 Stanford dissertation “supercedes” the version published here.

Two dissertations take contrasting approaches to the frontiers of Old English language study. The four chapters of Mark Shiv Sundaram, “The Conceptualisation of Futurity in Old English,” Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Toronto, 2003, *DAI* 64A, 3680, concern themselves with the systems within which concepts of the future feature—“futural constructions” form in the old philology of morphological inflection, a second chapter bridging the future as conceived in anthropological and cognitive linguistics with these linguistic representations in Old English literature, a sociolinguistically inflected third chapter examining the ways that the construction of the future “implemented social purpose,” and a final chapter offering insights into narrative structure from the new philology.

The brief abstract for H. C. Yoon (“Word Order and Structure of Old English: With Special Reference to Ælfric’s *Catholic Homilies*,” Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Edinburgh, 2002, *Index to Theses* 53, 2758) only hints at the complexity of the author’s examination of Ælfric

under the assumption that tenth century Old English is, as the Minimalist syntactician Richard Kayne states as a syntactic universal, head-initial. Deviations from this order come about though a postulated feature [+Affix] that applies optionally to account for the variety of positions taken by the finite verb in main and subordinate clauses. This analysis is claimed as an advance on postulating various kinds of movement from head-final position, and is intended to account for the distribution of particles relative to these verbs and the analysis of pronouns as clitics. XP movement is handled through the EPP features.

The “M” in Hironori Suzuki’s “On MV/VM order in *Beowulf*,” (*New Perspectives on English Historical Linguistics* (ed. Horobin and Smith, 195–213), stands for the eight modals of *OES* §§990–9. Suzuki differs from Bliss and Donoghue in reducing to alliteration the issue of where the modal auxiliary occurs relative to the non-finite verb. Suzuki follows on Ohkado’s 2000 conclusions on weight, that in prose MV is more frequent when the clause contains an additional predicate element. [Also reviewed in sect. 4b.]

MB

*Works not seen:*

Miller, D. Gary. “The Morphosyntactic Legacy of Scand-English Contact,” in *For the Love of Inglis Lede*, ed. Marcin Krygier and Liliana Sikorska (New York: Peter Lang): 9–39.

Murakami, Madoka, “The Importance of Extra Elements in Old English,” *English Linguistics: Journal of the English Linguistic Society of Japan* 21, 192–211.

## 4. Literature

### a. General and Miscellaneous

#### *Surveys and Collections*

The title of this section demands the first text: Daniel Donoghue’s *Old English Literature: A Short Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell). Donoghue here tackles a very large issue: how to introduce the ideas and concerns of Old English literature for the novice, without simplifying too much or scaring the neophyte away. The method he chooses is to provide a very brief introduction, and organize the book into five chapters based on five “figures” in the Auerbachian (or medieval) sense: the vow, the hall, the miracle, the pulpit, and the scholar.

At the beginning of the book, Donoghue provides a two-part chart, the first part a list of the texts in each of standard teaching books and the second a chart of his discussions of the texts which appear in each book. His coverage is, unsurprisingly, most comprehensive for the other text published by Blackwell, Elaine Treharne’s anthology (see below); the second- and third-closest texts are Whitelock’s edition of *Sweet’s Reader* and the Mitchell and Robinson *Guide to Old English*. A strength of the book is that it does not introduce prose and then poetry, or arrive triumphantly at *Beowulf* at the end. One chapter, that on the miracle from the middle of the book, may serve as a detailed example of the approach. Donoghue starts with the details of the

story of Caedmon, discusses the poem as it is written in Northumbrian Old English, marks the epithets for the deity and discusses them, and after summarizing the manuscript survival of the hymn turns to a brief synopsis of the oral verse form of OE. The chapter segues into a discussion of Hild of Whitby, and to the other productions of Whitby including a Latin life of Pope Gregory I and the genre of saints' lives, then moving into a general discussion of hagiography in Anglo-Saxon England. Donoghue briefly recapitulates Guthlac and the versions of his story, *Juliana*, *Andreas*, the *Fates of the Apostles* in some detail, which leads into a brief analysis of runes and thence to the poems of Cynewulf (with a facsimile from the Exeter Book showing the runic signature of *Juliana* provided). *Christ II* gets more discussion than usual, and Donoghue uses the notion of authorship to shift into his first discussion of Ælfric, here focusing on his saints' lives and especially on the life of St. Edmund. Turning to the alliterative prose used in Ælfric's version of the *Life*, he demonstrates the stylistic peculiarities of the form, before turning back to other miracles described by Ælfric. He provides details of the lives of Æthelthryth and Oswald, and distinguishes among the kinds of saints' lives these three Anglo-Saxon saints received. Finally, the chapter closes with an extensive analysis of *The Dream of the Rood*, making a relatively new point about the chiasmus in line 44, discussing the genre of the dream vision, explaining the ekphrasis and prosopopoeia at work in the poem (in terms an undergraduate could understand), and closing with a brief but not too confusing discussion of the other crosses on which elements from the poem appear. This is intelligent and perceptive stuff. One caveat from the classroom, however: this book is best used not at the very beginning of the course, or even near the beginning. Students will want to use it rather *in medias res* and will need some basic background before they are comfortable working through it. Written as it is to provoke both students and scholars, it may need some introductory words in class before it can readily reach the former.

Fred C. Robinson proves himself an exponent of that difficult art, the explanatory introduction to the entire field, in "Old English," *Early Germanic Literature and Culture*, ed. Brian Murdoch and Malcolm Read (Rochester, NY: Camden House), 205–33. As always, Robinson provides unexpected data: for example, 3,895,061 vernacular words survive in manuscripts and inscriptions (Roman-letter and runic) from Anglo-Saxon England. He then provides word counts and information about the surviving runic inscriptions, words in

Latin-Old English glossaries, Old English glosses, prose (63% of the corpus), and poetry, and discusses dialects before considering the West Saxon in which most of the surviving prose was written. The review is more balanced than usual, turning from homilies to scientific writings, legal materials, and exotica (providing examples from *Solomon and Saturn* and from *Adrian and Ritheus*). Robinson begins his consideration of poetry with *Beowulf*, then other heroic poems, elegies, and the wisdom literature (also discussed in the section on prose), quoting from *Maxims*. Translations including *The Phoenix*, three sections of the *Physiologus*, many of the riddles, and Boethius come next, after which Robinson turns to the poetry of "field and hearth" (221), the charms. The review considers religious poetry last, reviewing the remarkable cultural syncretism of these texts, their quality, their sources. He concludes with *Dream of the Rood*, which "leaves a sublime example of that native heroic ideal that animates so much of what we have called secular poetry" (226).

2004 seems very much to have been a year for general works, and two further collections belong in the introductory section, one on literature in its manuscript context, and one on the Christian tradition. The first of these, *Old English Literature in its Manuscript Context*, ed. Joyce Tally Lionarons (Morgantown: West Virginia UP), is the product of a seminar at Corpus Christi College Cambridge, and its authors use Fred Robinson's re-consideration of the manuscript context of OE texts as their lodestone. Paul E. Szarmach and Timothy Graham, organizers of the seminar, provide a brief foreword highlighting the riches and the hospitality of the Parker Library (vii–viii). Lionarons's "Introduction: Manuscript Context and Materialist Philology" (1–9) reviews Robinson's clarion call to revisit manuscripts, briefly discusses materialist philology and one of its nay-sayers, and previews the eight pieces which comprise the body of this book. Three of those chapters fall under the purview of this section, the first of them Nancy M. Thompson, "Anglo-Saxon Orthodoxy" (37–65), which reconsiders CCC MS 41, and the vexed question of its extensive collection of marginalia unrelated to the copy of the Old English translation of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* which is the main text. Rejecting the critical consensus that these texts are Irish or Irish-influenced "strange bedfellows" with Bede, Thompson proposes that the compiler would have regarded this material as "an anthology of useful religious texts" (40). Her focus is the *Assumption of the Virgin*, one of the apocryphal texts appearing here, and she begins by pointing out that modern commentators err when

they take Ælfric's condemnation of apocryphal texts as orthodoxy. Thompson demonstrates a sure grasp of the scholarship she addresses, and her deconstruction of the paradigm of loss and reinstatement of orthodox doctrine that inheres in the study of Anglo-Saxon texts is masterly. The *Transitus* narrative and its versions provide her detailed example. The earliest of these occurs in the Blickling Homilies with a variant version in CCCC MS 198, but CCCC 41—although based on the same deficient source—is a much more accurate translation. An abbreviated and more dramatic version of the Latin *Transitus*, belonging to the same tradition as the first part of the Blickling homily, also exists in Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 25. Thompson suggests, *pace* J.E. Cross, that the Pembroke manuscript may have served to supply readings for monks; the details of the story of Mary are particularly modest and there are hints of monastic liturgical use as well. Thompson concludes that the surviving manuscripts of the *Transitus* narratives demonstrate private reading (the cramped marginalia in CCCC 41), monastic offices, and public preaching—a range of uses that suggests a “vibrant and healthy tradition as well as broad acceptance of this apocryphal tale” (55). Moreover, Ælfric's objections to these texts were not his own, but based on his occasional discovery that a venerable authority had objected to a particular apocryphal text. Thus, he himself translated other apocryphal matter, including especially the *Acts of Peter*. In short, Thompson proposes that we have given Ælfric too much authority because we know his name and admire his industry and popularity. Even his contemporaries did not slavishly follow his judgment, since quite clearly texts that he condemned continued to be copied during and after his lifetime.

In the same volume “Glastonbury and the Early History of the Exeter Book” is the concern of Robert M. Butler (173–215), who steps into the scholarly discussion of where the Exeter Book was written following after Patrick Conner, Richard Gameson, and Frederick Biggs (though he seems unaware that Biggs's 1997 paper was in fact published as “The Exeter *Exeter Book*? Some Linguistic Evidence” in *Old English Newsletter Subsidia* 26 (1998): 63–71). He discusses the donation list, and especially the summarizing comments which distinguish between those items at Exeter when Leofric arrived, and those which he acquired. Butler's conclusion is that the Exeter Book was an acquisition, and he connects it with Lambeth 149. He then investigates the possible sources for the name “Æthelwine” in the Lambeth manuscript, linking all three of his candidates (the former bishop of Wells, the ealdorman of East Anglia from 962–92, and

the successor to the Wulfric who managed the Glastonbury estates during Dunstan's abbacy), somewhat conjecturally but interestingly, to Glastonbury. The actual donor of the manuscript was Æthelweard the ealdorman, also connected by Butler to Glastonbury as a possible abbot. Butler then proposes that the vexed erasure in the donation list concerning the blotted name of the town of origin could be “Glastoniensis” or an OE variant thereof. Having made this tentative connection to Glastonbury, Butler adduces other pointers to a Glastonbury origin for the Exeter Book, including the Irish influence there (perhaps reflected by the riddles and by Dunstan's own interest in riddle anthologies and enigmas), the appropriateness of beginning the manuscript with the *Advent Lyrics* given Glastonbury's dedication to St. Mary, the connection of the feasts of Juliana and Guthlac particularly to Glastonbury, and issues of monastic reform relevant to Glastonbury in *Guthlac A*. Of course, as many have noted, the fire that destroyed the Glastonbury library in 1184 took with it any serious opportunity to identify the books of what must have been an extensive pre-Conquest library. The details of letter formations not proving useful, Butler turns to a list by William of Malmesbury of treasures sold by abbot Æthelnoth of Glastonbury, which corresponds strikingly to some of Leofric's purchases for Exeter. He further notes the Glastonbury origin of the Leofric Missal and notes the inscription in CCCC MS 41 which documents Leofric's gift of the volume to Exeter. Butler considers possible connections between CCCC 41 and the Exeter Book, including in particular the fourth marginal homily which “contains a speech of Christ to the damned (beginning *ego te, O homo*) that runs parallel to that in *Christ III* of the Exeter Book” (213–14) and some name additions. He concludes corroborating Christopher Hohler's view that the Corpus manuscript was near Glastonbury before 1050, and proposes that perhaps all these manuscripts were acquired by Leofric during Æthelnoth's sell-off. The proposal is an interesting one, and we can no doubt look forward to many more installments to the continuing saga of the origin of the Exeter Book.

The second collection is edited by Paul Cavill, *The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England: Approaches to Current Scholarship and Teaching* (Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer). Five chapters in the book are relevant here, two in the section on approaches to scholarship, and three in that on approaches to teaching. The first piece in the volume is Graham D. Caie, “Codicological Clues: Reading Old English Christian Poetry in its Manuscript Context” (1–15). After some brief opening notes about the

importance of teaching students the manuscript context of Old English texts, Caie uses his own previous scholarship on the liturgical poetry of Anglo-Saxon England to argue for Corpus Christi College Cambridge MS 201 as connecting to the theme of eschatology. He analyzes the layout and ideas in *Judgment Day II* in this respect, agrees with Robinson that *Exhortation to Christian Living* and *A Summons to Prayer* are actually one poem (although Caie unfortunately treats them as two), and argues that the sequence is a pilgrimage of repentance. Following James Ure, Caie then argues that as penitential literature, the sequence of poems is tied to the vernacular version of *The Benedictine Office* found earlier in the same manuscript. Together they might serve a “didactic function for a lay audience, in particular the secular clergy” (11). Richard Marsden makes a more comprehensive argument in “Wrestling with the Bible: Textual Problems for the Scholar and Student” (69–90). He first reviews the Bible text—“an elusive and perplexing creature” (70)—by discussing the content, original composition, early biblical study and textual analysis, and the translations which became known as the Vulgate. He gives several specific examples to demonstrate the textual variation in early medieval Bibles, and discusses the critical editions, modern English translations and even (very briefly) web resources for textual study of the Bible, before providing detailed and precise advice as to versions of the Bible and methods of citation. Marsden even provides over four pages of bibliographic information about good versions of Biblical texts. This is an exceedingly useful chapter for the student and the beginning scholar.

Strangely, the chapters by Caie and Marsden are in a section on approaches to scholarship, though they both address issues of teaching and beginning research. The other three chapters relevant here are explicitly concerned with approaches to teaching. Dabney Anderson Bankert starts the section with “Medieval Conversion Narratives: Research Problems and Pedagogical Opportunities” (141–52). Describing our teaching role as “transformers of perceptions” (141), Bankert discusses the common stock of conversion narratives which feed the voluminous extant stories of this genre in terms of a course she developed to provide students with a complex research problem to investigate and solve. The course proved highly successful, partly because Bankert had not herself fully resolved the issues of conversion narratives so the students learned along with the instructor as they developed research skills and knowledge of a richly complex context for conversion experiences. Hugh Magennis also discusses early Christian

saints in his “Approaches to Saints’ Lives” (163–83), providing a detailed introduction to saints and saints’ lives in Anglo-Saxon England and then proposing some ways with which to make hagiography less alien and uncomfortable. He discusses the problem of miracles, the occasional cruel behavior of saints such as that in *Elene* with respect to Judas, and suggests foregrounding the cultural context of these behaviors. The accommodation of hagiography to the test of the heroic moment, issues of gender and genre including romance features, the bodily torture of the saint (especially the young, virginal, naked female saint), chastity and marriage: all these issues Magennis discusses with reference to scholarship that provides useful fodder for teaching. The essay closes with five pages of detailed analysis of bibliographical resources for the study and teaching of saints’ lives. Homiletic prose, rarely addressed in any detail with undergraduates because of its strangeness, is briefly discussed by Mary Swan in “*Men ða leofestan*: Genre, the Canon, and the Old English Homiletic Tradition” (185–92). She labels the “committed, polemical nature” (186) of the homily as its greatest alterity, discusses the challenge of working with such engaged texts, and recommends that the most useful approach might be to use new scholarship on the performativity of texts and speech act theory. The collection as a whole seems particularly useful as advice for teaching, less so for its presentation of the scholarly situation with respect to the Christian tradition in Anglo-Saxon England.

Another collection of essays, rather more wide-ranging than those listed above, is *Signs of Change: Transformations of Christian Traditions and their Representation in the Arts, 1000–2000*, ed. Nils Holger Petersen, Claus Clüver, and Nicolas Bell (Amsterdam: Rodopi). The preface describes the book as questioning “the possibilities for writing a theologico-cultural history of the arts in Western Europe during the last millennium” (xi). Judging from the range of the nineteen extended papers, six long introductions to individual sections, and extensive introductory essay by Holger Petersen, the answer to the implicit question might well be yes. Another European volume which is also both general and mammoth is Piero Boitani, Mario Mancini and Alberto Varvaro, *Lo spazio letterario del Medioevo; 2, Il Medioevo volgare; Vol. II: La circolazione del testo* (Rome: Salerno, 2002). It has three large sections: languages and linguistic concerns, the forms and genres of circulation, and the manuscript tradition and textual history. In the first section, Ermanno Barisone tackles “L’area inglese” (217–46), only the first ten pages or so of which are relevant here. Barisone reviews the history of Anglo-



Saxon dialects and, referring to Bede, discusses briefly the development of English writing with its additional letters and particular orthography. He considers the relationship between Old English and the Scandinavian languages (especially with respect to the Danelaw) and discusses the hegemony of the West-Saxon dialect during and after Alfred's rule. He briefly discusses language features, including word order and sentence structure (also in verse), and before turning to the Norman Conquest and its effects addresses the interesting issue of the respective roles of Winchester and London in establishing the *koinè* of late Anglo-Saxon usage. The third section of the book has two somewhat overlapping pieces which are of interest here: Anna Maria Luiselli Fadda on "La tradizione germanica" (643–81) and Derek Pearsall on "La tradizione inglese" (705–29). Luiselli Fadda begins with the Gothic tradition before turning to a relatively extensive analysis of the Anglo-Saxon manuscript tradition (648–60) in which she considers the first developments of scholarship after the arrival of Irish and Roman missionaries, which resulted in the use of the Latin alphabet. She considers the alterity of Anglo-Saxon England in some detail, with its vernacular and Latin productions and traces the development of scripts, manuscripts, and the textual tradition with detailed discussion of the leadership of Alfred the Great, and especially of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. She discusses the poetic manuscripts in some detail, and concludes with the manuscript tradition and ideas raised by Ælfric and Wulfstan. Pearsall, on the other hand, disposes of the Anglo-Saxon tradition in two rather curt pages, starting with runes, a Christian-Latin alphabetization, Caedmon, Bede, the codices of Alfred and of poetry and of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and (like Luiselli Fadda but in a couple of sentences rather than a few pages) finishes with Wulfstan.

Also in the general category are the anthologies and readers; Elaine Treharne's edition *Old and Middle English c. 890 – c. 1400: An Anthology* is already available in a second edition (Oxford: Blackwell). At the publisher's request, some very well-known Middle English texts were added to the edition (and others altered to keep the length the same); there was no obvious change to the OE selections. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, Richard Marsden published in this year *The Cambridge Old English Reader* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP). At 532 closely-printed pages, this is no reader for the faint-hearted undergraduate (one wishes that designers of introductory readers had a better grasp of the need for white space and crib notes), but this book is a thoughtful reader which starts the process of

thinking about which texts are the best introductions to Old English from scratch, and answers the question innovatively and intelligently. At the same time it does not neglect the old favorites, so that among the forty texts Marsden provides are *The Battle of Maldon*, *The Dream of the Rood*, *Judith*, *The Ruin*, *The Wanderer*, *Wulf and Eadwacer*, and *The Wife's Lament*. The texts are also extensively rethought, so that for example *The Seafarer* (the whole text) is provided but at number 26 when its usual companion, *The Wanderer*, is at 38; Marsden explains this by saying that the former is not particularly elegiac but rather hortatory and obviously based on the theology of Augustine. Two passages from *Beowulf* appear, the Finnsburh episode (now called "The Tragedy of Hildeburh") and the slaying of Grendel's Mother. Two saints' lives focus on holy women: Æthelthryth and Eugenia. One might almost see here an unwontedly feminist approach to the tradition of OE texts. There is a very good and well-chosen selection of other prose, including the Fonthill Letter, the will of Ælfgifu, Ælfric's homily on Easter Sunday, two sermons by Wulfstan, and passages from both *Apolonius of Tyre* and the *Letter of Alexander*. The layout of each text will appeal to most instructors: each section gets a quite lengthy headnote, the text has a layer of glosses below it indicated by sigils in the text, and the lower part of each page has extensive translation and commentary notes. Moreover, there is a relatively full glossary. The volume has other graces as well: a very useful reference grammar, unfortunately hidden at the end of the book sandwiched between the section on manuscripts and emendations and the very good and detailed glossary. Each text has a very clear introduction, with up-to-date and helpful suggestions for further reading (often including recent articles, which thereby suggests that undergraduates are expected to think too). There are decisions to quibble with: however intriguing the medicinal remedies for dysentery and for vomiting might be, the texts are not easy and might not serve as the early and easy introductions to Old English that their placement at 3b and 3c might suggest. The division of the texts into six subsections entitled Teaching and learning, Keeping a record, Spreading the Word, Example and Exhortation, Telling Tales, and Reflection and Lament might not seem to some self-evident ways to divide up OE texts for students. The desire to include a much wider range of texts is indeed laudable, and the three selections from King Alfred's Psalms, the passages from *Genesis B*, and *Exodus*, and the selections from law-codes are very good ideas, but if showing the entire range of vernacular texts was the idea, then perhaps one sample glossed text might have been useful, or a

piece from the *Regularis Concordia* or the *Indicia monasterialis*, in order to show everyday religion in action in late Anglo-Saxon England. One might cavil as to whether Marsden's anthology should really have been two smaller and less intimidating tomes with some additional material on a website. But in general, this is a very fine piece of work, and one of the most important works of this year. In closing, it seems a shame that readers and grammars like Marsden's will not receive the scholarly attention and reviews that critical monographs, often doing far less that is new and interesting about Old English texts, will garner. It is also a shame that this fine volume will receive the generally poor advertising of the usual Cambridge book.

MJT

#### *Saints' Lives and Monastic Literature*

Ely, Peterborough, and Ramsey—three important Fenland abbeys—all produced house-histories at about the same time in the second half of the twelfth century. Jennifer Paxton in "Textual Communities in the English Fenlands: A Lay Audience for Monastic Chronicles?" (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 26: 123–37) argues that the appeal to the past in these manuscripts was tied to what would today be outreach and fundraising. The chronicles include miracle stories, charters, property deeds, and other evidence of the community's supernatural power. The stories told concern the relics of saints, including Æthelthryth, Edmund, and Oswald, for the purpose of attracting pilgrims and generating further miracles. Since the loss of powerful Anglo-Saxon *ealdormen* supporting the monasteries was an acute problem, the chronicles made much of the connections that could be forged in this regard so as to solicit further donations and to remind those listening that their gifts, too, could be immortalized in these texts. Finally, Paxton discusses the way in which these texts made much of the tombs of exalted figures in their houses, and of the ability they had to recruit future corpses. Ely had many bishops but also Archbishop Wulfstan; Peterborough had a good run of archbishops of York, and Ramsey set great store by its famous inmates, including Ælfward. Paxton concludes with the more formal deals linking patronage and burial that came to be developed in the twelfth century. Past glory, she notes could "help provide their present daily bread" (137). The link of the manuscripts themselves to the laity is unclear since these chronicles were internal documents for the monasteries, though clearly prepared for reading aloud—though to what audience is uncertain.

Yet another of the Germania Latina conferences results in a useful collection of essays this year: *Miracles and the Miraculous in Medieval Germanic and Latin Literature*, ed. K.E. Olsen, A. Harbus, and T. Hofstra (Leuven: Peeters). Among the useful articles in this collection is Bea Blokhuis, "The *furtum sacrum* of St Wihtburga and the Incorruption Story of St Etheldreda," 121–39. The posthumously incorrupt Wihtburga was far less well-known than her putative sister Etheldreda, and Bede made no mention of her although he appears to have been the impetus for the great interest in incorruption in medieval England. Two of the most famous incorrupt saints, Edmund and Cuthbert, were examined and translated around 1100; the translation of Etheldreda at Ely was planned but her body objected greatly to any study of its incorruption and attacked those who tried to test it. As a result, Blokhuis argues, the legend of Wihtburga was used to resolve the problem of Etheldreda's inaccessibility. She considers the origin of Wihtburga, sources of the legend including one passing reference by Ælfric, the OE text on the resting-places of saints called *Pa halgan*, the *Liber Eliensis*, the *Lambeth Fragment*, and two versions of the *Life of Wihtburga* (from Ely in the twelfth century). Blokhuis suggests that confusion between Ethelburga and Wihtburga may have resulted in the erroneous conclusion that Wihtburga was Etheldreda's sister; she also suggests that Dereham, Wihtburga's home, was acquired by Ely in the twelfth century (something dubiously attested by the F-manuscript of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, but Blokhuis has other pieces of evidence as well). Her presence at Ely provided an incorrupt saint, a "sister" of Etheldreda, and corroboration of the perfection of the Ladies of Ely. Blokhuis makes a coherent and convincing argument here.

Marianne Malo Chenard investigates how the bodies of holy men and women were constructed through the *vitae* and *passiones* which depict them in her thesis "Narratives of the saintly body in Anglo-Saxon England" (University of Notre Dame, 2004). Aldhelm, for example, constructs the sanctity of virgins specifically in terms of the presence or absence of a body part, the hymen. Bede's account of Oswald makes the king's body itself hold metonymic value, and the Old English martyrologist's account of Mary Magdalene and Pelagia focuses on their nakedness, and hence, perhaps, their harlotry. Ælfric also focuses his discussions of Agatha and Eugenia on the *breost* in his version of their *passiones*. Malo Chenard argues that the body itself becomes a ground of argument in the discourse of sanctity, and that the rewriting of these biblical, exegetical and hagiographic

texts demonstrates the complexities of early medieval chastity, kingship, penitence, and monasticism.

MJT

Kathryn A. Laity's dissertation, "Local Heroes: The Sociocultural Context for the Development of Vernacular Saints' Lives in Old Irish, Old Norse, and Old English" (Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Connecticut [2003], *DAI* 65A: 140), "investigates the vernacular lives of three native saints, Brigit, Olaf, and Guthlac, within the context of the heroic and literary traditions of Ireland, Scandinavia, and England during the Middle Ages" (2). Laity is most concerned in these three vernacular *vitæ* with the ways in which they both follow but also creatively enlarge their generic *exempla*. Of particular interest to readers of this review would be Chapter Four, devoted to the treatment of Guthlac in the Old English *Guthlac A* and *Guthlac B* texts, where Laity delineates how the "heroic imagery of the saint's life develops the specifically Christian warrior model" (14). In this respect, Laity's study accords well with the arguments of Damon's book and Hare's article reviewed here (see below), although this reviewer is beginning to wonder what is so novel (or even interesting) about this argument. Ultimately, Laity concludes that "the Anglo-Saxons seemed to have the greatest success blending the two disparate traditions" (Christian and martial-heroic), and "[u]nlike the Irish and Norse texts which seem to cover the pagan hero with the new Christian armor, the English texts combine warrior with saint by recasting suffering and sacrifice as heroic traits, while apparently jettisoning the remainder of their pagan past" (14–15). Laity's investigation into these vernacular lives is augmented "by current theories on intercultural communication" which look at "[r]elative hierarchical power" relations between competing cultures. In this scenario, the vernacular saints' lives, including those of Guthlac, represent a "syncretistic layering which preserves the recognizable similarities to the common heroic culture while demonstrating the greater virtue of the Christian saint" (21).

Some thirty-four Latin *passiones* of Christians who were martyred and ultimately culted at Rome, and how these Roman saints came to be memorialized in Anglo-Saxon England, is the main concern of Michael Lapidge's essay, "Roman Martyrs and their Miracles in Anglo-Saxon England" (*Miracles and the Miraculous in Medieval Germanic and Latin Literature*, ed. K.E. Olsen, A. Harbus, and T. Hofstra [Leuven: Peeters], 95–120). Lapidge's more pointed intention is to identify the characteristic features of the genre of the Latin

narratives and to determine to what extent those narratives were the "vectors" of their commemoration in Old English texts. Lapidge's essay represents an important initial contribution to the subject, for as he himself points out, "the 'corpus' [of thirty-four Latin *passiones* concerned with saints martyred at Rome] ... has hardly even been studied as such," "the texts are difficult of access (they are edited principally in the fifteenth-century *Sanctuarium* of Mombritius and in the early, seventeenth-century volumes of *Acta Sanctorum*)," and "they have never been translated into English" (95). One of the first questions Lapidge examines, with respect to the *passiones* in his survey, is "what relationship they bear to the historical reality of persecution at Rome (as far as that can be ascertained), and how and when they were confected" (102). What Lapidge concludes is that the *passiones*, written many years, even centuries, after the Peace of the Church (AD 313), "needed to be created *ex nihilo* in order to clothe the bare names with a vestment of personality," and "it became a principal aim of hagiographers to establish the historical significance of the site in which the particular martyr was being worshipped, even if that significance was in fact fictitious" (102). Next, Lapidge outlines the strict plot conventions the Latin hagiographers followed when composing their *passiones*, with a special emphasis on those details that were meant to impart historical verisimilitude. From his analysis, it is clear to Lapidge that the Roman *passiones* "very rarely were solely concerned with an individual martyr; the normal form is that, through the one Christian's commitment and miraculous powers, more and more unbelievers are drawn to the faith, so that what we see in the *passiones* are small and ever-growing communities of Christians devoutly practising their faith under the threat of death" (107–8). Further, the narratives are, "on the whole, characterised by commendable sobriety. They contain no excessive indulgence in descriptions of grisly tortures and bodily mutilations," and therefore "contrast strikingly with *passiones* composed in Greek and the eastern Mediterranean" (108). Lapidge concludes that their unadorned style is "evidently a reflex of the simple faith of the lower classes for which they were conceived" (109). In the case of the thirty-four Roman martyrs in Lapidge's survey, Bede included synopses drawn from eighteen of those, "a strikingly large number, in comparison with the five *passiones* used by Aldhelm" (112). In the Old English Martyrology, twenty-four of the Roman *passiones* included in Lapidge's survey were used in the anonymous author's compilation, and in the Cotton-Corpus Legendary, twenty-seven. Regarding Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, Lapidge notes that Ælfric chose five *passiones*

of Roman martyrs: Sebastian, Agnes, Caecilia, Chrysanthus and Daria, and Abdon and Sennes. Lapidge concludes his survey of the influence of Roman *passiones* in Anglo-Saxon hagiography with the Anglo-Latin *Passio S. Eadmundi* by Abbo of Fleury. While Edmund, strictly speaking, was an East Anglian king murdered by Vikings, and not a Roman martyr, “Abbo took the decision to cast ... oral reports [of Edmund’s martyrdom] into the form of a Roman *passio*” (115). Lapidge’s final comment on his subject is that, while the bulk of the Anglo-Saxon hagiographical tradition was formed by *vitae* of confessors, “alongside these *vitae*, the *passiones* of Roman martyrs were certainly known in Anglo-Saxon England, and knowledge of these texts helped to determine the form taken by liturgical devotion, as can be seen by surviving calendars and litanies” (115). Included with his essay is a very helpful Appendix, “A Working Corpus of Roman *Passiones Martyrum*,” that includes citations for each appearance of a Roman martyr in an Old English text.

It would be somewhat redundant to provide a review of what is itself a review in Claire Watson’s “Old English Hagiography: Recent and Future Research” (*Literature Compass* [September 2004]: n.p. [online journal]). Suffice to say, for those working on Old English saints’ *vitae*, that Watson provides here a very useful overview of recent trends in the relevant scholarship. She aims “to give an impression of the breadth and range of current work whilst highlighting future directions for study” (such as the anonymously-authored corpora, which has only recently been given some concerted attention), and she structures her discussion of the scholarship around the following areas: “attitudes to source studies; intertextual trends and motifs within the genre; the social relevance of hagiographic texts; and the growing interest in female saints’ lives.” Watson also devotes special attention to the “relative states” of scholarship on the Ælfrician and anonymous hagiographic corpora, where she supplies references for central anthologies of essays and recent editions of anonymous *vitae*.

In her essay “*Sanctimoniales Cum Sanctimoniales*: Particular Friendships and Female Community in Anglo-Saxon England” (*Sex and Sexuality in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Pasternack and Weston, 35–62), Lisa M.C. Weston looks at the narrative of Barking Abbey nuns Ethelburga and Torhtgyth recorded in Book IV of Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History* and also at Rudolf of Fulda’s *Life of Saint Leoba* in light of the questions they prompt about women “as friends as well as co-workers within monastic community,” and also about the place

of female friendship in the construction of community. Further, “if stories of female homosocial relationships can be teased out of histories and saints’ lives, what anxieties might such stories betray? And how might a text attempt to transfer and inculcate those anxieties within a female audience so as to stifle same-sex relationships?” (37). According to Weston, the sanctity of female saints, in general, “especially in so far as it is intricately connected with their gendered sexuality ... is discursively constructed primarily to produce male social, cultural, and political meaning.” However, some female saints’ lives, such as Bede’s Ethelburga and Rudolf’s Leoba, that could have circulated within female communities, may have given rise to “an alternate or counter-memory of female homosociality—albeit one which, if it is to be revealed, must be sought in texts dismissive or even hostile, anxious about such possibilities” (37). Indeed, writers such as Bede “set the textualization of ‘soul friendships’ between women within a rhetoric eloquent about both the ‘danger’ and the paradoxical necessity of female homosocial and homoerotic ties, especially within enclosed communities outside male vigilance and knowledge” (38). Bede’s account of Torhtgyth’s visions of Ethelburga (after Ethelburga’s death), especially, reveal his worries about what happens beyond the gaze of the male witness. Because a focus on female friendship “seems to require a rhetoric which links female community with concerns about the limits of (male witness)—or secrecy—and the possibilities of sin, that requirement is symptomatic of cultural anxieties about female friendship and desire” (40). Weston also considers the penitential literature, which is more concerned with male than female sexual sins, and therefore “reinforce[s] and police[s] social order ... in so far as such order is rooted in the bonds between men.” Nevertheless, when the penitential literature and monastic *regulae* do address female homosexuality, it “discloses another way in which anxieties are contained and defused” (44), primarily through a kind of “suppressed homorerotics of community” where the female gaze toward the erotic act is redefined as policing rather than desiring. In Fulda’s *Life of Saint Leoba*, Weston notes a similar “suppressed homoerotics of community,” where the “dictates of female enclosure in reconstructing female homosocial tradition entail for Rudolf perhaps even more than for Bede a paradoxical and problematic anxiety which connects the regulation of social exchange with the policing of desire” (53). Both Bede’s and Rudolf’s texts “fear the possibility of an excessive (and potentially but not necessarily carnal) female desire which escapes male witness, definition, and regulation,” while at the same time, “they recapture



exclusive female friendship for patriarchal scrutiny by inscribing it within a rhetoric of secrecy, sin, and community" (62).

John Edward Damon's *Soldier Saints and Holy Warriors: Warfare and Sanctity in the Literature of Early England* (Aldershot: Ashgate) is a study of the Anglo-Saxon literature on pre-Crusade soldier saints, primarily Martin, Edwin, Oswald, Guthlac, and Edmund, with a special emphasis on the evolution of the depiction of the life of Martin, from the early Latin Christian account of Sulpicius Severus, through Aldhelm, Alcuin and Ælfric, to the *South English Legendary*, in order to show the development of the image of the soldier saint from a Christian anti-Achilles who embraces self-sacrifice and pacifism over pride in prowess and martial combat, to a figure that operated as a kind of divine benediction on the warrior's occupation and even war itself. Damon is primarily concerned, though, with "tracing a conflict within Anglo-Saxon society between two contrasting and yet intertwined states of being: warfare and sanctity" (21). Damon writes that an analysis on the lives of soldier saints written in Anglo-Saxon England shows "a somewhat unexpected pattern":

Rather than a steady progress away from a pacifist form of Christianity toward the acceptance of warfare for Christ, as originally hypothesized by Carl Erdmann in *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade* and studied at length by many scholars since, instead the earliest Anglo-Saxon hagiographers described the earthly battles, replete with bloodshed, of more than one native saint. (21)

Damon is especially interested in a certain Anglo-Saxon sub-class of soldier saints: the martyred warrior kings, such as Oswald of Northumbria and Edmund of East Anglia. Whereas early Latin Christian accounts of soldier saints "presented a form of sainthood that overturned classical Greek and Roman ideas of heroism," Old English narratives of martyred warrior kings "held up a model of sainthood that united Germanic heroic ideals with Christian faith" (22). Ultimately, for Damon, the "pull" between contrasting forms of sanctity in Anglo-Saxon hagiography—one pacifist and the other more militaristic—"documents the development of a crusading ideology" (22). Damon sees Ælfric as the great synthesizer of the "disparate threads of Christian approaches to the intersection of warfare and sanctity," and he argues that a "careful examination of his work reveals a man forging a unified theory of holy war in

the crucible of a nation at war" (24). A counter-analysis to Damon's can be found in the excellent essay by James W. Earl, "Violence and Non-Violence in Anglo-Saxon England: Ælfric's 'Passion of St Edmund'" (*Philological Quarterly* 78 [1999]: 125–49). Damon acknowledges that Earl's essay influenced the development of his argument, "despite fundamental differences of perspective and very different conclusions" (223, n. 92). In addition to a first chapter that incorporates an analysis of the life of Martin written by Sulpicius with a general introduction to the book as a whole and its argument, there are six other chapters. Chapter Two, "Holy Kingship: Sanctification of Warfare," concentrates upon accounts of Edwin in the anonymous eighth-century Latin prose *vita* of Gregory and in Bede's *Historia*, and also upon Bede's account of Oswald of Northumbria. Chapter Three, "Saint Guthlac, Spiritual Warrior," looks at Felix's *Vita Sancti Guthlaci* in order to show how that life fused together the tropes of the earthly hero and soldier of the faith. Chapter Four, "Holiness and Heroism: Poetic Lives of Soldier Saints," concentrates upon the variety of attitudes toward reconciling warfare and sanctity found in the Old English poetic vernacular narratives *Juliana*, *Elene*, *Andreas*, *Guthlac A*, and *Guthlac B*. Chapter Five, "Alcuin and Abbo: Cultural Cross-pollination," examines how, through "ongoing reciprocal contacts between the Continent and England, the Anglo-Saxon ideal of martyred warrior-kingship was transplanted to the Continent around the year 800 and returned to England in the late tenth century altered, strengthened and renewed" (148). Alcuin's *Verus de Patribus Regibus et Sanctis Euboricensis Ecclesiae* and Abbo of Fleury's *Passio Sanctii Eadmundi* are both analyzed in detail in this chapter, in order to highlight how Alcuin's and Abbo's conceptions of holy kingship were diametrically opposed. In Chapter Six, "Ælfric: Path of the Holy Christian Soldier," Damon looks at Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, paying special attention to the accounts of Alban, Edmund, Oswald, Judas Machabeus, and the Forty Soldiers, which Damon believes reveal Ælfric's highly original synthesis of a variety of already-established hagiographic tropes—an original synthesis, moreover, that may have played an important, yet mainly unrecognized ideological role in justifying the Crusades. Chapter Seven, "Warfare and Sanctity: Record of a Changing Ethos," returns to the life of St. Martin by way of Aldhelm, Alcuin, the *Old English Martyrology*, an anonymous homily, Ælfric, and the post-Norman Conquest *South English Legendary*, in which narrative lineage we can see Martin's transformation from an unwilling warrior to a soldier who actively embraced a crusading, martial ethos, demonstrating

the “well-forged link between war and holiness.” This is not to say that discourses of peace and Christian pacifism did not continue in the later Middle Ages, only that they appeared “with severely reduced frequency and lessened strength” (282).

EAJ

### *Themes and Approaches*

“Christian Heroism and the West Saxon Achievement: The Old English Poetic Evidence” (*Medieval Forum* 4, n.p. [online journal]), by Kent G. Hare, makes an argument that resonates with the thesis of Damon’s book (reviewed above)—that “the historical context of resistance to pagan Vikings and consolidation of the kingdom of England in the tenth century” led to a “syncretic martialization of the Christian ethos in the Old English poetic record” that was also harnessed to “the dynastic interests of the House of Wessex.” In Hare’s view, “a perhaps uneasy but nevertheless fruitful wedding of the heroic and Christian indeed marks virtually the entire corpus of extant Old English poetry,” which is “suffused with an aura of Christian martial piety which plainly foreshadows that of the age of the crusades commencing a century later.” As opposed to the argument of Michael Cherniss in *Ingeld and Christ: Heroic Concepts and Values in Old English Christian Poetry* (The Hague, 1972), that late Old English battle poetry represents “an enduring heroic tradition tempered little by Christianity,” Hare sees instead in that same poetry the expression of “the very same ethos as the religious poetry.” One cannot fully understand the literary context for those poems without also understanding their immediate historical context as well: the period of the Viking Invasions and the political conflicts within the Danelaw, extending from the late eighth into the ninth centuries, which essentially brought about a kind of “crisis” of Anglo-Saxon rule and hegemony that resulted in Alfred’s program of religious and cultural reform. The bulk of Hare’s analysis is devoted to *The Battle of Maldon* and *Beowulf*, in order to demonstrate how those poems functioned, along with other works such as *The Battle of Brunanburh* and even the “Capture of the Five Boroughs” recorded in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in 942, as part of Alfred’s and his successors’ attempt to provide “models of Christian heroism to serve as examples of in the expansion of Wessex and the consolidation of England.” Ultimately, in Hare’s view, the distinction between heroic and Christian in these poems “is less important than their reconciliation.” In his conclusion, Hare asserts that the “old controversy over the heroic or Christian nature” of this poetry is “of little import,” since

“that question would have far less meaning for men of tenth- and eleventh-century England than it does for twentieth-century critics and historians who approach the matter from what would have been to their forbears totally alien perspective.” But I would argue that Hare’s entire essay also devolves, to a certain extent, to that very same question he claims has either been exhausted or is ultimately historically irrelevant. Indeed, much criticism on the corpus of Old English poetry seems to almost never stray too far from the question. A more interesting question might be: how influential, really, might this poetry have been in the supposed inculcation of ideological and “national” values, and to what extent, and in what manner? A provocative answer to this question can be found in the last chapter of James Earl’s book, *Thinking About Beowulf* (Stanford, 1994), “*Beowulf* and the Origins of Civilization,” where Earl imagines Byrhtnoth, the hero (or anti-hero?) of *The Battle of Maldon* as one of *Beowulf*’s probable readers. Then again, as Earl also wonders, “For all we know, *Beowulf* never had any readers at all” (176).

Within an “overarching methodological position informed by psychological and sociological theories of nostalgia,” Melanie Heyworth explores “the possible social use and unity” of Old English elegies in her short article, “Nostalgic Evocation and Social Privilege in the Old English Elegies” (*Studia Neophilologica* 76: 3-11). Despite previous scholars’ emphasis on the elegies as “an artistic manifestation of a meditation upon the distance between the present and the past,” in Heyworth’s view, “there has been little detailed analysis or consideration” dedicated to the significance of nostalgia as a fundamental and defining feature of the elegies. (In fact, a treatment of this aspect of the elegies has been undertaken by R.M. Liuzza, in his essay “The Tower of Babel: *The Wanderer* and the Ruins of History,” *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 36.1 [2003]: 1-35, reviewed in *OEN* 37.2, although Heyworth may not have known about this article when she was working on her own essay.) Heyworth admits that “nostalgia” is a relatively modern term, but since it also denotes a psychological condition that “arises from a temporal dislocation and is a product of the dynamic created by the differentiation of past and present” (4), it accords very well—as both a term and an actual socio-psychological state of affairs—with the subject matter and tone of the Old English elegies. Most important in Heyworth’s mind are the two main components of nostalgia: desire, predicated upon the absence of some lost loved object, and memory, through which the lost object is always present. Nostalgia, therefore, conjoins absence and

presence through human longing and, “whether medieval or modern, nostalgia can be understood as a historical constant in cultural evolution and an enduring and common attribute of societies” (4). While nostalgia itself is universal, its manifestation in various artistic idioms is always unique, and therefore, the Old English elegies can be understood “as the expression of that universal experience through the culturally specific medium of the Anglo-Saxon form” (4). It is not Heyworth’s intention to propose a specific interpretation of nostalgia in the elegies, as it is to focus on “the ways in which the elegies participate generally in the confirmation and consolidation of normalizing discourses,” and to also “provide a methodological foundation and justification for further investigation into the specificities” of the uses of nostalgia in the poems (6). By focusing on the elegies’ participation in “normalizing discourses,” Heyworth believes it would be meaningful to look further into the ways in which the poetry reflects Anglo-Saxon society’s “determinations and prescriptions regarding the socially acceptable individual expression of nostalgic sentiments (distinct from the personal-physical-emotional ability to feel nostalgia)” (6). For Heyworth, then, nostalgia can never be just a personal emotion, but is, rather, an ideologically charged construct that reflects longstanding debates over which historical memories count and which do not. The Old English elegies, in particular, “facilitate the possibility for reminiscing nostalgically for an idealistic Anglo-Saxon social paradigm of social integrity and security,” and they do this by enumerating the corresponding negatives in the present: loss of comrades and family, the disintegration of the *comitatus*, architectural decay, exile, and so forth. Ultimately, “the elegies impart emotional and behavioural scripts to contend with, and ultimately prevail over” social hardships “in socially acceptable ways,” such as in *Wanderer*, “which privileges control and repression in the face of the breakdown of the mechanisms of the speaker’s social order” (8). Nostalgia, therefore, in the elegies, is never “memory for the past’s sake alone, but is also memory that promotes and prescribes action and emotion for the present and the future” (9).

Shari Horner’s essay, “The Language of Rape in Old English Literature and Law: Views from the Anglo-Saxon(ist)s” (*Sex and Sexuality in Anglo-Saxon England: Essays in Memory of Daniel Gillmore Calder*, ed. Carol Braun Pasternack and Lisa M.C. Weston [Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies], 149–81), is a consideration of “what attitudes were held in Anglo-Saxon England regarding rape and

sexual violence; what kinds of material and textual evidence might illuminate those attitudes; and how both Anglo-Saxon and modern writers have responded to the topic of rape in early English culture” (150). Horner notes that rape, “though increasingly of critical interest to scholars of the later middle ages, has only rarely been considered by Anglo-Saxonists” (and has even been suppressed or dismissed as a serious critical subject by some), and yet, its study would open up a wide field of important inquiry into many aspects of Anglo-Saxon culture: “gender relations, class status, property rights, female agency, and juridical and religious views of the integrity of the body—and the textual and cultural representation of all of these” (151). To that end, Horner’s essay examines “the vernacular legal and literary language of rape in Anglo-Saxon texts,” particularly legal and hagiographic texts, and suggests that “the representation, regulation, and disciplining of sexual violence in Anglo-Saxon England is symptomatic of a larger concern with the regulation of the Christian subject in Anglo-Saxon culture” (151). Horner begins her analysis with the Anglo-Saxon law codes, which she admits do not record a comprehensive juridical system. Nevertheless, Horner does view the extant written laws as “primarily concerned with regulating Christian subjects within secular society in a manner consistent with church doctrine and teaching,” and if they are read in conjunction with the religious literature they can “provide insight into Christian views of sexual violence and rape in Anglo-Saxon textual culture” (162). What Horner concludes from her survey of the law codes is that “they present a fairly wide range of illicit sexual offenses,” whereas “the homiletic and didactic literature presents a very narrow range, focusing almost exclusively on the threatened sexual violation of virgins,” and in which “sexual activity is always portrayed as violent and non-consensual” (162–63). Therefore, “while the law codes offer a pragmatic view of sexual behaviors in Anglo-Saxon England (often couched in economic terms), the religious literature presents us with the theoretical Christian ideal of preserving the chastity and the integrity of all Christian bodies against any illicit attackers” (163). In the Old English saints’ legends, in particular, Horner notes that, even while no saint is raped, “the sexual violence, the torture, and the threats remain,” and therefore, reading these narratives of the threat of rape “alongside the legal proscriptions of rape confirms the extent to which sexual violence was a fundamental part of the cultural landscape of Anglo-Saxon England” (180). In the saints’ lives, especially, representations of sexual violence “offer both an ideological link between sex and violence (purportedly

to discourage sex) and also a redeployment of sexual discourses into spiritual ones, thus legitimizing sexual themes in contexts where they would not otherwise be sanctioned" (180). The delineation of penalties for rape in the Anglo-Saxon law codes, along with the hagiographic literature's highly developed "rhetoric" of sexual violence, ultimately points to the materiality of real, literal rape in Anglo-Saxon England and to the personal and more broadly cultural anxieties that likely coalesced around that fact. Rereading rape in Old English literature, then, "means remembering the literal violence done to female (and male) bodies in the literature and culture of Anglo-Saxon England" (180).

"Gregory's Boys: The Homoerotic Production of English Whiteness" (*Sex and Sexuality in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Pasternack and Weston, 63–90), by Kathy Lavezzo, examines Ælfric's English prose homily on Gregory, which includes Gregory's famous encounter with Anglo-Saxon slave boys in the Roman marketplace, in order to demonstrate how "the intertwining of Englishness, male-male desire, and religiosity ... has a long history" (65). Although other scholars, such as Allen Frantzen, Mark Jordan, and John Boswell, have treated the issue of homosexuality in premodern culture, it is Lavezzo's contention that, in the case of the Gregory story, at least, the question of how "the love of a boy could be marshaled in the name of national affection remains to be addressed in a thoroughgoing manner" (67–68). More specifically, Lavezzo sees Ælfric's account of the Gregory story as "offering us an excellent means of investigating the imbrication of national and queer desires in Anglo-Saxon England," for "Ælfric seeks imaginatively to respond to and transcend the problem of boy love in his monastic culture, by symbolically transforming it into a love of England." Lavezzo argues that Ælfric does this "through what we might anachronistically term a racialist fantasy." To wit, "by constructing whiteness as a physical trait that is ineluctably bound up with Christian election, Ælfric manages to marshal the erotic investment his monastic culture had in boys for distinctly national ends" (68). In his homily on Gregory, in which Lavezzo argues that that "prime signifier of the English Christian's election is inexorably physical," Ælfric "encourages the Anglo-Saxons to imagine themselves as belonging to a chosen Christian people, whose worthiness for conversion inspires a long religious expedition" (73). To answer the question of why Ælfric would "enlist such a celebration of young male physicality in his national project," Lavezzo turns to the treatment of boys in Anglo-Saxon monastic culture, where male children could also be

the victims of sexual abuse. Evidence for this can be found in the penitentials, where many of the canons focus on young men and their sexual interactions with each other and with older men. Ælfric's own treatment of male-male sexual relations in his literary corpus indicates his squeamishness over the subject, and even his occasional suppression of it. It may be, as Lavezzo asserts, that Ælfric overcame the problem of the illicit homoerotic aspects of the Gregory legend through his "fetishization" of the slave boys' whiteness which could be linked to their supposedly angel-like nature, thereby rendering them as both embodied and disembodied at once. As Lavezzo writes, "[t]hrough this fetishization of whiteness, Ælfric imagines how the beautiful young male bodies that could lead to dire spiritual consequences for the monks in his culture instead do quite the opposite: enable the spiritual election of the English themselves" (85). As a kind of side-note, Lavezzo mentions that the status of the boys in the Gregory story *as slaves*—which may have conjured the image, for the Anglo-Saxon audience, of the boys being sold into sexual bondage, perhaps even in Islam—might have "intensified the disturbing national ramifications of the abuse of oblates in monasteries," but that ultimately, "as enslaved boys, who never speak but are spoken for, the Anglo-Saxon youths constitute a 'blank slate' upon which Gregory may inscribe a chosen national identity for the English" (87). While Ælfric's version of the Gregory legend may reflect certain specific conditions of the time in which he wrote, for Lavezzo, the story "also reminds us of certain troubling aspects that nearly always seem to accompany homosexual nationalisms" (88). More precisely, the slave-boy myth is a masculinist version of history that "excludes woman and her reproductive power," while it also elides the historical boy as much as the historical woman. It performs, as it were, a kind of vanishing act and spectralization of real persons upon which the very modern project of nationhood has long depended.

Nathan Alan Breen's study, "The Voice of Evil: A Narratological Study of Demonic Characters in Old English Literature" (Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign [2003], *DAI* 64A: 2879), focuses on seven Old English narrative poems that feature the Devil or demons as speaking characters: *Genesis A*, *Genesis B*, *Elene*, *Juliana*, *Christ and Satan*, *Guthlac A*, and *Andreas*. It is Breen's chief concern to "show how narratology illuminates the representational strategies whereby Old English poets imagined demonic characters" (3). Breen's narratological approach "relies heavily on the ideas and terminology developed by Gerard



Genette and Mieke Bal, especially the former's work on narrators, time, and narration, and the latter's development of the concept of focalization" (5). According to Breen, whereas source studies and typological readings "have provided numerous and invaluable contributions to our understanding of Old English literature, Anglo-Saxon culture, and the historical tradition within which the extant texts function," neither of these approaches look closely at narrative structures; narratology, on the other hand, when taken in conjunction with work already done in source studies, philology, and typology, "can show how the construction of the text into a narrative is a cultural act that requires work on the part of author and audience" (13, 14). Regarding the specific Old English poems examined in his dissertation, Breen argues that "narratology uncovers the process of narrativizing different elements of Christian doctrine, and the way the act of narrating can develop Christian theology in a manner that is perhaps not envisioned by the theology itself" (14).

The tracing of the history of "the discursive construction of the alphabetic letter in English" is the subject of Edward J. Christie's dissertation, "*Quid est littera? The Materiality of the Letter and the Presence of the Past from Alcuin of York to the Electronic Beowulf*" (Ph. D. Diss., West Virginia Univ. [2003], DAI 65A: 1791). According to Christie, Anglo-Saxon *literati* perceived individual letters as being imbued, like numbers, with "essential existence," and from the sixth-century *enigmata* of Aldhelm to Ælfric's late tenth-century grammar book, the "power and importance of writing to changing Anglo-Saxon culture is ... expressed as a power resting in the letter, and suggests their consciousness of the letter as a technology of cultural memory" (1–2). The letter, then, was seen as a custodian of history itself. Looking especially at Old English representations of the letter in grammatical and literary texts, typography in the work of early modern Anglo-Saxonists, and typographical and photographic technologies used by twentieth-century editors of Old English texts, Christie's study argues that, "despite the technological and historical differences in these situations, they nonetheless reveal a strikingly parallel perception of the letter as technology that provides unmediated access to history." Christie sees his study as timely since "the recent glut of digital facsimiles and electronic editions forces us to consider the effect of new media on the textuality of manuscripts whose material presence is frequently considered essential to authoritative reading, and whose decorated pages appear to be signs of a sensibility in which an immersive sensory experience

of text undermines strict distinctions between text and image, orality and literacy" (6). In addition to a very brief Introduction, "The Materiality of the Letter," and a very brief Conclusion, the dissertation comprises five chapters: "Mystic Writing and the Science of the Letter," the fuller introduction to the book's subject matter and outlines; "The Materiality of the Sign: *Lāstas*, *Lāf*, and the 'Scene of Writing' in the Blickling Homilies and *Beowulf*," an examination of "the occurrence of footprints and tracking in Anglo-Saxon literature in light of Derrida's suggestion that the history of the road and the history of writing are joined" (44); "*Quid Est Littera? Elementum, Rūn, Custos Historiæ*," an analysis of "the construction of the letter within Anglo-Saxon grammatical culture as both 'elementum' and 'custodian of history'" (45); "Antiquarian Graphology: The Letter and 'History' at the Turn of the Seventeenth Century," a look at early modern typographical technology in which the Anglo-Saxon letter form "was depicted as a conduit through which English religious identity could be bound in continuity with a pure Anglo-Saxon past" (45); and, finally, "Icon, Archive, and the Fictions of [Hyper]factual Representation," where the *Electronic Beowulf* is seen as a new remediation of Anglo-Saxon writing that reifies past dilemmas over writing's "visibility" versus its "transparency."

Leslie Lockett's dissertation, "Corporeality in the Psychology of the Anglo-Saxons" (Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Notre Dame, DAI 65A: 2194), argues that the Anglo-Saxons "did not uniformly espouse the belief in an incorporeal mind. Alongside the 'expert theory' of the mind as a component of the incorporeal soul, there flourished a 'common-sense theory,' arising from the physiological sensations accompanying strong emotions, according to which the mind was literally part of the body." Further, Lockett wants to attempt to answer a question that other scholars have considered unanswerable: "Was the corporeal-mind idiom in Anglo-Saxon literature employed and received metaphorically or literally?" (7). She is also interested in recasting the literary question as one of intellectual history: "When did the Anglo-Saxon concept of the mind become more indebted to Augustine's expert theory of the incorporeal *anima* than to the common sense observation that one experiences the physiological accompaniments of psychological phenomena in the region of the heart and abdomen?" (8). Lockett's first two chapters, "Beyond Dualism: The Components of the Human Being in Old English Narrative" and "The Hydraulic Model of Mental Activity in Old English Narrative," provide an overview of the numerous representations

of the “corporeal-mind idiom” in Anglo-Saxon literature, focusing especially on OE narrative verse. In Chapter Three, “The Status of the Hydraulic Model in the Intellectual History of the Anglo-Saxons,” Lockett questions “whether it is appropriate to refer to the corporeal-mind idiom, including the hydraulic model of emotion perception, as a metaphor of any kind in a culture that does not consider the mind to be demonstrably and sharply separated from the body.” Her tentative conclusion is that “it is highly probable that the Anglo-Saxons or their forebears, like many other cultures not under the influence of Galen, Augustine, or Descartes, actually conceived of the mind according to some variant of the hydraulic model, and therefore the idiom based on the hydraulic model was not metaphorical” (10). Chapter Four, “The Psychological Inheritance of the Anglo-Saxons,” presents a discussion of “the psychological doctrines inherited by the Anglo-Saxons from classical and patristic traditions as well as from two non-native sources conceived expressly for the benefit of the early Anglo-Saxons, namely the *Libellus responsionum* ascribed to Pope Gregory the Great (590-604) and the biblical commentaries preserved in the form of notes taken during lectures given at the Canterbury school headed by Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury (668-690) and his colleague Hadrian” (11). Chapters Five and Six, “The Assimilation of the Native Anglo-Saxon Psychology into Latin: Aldhelm and the Anglo-Latin Grammars and Riddles” and “Interactions Between Common Sense and Expert Psychologies in Later Anglo-Saxon England,” present research that points to the conclusion that “for the majority of Anglo-Saxons, the shift from common sense to Augustinian psychology, and hence the metaphorization of the corporeal-mind idiom, did not occur until around the year 1000 at the earliest” (8). Given the recent “turn to the body” in critical theory, sociology, and cognitive philosophy, and the fact that the structures of cognition in Anglo-Saxon culture have been so little treated in the scholarly literature, I consider this an important dissertation that could be of great interest to those exploring mind-body questions in Anglo-Saxon culture, and I very much hope it will be published as a book.

In “Poetic Memory: History and Aesthetics in Early Medieval England” (Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Notre Dame, *DAI* 65A: 141), Renée Rebecca Trilling seeks to demonstrate “the centrality of poetic aesthetics to the construction of specific vernacular models of historical understanding in the early medieval period” (3). More specifically, certain vernacular heroic poems invite readers “to think about the past in very different ways

from the linear, teleological view of history that governs both Latin medieval historiography and modern scholarly modes of inquiry,” and by approaching these texts as works of art, “it is possible to see how the distinctive poetic techniques of Anglo-Saxon alliterative verse, such as accretion, parallelism, chiasmus, and repetition, produce a vision of history as a constellation of interrelated moments” and continually manipulate an “aesthetics of nostalgia to reshape the ever-changing face of English cultural identity” (3-4). A large impetus for Trilling’s study is her post-New Historicism desire to “reintroduce the notion of aesthetics as a pertinent category for understanding literary texts and their relationship to their environment, either material or intellectual,” and to re-historicize aesthetics, as it were (9). Chapter One, “Ruins in the Realms of Thought: Poetry and the Past in Germanic Tradition,” examines the formal aesthetic elements of the Old English poems *Widsith*, *Deor*, and *The Ruin*, in order to argue that, by organizing history “through the relation of individual events to the present moment,” these poems reveal that “the underlying philosophy of Anglo-Saxon vernacular historiography differs significantly from the Christian teleology of salvation history that characterizes mainstream medieval history-writing” (14). Chapter Two, “From Salvation to Nostalgia: Trends in Historiography During the Viking Conflict,” looks at the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the homilies of Wulfstan, and *The Battle of Maldon*, to show how the “structural differences” between what Trilling terms “heroic history—the outgrowth of Germanic oral tradition” and salvation history “give rise to vastly divergent representations of an especially turbulent and politically-charged period in early English history” (16). Chapter Three, “Transitional Poetics and Shifting Ideologies: Politics, Place, and Poetry in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,” is an attempt to demonstrate that, as the diverse manuscripts of the Chronicle “move away from the sphere of royal influence, the heroic history so clearly articulated in *The Battle of Maldon* emerges as an ideological product of West Saxon hegemony which is tempered, and often supplanted, by alternative forms of verse and philosophies of history arising from an ecclesiastical context” (17). Chapter Four, “Memorials and Melancholia: Nationalist History in Anglo-Norman England,” analyzes the “powerfully nostalgic role of heroic history in post-Conquest historiography,” especially in the alliterative verse of the late twelfth century, such as Layamon’s *Brut* (18-19). As the time has, indeed, arrived to re-evaluate the worth of formalist approaches to literature, especially in relation to the project of historicizing aesthetic practices, Trilling’s study is quite timely.

Robin Norris's "Deathbed Confessors: Mourning and Genre in Anglo-Saxon Hagiography" (Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Toronto [2003], *DAI* 64A: 3679), explores how Anglo-Saxon hagiographers "negotiate between didactic prohibitions of sorrow and the generic conventions which encourage the representation of mourning men." She further "examines cases where an author exploits these conventions to emphasize and thus defend his interpretation of a saint as a confessor" (iii). Her Introduction looks at discussions of mourning men in early medieval culture, and argues that "men did mourn, despite the heroic code, and despite Phillipe Ariès' conception of death as tame in the early Middle Ages." Chapter Two, "Unhappy Birthdays: The Sin of Sorrow in Anglo-Saxon Culture," compares Ælfric's binary between sinful *tristitia* and salutary compunction to Freud's work on mourning and melancholy, and concludes that ultimately Ælfric bows to the conventions of the *uita*, which "seem to require the confessor's human followers to mourn his passing" (52). Chapter Three, "Life After Death: St. Guthlac's Many Mourners," asserts that the Old English *Guthlac B* "was written as a companion-piece to *Guthlac A*" and because the *A*-poet portrays the saint as a martyr, "the *B*-poet redeems Guthlac's status as a confessor by intensifying his physical decline and Beccel's sorrowful reaction" (iii). Chapter Four, "*Vitas Matrum*: Euphrosyne and Mary of Egypt as Female Confessors," concentrates on female saints who offer consolation to mourning men. According to Norris, "the shocking paucity of female confessors in Anglo-Saxon England is an indication of the anxiety elicited by these women" (iv). In her Conclusion, Norris turns to the modern fields of thanatology and sociology in order to pose the question of "whether grief is a normal response to death or the normal response," (18) especially with respect to mourning males, whom Norris actually wishes to "reclaim" from their often obscured historical position. In this sense, Norris's dissertation is not only an important addition to the existing body of scholarship on Old English hagiography (of both the Ælfrician and anonymously-authored variety), but is also a deeply ethical project.

The ways in which the insular literatures of the later Middle Ages represented the Orient is the subject of Edward Vincent Moss's thesis, "The Poetics of Alterity: Representations of the Oriental in Insular and Related Literatures, 1066-1453" (Ph.D. Diss., The Queen's Univ. of Belfast, *DAI* 65C: 875). Moss's study "locates these depictions in relation to the official discourses produced to sustain what has been termed the Crusading Movement, and explores the extent to which such

material influenced insular ideology and schemae of literary representation" (vii). In his Introduction (Chapter One), Moss looks at Edwards Said's theories of Orientalism and Gayatri Spivak's understanding of postcolonialism in relation to modern medieval studies, and explores the idea of the Middle Ages, propounded by some scholars, as a "subjective, constructed product of western modernity" (30). He concludes this chapter by comparing the *Chronicle of the Morea*, Boccaccio's *Teseida*, and Chaucer's *Knight's Tale* "in order to demonstrate processes of cultural, narrative and contextual transfer" (vii). Chapter Two, "Colonialism and Insular Literatures," is the chapter that would be of primary interest to readers of this review, as it is concerned with "the impact of Norman colonialism on insular literary activity." More specifically, "[a]ccess to literacy, linguistic contest and the political implications of the *Domesday* survey are looked at in relation to the decline of literary Old English," and post-Conquest Old English is reviewed "for the evidence of dissent or criticism of colonial policy, as is the Anglo-Latin *Gesta Herewardi*." Finally, this chapter surveys "the arguments for continuity in English prose composition associated with the so-called 'alliterative revival' and examines the fourteenth-century Middle English alliterative poem *Saint Erkenwald* for evidence of sympathetic identification with pre-Conquest culture" (vii). Other chapters treat "the concept of an Official Discourse to describe material produced from positions of religious and political authority and disseminated throughout Europe by the mechanism of ecclesiastical infrastructure," "the attempts of [medieval] European intellectuals to engage with Islam ... as a polemical resource," and "the cultural significance of pilgrimage and Jerusalem in the medieval imagination" (vii, viii).

When asked by the editors of *Literature Compass* (Blackwell Publishers' online journal, <http://www.literature-compass.com>) to choose just one "must read" book for Anglo-Saxonists for 2004, I selected Andrew Scheil's *The Footsteps of Israel: Understanding Jews in Anglo-Saxon England* (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P). I must have been on to something since the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists later awarded it the "ISAS Biennial Publication Prize" for best first book about the languages, literatures, arts, history, or material culture of Anglo-Saxon England for 2003-04. Many Anglo-Saxonists will have read this book already by the time this review appears, but for those who haven't, I cannot recommend it highly enough. For a long time, there has been, I believe, a kind of unspoken (and sometimes overtly expressed) notion in our field that the subject of

anti-Semitism is somehow beside the point since there were, supposedly, no Jews living in England until after the Norman Conquest. As Scheil himself points out, although absent in a physical sense from Anglo-Saxon England, "Jews were nevertheless present as imaginative, textual constructs, manifest only in the distorted shadow cast by the Christian tradition" (3). The phrase in Scheil's title, "the footsteps of Israel," comes from Bede's exegesis of a scene in the gospel of John, where, after identifying the Jews as those who have "already lost the name of Israelites," he writes that although the English are descended from "other nations, nevertheless by the faith of truth and by purity of the body and mind, we follow in the footsteps of Israel" (quoted on p. 2). Scheil notes that, in Anglo-Saxon England, "a land without Jewish communities, 'following in the footsteps of Israel' encompasses a variety of Christian apprehensions of Judaism, ranging from vehement denunciation and rejection to subtle embrace." For the purposes of his study, the terms "Jews" and "Judaism" thus stand in for "a nexus of rhetorical effects, a variety of representational strategies built into the very structure of medieval Christianity" (3). In this sense, Scheil's book makes an excellent companion to Elaine Pagels' *The Origin of Satan* (New York, 1995), where Pagels argues that, throughout the centuries, "countless Christians listening to the gospels absorbed ... the association between the forces of evil and Jesus' Jewish enemies," while at the same time, Jesus and his followers likely saw their movement "as a conflict within one 'house' ... the house of Israel" (xx, 34). For Scheil, even as rhetorical "strategy," the figure of the Jew in Anglo-Saxon England was a complex and not a stable one:

Jews were a meditative vehicle for exegesis; an *exemplum* of the direction of God's shaping hand throughout history; a record of the divine patterns of the historical imagination; a subject for epic and elegy; an outlet for anger and rage; a dark, fearful image of the body; a useful political tool—all in all, a variform way of fashioning a Christian *populus* in England and continually redefining its nature. In Anglo-Saxon England, Jews and Judaism signify not image, but process; not a stable concept, but a complex negotiation. (3)

Scheil's book is ethically important, for the dark energies first worked out in words and symbols have a way of ultimately inflicting themselves upon real human bodies, although, somewhat amazingly, Scheil also sets the improbable task for himself (and us) to "search out,

touch, and apprehend the humanity" revealed in the "often painful words from pre-Conquest England" (5). Because there are so few studies of medieval attitudes toward Jews in pre-Conquest England, Scheil's book, as he himself puts it, "outlines an important 'pre-history' and context to later persecutions in England," but he also argues that his book "moves beyond a *summa* of anti-Judaic discourse to a more nuanced understanding of the role Jews and Judaism play in the construction of social identity and the shaping of the literary imagination in Anglo-Saxon England" (9). Part One, "Bede, the Jews, and the Exegetical Imagination," details Bede's use of the Jews "as a complex, mobile signifier in various exegetical situations" (18), and also explores his "competing and often contradictory interpretations of the Jews ... from frustrated anger, to measured scholarly observation, to pity." Ultimately, for Bede, the Jews provide a "flexible hermeneutic" that also serves as "a strategy for social self-definition" (29). Part Two, "The *Populus Israhel*—Metaphor, Image, Exemplum," surveys the tradition in Anglo-Saxon letters of the *populus Israhel* as a complex set of representational strategies, as well as its sources in late antique authors such as Eusebius, Rufinus, Salvian, Prudentius, Orosius, Paulinus of Nola, and Gildas. Anglo-Saxon authors and texts treated in these chapters include Bede, Alcuin, *Genesis A*, *Exodus*, *Daniel*, and *Judith*. The *populus Israhel*, according to Scheil, was a "complex metaphor and political ideology" that embraced "both a figural understanding of past and present and a traditional metaphor for the vagaries of history," in which the Jews "were once the chosen people, but now the Anglo-Saxons represent a new covenant with God" (19). Part Three, "Jews, Fury, and the Body," examines the connections between the motifs of Jew, madness, flesh, and hunger, primarily in the Blickling and Vercelli homilies, and also poses the question of how the concentration of negative energies on Jewish bodies in these texts also served as an exploration of the boundaries of the human. In these manuscripts, the figures of Jewish bodies represented "an opportunity to express traditional ethnocentric anger," while also serving "as a repository of cultural anxiety over the body." Moreover, the "virulent expressions of antisemitism in the later Middle Ages can be seen as the manifestation of the fragmentary tendencies, the hermeneutic *in potentia*, represented by the Jews of Vercelli and Blickling" (203). Part Four, "Ælfric, Anti-Judaism and the Tenth Century," examines the representation of the Jews in the context of the Benedictine reform, with particular attention to Ælfric's homilies. Scheil argues that during "this time of political upheaval and the tightening of orthodox doctrine promoted by Ælfric's



generation of ecclesiastical reformers, the Jews became not only a surpassed people supplanted by the 'New Israel' and a dark repository of Christian anxieties, but also a rhetorical cipher, a political tool used to promote the visions of the Benedictine reform" (20). Scheil concludes his book with a meditation on the "tormented longing" at the heart of the Jew-Christian opposition, the limits of figural discourse and typological understanding, and "the paradox of Christian love and hate" as a kind of "inevitable consequence of human understanding" (340). A beautiful, brilliant, important book.

There are many points of convergence between Scheil's book and Janet Thormann's essay, "The Jewish Other in Old English Narrative Poetry" (*Partial Answers: Jnl of Literature and the History of Ideas* 2: 1-19), though the two works seem ultimately independent of one another. Thormann's essay begins with the assertion that medieval Christianity "shaped and interpreted Jewish belief and Jewish history, as well as its understanding of living Jews, according to the pressures and demands of constructing its own theological and ideological systems" (1). Judaism was not only integral to Christian thinking, but also to identity formation. Further, "medieval Christianity understood Jews and Judaism as and through textual productions, and, reciprocally, those productions were forms of cultural appropriation of Jewish texts" (2). Thormann's primary contention is that "representations of Jews and Judaism in Old English narrative poetry promoted the formation of an Anglo-Saxon national cultural identity" that was tied to the expansion of West Saxon power and the consolidation of an English national rule and culture from the late ninth through early eleventh centuries (2-3). According to Thormann, it is from the perspective of contemporary theory, especially postcolonial studies, that "it is possible to understand the relation of Anglo-Saxon culture to Old Testament texts and to Judaism as an expression of cultural power: Judaism offered a primary symbolic system that could be appropriated, adapted, explained, interpreted, judged, and repressed as an Other that facilitated the definition of Anglo-Saxon culture" (3). Because, following the thought of Homi Bhabha, there is always some kind of residue that "escapes from the total absorption of the host culture by the new power," Judaism therefore "haunts" certain Anglo-Saxon narrative poems "as a resistance to or a disruption of hegemony ... or as a ground that escapes complete reconfiguration" (4). Thormann's analysis concentrates specifically on scenes of the "Jewish Other" reading in the OE poetic narratives *Daniel*, *Elene*, and *Judith*. In *Daniel*, Thormann sees a representation of biblical

Jews as models for Anglo-Saxon Christians to imitate. In this poem, as Thormann notes, Daniel is described as wise and articulate, and as a skilled reader who interprets Nebuchadnezzar's dreams. Daniel's "reading" of these dreams, moreover, "casts Judaism as belonging to a past that is superseded by what follows: as the kingdoms of the world follow one another in the poem, so Judaism has been succeeded by Christian hegemony." Further, "Judaism in *Daniel* is compatible and continuous with Christian belief and indeed predictive of it" (8). In *Elene*, by contrast, the Jews "are associated with the devil and described as malicious," and "the poem dramatizes through the words of the Jews themselves that Judaism is an obstinate commitment to error" (9, 10). *Elene* is the reader here who, through her exegesis of the Old Testament, which in Thormann's view is an act of "interpretive violence," shows that "Jews are bad readers of their own scripture," and the result of her reading is "the eradication of a culture" (10). In *Judith*, the narrative "demonstrates the right use of language as it aligns speaking and seeing in a method of reading governed by a symbolic order under the rule of God" (13). Thormann points out the various ways in which Holofernes and his Assyrians are characterized as "being outside of language," whereas Judith is a "speaking subject," whose "cut into Holoferne's body provides a reading lesson that teaches the Assyrians right understanding" (14, 15). Indeed, Holoferne's "truncated corpse is said to produce meaning, 'getacnod,'" and Judith's action "has made the body a signifier revealing that time is governed by a logic, that the future results from law governing the present" (14). Ultimately, when Jews "read signs or marks on bodies or when they misread their own texts, they always perform as members of a textual community whose representations are figures for the Anglo-Saxon audiences that are reading them," and the Jewish Others in these texts "map out positions of identification for their audiences, whether through mimetic identification or rejection or expulsion," all of which assists in the motivations of the Anglo-Saxon textual community "engaged in the project of furthering a national cultural identity" (15-16).

EAJ

Renate Bauer in *Adversus Judaeos: Juden und Judentum im Spiegel alt- und mittelenglischer Texte* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang) adds to the recently-growing literature on Jews in the Middle Ages. She interleaves her study of Old and Middle English texts and, after an introduction to the issues and an extensive survey of Jews in Middle English society, considers a series of textual

roles played by Jews and Judaism. The roles include the blind and stubborn Jew, for which she considers in some detail Judas Iscariot in *Elene* and briefly discusses *Juliana*; the Jew as a symbol for false morality, which begins with consideration of the sinful body in *Vercelli VII*; the Jew as an enemy to the religious authority of Christendom, which starts with Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* II.13 (Dominica V in Quadragesima), though Bauer does not provide the full reference, just the quotation which refers to Christ's slayer as *manslaga*; and, last, the idea of Judaism as outdated or outmoded, fundamental to Christianity's self-justification, which Bauer uses to discuss typologies of Christianity and Judaism in the Middle English *Siege of Jerusalem*, in biblical translations and their paratexts such as Ælfric's *On the Old and New Testaments*, in *Andreas*, and especially in *Exodus* and *Daniel*. The last chapter provides the most interesting analysis of Jews and Judaism in OE texts; elsewhere the references to OE tend simply to place the Middle English material in its historical context.

L.A. Hay considers the measure demonstrated by the hero and the individual in social context, and especially the place of measure as a heroic virtue, which is thereby a social virtue, in "Measure as a Homeric virtue in early medieval English literature, to c. 1200" (Ph.D. London: King's College, 2002). Hay examines a wide range of texts from *Beowulf* and homiletic writings to historical and fictional texts in the twelfth century and the beginning of the thirteenth. The principal concern of the thesis is the cultural ramifications of the literary use of measure. Scott Bruce Lowry's thesis "Ritual and politics: Power negotiations at Anglo-Saxon feasts" (U of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2003) engages with the four feast scenes in *Beowulf*, using a social anthropological approach to analyse the three ritual activities that occur at each: presenting drinks, giving gifts, and making speeches. The upper ranks of the social and political and military hierarchy act in these rituals, which honor individuals but more significantly embed a sense of comradeship, loyalty and honor in the peoples of the Germanic kingdoms. At the same time, the individuals in the poem compete through their manipulation of these rituals for position and advantage. Lowry concludes interestingly that individuals in the poem behave with more propriety than corresponding individuals in the chronicles and histories which survive from the Anglo-Saxon period.

An interesting collection but not easy to find is Martin McNamara, ed. *Apocalyptic and Eschatological Heritage: The Middle East and Celtic Realms* (Dublin:

Four Courts Press), with articles on the apocalypses of John and Paul, these texts in Irish literature, and visions of the other world in Welsh, Breton, and Irish. John Carey offers "The seven heavens and the twelve dragons in Insular Apocalyptic," 121–36. He traces the details of the seven heavens and twelve dragons in "The Vision of Adomnán" the "Na Seacht Neamha," and the third recension of *In Tenga Bithnua*, comparing textual details of the relevant manuscripts in order to establish a stemma for the originary "Insular Seven Heavens Apocalypse" as previously studied by Jane Stevenson and Richard Bauckham. Carey focuses on details in Bauckham's commentary to develop a more subtle view of the manuscript relationships, rather than simply prioritizing the oldest fragment. He concludes agreeing with Stevenson that an Egyptian Gnostic source is the origin of this material, but disagrees with her specific proposal for the Nag Hammadi *Apocalypse of Paul*, proposing instead the *Pistis Sophia*, and comparing the *Two Books of Jeu* and Origen's account of the beliefs of one Gnostic sect in his *Contra Celsum*. The details of the dragons are particularly important, and depend partly on the indigenous traditions of Egypt as in the *Book of the Dead*.

Oral approaches to medieval literature suffered a thin year after the riches of the previous year, with only Mark C. Amodio, *Writing the Oral Tradition: Oral Poetics and Literature Culture in Medieval England* (Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P) producing a major work. Amodio refers to a wide range of OE texts and ideas throughout his book, but chapter two is most explicitly concerned with Anglo-Saxon materials. The term "oral poetics" is a particularly good one, defined by Amodio as "a powerful, supple, and highly associative expressive economy" (xvi). In the opening chapter Amodio elegantly and carefully picks his way through the real differences between oral and literate cultures and their production and reception of art, acknowledges the difficult irony that oral medieval culture survives only in silent, written records, considers the diglossic character of the medieval world (using Bede, Aldhelm, and the Eadwine Psalter as examples), and discusses Anglo-Saxon textual culture. The chapter concludes with an argument for three models of poetic composition in Anglo-Saxon England: oral composition (with only one example, Bede's description of Cædmon, and Amodio casts doubt on the story); the literate author dictating works to one or more scribes (proposed by John D. Niles for both Cædmon and *Beowulf*), and the "literate poet who engages the specialized expressive economy of the oral tradition (consciously or unconsciously)"

(27). This individual is Amodio's particular concern. The second chapter of the book directly addresses these models in Anglo-Saxon England, beginning with the remarkably uniform poetics of OE verse, and its stability in copies of *Cædmon's Hymn* and *Dream of the Rood* and generally in the uniformity of copying conventions for verse in OE manuscripts. Amodio comments on the traditionally adduced link between performance and composition, but notes that all of the poems and descriptions of poetic composition usually cited "invoke a temporally removed and hence romanticized and idealized performative matrix that may not represent contemporary praxis" (42). Thus, he recasts our thinking about oral and literate approaches, tradition and individuality. Two preliminary examples are the role of the *comitatus* and the motif of the beasts of battle, neither of which reflect contemporary cultural praxis. He then uses the *Death of Edgar* to demonstrate the intertextuality and the identifiable consciousness with which OE poets engaged in the process of producing poetry. As a result, Amodio focuses on how the traditional oral register works with two extended examples: *belgan* (-*mod*), and its traditional context of imminent slaughter as relevant to the battle between Beowulf and Grendel, and in *Andreas*; and the very traditional nature of the story-line in the battle between Beowulf and the dragon, both at the level of macrostructure, which is not securely contextualized for the audience as feud or anything else, and at the level of microstructure, with the unknown and unknowable dragon and the sudden reality of Beowulf's doom. The next chapter, turning to the post-Conquest and especially to *Brut*, includes many references back to Anglo-Saxon oral poetics in order to demonstrate the reshaping that was in the process of taking place. Amodio's argument in the book is subtle and intriguing, filled with learning lightly worn.

Another book that encourages us to reconsider received truths is Maidie Hilmo, *Medieval Images, Icons, and Illustrated English Literary Texts: From the Ruthwell Cross to the Ellesmere Chaucer* (Aldershot: Ashgate). Hilmo argues that illustrations to medieval texts do not simply provide visual renditions but rather "guide the reading process" (xv). Her introductory chapter argues that many scholars have considered medieval manuscript illustrations to poetic texts only for their "fidelity" or their artistic quality; reviewing the issues surrounding the iconoclastic controversies of the early Church, Hilmo notes the uneasy relationship between text and image in the Middle Ages, and especially that throughout medieval England this uneasy relationship reflected an understanding of the iconoclastic debates.

In chapter 2, which addresses the Ruthwell Cross, Hilmo investigates in particular the commentary and ideas surrounding Psalm 90 and the illustration on the Cross of Christ treading on the beasts. On the opposite side of the cross, Mary Magdalene anoints Christ's feet, wrapping them in her hands and hair, and the panels on that side emphasize Christ's divine nature and accomplishment. Hilmo addresses the mistaken ideas of Saxl and Schapiro by arguing that the program of the cross represents Christ's victory over the beasts, who stand for the devil and by proposing that this militant program has its origin in a small initial in the Cathach of Columba. She concludes that the cross demonstrates both the suffering and the triumph of Christ, emphasizing his divine aspect. In the third chapter Hilmo moves on to adduce several examples of images for meditation from later Anglo-Saxon England, illustrations for an incarnational theology: the Caedmon manuscript with its extensive program of visual narrative; the program of translation of King Alfred and the Alfred Jewel, which Hilmo interprets as identifying the king both with Wisdom and with Christ; the well-known miniature with Dunstan's self-portrait which Hilmo links with similar kneeling figures in the margin beside the opening of Psalm 24 in the Bury St. Edmunds Psalter and in the St. Bertin Psalter; and the *Liber Vitae* portrait of Cnut which allies him with insular models of authority. Hilmo analyzes the Caedmon manuscript in detail as a text which opens through an archway, opening up the secrets of the scriptures for its Christian audience. She argues that the arches and architectural images in the manuscript "lead into or out of celestial, paradisaical, and infernal spaces, a reminder also to the viewer to see beyond the literal and to explore the meaning of the words of the poem to bring about inner transformation" (81–2). Though she does not argue it or refer to the relevant literature, Hilmo clearly sees the act of addressing the manuscript and its poems as a conversion experience, an opportunity for the devout Christian to rethink and reconsider the meaning of the scriptures. Hilmo provides many examples of her argument with respect to the manuscript. A particular strength of her approach is her knowledge both of patristic commentary and of Anglo-Saxon history, which give real depth and scholarly weight to the arguments she makes. Thus the creation account with its emphasis on commanding and naming is aided by Bede's commentary on John 2:1–22 and by arguments made in Ælfric's treatise "On the Old and New Testament." Even Noah's ark is a "meditative gathering site" (92). In the remaining chapters Hilmo turns to the revival of the vernacular as exemplified in the Caligula, Auchinleck and Vernon manuscripts,

to the *Pearl*-manuscript, and to the Ellesmere manuscript of Chaucer. The book is illustrated by a genuinely stunning array of black and white plates, which would themselves almost be worth the price of admission.

The last work in this section is also the most difficult to address: Rochelle Altman's *Absent Voices: The Story of Writing Systems in the West* (New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press). The author herself indicates that this is not the first attempt at the subject; the project dates back fourteen years, but the research for it took forty-nine years, first of praxis as a calligrapher and producer of fine script, and later of research into the field. As a result, the argument, which some devotees of Ansaxnet will recall hearing over the years, is presented somewhat allegorically in two main sections: "Words," and "More Than Words." Altman argues "oral writing systems" are "complex unities" (1), and presents a psychological history of writing, starting from the caves of Altamira and analyzing the shape and structure of writing systems including the Sumerians, Phoenicians, and then Mediterranean systems. She concludes that the Phoenician writing system was adapted by all later cultures in two primary streams, the North-African Semitic and Greco-Roman, and distinguishes the manuscript shapes, layouts, and scripts used by each. The second section "More Than Words" begins with the British Isles, and from here on the principal focus of Altman's analysis is Anglo-Saxon scripts. Altman tends to write declarative sentences in short paragraphs which take the argument for granted; she describes writing systems in early Anglo-Saxon England and then chooses the word *stæfwrítung* as the term for what she calls the Anglo-Saxon Phonetic-Based Comprehensive Writing System, which is "a simple, comprehensive, language-independent, and systematic phonetic-based writing system" (87). Altman argues that parsing rhythms and speech rhythms are represented on the page in terms of quality, quantity, and volume, and that there is a frame box for each letter; the development of *stæfwrítung* can be discerned in development through early Anglo-Saxon England and flowering in the later period. This development appears first in Irish manuscripts, specifically in the Cathach of St. Columba, fully encoded in the North African-Semitic tradition; then in the Bangor Antiphonary and the scripts of Willibrord including the Willibrord Calendar; then in Alfred's introductory letter to the *Pastoral Care*, whose work she uses to determine the Anglo-Saxon phonetic alphabet (which is described in detail, including the derivation of each of the symbol forms—along the way, Altman argues for a gendered distinction between the mundane and the

transcendent). The Épinal Glossary is next (Altman notes there is no distinction in the script between Latin and OE); then the Moore Bede, a dictated manuscript, perhaps by Bede himself (including the Northumbrian Hymn); then the Leningrad Bede, written in six "different secular more or less Anglo-Saxon minuscules, which seems to point to one of the coastal *scriptoria*" (143). Next Altman considers the psalms and neo-Platonism, and explains the color-coding of the Psalm tone, an integral part of the *stæfwrítung* musical notation system. The OE psalters are, she argues, "an odd group under the best of circumstances" (159); Altman focuses on the Paris Psalter, which she claims is a Precentor's Psalter, a guide to singing intended for one to three singers. The prose psalms of King Alfred in the first part of the manuscript are reworkings of the poetic version, which "peeks out from between the 'prose,' connotative expansions" (164). Altman analyzes Psalm 23 (22) in detail, decoding its musical representation, before turning to Psalms 96 (95) and 29 (28). Altman concludes that the Paris Psalter and the manuscripts of Saint Gall demonstrate a radically different writing system from the one that Alcuin and also Alfred imposed, a musical notation system that was destroyed only very slowly in England. She argues that the "Winners" have rewritten history to obscure this fact. Alfred's desire to standardize language and writing through his chancery resulted in manuscripts such as the Parker Chronicle. Altman analyzes the writing, scribes, and scripts of this manuscript at some length, commenting on the constantly-changing set of symbols, and again analyzing in detail the symbol set of the Anglo-Saxon phonetic alphabet as it changed between Alfred and Ælfric. She identifies, and gives names to, the members of Alfred's chancery, and analyzes their writing habits in detail (including especially their use of *k*-graphs). Altman then turns to the Nowell Codex, arguing that the manuscript size makes it clear that its contents were classified as recreational rather than serious reading. She then analyzes the work of the two scribes, and considers the way in which the manuscript contents were estimated and structured for length, the effect of the presence or absence of the correct pens, and the ways in which the scribes created their graphs. In a final chapter Altman discusses Alfred's attempts to renovate and fix the authority of a revised *stæfwrítung*, and the parallels to Carolingian approaches. Finally, she considers the other poetic manuscripts, describing the script of the Caedmon manuscript as "a carefully designed formal bookhand to be used for the vernacular" (249) modeled on Alfred's chancery hands, and considering the Exeter Book as the work of a professional who



blended Alfred's scripts with a formal Biblical script. She briefly notes some other manuscripts before discussing some post-Conquest survivals (including the fully-encoded Eadwine Psalter) of the *stæfwritung* system. Perhaps because of her background as an artisan, Altman is particularly strong on the details of formation of a script's letter forms, but Altman's manuscript analyses are occasionally difficult to distinguish, often addresses simultaneously the history of scripts, the history of palaeography, kinds of texts and genres, texts from many ages, and philosophical issues of various kinds.

MJT

*Sources, Analogues, Parallels, Influences*

Joseph Harris's "Myth and Literary History: Two Germanic Examples" (*Oral Tradition* 19: 3-19) was the Albert Lord and Milman Parry Lecture for 2003. In his lecture he wants to "try to investigate where, if anywhere, myth fits into literary history," and how literary history, moreover, *constructs* the categories "myth" and "literature" (4). Harris offers two "myth complexes" as models to think with: the Masterbuilder tale and the Langobardic legend of "Lamicho the Barker." In the generalized version of the Masterbuilder tale, which has many variations, "a supernatural being enters into a contract with a building-sponsor to complete a construction task within a short time in return for a ruinously precious reward; when the work is almost finished, the supernatural is cheated of his reward" (6). Harris looks at Snorri Sturlson's thirteenth-century treatment of this tale complex in the *Poetic Edda* (the building of Asgard) in order to pose the questions:

Snorri knew at least one oral version of the tale, but was the tale as he knew it from oral tradition in the thirteenth century a "myth" or a "legend"? If it was a genuine myth, how are we to understand that the same narrative is spread all over Europe as a legend? How did the heathen sacred narrative manage to persist orally in Christian Iceland over two hundred years after the conversion; why is there no other trace of the myth in all the numerous remnants of Norse mythology; and why, in that mythology, is there no other case of a myth that so closely coincides with a complete secular folktale? (6-7)

Harris tries to settle the question of Snorri's tale's vexed relationship to its supposed source, the eddic

poem *Völuspá*, with reference to a more modern variant of the legend, which appears in the folklore collection of Jón Árnason, and which Harris sees as "a second early Icelandic outlier of the Masterbuilder complex" (8). Harris's second tale complex, the Langobardic "Lamicho the Barker," preserved in Paulus Diaconus's eighth-century *Historia Langobardorum*, concerns an infant exposed to the elements who later becomes a warrior and king, and Harris's chief interest here has to do with Lamicho's dog-like qualities, and how those qualities connect him to the hound symbolism of Langobardic and other Germanic legends. Harris next compares the Paulus story to an Indo-European Hittite legend, from about 1600 BCE, about a Queen Kanis who disposed of thirty sons with animal affinities in a river, and how those sons eventually returned. This tale also has roots in even earlier Greek and Rig-Vedic stories, as well as in Indic ritual. The provisional point that Harris wants to make about the Langobardic story of Lamicho is that the earlier exposed-animal-baby stories (and possibly rituals as well) ultimately coalesce, through various inter-tribal contacts, into a myth "thoroughly embedded in the old hound symbolism of the tribe, a symbolism that survived into late medieval folklore attached to certain noble families of central and southern Germany and in Lombardy" (13). From Harris's overview of the scholarship on the two tale complexes, it might seem at first that what appears as myth in Snorri's Masterbuilder tale (the building of Asgard) is really literature based on a legend instead, and in the Lamicho story, what was once thought to be the earliest appearance of a family-origin legend, can now be regarded as a myth "if restored to its proper pre-Christian milieu" (13). But is Lamicho's story *really*, in its origins, a true myth? How would we know? This is the question Harris really wants us to consider, as well as how the genres of myth, legend, and folktale can never really be fully separated by formal categories. Myth, in a sense, defies formalism, and thereby, also defies the very literary history that seeks to construct it as a genre. What Harris would like to see is "an understanding of the relationship of 'myth' to 'myths,'" in which we could understand "myths" as "the narrative way that 'myth' is usually communicated, especially in premodern cultural settings" (14-15). Ultimately, literary history will always have difficulty accommodating myth, because "[t]o deal only in 'myths,' sacred stories, their form, intertextuality, and diachronic development, would be to treat the material as literature and not fully as itself" (15).

According to R.M. Liuzza's "What the Thunder Said: Anglo-Saxon Brontologies and the Problem of Sources"

(*RES* n.s. 55: 1–23), “[o]ne of the most venerable as well as the most vexing of critical activities in Anglo-Saxon studies is the finding and analysis of sources.” Liuzza’s article considers source study “in its genealogical aspect—as a practice of placing texts in a vertical relationship of source and target—and suggests that this model, though often fruitful, may not always reflect the full range of possible relationships between Latin and vernacular texts in Anglo-Saxon England” (1). In order to demonstrate this, Liuzza looks to one particular set of texts—Anglo-Saxon prognostics for thunder—as a means for discussing some of the problems inherent in sorting out similarities and differences between texts, “while at the same time using them for a paradigm for how other theoretical approaches to the source-target relationship, such as orality and discourse theory, can help illuminate the historical origins of such texts but also their use in a monastic context” (1). According to Liuzza, source study and textual criticism “are affected by the same problems, which arise mostly from our own ignorance. The truth is that we do not know enough about how Anglo-Saxons translated, how they experienced and crossed the boundary between languages. Nor do we know enough about how they read and copied their books” (3). Liuzza views the Anglo-Saxon prognostic texts as an interesting basis for a case study, because they “exist somewhere in a scholarly no-man’s land between English and Latin, folklore and science, medicine and monastic computus, classical learning and vernacular tradition” (4). Further, “Latin and English texts of the prognostics do not exist in vertical or hierarchical relationship to the material context of their manuscripts, where texts in both languages often appear side by side, and they cannot always be made to do so in the schematic study of their sources” (6). In order to highlight more closely how the prognostic literature of Anglo-Saxon England lacks a “clear textual history” and thereby compounds our difficulties in discussing its supposed sources, Liuzza turns to texts on brontology, or the prognostics of thunder, “a small but diverse corpus of texts found in a few Anglo-Saxon manuscripts” (6). Through various comparisons of brontological texts written in Latin and Old English, ranging over more than several manuscripts, Liuzza shows how nearly impossible it is to differentiate between supposed “sources” and “targets,” or between “exemplars” and “variant copies,” or even to delineate “vertical” or “collateral” or more broadly “analogous” relationships between the different texts. As Liuzza himself puts it, “The absence of clear antecedent texts, along with the existence of numerous parallel and variant texts from later periods and other places, makes it impossible to

reconstruct clear genealogies for any individual text” (20). Further, “[p]erceiving difference and using it to analyse relationships depends on the differences having a sort of stability; such stability is lacking or inadequate in these texts” (21). Liuzza offers that one way of describing the relationships between these disparate texts “is to say that they seem to inhabit another border, on the margins of textual culture,” because “the textual relations between analogous works are curiously similar to the hallmarks of the written reflexes of an oral tradition like certain Middle English romances, transmitted in memory and performance, relying on mnemonic structures and variation within a pattern” (21). “It may be,” Liuzza continues, “that these works existed primarily as collections of common ideas, loosely organized according to various principles, brief enough to be memorized and improvised according to need. Their texts are fluid because they were utilitarian and non-canonical; their value was in their information, not the pattern of words in which this information was contained and conveyed.” Finally, “[m]nemonic transmission, and an interest in information content rather than textual form, erases the trail that might connect source and target, exemplar and copy: such texts fly below our critical radar” (22). Ultimately, what may be of greatest interest is not where particular texts *came from*, but how they circulated in daily use and also underwent various transformations—textual, oral, and otherwise—through their socially habituated uses. It strikes this reviewer that, in addition to orality and reception theory, meme theory could also apply here. Granted, it’s a theory mainly rooted in biology and cognitive philosophy, but can be easily applied to the transmission of culture, for the evolution of anything—whether a human body, brain, or a brontology—depends upon memes: according to Daniel Dennett, the smallest, identifiable “units” (or ideas) of cultural transmission that “replicate themselves with reliability and fecundity,” through variation, heredity or replication, and differential fitness (how well the unit can copy itself in a given environment)” (*Consciousness Explained* [Boston, 1991], 200–10). Texts, of any sort, are only one product of a meme machine, which will replicate itself by any means possible. In this sense, Liuzza’s essay is dead-on in its assertion that the brontologies’ “information content, and the structural matrix into which information could be placed, exist as it were apart from the written texts in which they were preserved” (22).

Richard Dance’s essay, “North Sea Currents: Old English-Old Norse Relations, Literary and Linguistic” (*Literature Compass* [December 2004]: n.p. [online]), is

essentially a review of recent scholarship on the connections between Old Norse and Old English, “especially the possible influences of the one on the other, in literary as well as linguistic terms.” He begins with a survey of the different approaches that have shaped the identification and interpretation of analogues in the two literary traditions, and he concludes that these differences in approach are based on either: 1) “the conventional belief that most similarities can be ascribed to a shared inheritance from a common Germanic stock”; 2) the counter-argument that the similarities may indicate “traces of more contemporary influence, especially of Norse on English literary tastes”; or, 3) a belief that similarities in the two traditions belie a much more broadly delineated cross-cultural “context of composition in Viking Age England.” Dance continues with a briefer survey of work in Norse-English comparative linguistics, where he notes that, while the methodologies have become increasingly theoretically sophisticated, “much remains to be done by way of detailed, textually-focused investigation of the [Norse-derived] words themselves, especially when it comes to the Middle English record.” An excellent bibliography of more recent scholarship on Old Norse-Old English literary and linguistic relations is also included.

EAJ

“Anselm and the *Articella*” by Giles E.M. Gasper and Faith Wallis (*Traditio* 59: 129–74) is an important article. Shortly after his installation as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1070, Lanfranc summoned to his aid various monks he had known in earlier posts, including Maurice of Bec. Our knowledge of Maurice and his intellectual pursuits comes from the letters to him by Anselm, still at this point prior at Bec, though in 1093 he would become archbishop of Canterbury. Gasper and Wallis study Maurice, Bec, and in particular the requests for copies of books that went back and forth between them. Anselm provided works by Jerome and Augustine to Canterbury; he asked for other texts, including Hippocrates’s *Aphorismi* and a short work entitled *De pulsibus*. Maurice got bogged down in the copying, possibly because of the Greek terms (or so Anselm supposed in his follow-up letter), especially in what was a commentary on Hippocrates’s work which Anselm also wanted. Since it seems all these texts were in the same manuscript, the authors suggest the manuscript was an *Ars medica* or *Articella*, perhaps a copy before the twelfth century, the date of the earliest known manuscripts of this medical anthology compiled in southern Italy and probably associated with Monte Cassino. Gasper and

Wallis propose a new conceptualization of the early history of the *Articella*, including Anselm’s involvement, and argue that what he wanted was a copy of the new translation of the *Aphorismi*, the *Articella* version made anew from the Greek but with the older Ravenna translation at hand. They consider the relatively stable text-clusters by which medical texts circulated in the early medieval period; they propose that Alfano, archbishop of Salerno from 1058 to 1085 (and poet and doctor) was the key figure in the retranslation of the *Aphorismi*. They argue that a proto-*Articella*, a diagnostic-prognostic anthology, was in place before Constantine was working on his translation of the *Isagoge*, the last element of the *Articella*. Finally, they examine the paths by which medical learning could be transmitted from Italy to England in the late eleventh century and assess Anselm’s knowledge of the *Articella* (hitherto dated to the twelfth century). The article makes many new and important claims, both about the development of medical texts and about the new medicine with its theological and theoretical connotations.

Barbara Raw finds the continental liturgical source in three sacramentaries for part of one of the prayers in the Book of Nunnaminster in “A New Parallel to the Prayer ‘*De tenebris*’ in the Book of Nunnaminster (British Library, Marl. MS. 2976, f. 28rv *Electronic British Library Jnl* (2005 for 2004): 1–9. The article includes color illustrations of the recto and verso of the relevant manuscript page. She briefly considers previous scholarship on the uncertain relationship between the Book of Nunnaminster, the Royal Prayerbook, and the Book of Cerne; provides the text and translation of the *De tenebris* prayer; compares its phrases to those in the other Nunnaminster prayers and the prayers in the other two manuscripts; notes not for the first time the similarities of the first part of the prayer to the Royal prayer *O unigenitus*, to the *Dream of the Rood* lines 52–6 and to the antiphon sung during Good Friday adoration of the cross in the *Regularis Concordia*, and then turns to her real focus, the source for the second part of the *De tenebris* prayer. Here she adduces three Frankish sacramentaries of the late eighth or early ninth century: the Sacramentary of Gellone where the text is the *Contestatio* or Preface for the reconciliation of penitents *ad mortem* on Maundy Thursday; the Sacramentary of Angoulême, where on the same day it is the preface for the reconciliation of penitents but not *ad mortem*; and the Bobbio Missal, in which, also on Maundy Thursday, it is the *Contestatio* for the ordinary *Missa in Cena Domini*. The parallels are very convincing. Raw closes the article with other examples of liturgical borrowing

in the Nunnaminster manuscript, and a plea for further work on the relation between the Nunnaminster and the Royal manuscripts.

Sources, of course, also run in the other direction, so that Anglo-Saxon outreach initiatives could mean that other literatures might take their cues from OE texts. Christopher Abram's "Anglo-Saxon Influence in the Old Norwegian Homily Book" (*Mediaeval Scandinavia* 14: 1–35) reviews scholarship on Scandinavian homily collections, including the influence of the Saint-Père homiliary and its English provenances, and the *Hauksbók* and its two instances of transmission from OE sources. He then turns to the Norwegian Homily Book and investigates its parallels with OE homilies rather than Latin, beginning with a rare (nowadays) set of references to Napier XXIX, a Wulfstan homily. He adduces parallels between the lists of sins, the need to guard against pride, and catechetical exhortations (in Bethurum VIIA and Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* XIII). In particular, *The Prayer of Moses* in LS XIII is to date the only source for a similar section in the Norwegian Homily Book 36. Following Joan Turville-Petre, he also discusses concerns about misbehavior in church, and a catalogue of proper behavior, elucidating OE sources for all these features in the Norwegian Homily Book. Having analyzed in some detail the first Norwegian *Sermo ad populum* for its OE influences, Abram then considers the Worcester milieu through which, he believes, these texts were made available to the Norse. His second homily for detailed analysis depends on OE apocryphal traditions; a homily for Christmas Day (NHB 31), it has parallels to English and Irish sources for its descriptions of heaven and hell, the "joys of heaven" motif, the "negative specification of heaven" topos, the extraordinary heat of the fire in hell, and especially the "men with tongues of iron" motif. This latter motif is a late interpolation into the Latin text, Abram argues, and here the Norse text depends more upon the Latin than upon the many OE adaptations (which Abram includes in a chart). Nonetheless, he concludes that "the material contained in these Norse texts is most closely paralleled by the types of Old English homilies that were being copied into new English manuscripts in the twelfth century" (34). Although the references to the OE texts in question could and should be clearer, using the now-standard references of the Dictionary of Old English, this is an important and useful study both for its review of previous work in the field, and for the possibilities that open up given that Abram focuses only on the first two homilies in the Norwegian Homily Book, and finds a richness of insular influence.

Phyllis Portnoy finds a different kind of richness in "Biblical Remnants in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Old English" *Daimonopylai: Essays in Classics and the Classical Tradition Presented to Edmund G. Berry*, ed. Rory B. Egan and Mark A. Joyal (Winnipeg: Univ. of Manitoba), 319–40. Her argument is that the Junius Codex is genuinely a vernacular version of scripture, using the motif of the "remnant" as occurring in biblical, rabbinical, and patristic sources and in the Junius manuscript in particular and striking ways. The first part of the paper addresses the sources and the relevant biblical hermeneutics of the doctrine of the remnant, the elect group chosen by God to be spared from destruction but also chastened. The remnant therefore carries eschatological implications, and over time Portnoy demonstrates that it acquires vegetative images, notions of regeneration, and the promise of future and universal salvation. The second and shorter part of the paper jumps to what Portnoy describes as possibly the "earliest rendering of scripture in English: the Junius Codex" (330). *Laf* has a range of meanings in Old English, from "remnant" and "survivor" to "legacy" and "sword." Portnoy investigates the available usages, comparing in particular to Greek and Latin periphrastic expressions, and then investigating the motif in the poems of the Junius manuscript. Thus in *Genesis* the "remnant" occurs at the beginning and end of the Flood narrative, and the Flood typology associated with the motif recurs in a pronounced way in *Exodus*. In particular, a triple repetition of *laf* (lines 387–408) invokes a pun centered on Isaac, himself a remnant. In *Daniel*, the remnant does figure, very unusually, and Portnoy argues that this confirms a particular typological usage of the motif, the single ancestral story of the Israelites preparing the way for future possibilities. A table at the end of the paper considers variant translations of passages in Isaiah and Genesis referring to the remnant.

MJT

#### *Performance, Poetics, and Meter*

Dennis Cronan makes a very ambitious argument in "Poetic words, conservatism and the dating of Old English poetry" (*Anglo-Saxon England* 33: 23–50). Based on a meticulous comparison of poetic simplexes and their patterns of distribution, he draws conclusions that link poems that have at least two simplexes in common. His preliminary conclusion is that *Beowulf* is the center of two such patterns, one with *Genesis A* and one with *Maxims I*. The argument is subtle and careful, basing itself only on very clear linkages; nonetheless, it is somewhat



disturbing that Cronan, once he has proven that a simplex is found in both poems and other synonyms could have been used but weren't, should instantly conclude that the poems have thereby a close and certain relationship. Nonetheless, much of the scholarship in the paper is quite superb: Cronan discusses poetic compounds well, and it is clear that he has counted those as well as the simplexes; he addresses in detail and largely dismisses Bernard Muir's recent argument that *Maxims I* might be three poems rather than one; *suhtriga* or *suhterga* is very fully discussed, including analysis of its glossing context and the argument that the word "points decisively towards a connection between the eighth century and the composition of *Genesis A*" (39); and other patterns linking two or more poems are well analyzed, including for example *missere* and *þengel*. Towards the end of the article Cronan provides several sets of word counts and comparisons (which might have been very useful and more logical if placed near the beginning of the article), and he considers the limited distribution of poetic simplexes in the corpus as a whole, arguing that shared simplexes demonstrate conservatism and point towards earlier dates of composition. (This part of the argument is perhaps unduly strengthened by his decision to take the signed poems of Cynewulf as a single text for his purposes.) The conclusion, which presents a proposed chronology for the composition of OE poems based on sixteen words importantly in common, and an additional thirty-two words which demonstrate some commonality among some poems, may be dubious (although more positively it does replicate the proposed chronologies of Fulk and Cable and might more reasonably be taken simply as another small piece of evidence about dating issues). However, much of the analysis is very good indeed.

"Anglo-Saxon Charms in Performance" is the topic of Lori Ann Garner's article in *Oral Tradition* 19.1: 20–42, in which Garner explores the charms as they occur in twenty-three manuscripts and how the few cues in those manuscripts would have shaped their performance. She briefly compares modern living oral traditions, including transcriptions and individual performance styles of the Zuni story of the world's beginning, before examining two remedies from the *Lacnunga*, one a charm against black blains which includes ritual directions and an incantation (in abbreviated form like the form frequently used to refer to the *Pater noster*), and the second an aid in five parts for women both before and after childbirth. She argues for careful consideration of the verbal and nonverbal elements, and their interaction, in these texts. Garner's second focus is the nexus

between poetry or superstition and science, using M.L. Cameron's discussion of the medical effects of charm elements to argue for the intertwining of the poetic and curative functions of the charms. Another issue is the misplaced focus on the metrical charms, caused by their separate edition by Dobbie. She provides as examples the two charms against wens, and similarities between the "Nine Herbs Charm" and a non-metrical charm protecting travelers, arguing that the two iterations of the same idea demonstrate OE apposition or variation. Finally, Garner deconstructs the binary of pagan vs. Christian often used for these texts, arguing for syncretism.

E.V. Thornbury's Ph.D. thesis at the University of Cambridge, "Anglo-Saxon Poetics," is somewhat more specific than the title suggests. It examines the "rejection of the Muses" theme in early Anglo-Latin poetry and its hybrid nature in England, compares verse with prose in *opera geminata* and works of lapidary prose, and considers the paucity of technical vocabulary for poetry in order to postulate the absence of an *ars poetica*. The thesis then turns to consideration of Latin quantitative meters, the Anglo-Saxon preference for the dactylic hexameter, and the metrical rules of Old English poetry perceptible to the poets. Finally, the thesis looks at word-order and syntax, and the restrictive rules in both Latin and OE, concluding with the transmission of poetic learning in the Anglo-Saxon period. Christopher LeCluyse is also concerned with Latin and Old English texts in "Sacred bilingualism: Code switching in Medieval English verse" (Ph.D. University of Texas at Austin), using the modern linguistics term 'code switching' for the macaronic verse of the Middle Ages. He uses linguistic, literary and social perspectives to investigate three Anglo-Saxon poems that alternate Old English and Latin, noting that only three times is the Functional Head Constraint violated such that ungrammatical switching occurs. In carols from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, LeCluyse finds twelve types of code switching depending on the way in which the carol integrates English and Latin, and again notes that ungrammatical switches occur only when poetic constraints are more important than linguistic ones.

Image and symbol are the concern of Maren Clegg Hyer in "Textiles and Textile Imagery in the *Exeter Book*" (*Medieval Clothing and Textiles* 1: 29–39). The riddles of the Exeter Book include many references to the material culture of textiles; riddles 35 and 56 especially focus on the details of weaving for comparison to the making of a mailshirt, and to the hunt and capture

of a wild creature respectively, while Riddle 70 may describe a shuttle. *Maxims I* lauds the gender-specific role of women as weavers, and elsewhere in the manuscript the personification of fate or destiny as a weaver appears in several texts: *Guthlac*, riddles 35 and 40, and perhaps the grammatical femininity of *wyrd*. Peace-weaving appears in *Widsith* and *Maxims I*, so that Hyer connects noble women with metaphorical and literal weaving. Finally, the obscene riddles often rely upon textile imagery for their word-play, including riddles 42, 44, 45, and particularly 54 (the butter-churn).

This was another very good year for meter. First, Seichi Suzuki produced an important book, *The Metre of Old Saxon Poetry: The Remaking of Alliterative Tradition* (Cambridge: Brewer). Although the apparent link to Old English is only in the opening pages, Suzuki's background is the meter of *Beowulf* so that poem is his principal comparandum for this detailed study of the meter of *The Heliand*. He considers every aspect of the meter, every example of Sievers's five types and his own further development of metrical distinctions, and examines well-nigh every verse in this Old Saxon text of nearly six thousand lines. Those interested in Old English metrics will find much to ponder in this analysis. One who will certainly be reading Suzuki is Douglas Peter Allen Simms, whose doctoral thesis at the University of Texas at Austin was entitled "Reconstructing an oral tradition: Problems in the Comparative Metrical Analysis of Old English, Old Saxon and Old Norse Alliterative Verse." The thesis first considers a hypothesized Proto-Indo-European verse, then turns to the anomalous heavy hypermetric verse form in Old English and in Old Saxon in order to conclude that there is no guarantee that the form existed in the common Germanic poetic tradition. Next, the thesis considers the Old Norse *dróttkvætt* verse to conclude that it is historically related to Old English and Old Saxon hypermetric verse. Finally, Simms reconstructs the common Germanic hypermetric poetic line and proposes a revision of metrical models of OE hypermetric verses. Another comparative metrical thesis, and from the same university, is Steven James McCartney, "Ternarity through binarity" (Ph.D., University of Texas at Austin). McCartney addresses ternary stress pattern, the lapse of more than one syllable between stresses, and argues that the idea of a ternary primitive is wrong, and that systems which have been widely believed to be ternary are more likely binary with sporadic ternary effects. The evidence he adduces is Finnish, Estonian and Koniag Alutiq, in addition to Old English, Bani-Hassan Bedouin Arabic and Sentani.

Michael Schulte's "The Germanic Foot in Ancient Nordic Resolution and Related Matters Revisited" (*NOWELE* 45: 3–24) will be of interest to metrists interested in Prokosch's Law. Schulte proposes that the "correlation between quantity and stress in Nordic along with the bimoraic condition is a progressive, rather late development, not yet fully established in pre-syncope Germanic" (3). He reviews some past analyses of the Germanic foot, its parsing, and its diachronic development. The suspension of resolution in early OE verse, noteworthy in the case of compounds, argues for relative stress in OE. Not a new conclusion. Schulte concludes from the relatively higher failure of resolution in LH (Light Heavy) sequences as against LL (Light Light) sequences in OE that there is "clear evidence against the 'resolved moraic trochee' in Ancient Nordic" (17). Schulte is nonetheless aware that evidence from OE is not normative with respect to Ancient Nordic, and carefully concludes that further reassessment of the Germanic foot, and the theories of Drescher and Lahiri, will be necessary. In this he is certainly correct.

A fascinating sequence on Middle English meter and its relationship to earlier traditions is found in the pages of *Studies in the History of the English Language II: Unfolding Conversations*, ed. Anne Curzan and Kimberly Emmons (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter). Geoffrey Russom opens with "The Evolution of Middle English Alliterative Meter" (279–304), Robert D. Fulk responds with "Old English poetry and the alliterative revival: On Geoffrey Russom's 'The evolution of Middle English alliterative meter'" (305–312), and Russom gracefully closes with "A brief response" (313–314). Russom proposes that "Old English meter was indeed profoundly changed, but through reanalysis rather than reinvention" (281) in Middle English, and briefly but elegantly explicates his word-foot theory of OE meter, showing how it evolved into Middle English. The decline of compounding meant the loss of two-word realizations of types A2, B, C, D, and E; similarly, the increased use of function words because of the decay of the inflectional system led to more unstressed words in the metrical line. Russom then looks at *Battle of Maldon*, a late OE poem which has independent function words appearing as anacrusis; at the Old Saxon *Heliand*, which provides a useful illustration of similar developments; and at *Psalm 118* of the *Paris Psalter*, which has variants unacceptable in traditional verse only in the a-verse, and two-word paradigms of the A1 Sx/Sx pattern occurring a striking 94% of the time in the b-verse. Russom's main argument, then, is that the principle of closure concentrates new complex variants

in the a-verse. He disagrees with Cable and others who have argued a radical-break hypothesis, arguing for a hypothesis of continuity. He compares the evolution of Greek and Indo-Iranian meters to suggest that the meter evolved and the alliterative tradition persisted through major language changes. Robert Fulk in his response notes that Russom is surely right to warn that the idea that OE poetry disappeared and Middle English poetry is rather a descendant of Ælfric's alliterative style may not be as convincing as has been assumed. He considers the historiography of the idea, and the absurdity of the proposal that together Ælfric and Wulfstan developed rhythmical prose as an alternative to poetry and thereby "sparked a poetic revolution" (306). In particular, he analyzes some examples of early Middle English verse to see what support it offers for a great differentiation in verse types between the a-verse and the b-verse. It offers none. Fulk then turns back to Ælfric to consider whether he thought he was writing verse or prose, and provides some hints of evidence that he considered himself to be writing prose. Thus he rejects the modern tendency to conflate Ælfric's alliterative prose with verse, arguing in favor of a wider array of possible classification and less illogic, despite the "unruliness of the data" (310). Russom's response follows from Fulk's convergent reasoning to continue to keep open the question as to whether Ælfric was writing "non-traditional poetry or heavily ornamented prose" (313), if only because doing so incites scholarly debate on this genuinely interesting problem.

Thomas Bredehoft, "Ælfric and Late Old English Verse" (*ASE* 33: 77–107), also addresses the definition of Ælfric's so-called rhythmical prose; Bredehoft follows Russom in choosing rather to focus on the demonstrably late poetry of Anglo-Saxon England and to analyze its metrical characteristics. The relevant texts demonstrate little or no resolution, have only two levels of metrically-significant stress rather than three (which signals a very noteworthy decline in Types C, D, and E), demonstrate relaxed constraints on anacrusis, and it is even possible that "rather than having metrical verses be patterned on the juxtaposition of two word-stress patterns, late verses were defined by patterns of stressed and unstressed syllables" (86). Bredehoft therefore posits a revision of Russom's word-foot theory for late verse, a development from the classical OE verse form, and demonstrates the kind of effects this would produce with a set of diagnostic examples of late verse forms. At the level of the line, Bredehoft suggests using his favorite examples from *Chronicle* verse, rhyme becomes a key linking device (though Bredehoft

unaccountably seems unaware of the previous work on rhyme of Tranter, McKie, and Stanley). In particular, Bredehoft concludes that the composition pattern in this late verse could not have been formulaic. The last quarter of the paper turns to Ælfric and his usage, noting the extensive use of pointing in at least some of the relevant manuscripts for structural rather than syntactic reasons and indicating that these structures do fit within the purview of the scheme of OE late verse as previously defined in the paper. He argues that the end of the *Life of Oswald* is in fact "powerful and effective poetry" (99), with extensive cross alliteration, and analyzes the opening of *Life of St. Edmund* for its stylistic effects. His conclusion is that Ælfric's rhythmical compositions are verse, part of a tradition of late OE verse. Taken together with Russom's argument, Bredehoft makes a strong case for reconsidering our preconceptions about late OE verse and prose.

Bredehoft offers another case for questioning "The Boundaries Between Verse and Prose in Old English Literature" in *Old English Literature in its Manuscript Context*, ed. Lionarons, 139–72. He wants to investigate the use of meter as a definitional tool in establishing the dividing line between verse, however irregular, and prose; his approach to this vexed question is (appropriately, given the context of the collection) through the manuscript layout of texts with prose-poetry juxtapositions. He starts with a helpful table of the texts and their manuscripts or material location (in the case of the Brussels Cross), and the lion's share of the paper is a very useful detailed consideration of the boundary markers in each manuscript iteration of each text. He starts with Caedmon's "Hymn" and the capital letter for the opening that often distinguishes it from the introductory comments about the text, and other visual cues including punctuation and, for one manuscript, layout. The transition from prose to verse and back is often marked, at the very least with a point but more commonly with a capital letter. The *Meters of Boethius* enjoy a prominent set of markings dividing verse from prose, but several charms depend rather upon internal performance instructions, notably the use of the verb *singan*, to distinguish themselves from prose. The charm "Against a Sudden Stitch" is a striking counterexample, however, with extensive boundary markings between the prose and poetry. Bredehoft notes that the charms with the highest number of metrical irregularities or anomalies are not treated differently in the manuscripts, however. The *Chronicle* poems are notably examples of texts without explicit contextual cues to mark the prose-poetry boundary (it is intriguing

that Bredehoft uses this terminology throughout, when a more likely term might be something like “slippery slope”). Here Bredehoft correctly complains about the canonization that has resulted from the choice of these poems appearing in the Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records edition; distinguishes among the presentations in various manuscripts, Swanton’s translation, and Plummer’s edition (which is the base for his approach); and concludes that “the *Chronicle* poems are sometimes distinguished from surrounding prose very clearly (e.g. 1065CD, 942BC) and sometimes not at all (942A, 1011CDE, 959DE, 1057D)” (167). He notes that at least two wholly undifferentiated texts nonetheless have all the metrical and alliterative characteristics of poetry. Finally, the paper considers some of the odder juxtapositions, including the Brussels Cross, *Solomon and Saturn*, and the so-called “Metrical Epilogue to CCCC 41”

MJT

#### Works Not Seen

- Bueno Alonso, Jorge Luis. “Is there an ‘elegiac discourse’ in Old English poetry?: A Proposal for a Conceptual Model Based on a Threefold Hermeneutical Approach.” *Voices on the Past*. Ed. Rodríguez and Alonso. Pp. 157-64.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “A note on verse metrical patterns and generic labels in OE poetry: ‘Disturbing’ samples from the Old English poetic elegies.” *Medieval English Literary and Cultural Studies*. Ed. Conde Silvestre and Vásquez González. Pp. 33.-41.
- Conde Silvestre, Juan Camilo, and María Nila Vásquez Gonzalez, eds. *Medieval English Literary Cultural Studies: SELIM XV*. 2004. 251 pp.
- Dubs, Kathleen E., ed. “What Does It Mean?” *Pázmány Papers in English and American Studies* 3. Piliscsaba, Hungary: Pázmány Péter Catholic Univ., 2003-04. 339 pp.
- Gvozdetskaya, N. Yu. “Old English Lyrics: The Semantics of Composition.” *Slovo v perspektive literaturnoi evolyutsii*. Ed. Smirnitckaya. Pp. 334-51.
- Hines, John. *Voices in the Past: English Literature and Archaeology*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2004. 216 pp., ill. [Chap. 2, “Knowledge and Vision in Old English Poetry, pp. 37-70]
- Kleiner, Yu. A. “The Plot, the Song, and the Tradition.” *Slovo v perspektive literaturnoi evolyutsii*. Ed. Smirnitckaya. Pp. 161-72.
- Morini, Carla. “Measuring Time in Anglo-Saxon England and Temporal Prognostics.” *Études médiévales* (Amiens) 6 (2004): 24-32.

- Schaefer, Ursula. “Rede aus der Unvernunft: Annäherungen an den Ort der Lüge in altenglischer Dichtung.” *Das Mittelalter* 9.2 (2004): 44-53.
- Watanabe, Hideki. “Textual Significance of the Sentences in the Form of *Pæt wæs god cyning* in Old English poems.” *Approaches to Style and Discourse in English*. Ed. Risto Hiltunen and Shinichiro Watanabe. Osaka, Japan: Osaka Univ. Press, 2004. Pp. 135-64.
- Zvereva, V.V. “‘The New Sun in the West’: Images of the Venerable Bede in Medieval Legend” *Casus* (Moscow) 3 (2000): 299-318.

#### b. Individual Poems

##### *Andreas*

In “Old English *willan brucan* in *Andreas*, Line 106b” (*N&Q* n.s. 51: 3-5), Alfred Bammesberger argues against the editorial consensus of Kock, Krapp, and others, namely that *willan* here is a genitive and functions as a variation of *tyres*. While grammatically possible and emphatically argued by Kock, this reading is less compelling than an alternative suggested by C.W.M. Grein in *Sprachschatz der angelsächsischen Dichter, unveränderter Nachdruck der zweiten, unter Mitwirkung von F. Holthausen und J.J. Köhler neu herausgegebenen Auflage* (Heidelberg, 1974). Following Grein, Bammesberger suggests that *willan* should be parsed as an instrumental in adverbial function, with *willan* construed as a weakened form of *willum*, making *willan brucan* in *Andreas* 106b similar to other adverbial instrumentals formed with *brucan* and *neotan*, as *willum neotan* is found in *Christ* 1343 and in *Guthlac* 1373b, and *willum bruce* in *The Paris Psalter* 118.14. Such a reading in *Andreas* would render the line “where you may forever joyfully partake of glory.”

Ananya Jahanara Kabir assesses the aesthetic effects of *Andreas* and a contemporary postcard image of the Virgin Mary from Mexico in “Towards a Contra-Modern Aesthetics: Reading the Old English *Andreas* Against an Image of the Virgin of Guadalupe” (in *Signs of Change: Transformations of Christian Traditions and their Representation in the Arts, 1000-2000*, ed. Nils Holger Petersen, Claus Clüver, and Nicholas Bell [Amsterdam: Rodopi], 31-50). Through this unusual pairing, Kabir highlights modern notions of aesthetics, from Kant to Adorno; in her analysis, the temporal borders of the poem resonate in interesting ways with the spatial borders of the picture. Acknowledging the significant differences between the two works, Kabir nevertheless suggests that the methods of production,



circulation and consumption of each lead to certain similarities, most notably: formulaicity, predictability, and anti-linearity (33); to read each against the other affords insights perhaps otherwise unavailable. The second section suggests a link between the discipline of aesthetics and modernity that, perhaps inevitably, marginalizes works from pre- or post-modern cultures; Kabir argues that such cultural productions, whether medieval poetry or mass-produced “holy cards,” can best be examined “by breaching the customary boundaries between research into medieval and contemporary cultures, so as to cross-pollinate various revisionist approaches to aesthetics and to modernity” (32). She insists that “the correspondences between such wider medieval paradigms and the methodologies of post-modern philosophers should be examined not merely as fortuitous, but as the starting points for the construction of a contra-modern aesthetics that historicizes cultural expressions and their functions and reception” (42). The third section then returns to examine *Andreas* more closely, attempting to utilize just such a contra-modernist approach, thinking of the poem as “art as process, reception as participation and aesthetic experience as pleasure” (32). Kabir uses a post-colonial stance here, seeing, for example, the poet’s use of the previously secular medium of alliterative verse to validate forcible conversion “through othering and dehumanizing the non-Christian” (43); however, her analysis is not so simple, and she spends the rest of the article demonstrating that the poem builds “a complex grid of contrasts and associations” (44), which places *Andreas* in a similarly complex grid of contrasts and associations in the world outside the poem.

MKR

#### *Battle of Brunanburh*

Paul Cavill, Stephen Harding, and Judith Jesch reassess the meaning of the term *Dingesmere*, which appears exclusively in *The Battle of Brunanburh* (“Revisiting *Dingesmere*,” *JEPNS* 36 [2003–04]: 25–38). The passage in question, quoted from the ASPR:

Gewitan him þa Norþmen nægledcnearrum,  
dreorig daraða laf, on Dinges mere,  
ofer deop wæter Difelin secan,  
eft Iraland, æwiscmode (53–6).

In a thorough and convincing treatment of the term, the authors note that there are two main lines of interpretation, the first that it is not a place-name, but a

noun in the genitive (*dinnes*) that qualifies the word *mere*, rendering the meaning ‘sea of noise,’ or ‘noisy sea.’ The second is that *dinges mere* is indeed a name, “with a personal- or place-name in the genitive for the first element and poetic *mere* ‘sea’ for the second. The authors’ stated aim is to point out difficulties in both of these interpretations, and to suggest another (26). They suggest that the first line of interpretation can be dismissed pretty much out of hand, partly because it privileges a scribal spelling of the phrase that reveals no small degree of puzzlement on the part of one of the scribes, and partly because the translation rendered does not make much sense within the context of the passage. The second interpretation was advanced for the most part in a number of articles by John Dodgson, in which he argues that the form means something like ‘the water of Ding.’ Dodgson’s oscillating views on the subject are summarized for readers unfamiliar with it, after which the authors take each element in turn (*þing* and *mere*), subjecting it to an exhaustive analysis. Their conclusion is as fascinating as it is convincing. They suggest “that the *ding* of *dinges mere* in the Old English poem of *Brunanburh* refers to the *þing* of Thingwall. There can be little question that *mere* refers to a water feature, and we further suggest that the name refers to water overlooked or controlled by, or associated with the *þing*... But the name probably derives ultimately from the hybrid Norse-OE *þings-mere* ‘wetland by the thing,’ or possibly from a pure Norse compound, *þings-marr*, ‘marshland by the thing’ (36). The authors lend further credence to their argument by contextualizing the meaning of the reference as they explain it within the larger context of the poem: “For those who understood the name and were familiar with the area, this name was used to emphasize the desperation of the fugitives, in that they had to depart as best they could from an unsuitable place, wetland or coastal marshland (*mere* in Old English, *marr* in Old Norse), before they could make it to the safety of the deeper water and escape to Dublin. But the name would especially highlight the brutal fact that the Norsemen fled from a place close to the centre of Scandinavian power and the symbol of Scandinavian independence and self-determination, the *þing*” (36–7).

DFJ

#### *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Battle of Maldon*

In “The Good, the Bad and the Fearless: De Vikingen en hun vijanden in Oudenoorse en Oudengelse oorlogspoëzie” (*Madoc: Tijdschrift over de Middeleeuwen* 18:

2–10) Letty ten Harkel seeks to establish whether the current and long-standing reputation of the Vikings as fierce, fearless, and ruthless killers holds up in the face of contemporary evidence. “Were the Vikings indeed so fierce and cruel?” she asks (25). Ten Harkel notes that this reputation is largely based on historical writings of prominent church figures, like Alcuin and, later, Henry of Huntingdon. Historians ignore other kinds of sources to their peril, she argues (26), such as Old English battle poems and Old Norse skaldic poetry. While these sources may contain less factual information than, say, Henry of Huntingdon’s *Historia*, they do provide useful information on the question at hand: first, they focus on the behavior of the Vikings and their enemies, the skaldic poems having been composed expressly with them in mind; and second, they usually date to shortly after the confrontations they describe, which minimalizes the chances of any tendency toward romanticization (26). In order to arrive at a more nuanced picture of the Vikings, ten Harkel examines two OE battle poems (*The Battle of Brunanburh* and *The Battle of Maldon*) and two skaldic poems (*Liðsmannflokkur* and *Knutsdrapa*). What follows is divided into two main parts: “The Vikings, as they saw themselves,” and “The Vikings, as their enemies saw them.” The skaldic poems demonstrate that the Vikings believed that violence was the path to glory, but they were not averse to capitalizing on advantages in battle such as surprise or clever tactics. The Old English battle poems provide us with the Anglo-Saxon perception of their enemies, whose worst fault seems to be their cunning. In the end, ten Harkel concludes that our perception of the Vikings as fierce and merciless is probably not far from the truth, but that the Old English battle poems show that the Anglo-Saxons were no different. Why, then, the discrepancy in reputation between the Vikings and the Anglo-Saxons? Ten Harkel suggests that it is due at least in part to the attitudes of historians who ignore such poetic sources and thus create a one-sided view based on “real” historical sources (32). Our view of the past is still influenced by western, Christian historiography, based on the classical tradition, and it may well be time to abandon this myopic view and to accept that “de Vikingen, ook al waren zij inderdaad woeste en wrede krijgers, niet veel woester of wreder waren dan menig ander volk uit die tijd, of inderdaad, uit deze tijd van tegenwoordig (the Vikings, though they were indeed fierce and cruel warriors, were not much fiercer or crueller than many another people from that time period, or, indeed, from our own)” (32).

DFJ

### *Cædmon's Hymn*

Both articles on *Cædmon's Hymn* in 2004 were written by Daniel Paul O'Donnell, whose expanded edition came out the following year and will be reviewed in *YWOES* 2005. The first of the two, “Bede’s Strategy in Paraphrasing *Cædmon's Hymn*” (*JEGP* 103: 417–32), examines the relationship between the Latin and OE versions of the *Hymn*, affirming that while they are related, the nature of the relationship is unclear, especially in light of the relative closeness of the two versions in ll. 1–5, contrasted by the freer association of ll. 6–9. O'Donnell summarizes the three explanations offered for this discrepancy: Ute Schwab’s suggestion that “the paraphrase must be adapted from an intermediate rhythmic Latin translation” (421), Kevin Kiernan’s that “the Old English text is a back-translation from Bede’s Latin rather than its source” (421), and Andy Orchard’s that the differences “indicate a change in translation strategy on Bede’s part midway through his adaptation of the Old English” (422). He points to weaknesses in each of these solutions, then suggests that the roots of the change in tone lie not in Bede’s Latin translation strategy, but in *Cædmon's* Old English text: “Bede’s paraphrase reflects [the] change in *Cædmon's* original by becoming itself less literal at the moment the ornamental variation increases” (423), as Bede uses hexameter cadences in the last four lines to give the audience a sense of the effect, though not the actual structure, of the vernacular poem. O'Donnell then outlines the structure of the poem, then Bede’s strategy in translating it, quoting his caution about the difficulties of translating poetry. (There is a minor typo in the translation provided, which should read “without some loss of beauty and dignity,” 426). O'Donnell argues that the second section of the poem is most affected by Bede’s strategy because it contains more appositives, which Bede systematically strips out in the Latin, substituting hexameter cadences to partially mimic the ornamental effect of the original appositives (427). Further, in substituting classical ornamentation rather than reproducing the vernacular appositives, Bede places *Cædmon* “into the same exalted company as the Christian Latin poets he quotes in his rhetorical works” (429). This careful substitution of the Latin cadences for Old English variation “constitutes important, though implicit, evidence for contemporary recognition of the aesthetically important role such variation plays in Anglo-Saxon vernacular poetry” (430). In this way, O'Donnell suggests that the relationship between the Latin and Old English versions of the poem are less perplexing than has been imagined, and that Bede’s apparent shift in translation practice is the

result of a conscious decision to highlight a key aesthetic feature of the Old English.

In “Numerical and Geometric Patterning in *Cædmon’s Hymn*” (ANQ 17.3: 3–11), O’Donnell considers recent attempts to explicate the poem’s formal structure in terms of classical and medieval theories of those patterns, most notably by Bernard F. Huppé, Morton Bloomfield, Ute Schwab, and David Howlett. He emphasizes that use of patterns discerned by scholars cannot be proven to have been conscious in the absence of an explicit statement of the principles actually used; moreover, O’Donnell shows that few of these patterns reinforce each other, given, for example, that the center of the poem shifts depending on whether one reckons by syllables, words, or half lines, and that a similar difficulty inheres in discerning the symmetrical and concentric arrangement of etymological pairs suggested by Schwab: “the pairs in question are separated from their neighbors by different intervals, rotate around different axes, and are arranged asymmetrically within the poem as a whole” (5). O’Donnell does not dismiss these studies outright, because even though the poem does not to his mind exhibit the kind of precision patterning insisted upon by some scholars, in broad terms, their observations are correct; for example, the pattern Schwab discerns may not have been intended exactly as she discerns it, but she is certainly correct that the etymological pairings she sees are indeed arranged at least approximately around the center of the poem (6). Use of the number three is more compelling as a structural principle, as it is confirmed by “the mutually reinforcing evidence of syllable, word, and line counts” (6), but O’Donnell is cautious to point out that contradictory evidence exists even here, meticulously summarizing the various arguments for patterning and carefully demonstrating the weaknesses of each while also highlighting their strengths (8). In the end, however, and in the absence of an explicit statement on the part of the poet, he suggests that most of the patterning theories are either not fully proven or not likely, though he is more persuaded by the arguments for the poem’s use of multiples of three as a pattern and, perhaps, fours and fives, but these last only in the broadest terms.

#### *Christ I*

The crux examined in Alfred Bammesberger’s “*Christ I: The Beginning of the First eala*” (N&Q n.s. 51: 112–14) occurs in ll. 19–20 of the poem. These lines occur in the middle of a four-line sentence beginning with the word *eala*. Bammesberger asserts that while ll. 18 and 21 offer

no particular problem with translation, ll. 19 and 20 present “a number of difficulties” (112). He cites other scholars’ work, especially an early analysis by Stanley B. Greenfield that concentrates on the word *locan* in l. 19a, in which he asserts that, while a number of authorities translate the word as “key(s),” the usual Old English word for ‘key’ is *cæg*, making a translation of the half-line *se þe locan healdeð* more sensibly “he who holds (or guards) the locks” (113). Bammesberger agrees with Greenfield’s reasoning that ‘key’ is a less compelling suggestion because it is not the usual translation for *locan*, but suggests instead that it should be construed as the accusative singular of *loca*, m. ‘enclosure, stronghold’, resulting in the reading: “(Christ) holds (keeps, guards) the (heavenly) stronghold.” Similarly, Bammesberger reconsiders *eadga[n]* in l. 20a as a dative singular of the weak declension (as against John C. Pope’s translation as a plural), reasoning that because *his* in l. 21b is clearly singular, *oþrum* must be singular and the likelihood is that both dative objects are singular. The resultant translation of the four lines, then, is “O Thou King and Ruler, He who holds (keeps, guards) the (heavenly) stronghold, opens life, the heavenward ways, to the blessed one, to another denies the fair journey he desires, if his work is not sufficient.”

#### *Dream of the Rood*

In his note on “The Half-line *unforht wesan* in *The Dream of the Rood*” (NM 105: 327–30), Alfred Bammesberger suggests that the first occurrence of this half-line in the poem fits the context (l. 110b), but the second (l. 117b) does not. To achieve sense, scholars have emended *unforht* in l. 117b to *[a]nforht*, interpreted as ‘very afraid,’ though the result is a hapax legomenon. Bammesberger suggests that *unforht wesan* be allowed to stand and that an acceptable contextual meaning be derived by omitting *ne* from l. 117a, which he argues is an erroneous insertion (329). He explains that, although “*þurfan* is mainly found together with the negative particle *ne*, it is by no means easy to describe the verb’s basic semantic range” and, further, that it can appear independent of *ne* (329). Usage in *Beowulf* suggests that ‘have occasion to’ would be a possible translation for *þurfan*, thereby allowing for the reading of ll. 117–18 as “(in contrast,) anyone, who bears the best of signs in his heart, will then have occasion to be unafraid.”

#### *Elene*

According to Laurence Erussard in “Linguistic Style and the Negation of the Self in *Elene*” (in *Medieval English*

*Literary Cultural Studies: SELIM XV*, ed. Juan Camilo Conde Silvestre and María Nila Vázquez González [Murcia: Universidad de Murcia]), the heroine of the OE poem is often perceived by critics as an unpleasant, impersonal and unsympathetic character; however, Erussard argues that her style in speaking, which results in this characterization, is deliberate on the part of the poet, that a certain imperiousness is reinforced by the “predictable patterns of Elene’s majestic, impersonal and official style” (43), which contrasts with the style of both the devil and the early speeches of Judas. Where the unrepentant Judas shares a style with the devil, after his conversion, “he abandons the personal self-centered mode of expression and adopts Elene’s impersonal style” (43). Erussard points out that he does not achieve the same elevation of style because he is not Elene’s social equal, but in rejecting the self-centered style that previously linked him with the devil, he takes on instead the patterns of saintly, though impersonal, style, thereby unmistakably identifying himself with Christianity. For Erussard, “the apparent, conventional platitude of Elene’s rhetorical style is, in fact, an expression of spirituality for the saint who reaches towards the other world by denying worldly realism and individuality” (43). “The impersonal style that makes Elene ‘unpleasant’ makes her holy as well ... [and] it imposes an iconographic, linguistic model of holiness that is adopted by Judas upon his conversion” (44), providing a stark contrast with the devil’s language, further underscoring the saintliness of both Elene and of the redeemed Judas.

In “Cynewulf’s *Elene* and the Patterns of the Past” (*JEGP* 103: 180–96), Cynthia Wittman Zollinger explores the way the poet uses “the discovery of the Cross [as] a powerful metaphor for the reconciliation of historical traditions and the requirements of personal salvation.... [T]hese interpretive approaches offer an expressive connection between the local circumstances of Anglo-Saxon Christianity and the broader patterns of the Christian faith” (182). Zollinger begins by outlining the sources and varying versions of the *Inventio Crucis* legend, demonstrating that Cynewulf’s probable source, the Judas Cyriacus legend, lends itself to the Germanicization of the legend, with Constantine defending the empire from invading barbarians across the Danube, a situation more likely to resonate with an Anglo-Saxon audience than the putting down of a civil war, as in Eusebius of Caesarea’s version of events. The account of battle is dramatically expanded by Cynewulf, and “the unspecified barbarians that Constantine faces across the Danube acquire identities that are rooted in

Germanic historical tradition ... echoes of Germanic legend, the ghosts of the Anglo-Saxons’ own Continental past” (183–84). Complex historical associations abound, as the Anglo-Saxons are related to the Germanic invaders of the story, but are also related to the emperor and his saintly mother through shared British connections: the Anglo-Saxons occupy lands previously held by Celtic Britons, and one of those British kings, Coel, was thought to be Elene’s father (Zollinger provides a discursive footnote explaining the history of this connection). Further, “Bede notes that Constantine was made emperor in Britain upon his father Constantius’s death in York; his Old English translator interprets Bede’s statement to assert that Constantine was born in Britain” (184). Similarly, within the context of conversion, the Jews are analogous to the Anglo-Saxons, “a community whose understanding of the past is similarly transformed by its conversion to the Christian worldview” (189). The epilogue, however, marks a shift “from the historical past to the devotional present” (190) as “the epilogue explicitly depicts the narrator’s own desire to engage with and interpret the past from his position in a timeless present” (191). In it, Cynewulf “reframes the events of the poem by introducing the context of personal salvation” (191) with three specific moves. The first occurs in ll. 1219–35, where “events of the poem are situated with the liturgical calendar” (191); the second occurs in 1236–56, which link “the poet’s identification of the meaning and the power of the Cross with his own spiritual state at the end of life” (191); the third occurs in 1256–1321, where Cynewulf “vividly describes the world’s passing and the events of Judgment that will close the human experience of linear time” (191). In this way, “history becomes didactic, and the events of the poem move beyond their literal significance to provide the basis of the universal experience of venerating the Cross” (191). The poem not only connects the Anglo-Saxon past with the legend of the *Inventio Crucis*; it also demonstrates how “the lessons of the past shape the spiritual life of the present, and history finds its fulfillment in the world to come and the end of time. In this way *Elene* reaffirms the connection between the patterns of the past and the enduring experience of the Christian faith” (196).

MKR

#### *Meters of Boethius*

Daniel Anlezark examines three passages in the OE *Meters of Boethius* with an eye toward determining what they may tell us about the text’s authorship (“Three Notes on the Old English *Meters of Boethius*,” *N&Q*



n.s. 51: 10–15). “In three places in the *Meters*, one noted as long ago as 1842, we find changes to the text which cannot be accounted for as straightforward modifications required when rendering prose into verse, but may question Alfred’s authorship of the poetic sections of the Old English Boethius. However, in each case I would suggest these three differences can be accounted for either by the requirements of putting Old English prose into verse, scribal alteration of the text, and Alfred’s ongoing interest in ideas found in the *De consolatione*” (10). The first passage (lines 10–17a) helps to clarify the relationship between the prose translation and the verse, the latter being demonstrably dependent upon the former in many places. For the second passage (lines 166–75, the famous analogy of the egg as illustration of the concept of the waters surrounding the earth), Anlezark posits as source the *Old English Martyrology*, but moreover argues that the inclusion of this passage is an indication of Alfred’s ongoing interest in questions of geometry and physics and “an increasing sophistication in his understanding of the celestial spheres” (14). The third and final passage involves the erroneous attribution of Ulysses’s homeland in *Meter 26* (Thrace) where the prose gets it right (Ithaca). Anlezark: “It is unlikely that Alfred as author of the prose would have confused the two names if he found *Iþacige* in the prose version he had made himself” (14), so he attributes the original mistake to Alfred, and posits a later scribal alteration as the explanation for the appearance of the correct form in the prose version.

#### Phoenix

Alfred Bammesberger scrutinizes lines 3b–6 of the Old English *Phoenix* in order to arrive at a translation that makes sense within the context of the poem (“The Old English *Phoenix*, Lines 3b–6,” *N&Q* n.s. 51: 223–25). The lines are part of the description of the Phoenix’s homeland:

Nis se foldan sceat  
ofer middangeard    mongum gefere  
folcagendra,    ac he afyrred is  
þurh meotudes meaht    manfremendum

The second clause may be rendered “but it [*se foldan sceat*] is removed from evil-doers by the might of the Lord,” but the first clause is in Bammesberger’s view more problematic. The crux is the word *mongum*, which has been variously translated by some editors as ‘to many’ or ‘to everybody’. Blake and Cook are especially to blame for obscuring the meaning of this

passage in this way, the former stating in the Introduction to his edition that “The poet first states a negative and then its opposite ‘paradise is not open to any man, but it is barred to all sinners’” (224). Bammesberger rightly notes: “I doubt whether this approach to the text is correct. If lines 3b–5a really meant that the land of the phoenix was accessible to no one, then the immediately following statement that evil-doers had no access to it would be pointless” (224). He goes on to cite a number of translations (Gollancz, Gordon, Grein, Schlotterose) that correctly interpret *mongum* as ‘to many’, thus clarifying that the wonderful land of the phoenix is not accessible to “many of the leaders of the people in the world” (225).

DFJ

#### *Rewards of Piety*

As Samantha Zacher points out, CCCC 201 “is a very busy manuscript” (83); its busyness, exemplified here by *The Rewards of Piety* and due in part to its complex blending of homiletic prose and Old English poetry, is the subject of “The Rewards of Poetry: ‘Homiletic’ Verse in Cambridge Corpus Christi College 201” (*SELIM* 12 [2003–04]: 83–108). To Zacher, “this poem demonstrates clear verbal and stylistic parallels with surrounding texts in the manuscript both in prose and verse and therefore offers a useful index to the aims and methods of the compiler” (84). She begins by discussing the poem’s identity (formerly considered two poems, *An Exhortation to Christian Living* and *A Summons to Prayer*, but read as one and renamed by Fred C. Robinson), then examines the “significant and widespread connections” of the poems in the manuscript with the prose, especially the didactic prose (85), importantly noting that scholars perceive Old English genres in such a way as to consider verse influenced by prose as “adulterated,” but prose incorporating elements of verse as enhanced, or at least not damaged by the generic mixing (86). Using *The Rewards of Piety* as an exemplar, Zacher minutely examines this generic mixing, especially of vocabulary, syntax, and punctuation; one important conclusion reached is that “[w]hile many editors emend most of the alliteratively ‘defective’ lines in *Rewards* to create more ‘correct’ poetry, such a revision perhaps misrepresents the very real blurring of boundaries between poetry and prose found in the compilation of CCCC 201” (96). This article also includes an extremely useful appendix containing the text and translation of *The Rewards of Piety*, text adapted from *ASPR* VI.

MKR

## Riddles

In her “*Sindrum Begrunden* in Exeter Book Riddle 26: The Enigmatic Dative Case” (*N&Q* n.s. 51: 7–9), Elena Afros asserts that the ambiguous syntax and morphology of the Old English riddles constitute a linguistic trap and that among the various constructions so used, “some of the most challenging for the (modern) solver are noun phrases in the dative case” (7). Afros summarizes the various ways the phrase has been construed, showing that “[i]n brief, scholars differ on three points: first semantic, the precise meaning of *sinder*; second, syntactic, the function of *sindrum* in the participial phrase *sindrum begrunden*; and third, syntactic as well, the element to which the participial phrase *sindrum begrunden* refers” (8). She concludes that “the noun *sindrum* is an argument of the participle *begrunden*, and the whole phrase *sindrum begrunden* is appositive to the first person pronoun *mec* (5b) referring to the skin of an animal. In light of this analysis the meaning of *sinder* ‘impurity’ is more plausible. On the whole, the ambiguity of *sindrum begrunden* is apparent: it issues from our limited knowledge of the principles of composition of Old English verse and the valency patterns of Old English verbs” (9).

The central thesis of Tine Defour’s “The Use of Memory in the Old English Bookmoth-riddle: A different light on ‘healthy obscurity’” (*Studia Germanica Gandensia* 1/2: 17–32) uses the Bookmoth-riddle to illustrate Augustine of Hippo’s acceptance of rhetorical and poetical devices to develop *memoria* and to instruct the faithful. Defour sees multiple levels of meaning in the riddle, especially the literal devouring yet ignorant moth and the allegorical reader seeking wisdom in the text. This essay follows the well-trodden path of examinations of didactic literature in light of *De Doctrina Christiana*’s discussion of ornament, interpretation, and the crucial distinction between use and enjoyment. The occasionally tortured logic of the argument is troubling, as is the dated nature of Defour’s secondary sources, especially the scholarship on Old English, all of which was written in 1982 or earlier.

In moving beyond the received wisdom that the riddles, like other OE poetry, utilize formulaic phrases, Anita R. Riedinger’s closely reasoned study demonstrates that uses of formulas may indicate the relative poetic and cultural sophistication of the poet. “The Formulaic Style in the Old English Riddles” (*SN* 76: 30–43) begins by distinguishing between formulas for the purpose of Riedinger’s examination: Traditional

Formulas recur more than once elsewhere in the corpus, whereas Riddle Formulas recur in riddles only (31). This useful distinction throws interesting light on formulaic style, to which Riedinger adds the notion of traditional concepts, which, while they may not be recognizable as lexical formulas, are readily seen as common ideas that can be used in much the same way as formulaic expressions; further, both verbal and conceptual formulas are integral to riddle-style (31). Using Riddles 35, 5, and 57, with nods at other riddling texts to provide analogues, Riedinger convincingly contrasts the almost incidental use of formulas in Riddle 35—none of the formulas are integral to the enigma—with the heavily formulaic style of Riddle 5, which not only uses far more formulas but uses them to mislead the reader. For example, by beginning the riddle with the phrase “I am” ( *Ic eom*), the poet immediately signals that what follows is a riddle. “But when he completes his formula with the word *an-haga*, he is saying to those knowledgeable in the tradition, ‘I am alone, I am probably parted from my homeland, I am a warrior, and death is close at hand.’ Thus the first clues to the riddle’s solution are an integral part of the opening formula, richly illuminating to the poetically literate—and in this case, equally misleading” (34), as the solution to this riddle is generally taken to be Shield, not a human being at all. While traditional formulas can be misleading, verses with no traditional context can be the most difficult for the audience to solve, for the very reason that they lack any sort of cultural resonance; still, “knowledge of the tradition is subversive, leading the audience astray” (34). The last section of the essay argues that recognition of such skilled use of verbal and conceptual formulas can keep editors from making unnecessary emendations of texts. Riedinger notes that editors often emend line 5 of Riddle 33 (“Iceberg”) from “slow into battle” (*hilde to sæne*) to “not slow into battle” by various means, trying to force the second half line to agree with the first: warriors who are “hatefully fierce” (*hete-grim*) are not usually slow to battle. Riedinger points out, however, that the paradox demonstrates the skill of the riddler, who may be counting on exactly that assumption to mislead the reader. Similarly, “[w]hen the Riddle-poet describes the iceberg as *hete-rune bond*, ... he manipulates the single verb *bond* to achieve two ends at once: the *wiht* moving on the water is very cold, perhaps icy, as it suppresses a horrible secret. The riddler embraces one aspect of the tradition, the binding power of ice, while contradicting and thus rejecting another, the revelation of secrets. He reveals and suppresses simultaneously” (40); for Riedinger, this type of sophisticated wordplay indicates skilled riddlers composing for a culturally literate

audience. “The greater that audience’s knowledge of the formulaic tradition, the more complex the riddle, and the greater the riddler’s success” (40).

In “The Oyster and the Crab: A Riddle Duo (nos. 77 and 78) in the *Exeter Book* (MP 101: 400–19), Mercedes Salvador examines these riddles as a contrasting pair. She begins by admitting the difficulty presented by damage to the manuscript, especially portions of Riddle 78, but believes it possible to draw conclusions, however tentative, based on what survives. Agreeing with other editors that the solution to Riddle 77 is “oyster,” Salvador focuses instead on the voracious eating of the oyster by the one who pries off its shell (lit. ‘skin’) with the point of a knife; the oyster is cast as an innocent victim of another’s ravaging, a type of eating explicitly or implicitly disapproved of by the author, reflected in his use of the verb *fretan* rather than *etan* (403). A connection with the Benedictine reform is possible, given that oysters were considered an acceptable food for monks, though *The Seasons for Fasting* shows that oysters and other allowable foods may be overindulged in, to poor effect (404–05). Riddle 78, though badly damaged, provides Salvador with enough clues to speculate on the nature of the subject. She argues that, while it is clearly a sea creature, it is likely not an oyster, as some editors have suggested. “Lamprey” has been suggested as a possible solution, but Salvador argues from a grammatical ambiguity that such a reading “would break the coherence of what seems to be a sequence of clues referring to the animal’s sophisticated hunting practice” (409). Rather, she identifies the subject as a crab, in part because the surviving phrases could describe a crab, especially the suggestion of cunning in the hunt for prey that she detects. Given that the enmity between oysters and crabs was a medieval commonplace, Salvador suggests that Riddles 77 and 78 form an intentional pairing, with the innocent oyster victim in the first meant to contrast the rapacious cunning of the crab in the second. Similar pairings occur elsewhere in the Exeter riddle collection, in its *Physiologus*, and in Latin enigmatography; Salvador argues that the correspondences could not be fortuitous and that “[f]or a monastic audience, the oyster and the crab could well represent good and bad Christians. Read as a thematic pair, Exeter Riddles 77 and 78 would provide positive and negative examples of conduct for the ecclesiastical readers: the pious, defenseless Christian and the covetous, wicked sinner, who usually takes advantage of the former’s naiveté” (418–19).

MKR

#### *Seafarer and Wanderer*

Santha Bhattacharji uses contemporary critical theory in the undergraduate classroom to illuminate the commonly overlooked second half of both *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer*. In “An Approach to Christian Aspects of *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer*” (*The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Cavill [see sect. 7], 153–61), Bhattacharji states that students’ prior exposure to post-structuralism has imbued them with important concepts (for example, multiplicity of meaning and its deferral) that help them read these two poems more fruitfully. Although such students seem “instinctively willing to consider multiple levels of meaning for even the most apparently concrete terms” (154), a skill particularly important when reading ambiguous texts such as the elegies, Bhattacharji also laments “the near-impossibility of keeping the two poems apart in students’ minds” (155). Thus, the author wisely suggests that “Saussure’s concepts of *langue* and *parole* can usefully be brought into play, with *langue* representing, in terms of Anglo-Saxon poetic diction, an overarching symbolic system within which each poem can be seen as *parole*, an individual utterance,” a line of reasoning “reinforced by Barthian notions of intertextuality” (155). In the second half of the essay, Bhattacharji considers the riddle as “the basic Old English poetic form,” one which “intrinsically ‘defers’ its meaning, not revealing it on a first reading of the literal level of the text” (157).

A like-minded focus on *The Seafarer* is offered in “True Confessions: *The Seafarer* and Technologies of the *Sylf*” (*JEGP* 103: 156–79). Here, Michael Matto raises an issue vital to analysis of the poem: “Assumed throughout the discussions of *sylf* has been that an understanding of what that self might be—the underlying psychological paradigm that would allow for an Anglo-Saxon ‘I’ to discuss his medieval *sylf*—is intuitively apprehensible for the modern reader” (157). Rather, Matto concludes, “The problem of the *sylf* cannot be understood directly in terms of the modern self, but instead must be read in terms of late ninth- and early tenth-century tensions among mechanisms for the production of wisdom, confessional technologies of personal salvation, the heroic and elegiac ethic of constraining the impulses of the inner mind, and public rituals of communal reintegration” (178). Matto’s reading of the poem depends on an awareness of confession as practiced in Anglo-Saxon England (162–5) and comparisons with the soul and body motif (171), but unlike the speaker of the soul and body poems, the seafarer is not yet dead, “and so must employ a technology of the *sylf* to accept culpability for

the body's actions while not identifying himself with the body" (178). Moreover, while Matto acknowledges the centrality of gender to many studies of medieval subjectivity, he makes the distinction that "the body's importance in this poem is not found primarily in its status as a gendered object. Instead, the body in *The Seafarer* serves as part of a mind-body-soul dynamic that informs Anglo-Saxon psychological theories and, by extension, Anglo-Saxon subjectivity" (158). Matto goes on to explain, "Specifically, in *The Seafarer* the narrator's concept of *sylf* is informed by an inner/outer schema that relates the mind, body, and soul in terms of a container and its contained" (159). However, "the seafarer must deconstruct this binary before he comes to a full Christian understanding of the self" (160). Thus, while the seafarer's movement from the physical to the spiritual is widely acknowledged, Matto posits at the center of the poem a paradoxical but "*simultaneous* [emphasis his] deep engagement with and renunciation of the physical self" (166).

Just as Matto advises modern readers to refrain from imposing a twenty-first-century notion of subjectivity onto the seafarer, Thomas D. Hill cautions that readers of *The Wanderer* may be misled by modern views of happiness. Hill begins "The Unchanging Hero: A Stoic Maxim in *The Wanderer* and Its Contexts" (*SP* 101: 233–49) by offering an interpretation of lines 62b–72. "The essential problem here," he explains, "is that in the modern world 'happiness' is thought an unqualified good; the notion that one might be too happy simply does not make sense to us" (236). Yet unlike the modern reader, the stoic regards happiness as "an excess which the wise man avoids" (236). In order to demonstrate the influence of stoicism on the poet of *The Wanderer*, Hill discusses analogues from Old English poetry including *The Descent into Hell* (ll. 50–55), *Solomon and Saturn II* (ll. 348–52), *Precepts* (l. 54), *The Wife's Lament* (ll. 42–50), and of course the Wanderer's own earlier speech (ll. 11–14). Likewise, stock descriptions of the stoic saints Antony and Martin are echoed in a description of Charlemagne by the nameless Poeta Saxo (Book 5, 257–70). With standard disclaimers about their relevance to Anglo-Saxon literature, Hill also references the Old High German *Otfrids Evangelienbuch* (ll. 5–10), the *Historia Danorum* (Book 2, 7.6.23–26), and the characterization of Halldor in *Halldórs þátr Snorra-sonar II*. Somewhat more surprising is Hill's treatment of classical authors, knowledge of whom was of course transmitted through monastic education and patristic authorities, for Hill makes a sub-argument about a third means of transmission: "Obviously, the Roman

authorities were not particularly concerned with providing their Germanic mercenaries with a good liberal education, but there must have been some acculturation as the result of centuries of contact" (242). Thus, stoic teachings from Horace's Ode 2.3 or Seneca's *Moral Epistle* 86.20 "could have been transmitted ... through an oral, 'traditional' path, and it is perfectly possible that this was how they acquired their stoic wisdom" (242). Ultimately, Hill argues that "these parallels demonstrate that an Anglo-Saxon poet could indeed mean what he says when he claims that a wise man should not be too happy. 'Ne to forht ne to fægen' means what a straightforward translation would imply" (248). But Hill further refines his argument by noting that Jerome, Augustine, and Christ himself all manifest a vexed relationship with *apatheia*. In fact, Hill notes too that "the Wanderer is anything but stoic in his passionate lament for his lost lord and friends" (249), a paradox paralleled by poetic interludes in the Icelandic family sagas. "We may therefore imagine," Hill concludes, "that poetry itself is a kind of privileged medium in which warriors can lament openly without demeaning their masculine dignity" (249).

James M. Palmer summarizes the argument of "*Compunctio* and the Heart in the Old English Poem *The Wanderer*" (*Neophilologus* 88: 447–60) when he writes, "I contend that attention placed on the medically (secular) derived (now religious) doctrine of compunction can result in a reading that highlights both the poem's religious and secular ambiguities, though the Christian elements receive far more emphasis through my reading here. The poem's use of terms for heart, spirit, and mind, illustrate one way we can see its Christian connection to compunction, and it is an exploration of this doctrine that lies at the 'heart' of this essay" (448). To make his case, Palmer draws on *The Ladder of Divine Ascent* by St. John Climacus, an eastern text "not translated into Latin for the West until the eleventh century" (449), and Defensor's *Liber scintillarum*, whose sixth chapter is titled *De compunctione*. According to Palmer, "All of those writing on the doctrine also emphasize the importance of the heart, ... mind and soul and all that accompanies them, such as thoughts, intentions, memory and will" (451). Turning to *The Wanderer*, Palmer notes, "A number of Old English terms are used for heart, mind, and spirit. We might translate *mod* as mind and heart, *sefa* as heart, *breostcofa* as heart or breast, *breostloca* as feelings of the heart, *ferð* as heart or spirit (mind), *ferðloca* as breast, *hordcofa* as treasure-chamber or heart, *hreðer* as heart, and of course *heort* as heart" (452). Palmer observes that the poem employs



nineteen such terms in its first seventy-three lines, and then “two surface in the last five lines” (452). Palmer asserts that this distribution “is important for seeing the doctrine of compunction, as it is for seeing the secular and religious ambiguities in the poem” (452), for “the absent heart indicates that the Wanderer has given up mourning for his past life, since the locked heart image represented his feelings and memories of the past in lines eleven through twenty-one. The rationale for the heart’s absence, given the link with compunction, is to highlight both the poem’s religious nature and Christian moral” (455).

RN

#### Waldere

In “Old English *Waldere*: A New Edition of the Epic Fragments” (Ph.D. Diss., Texas A&M Univ., 2003. *DAI* 64A, 4456) Jonathan Bryant Himes edits the Old English poem contained in the fragments of MS N.K.S. 167b. Himes’s extensive introduction to the edition (weighing in at 194 pages) seeks to provide the following information: “(1) an overview of the Walter legend and editorial procedures used in this edition; (2) a linguistic analysis of the orthography, syntax, and vocabulary; (3) a comparison of the motifs, imagery, allusions, and leisurely epic pace with other heroic poems in the corpus, as well as an examination of the alliterative style of *Waldere* as heroic poetry; (4) an assessment of the probable speakers in the narrative and the sequence of the MS leaves contingent upon those heroic voices; and (5) a diachronic study of the material culture and the ethics of ritualized combat in both the Migration Period and the Viking Period, as reflected in the narrative” (iii). The edition itself includes a full glossary, textual notes with commentary, and a translation.

DFJ

*Wanderer*: See *Seafarer* and *Wanderer*

#### *Wulf and Eadwacer*

In “*Wulf and Eadwacer*: For Whom, For What?” (*Medieval and Early Modern English Studies* [Seoul, Korea] 12: 341–56), Dongchoon Lee offers a translation and interpretation of the poem that both respect and illuminate the text’s ambiguities. Lee begins by parsing and translating the poem line-by-line in order to “answer some intriguing questions” concerning the female speaker’s situation, the identities of Wulf and Eadwacer, the relationship of each to the speaker, and the imagery and metaphors “employed to disclose their ‘drastic’

situation” (4). His proposed answers include several interesting suggestions. Reading lines 1–2, Lee’s literal rendering of *aþecgan* leads him to conclude, “Just as, in a ritual ceremony, an animal is offered as a sacrifice, *hine* (though we do not know yet whom *hine* indicates here) seems to be ‘consumed’ or ‘killed’ by the speaker’s people” (5). Yet Lee also notes that “the island where *wulf* stays is not necessarily a literal island, but a figurative one, representing a deserted place where man rarely lives” (5). Most interesting is his treatment of line 11: “*Bog* can be understood as ‘branch,’ or ‘bough.’ In this case, it might be used as synecdoche through which the poet conveys to us the meaning of shelter or house in conjunction with food (line 15) provided to the female speaker by the ‘battle-brave’ man. On the other hand, if *bog* is translated as ‘shoulder of an animal,’ ... line 11 takes a reference to a physical relationship between the speaker and the man” (7); for Lee, either reading implies “a certain illicit relationship with him” (9). Finally, Lee notes that “the speaker’s helpless situation which results from the absence of her own guardian, the ‘property-watcher’ ... might drive her to justify the possibility of being another man’s woman, probably *se beaducafs*, regardless of her own will,” much like Chaucer’s *Criseyde* or “women who do not have proper guardians in the Bible” (9).

Somewhat less productive is James J. Donahue’s “reading” of the critical discourse that has constructed a play of meaning(s) around *Wulf and Eadwacer*”; his hands-off approach is implied by his title, which quotes Benjamin Thorpe. In “‘Of this I can make no sense’: *Wulf and Eadwacer* and the Destabilization of Meaning” (*Medieval Forum* 4: n.p. [online]), Donahue explains, “[b]ecause we cannot place the poem, with any certainty, within a particular historical, cultural, or even genre-defined context, any critical discussion must first construct such a context in order to construct a reading and to ‘make sense’ of the work.” This strategy has failed, however, because “the critical apparatus that has been constructed around this poem has worked not to further its understanding, but to further remove us from any one understanding.” Indeed, Donahue argues not only that “this poem may be *intended* to be ambiguous [his emphasis], and thus intended to resist contextualization”; in fact, “it may also have been ambiguous for a contemporary audience.” Nonetheless, Donahue offers a “brief survey of major critical readings,” only to conclude that “the critical community has only complicated whatever meaning is to be found in the work” and “also over-contextualized this work, which has further confused any attempt to reach a uniform understanding

of the poem.” Finally, Donahue considers recent post-structuralist approaches to Old English literature by Carol Braun Pasternack, Marilynn Desmond, and Patricia A. Belanoff, in order to point out “the inability for yet another method of inquiry to uniformly and definitively construct a meaning for the poem.”

RN

*Works not seen*

Åström, Berit. *The Politics of Tradition: Examining the History of the Old English Poems ‘The Wife’s Lament’ and ‘Wulf and Eadwacer’*. Skrifter från moderna språk 5. Umeå (Sweden): Institutionen för moderna språk, Umeå universitet, 2002. 151 pp.

Бочкарева, Т. В. [Bochkareva, T. V.] “Хронотоп древнеанглийской элегии «Скиталец»” [“Khronotop drevneangliyskoi elegii ‘Skitalets’” = “The Chronotopic Structure of the OE Elegy *The Wanderer*”]. *Slovo v perspektive literaturnoi evolyutsii*. Ed. Smirnitkaya. [see sect. 2] pp. 352–73. [with summary in English]

Bueno Alonso, Jorge Luis. “Actitudes Anglosajones hacia el Humor: La Caracterización del Humor Obsceno y Sexual en los Acertijos del *Exeter Book*.” *Cuadernos del CEMyR* 12 (December 2004), 17–36.

Dubs, Kathleen E. “Devising Meaning in *Genesis B*.” in ‘*What Does It Mean?*’ ed. Kathleen E. Dubs, Pázmány Papers in English and American Studies 3 (Piliscsaba, Hungary: Pázmány Péter Catholic University, 2003–04), 7–18.

Frese, Dolores Warwick. “Sexing Political Tropes of Conquest: ‘The Wife’s Lament’ and *Lazamon’s Brut*.” *Sex and Sexuality in Anglo-Saxon England*. Ed. Pasternack and Weston. [see sect. 2], 203–33.

Halácsy Scholz, Katalin. “*Mid noman rihte nemned wære*—‘You Were Rightly Called by the Name,’ God’s Names in *The Advent Lyrics VI* (ll. 130–163)” in ‘*What Does It Mean?*’ ed. Dubs, 19–29.

Malaczkov, Szilvia. “The Virgin Mary in *Advent*: A Word Study” in ‘*What Does It Mean?*’ ed. Dubs, 30–45.

Oppelt, Csaba. “Meaning in Hiding—Deciphering *Wulf and Eadwacer*.” *What Does It Mean?* Ed. Dubs, 46–56.

Yoshimi, Akitoku. “The Old English Poem *Deor*: Tentative Translation, Facsimile of the Original Manuscript, and Text.” *Meiji Gakuin Bulletin* 691, *Studies in the General Sciences* 68 (March 2003), 89–95. [in Japanese]

\_\_\_\_\_. “A Study of the Old English Poem *Deor*: The Portrait of a Recitation Poet.” *Meiji Gakuin Bulletin* 701, *English Language and English and American Literature* 112 (September 2003), 1–49 + map. [in Japanese]

**c. *Beowulf***

*Text, Language, Meter*

Version 2.0 of Kevin Kiernan’s *Electronic Beowulf*, with Ionut Emil Iacob *et al.* (London: British Library Publications) upgrades his earlier 1999 version so that the two CDs now run on newer platforms and browsers through Netscape 7.1 and Internet Explorer 5 and 6. As before, it includes a digital color facsimile of the manuscript text in British Library Cotton Vitellius A.xv with fiber-optic and ultraviolet images of damaged or erased text, a transcript and edition of the poem with complete glossarial index, Thorkelin’s two eighteenth-century transcriptions, his 1815 edition and translation into Latin, Conybear’s revised 1826 edition of Thorkelin, and Madden’s further corrections to Conybear.

Pearl Ratunil prints “A Letter from Benjamin Thorpe to George Oliver concerning John Mitchell Kemble and *Beowulf*,” *N&Q* 51: 109–12. The letter is dated 23 November 1832 and is currently bound as the front flyleaf of a first edition of Thorpe’s *A Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Tongue* (Copenhagen, 1830) in the Richard J. Daley Library of the University of Illinois at Chicago. Thorpe (1782–1879) informs his fellow antiquary Oliver (1781–1861) that the twenty-five year old Kemble, “a very learned young man” (1807–57), “is preparing an edition of the very famous Saxon poem, ‘*Beowulf*... It is, in many respects, one of the most interesting reliques of Teutonic antiquity” (110). Kemble’s edition of the poem appeared in 1833 and, during the next decade, Thorpe and Kemble formed a scholarly alliance based upon their shared appreciation for the new approach to philology it reflects, one practiced on the continent by their respective mentors, Rasmus Rask and Jacob Grimm.

In “*Epel-Weard*: The First Scribe of the *Beowulf* MS,” *NM* 105: 177–86, Damian Fleming examines the three runes in the sole manuscript witness of the poem in Cotton Vitellius A.xv. These appear in lines 520b, 913a, and 1702a, or folios 143v18, 152v16, and 170r15, respectively. In each instance, the Old English rune called *epel* ‘ancestral estate, homeland’ (𐌺) is substituted for the spelled-out form of the word by the first scribe who copied the poem through most of line 1939, even though he did write out the word *epel* fully in four other instances when it appeared twice as the dative *eple* in lines 1730a and 1774a, and in two dative compounds, *epeltyrf* ‘[on my] home-soil’ (line 410a) and *epelwearde* ‘to the home-guardian’ (line 616b). The second scribe

spelled out the word eight times in all grammatical circumstances in which it appeared during his stint with no rune substitutions. Fleming suggests that Scribe A wished to add an antique patina to certain parts of the poem and inserted “the runes to the manuscript as a sort of archaism, an heirloom which itself is part of the same past that is celebrated in the poem” (181). He notes that the rune substitutions do not occur in the narrative present of the poem, but only when a story about the past “is being presented in a pluperfect kind of way” (182), that is, in Unferth’s account of Beowulf’s swimming match with Breca (lines 518b–521), a reference by Hrothgar’s *scop* to the pre-Scylding tyrant Heremod (lines 910–13a), and in Hrothgar’s own comment after studying the ancient sword-hilt of the giants (lines 1700–03b), which is inscribed with the same kind of *runstafas* ‘runestaves’ (line 1695a) as the one the scribe illustrates a few lines later in 1702a. The first scribe of *Beowulf* could thus be seen, according to Fleming, as a kind of *epelweard* himself, a conservator of archaic native tradition epitomized by the old runic script.

In “Reading *Beowulf* Now and Then,” *SELIM* 12 (2003–04): 49–81, Andy Orchard lists and discusses the many corrections that both the first and second scribes made to their own portions of the manuscript text, as well as of Scribe B’s corrections to the work of his colleague, described more fully below in the section on *Criticism*.

Hideki Watanabe explores the “Textual Significance of the Sentences in the Form of *þæt wæs god cyning* in Old English Poems,” *Approaches to Style and Discourse in English*, ed. Risto Hiltunen and Shinichiro Watanabe (Osaka: Osaka UP), 135–64, noting first that the poet uses this eulogistic phrase, “that was a good king,” three times in *Beowulf*, in lines 11b, 863b, and 2390b, but that most editions and translations of the poem only treat the first, referring to Scyld Scefing, as an exclamation. However, all three uses of the formula “summarize the foregoing topic” and highlight the character of the figures to whom they refer—Scyld, Hrothgar, and (the author believes) “old Beowulf,” respectively—thus “presenting them in strong association with each other” (136). Both scribes of the poem shared this sense of emphatic summation in the phrase, Hideki Watanabe argues, since they placed a medial *punctus* after each instance in the MS. (For the problematic third instance in Scribe B’s stint after line 2390b, on the crumbled right edge of folio 183r, Hideki reports that he can clearly see the middle point just above the *fitt* number XXXVIII [p. 157, note 1]). The author then reviews commentary

on the phrase, both as a formula and as an exclamation, and examines its variations, such as *þæt wæs god ælmihtig* ‘that was God Almighty’ in line 39b of the *Dream of the Rood*. He notes that the construction *þæt is/wæs* ‘that is/was ...’ followed by two elements, usually an adjective or genitive noun modifying a predicate nominative, appears in the b-verse over sixty times in Old English poetry. He lists and divides these appearances into personal and non-personal assessments, and notes that this type of half-line “functions as an end-marker of discourse at various levels” (147), summarizing a description, speech, episode, *fitt*, or whole poem, though occasionally the concluding sentence runs into the a- or b-verse of the next line. The author then reviews the sensitivity of editors and translators of *Beowulf* to the rhetorical stress implied by the use of this formula, finding that only the editors Magoun and Bessinger (1966) and the translator Leonard (1923) consistently present all three instances of the half-line *þæt wæs god cyning* with an exclamation mark. Full appendices note the punctuation of these half-lines in twenty-three translations and fifteen editions of the poem.

Alfred Bammesberger argues that “of both nations,” which is the usual translation of “The Half-Line *bega folces* (*Beowulf*, 1124A),” *NM* 105: 21–23, is mistaken. The two elements of the phrase cannot be grammatically coordinated since the first, *bega* ‘of the two’, is genitive plural, while the second, *folces* ‘of the troop, nation, people’, is genitive singular. He suggests “of the troop of both” as the most accurate rendering (22), which yields for lines 1122b–24: “Fire, the greediest of spirits, swallowed all whom battle had taken away of the troop of the two (namely Hnæf and his nephew); their glory was crushed” (23).

Bruce Mitchell rejects Bammesberger’s argument (2003) that “OE *befeallen* in *Beowulf*, line 1126a,” *NM* 105: 187–89, refers not to *wigend* ‘warriors’ in the previous half-line 1125a, which would more correctly require the nominative plural form of the past participle *befeallene*, but to the neuter *Fryslan*d in the following half-line 1126b, which would require no inflectional ending. Mitchell counters that *befeallen* and *Fryslan*d “are unlikely to be linked grammatically because they are in different clauses” (187), and notes that uninflected plural past participles and adjectives do occur, although rarely, in prose.

Carole Hough examines “*Beowulf* lines 480b and 531a: *beore druncen* Again,” *Neophilologus* 88: 303–05, to support Gould’s claim (1997) that the term *druncen*

is a reference not to “mellow conviviality” but to “serious intoxication” (303). However, Hough disputes Gould’s translation of these half-lines, “drunk with beer,” because modern English “*beer* is a loan-word with a quite different meaning from that of OE *bēor*” (304). Hough cites Christine Fell’s 1975 analysis, which “places it beyond doubt that OE *bēor* referred primarily not to a malt-based drink but to a highly alcoholic mixture of fermented fruit juice and honey, much more potent than other drinks obtainable during the Early Middle Ages” (304). As a translation of the two half-lines in question, Hough suggests “either ‘drunk with alcohol’ or ‘intoxicated with strong drink,’ in order to remain as close as possible to the sense of the original while avoiding a false association with the product of modern breweries” (304).

Stefan Jurasinski sets out to illuminate the meaning of *folcscaru* ‘folk-share’ and *gumena feoras* ‘lives of men’ in “*Beowulf* 73: ‘Public Land,’ Germanic Egalitarianism, and Nineteenth-Century Philology,” *JEGP* 103: 323–40. The same “collocation of lands and men” occurs in Bede and later charters to describe the “donation of unfree laborers with the lands they worked” from royal estates (326). The term *folcscaru* in line 73a should thus not be understood as territories set apart for common use by the Danish people as a whole, in accordance with nineteenth-century views of “primitive Germanic collectivism” that Klaeber (1950) derived from Kemble (1833), but as “ancestral lands” that were reserved for Hrothgar personally as part of his *epel* or patrimony as a member of the Scylding royal clan (340).

Robert D. Fulk challenges the prevailing view that “The Name of Offa’s Queen: *Beowulf* 1931–2,” *Anglia* 122: 614–39, is specified in these lines as *Pryð* or *Modpryð(o)*. He rejects an assumed parallel to these words in the name of the wife of the Mercian king Offa II, *Quen Drida*, as it is recorded in the *Vitae duorum Offarum* (ca. 1200), since the name of the woman in that text is simply a garbled Latinization of the personal name *Cynethryth*, rather than a rendering of the royal title *Cwen Pryð* ‘Queen Thryth’ (614). Fulk prefers the reading of these lines tentatively offered by E.A. Kock (1920) that the first Offa’s wife’s name is given in line 1932a as *Fremu*, *folces cwen* ‘Fremu, queen of the people’ who *modpryðo wæg* ‘acted arrogantly’ in line 1931b, a phrase which can be paralleled in the *hygepryðe wæg* ‘acted arrogantly’ of *Genesis A* (line 2238b). Lesley Jacobs supplies a Modern English translation of the relevant parts of the *Vitae duorum Offarum* in an appendix (631–39).

In *Slovo v perspektive literaturnoi evolyutsii: K 100-letiyu M.I. Steblin-Kamenskogo* [The Word in the Context of Literary Evolution: For the 100th Birthday of M.I. Steblin-Kamenskii], ed. O.A. Smirnitskaya, *Studia Philologica* (Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskoi kul’tury [Languages of Slavic Culture]), N. Yu. Gvozdetskaya writes on “Drevneangliiskii poeticheskii stil’: slovo i tekst [Old English Poetic Style: Word and Text],” 307–33, with a summary in English. The author stresses the crucial function of poetic compounds in generating the cumulative stylistic effect of the poem. In particular, Gvozdetskaya sees the two parts of such compounds (the nominative and the predicative) as being reflected on a larger scale in the two half-lines of an alliterative verse, which in turn can be seen in two complementary aspects of Old English poetic narrative style in general: “the story and the comment upon it” (333).

In the same volume, T. B. Magniskaya examines “Nekotoryye osobennosti sintaksisa drevneangliiskogo epicheskogo teksta [Some Syntactic Peculiarities of Old English Epic Narrative],” 265–71, with a summary in English. Magniskaya believes that the loose and leisurely syntax of *Beowulf*, which employs many appositional “synonyms and identical finite verb forms,” serves to create a series of short narrative segments or “microthemes” which are used to build the poem as a whole (271). These syntactic microthemes are designed to aid oral extemporaneous composition and facilitate audience comprehension. They focus not upon “*action*, but *situation* with constant shift of focus: from antagonist—to protagonist—to both of them—to some other characters, etc.” (author’s emphasis, 271).

Hironori Suzuki writes “On MV/VM Order in *Beowulf*,” in *New Perspectives in English Historical Linguistics: Selected Papers from 12 ICEHL, Glasgow, 21–26 August 2002, Volume I: Syntax and Morphology*, ed. Christian Kay, Simon Horobin, and Jeremy Smith, *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science: Series IV, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* 251 (Amsterdam: J. Benjamins), 195–213, in which M = a modal auxiliary verb and V = its non-finite (that is, infinitive) complement. Suzuki discovers that alliteration is “the crucial factor in determining” MV or VM order in the subordinate clauses of Old English verse (196), in contradistinction to prose usage where “heaviness” or the proximity of an extra element like an adverb or prepositional phrase governs the choice of verb order. He concludes that in subordinate clauses, “the VM order is always observed when only the non-finite verb alliterates and both verbs appear within the



same half-line boundary. On the other hand, the MV order is always observed either when the alliteration pattern differs from the above, or when the modal and non-finite verbs are separated by a half-line boundary. The same is true of ambiguous clauses and *ond/ac* clauses” (212). Suzuki finds that “this phenomenon can also generally be observed in main clauses in *Beowulf*,” but that there is an “unexpected prevalence of the MV order, with the non-finite verb alliterating,” in a-verses, while main clauses in b-verses display the same pattern as subordinate clauses in both kinds of half-line (212).

B.R. Hutcheson, in “Kaluzá’s Law, The Dating of *Beowulf*, and the Old English Poetic Tradition,” *JEGP* 103: 297–322, continues his 1995 challenge to Fulk’s view, published in 1992, that “Kaluzá’s law provides a reliable basis for dating *Beowulf* to approximately the year 725 or earlier” (297). This law stipulates that short inflectional endings “are prone to metrical resolution,” while long endings “resist resolution” (297) in certain types of Old English meter. The high percentage of long vowels in the inflectional endings of *Beowulf* in these metrical situations suggests to Fulk that it was composed before these vowels were shortened after the earlier part of the eighth century. Hutcheson argues, to the contrary, that Kaluzá’s law was simply part of an archaic tradition of formulaic poetry that was propagated for centuries after the phonology of ordinary spoken Old English had changed. He compares *Beowulf* with poems known to be composed in the tenth century or later—*The Battle of Maldon*, *Brunanburh*, *The Five Boroughs*, *The Coronation of Edgar*, *The Death of Edgar*, *The Death of Edward*, and *Durham*—and finds “that there is absolutely no statistically significant difference between the rate of adherence to Kaluzá’s law in the later poetry for those metrical types on which Fulk bases his argument” (298). Hutcheson concludes that *Beowulf* “need not necessarily be a particularly early poem: it could simply be a late poem that was composed by a poet who was thoroughly versed in the Old English poetic tradition” (320), one “dating back to the period when the phonology that brought about the law was a part of the living language” (321). However, Hutcheson still believes that “*Beowulf* was almost certainly composed before the tenth century” (322), since it adheres to Kaluzá’s law in *all* metrical situations (not just the special ones considered by Fulk) at a higher rate of frequency than do poems known certainly to belong to the tenth century.

In “Textualization as Mediation: The Case of Traditional Oral Epic,” *Voice, Text, Hypertext: Emerging Practices in Textual Studies*, ed. Raimondo Modiano, Leroy

F. Searle, and Peter Shillingsburg (Seattle/London: Walter Chapin Simpson Center for the Humanities in assoc. with the U of Washington P), 101–20, John Miles Foley summarizes the way he believes the narratives derived from oral tradition, which are presented in written texts like the *Beowulf* manuscript, were received by their original readers and hearers. Oral poets allude with varying degrees of specificity to stories they can confidently assume most of their audience will recognize from their prior experience of this particular tradition of narration. Adept consumers of an oral tradition of epic, even when reading (or hearing read) a textualized version of partially told stories from that tradition, are able to “expand” these narratives in their own minds and recognize their relevance to the writer’s main themes in just the same way that they would actively extrapolate from a traditional poet’s allusions during an oral performance (115–16). A manuscript or printed text thus mediates the tradition of oral epic in a way analogous to the spoken words of the oral performer. By comparing the degree of allusiveness admitted into the different textual versions of South Slavic oral epic produced during the last two centuries, and the increasing necessity for notes and other scholarly apparatus to aid the reader’s comprehension through time, Foley suggests that the high degree of allusiveness admitted into the manuscript text of *Beowulf* suggests how close in time the production of its original written form was to the active performance of oral narrative in the experience of its intended readership.

#### Sources and Analogues

Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr., includes an understudied chapter in the history of scholarship on the poem in his study of “The Frisians in *Beowulf*—*Beowulf* in Frisia: The Vicissitudes of Time,” in *Medieval English Literary and Cultural Studies: SELIM* 15, ed. Juan Comilo Conde Silvestre and María Nila Vásquez González (Murcia: Universidad de Murcia), 3–31. The author notes first that, while the main episodes of the poem are set in Scandinavia rather than Anglo-Saxon England, one West Germanic people, the Frisians, “play a considerable role in two of the epic’s sub-plots: the *Finnsburg Episode* and Hygelac’s raid on Frisia” (3). Bremmer attributes the poet’s interest in Frisians to their fame for wealth in gold, which resulted from their raising of cattle and control of trade between the Frankish empire and the north. The relative wealth of Frisia during the seventh and early eighth centuries supports an earlier dating of the poem’s composition to some time during this period. Bremmer rejects Walter Goffart’s hypothesis

(1981) that the *Beowulf* poet learned of Hygelac's attempt to acquire Frisian treasure for himself from the anonymous early eighth-century *Liber Historiae Francorum*, which is based upon Gregory of Tours's *Historia Francorum* (late sixth-century) but includes further mention of the *Hetware*, a tribal group also alluded to by the *Beowulf* poet in lines 2363a and 2916a. Bremmer points out that there is still no evidence that the *Liber Historiae* was known at all in Anglo-Saxon England and that its scant mention of Hygelac's raid could hardly have inspired the significance attributed to it in the poem, where it is mentioned four times. In the second half of his essay, Bremmer details the interest by Dutch scholars in Old English during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, especially that of two Frisians, Albert ten Broecke Hoekstra (1765–1827) and Joost Halbertsma (1789–1869). This interest was primarily patriotic in inspiration, but Thorkelin's first edition of *Beowulf* in 1815 gave it special impetus. Halbertsma contributed to Joseph Bosworth's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (1838) by supplying "many Frisian and Dutch cognates" and a chapter on "Friesic" (24). Halbertsma, by the way, was the first to recognize "that *Cædmon's Hymn* as it is found in the Old English translation of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, was not the original version, but a rather late one" and "that the original version must have been the Northumbrian one" (25).

Joshua R. Eyer, "Reassessing the Wrestling in *Beowulf*," *ELN* 41.3: 1–11, challenges Frank Peters (1992), who had argued that the struggle between the hero and Grendel is a form of Norse *hryggspenning* 'back-clasping' or 'bear-hugging'. Eyer suggests instead that the description of this fight is based upon a Greco-Roman wrestling move in which Beowulf grabs his opponent's right forearm from the outside, turning Grendel's body "continuously in a circle" backwards so that the monster is unable to grasp him with his left claw (7). This maneuver produces a lot of collateral damage in Hrothgar's hall as the huge combatants wheel about until our hero tries a "dirty trick," one regularly practiced also by the Olympic champion Leontikos in the mid-fifth-century BC: "he slides the hand that is holding Grendel's wrist down to the monster's fingers and breaks them [line 761]," eventually applying enough pressure on the arm as a whole, when Grendel struggles to escape, to tear it from his shoulder (7). The ripping out of arms from sockets is not a real wrestling move, Eyer reassures us, but suggests nonetheless that the Roman army brought to Britain a style of wrestling they had "adopted from the Greeks ... due to its popularity as an amphitheatre sport," a tradition which he thinks may have been

passed on to the native Britons and eventually to the Anglo-Saxons in that island (3).

Martin Puhvel has discovered "A Seventeenth-Century Parallel to the Circling of Beowulf's Barrow," *NM* 105: 33–35, in Robert Herrick's poem, "The Dirge of Jephthah's Daughter: Sung by the Virgins" (1648). Puhvel observes that this analogue differs from previously noted parallels "in ancient literature—such as the compassing of the corpse of Patroclus by chariots in *The Iliad* and that of Attila by riders in Jordanes's *Getica*" (33)—in that "Herrick's poem offers the only instance aside from *Beowulf* where it is the grave, "rather than the corpse, that is circled" (34). Puhvel notes that the circumambulation of the grave in Herrick's piece is indisputably a "seventeenth-century English custom" and considers it likely that it was also practiced at the time of the composition of *Beowulf* (34). He proposes, therefore, that the circling of the barrow in *Beowulf* reflects not a literary influence, but "a deep-rooted, time-honored popular death-rite, elevated in the epic to a heroic level" (35).

T. K. Salbiev examines "Motiv mesti v epose anglosaksov i osetin [The Motif of Revenge in Anglo-Saxon and Ossetian Epic]," in the festschrift for Steblin-Kamenskii, ed. Smirnit'skaya, 424–28, with a summary in English. Ossetian is an Indo-European language of the Caucasus Mountains, related to the speech of the Alans, who joined forces with the Germanic-speaking Vandals in the early fifth century AD, and to Old Persian, in which has been preserved the story of a hero who cuts off the arm of an enemy in order to prove that he has avenged a kinsman. The author believes this analogue to Beowulf's removal and display of Grendel's arm suggests an explanation as to why the hero quietly lets Grendel kill and eat his retainer Hondscioh: the slaying of his man thereby justifies the hero's personal vengeance upon the monster, for which he needs at least an arm as evidence of the deed.

In the same volume, I.I. Chekalov, "Makbet v sopostavlenii s Kheremodom i problema fabul'noi variativnosti [Macbeth and Heremod and the Problem of Narrative Variation]," 429–44, with a summary in English, observes several similarities in the career paths of these two characters which he attributes to the influence of Scandinavian oral tradition upon Anglo-Saxon and Scottish storytelling from the ninth century on. In another piece in the same collection, "Mech v *Beovulf*: aspekty izobrazheniya i fabul'naya znachimost' [The Sword in *Beowulf*: Aspects of its Depiction and

Narrative Significance],” 283–93, with a summary in English, Chekalov describes the general importance of this weapon in Germanic culture and Old English poetry, especially *Beowulf*, but notes that in the hero’s own fights, swords often prove problematic or ineffective and are only rarely used as a positive symbol of victory.

In “The Hagiography of Steel: The Hero’s Weapon and Its Place in Pop Culture,” in *The Medieval Hero on the Screen: Representations from Beowulf to Buffy*, ed. Martha W. Driver and Sid Ray (Jefferson, NC: McFarland), 151–66, Carl James Grindley describes the motif in which a distinctive weapon is used to symbolize the hero’s “inherent worth” (153), like Clint Eastwood’s .44 Magnum in the Dirty Harry movies. Grindley does not discuss film representations of the character Beowulf *per se*, but notes by way of comparison that the *Beowulf* poet honors this convention in the breach with a hero who eschews carrying any weapon at all against Grendel in lines 679–88 and who finds that Hrunting, a sword belonging to the inferior warrior Unferth, will not work for him against Grendel’s mother. Even the blade of the giants’ sword with which Beowulf dispatches the mother and decapitates her dead son dissolves in his hand, demonstrating that “no sword is the match for Beowulf; no object can symbolize his worth” (154).

#### Criticism

Andy Orchard considers the efforts of several transmitters of the poem during the last millennium in “Reading *Beowulf* Now and Then,” *SELIM* 12 (2003–04): 49–81, already noted briefly above in the section on *Text, Language, Meter*. The formulaic collocation of temporal adverbs in the title of his article refers to (1) the scattered nature of the readings of the poem Orchard has selected to discuss, (2) the relevance of these past interpretations (then) to the many competing ones offered in our own time (now), and (3) what this past and present “multiplicity of perspectives” (49) can predict about how *Beowulf* will be read in the future (then, again). He begins with the two Anglo-Saxon scribes of the manuscript text in Cotton Vitellius A.xv, whom Orchard sees as the first real editors of the poem (53), forced to grapple with its verbal density and thematic complexity on a letter-by-letter, word-by-word, line-by-line basis. Scribe A copied from the beginning of the poem through the penultimate word of line 1939 (*scyran*); Scribe B wrote from the last word of line 1939 (*moste*) through the end of the poem. These two scribes troubled to make many more corrections to the text

they produced than did any other Anglo-Saxon copyists on record: the exemplar from which they were working obviously gave them great difficulty. Not only do both scribes correct their own stints, but Scribe B, presumably the senior since he uses an older-fashioned hand, also felt it necessary to go back to correct the work of his junior partner. Orchard supplies an appendix tabulating these scribal corrections to the manuscript text (68–75), including notes on the various kinds of error thus corrected, according to a common pathology of “textually transmitted diseases” (52): haplography, ditto-graphy, metathesis, etc. In a few instances, the scribes have erroneously obtruded a familiar Christian word or idea into this poem about pagan heroes without subsequent correction, a kind of mistake that can be paralleled in the work of other Anglo-Saxon scribes who produced the *Vercelli Book*, the *Junius Manuscript*, and the *Exeter Book*. For instance, in line 1816a, “the form *helle* (‘hell’) is clearly visible in the manuscript, although editors in general prefer *hæle* (‘warriors’); in line 225ob, the form *fyrena* (‘crimes, sins’) is mostly emended to *fyra* (‘fires’); and in line 1983a Scribe B has first written *hæðnum* (‘heathens’), then the -ð- has been erased, and most editors prefer to emend to *hæleðum* (‘warriors, heroes’)” to restore what they believe to be the correct authorial version (54). (It should be noted that the emended form *fyra* in line 225ob is not usually understood to be the genitive plural of *fyr* ‘fire’, but of *firas* ‘men, mankind’, as Orchard himself elsewhere translates it (2000, p. 228).

Orchard then fast-forwards over the next eight centuries to Grímur Jónsson Thorkelin’s first rendering of the poem as a scholarly edition in 1815, using modern conventions of “lineation, capitalization, word-division, and punctuation,” plus an expansion of abbreviations and a facing-page translation into Latin (54–55). This text, too, like that of the Anglo-Saxon scribes, is an interpretation of the poem that is full of obvious confusions and mistakes. John Josias Conybeare sought to correct these errors and made plenty of his own in a posthumously published revision of Thorkelin’s text and translation in 1826. The mistakes in Conybeare’s version were noted “with undisguised glee” (55), though not in print, by Frederic Madden, eventually Keeper of Manuscripts in the British Museum, including that of *Beowulf*. Later in the century, William Morris acquired Conybeare’s marked-up copy of Thorkelin, which had been used to create the 1826 edition and translation. He was inspired to produce his own rendering of the poem into Modern English, *The Tale of Beowulf, Sometime King of the Weder Geats* (1895), which was “in its day

every bit as famous as the recent one of Seamus Heaney” (57). Morris’s translation has not worn well among twentieth-century critics, even though Orchard himself admires the translator’s respect for the verbal and thematic richness of the poem. Among translations of *Beowulf*, he believes that Morris’s is “one of the most faithful, one of the most honest in its transmission of the difficulties of the text, one of the bravest in attempting to convey its complexities” (67). Orchard thus honors the scribes, scholars, and translators who have undertaken the challenge of trying to comprehend and present *Beowulf* as a complete poem. But even more, he finds himself “left in sheer admiration of this deeply layered and textured work, the resonances of which remain long after it is read or heard read” (67). For a thousand years, no reader has found “any all-embracing solution to the poem’s mysteries” (67). This may not always be the case, Orchard admits, but he suspects that the multifarious responses expressed to *Beowulf* thus far simply reflect the poem’s own inherent depth and complexity, its reluctance to offer simple views, its reticence about answering definitively the many questions it poses or implies.

Tony Davenport’s chapter on “Epic—from *Beowulf* to Boccaccio,” in his *Medieval Narrative: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford UP), 105–30, offers a brisk plot summary of the poem and reprise of Tolkien’s classic essay, “*Beowulf*: The Monsters and the Critics” (1936) (109–11). Davenport allows himself only one or two passing judgments of his own, such as: “Considered simply in terms of effective narration the best part of *Beowulf* is the central one of the three episodes, Beowulf’s fight with Grendel’s mother [which] demonstrates the poet’s skills in unfolding an event with appropriate visualization, adjustment of pace, mixture of narrative, speech, and description” (109–10). Otherwise, Davenport presents, in very general terms, Tolkien’s estimation of the poem not as a “national epic” or “ancestral memory of the race,” but as a unique composition, an “elegiac[,] ... melancholy meditation,” through the youthful career and ultimate death a “fictional” hero, “on the attempts of human society to stem the forces that threaten” (111).

Richard Bodeck, in “Beowulf,” *Explicator* 62: 130–32, briefly reviews the old question of whether the poem is essentially pagan in ethos and world-view with a superficial “Christian overlay,” or basically a Christian poem with “pagan overtones” (130). The author examines Hrothgar’s thoughts on the Geatish hero’s “seemingly self-evident act of Christian valor” in coming voluntarily to fight monsters in a foreign land (131).

Of particular interest to Bodeck is the Danish king’s cautionary tale about his predecessor Heremod in lines 1709b–22a, the thrust of which the author sees rather distinctively: “Hrothgar, the poem’s moral center, tells Beowulf not to renounce tradition for Christianity. This is the undeniable logic, intended or not, of Hrothgar’s report on Heremod’s rise in the world. Heremod’s tragedy lay in his reliance on Christian blessing and favor with God, rather than on adherence to the traditional Danish code” of taking care of one’s own people first and protecting them from all enemies (131). Hrothgar very much appreciates Beowulf’s help, but discourages him from further foreign adventures of the kind on which Heremod came to grief. One should not go around trying to do good deeds for just anybody, the old king implies, because the Christian God is quite “fickle” in rewarding such “random acts of kindness”: “The only gifts that matter are those exchanged among mortals with generosity” (132). Beowulf takes this advice to heart, Bodeck believes, by choosing “the old ways” in his subsequent career as king of the Geats. Through his fierce protection of his own people in their own land for half a century the noble king finds what in the pagan value system would be regarded as the supremely “good life” (132).

In “...*prym gefrunon ... helle gemundon*”: Indogermanic *shruti* and Christian *smrti* in the Epistemology of *Beowulf*,” *Jnl of Northern European Studies* 1: 5–14 (available online at <http://heorot.dk/beowulf-indogermanic.html>), Benjamin Slade, too, judges the balance between the poem’s pagan and Christian ideas in favor of the former. He introduces two terms from Sanskrit to differentiate between levels of sacred tradition: *shruti* ‘what is heard’ are timeless canonical truths revealed by the gods in the *Vedas* and *Upanishads*; *smrti* ‘what is remembered’ are accounts of the past, like the *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana*, which are of secondary authority and may be elaborated or adapted in various ways. Slade suggests that the *Beowulf* poet viewed the biblical stories he learned from the Old Testament as just this kind of secondary *smrti*, new historical information with which to supplement the *shruti* or truly sacred myths he had inherited from his forebears. The poet can thus represent the biblical Cain as the ancestor of the giants and other creatures of native mythology in lines 99–114 without himself having undergone a particularly thorough conversion to Christianity or “a major change of world-view.” Likewise, the Flood story in the poem, Slade argues, is really an ancient pagan myth, which has merely been conflated by the poet with the story he has learned from Genesis 6 as a kind of



learned rationalization. Slade believes that Snorri Sturluson (1179–1241) has preserved in his *Edda* a northern Germanic version of an earlier Indo-European myth, in which the gods slay a primeval titan whose flowing blood drowns the whole race of giants, except for one family. In the Hindu cognate of this story, Indra slays the dragon-like Vrtra releasing a deluge of blood/water that similarly washes away the monster's own body. In *Beowulf*, Slade concludes, a pagan "*shruti*-myth" has thus been updated by "Christian *smṛti*," in which the evil giants have all been destroyed in a violent flood that has nonetheless spared one family of amphibious survivors. We found one small puzzle in Slade's presentation, however. In the first part of the title of his essay, the author quotes two nearly rhyming, but widely separated half-lines from the poem: line 2b, *brym gefrunon* '[we] have heard of the strength [of the Spear-Danes in the old days, etc.]', and line 179b, *helle gemundon* '[the Danes] remembered hell [in their hearts]'. This second phrase is apparently the comment of a Christian poet who suddenly remembers and regrets the heathenism of the Danes. He laments that their ignorance of the true God ironically drives them to sacrifice for relief from Grendel to the old gods who, in standard Augustinian demonology, are really just devils in disguise and thus under the direction of the ultimate source of the Danes' distress, the *gastbona* "soul-slayer" Satan himself (line 177a). Calling attention to this passage would seem to contradict the author's thesis that the *Beowulf* poet is essentially pagan in his view of the world and that he has only colored his rendering of traditional sacred story, his *shruti*-myth, with a few details of biblical lore. Perhaps Slade wishes to imply that the "hell" which the Danes recall during their sacrifices to the old gods is the dreadful calamity those gods had once inflicted upon the giants of old, a perdition which they devoutly hope will once again be visited upon the evil offspring of the survivors of that flood.

Paul Cavill, on the other hand, vigorously affirms the clarity and consistency of "Christianity and Theology in *Beowulf*," in *The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England: Approaches to Current Scholarship and Teaching*, ed. Cavill (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer), 15–39, by comparing this poem with other more obviously Christian ones in the Old English corpus, like *Genesis* and *Exodus*, which similarly exclude any mention of Christ or of events described in the gospels. Cavill notes that the *Beowulf* poet uses the same "standard words and images" as these other Old English poets in expressing his religious ideas (39) and that he makes his characters voice the same "New Testament understanding of

God, the devil, judgement, heaven and hell; and indeed of the Old Testament" itself (38). The allusions to Cain and the Flood would thus have been immediately intelligible and explanatory to a Christian Anglo-Saxon audience whose hypothetical limitations Cavill believes have been greatly exaggerated in recent scholarship: "it is the audience of the poem in the last half-century that has been confused about the Christianity of the poem, not the poet or whatever contemporary audience the poem might have had" (39).

Horace Jeffery Hodges also maintains the essential Christianity of *Beowulf* in "*Preparatio Evangelium: Beowulf as Antetype of Christ*," *Medieval and Early Modern English Studies* (Seoul, Korea) 12: 307–39. Hodges interprets the pagan hero in much the same way that Old Testament patriarchs, judges and kings—like Adam, Noah, Isaac, Moses, or David—were understood to prefigure the coming of Christ. Following Tolkien (1936), Morton Bloomfield (1963), Nicholas Howe (1989), and Thomas Hill (1994), Hodges sees the poem "as set in an Anglo-Saxon equivalent of Old Testament times" (327). Hodges takes this view even though the action of the poem technically already belongs to the Christian era, if it is understood to take place during the time of the Germanic migrations of the fifth and sixth centuries A.D. The author implies that insistence upon this latter chronology would be an over-literal misreading of the pre-Christian world imagined by the poet, one which would put "Beowulf and Christ in the wrong temporal order," taking Christ as an "archetype" against which the hero must inevitably fail to measure up (328). It is true that the hero's self-sacrifice fails to "ensure the long-term salvation of his people" (339), Hodges admits, but it is thereby intended to anticipate the more perfect and universally efficacious sacrifice to come. Hodges notes typological foreshadowings of the Passion in the dragon-fight episode: (1) the hero approaches the barrow with eleven followers, the twelfth being the Judas-like "thief" (line 2219a) who provoked the dragon's attack; and (2) the hero is aided by his *leofa* 'beloved' retainer Wiglaf (line 2745a), recalling the similarly *agapa* 'beloved' disciple John (John 13.23, 19.26, and 21.20) who stands by his lord until his death on the cross. Hodges thus challenges the position taken by E. Talbot Donaldson (1966) and Harold Bloom (1987) that *Beowulf* is lacking any reference to the New Testament. He insists instead that the figure of Christ "is present, even pervasive" in the poet's depiction of its hero (339).

John M. Hill, in "Violence and the Making of Wiglaf," *A Great Effusion of Blood?: Interpreting Medieval Violence*,

ed. Mark D. Meyerson, Daniel Thiery, and Oren Falk (Toronto: U of Toronto P), 19–33, looks more closely at the role and status of the hero's loyal young retainer. Hill suggests that Wiglaf's brave and canny blow against the dragon, in which his hand is burned, serves to raise him from a remote, non-royal relative of the king to the new leader of the Geats. Hill acknowledges that Wiglaf disappears from the poem as an individual character soon after the king dies, but resists the notion that his importance is thereby diminished or that the Geatish nation will certainly soon be destroyed by its enemies, as both Wiglaf himself in lines 2884–91 and his messenger to the camp in lines 2910b–3027 predict. The accuracy of this prediction is confirmed by the poet himself in lines 3028–30a and repeated once again at the very end of the poem by the Geatish woman in lines 3150–55a. But Hill reads these prophecies primarily as dramatizations of the characters' own sense of their great loss. The Geats under Wiglaf's rule will not actually be destroyed, he suggests, but simply relinquish their old name and take on that of the family of their new king, the Wægmundings. In this scenario, Wiglaf's act of violence, though leaving his hand presumably disfigured and perhaps permanently maimed, has served to ennoble him far beyond his initial status in the poem and comes to symbolize his right to rule.

Stefan A. Jurasinski, in "The Ecstasy of Vengeance: Legal History, Old English Scholarship, and the 'Feud' of Hengest," *RES* n.s. 55: 641–61, believes that nineteenth-century accounts of early Germanic society greatly exaggerated the duty of blood revenge, a view that had already become obsolete among legal historians by the time Frederick Klaeber first published his influential edition of *Beowulf* in 1922. Klaeber assumed that the Finn Episode (1063–1159a) dramatized this ancient revenge imperative with special force and clarity, and most subsequent scholars have interpreted the hapax legomenon *worold-ræden* of line 1142b as "world's counsel" or "custom," referring to a categorical social ideal that a man should avenge his lord with blood, a principle which Hengest did not reject in spite of oaths sworn under duress to his lord's slayer Finn. Klaeber's edition promotes this understanding of the situation, even though he himself emended the accusative *worold-rædenne* to dative *weorod-rædende* 'ruler of the host, king,' yielding a translation of line 1142: "So, then, he [Hengest] did not refuse it [the *torngemot* 'hostile meeting, fight' of line 1140a] to the ruler of the host [Finn]" (see Klaeber's edition [1950], p. 176). Jurasinski admits that certain "rules of vengeance" may yet be revealed by this narrative sequence, but insists that the

standard readings of it "illustrate the dangers of assuming the poem's historical 'context' to be anything other than the construct of a particular era of scholarship" (661).

Inspired by anthropologist Gayle Rubin's 1975 call for further study of the transfer of women in economic and political relations, Carol Parish Jamison examines the "Traffic of Women in Germanic Literature: The Role of the Peace Pledge in Marital Exchanges," *Women in German Yearbook* 20: 13–36. She draws upon evidence from *The Wife's Lament*, *Wulf and Eadwacer*, *Völsungasaga*, and *Beowulf*. Jamison concludes that marriages arranged by male relatives were, "in many respects, ... oppressive to Germanic women, who sometimes had no voice in marital decisions and could end up in unhappy and even disastrous unions" (30). The stories of Hildeburh and Freawaru are two examples from *Beowulf* where "traffic in women fails to preserve peace" (23) and the women themselves end up in misery. However, the characters Wealhtheow and Hygd in the poem are shown to be more successful in finding a powerful role for themselves in their husbands' courts through their status as mother of their sons. Jamison sees the character of Thryth as an example of a woman who rebels against her use as an object of exchange. If her *firen' ondrysne* 'terrible crimes' (1932b) are taken, as they usually are, to be those of an unmarried woman, then Thryth is princess who resists being used by her male relatives in marital exchange by eliminating (literally) all her potential suitors on hypersensitive pretexts. Or if, as Shippey argues (2001), Thryth's misbehavior is that of a married woman, she can be seen as "acting out" in the court of her unnamed first husband against the role intended for her by pretending grievances where she should be cultivating peaceful relations. "Thryth acquiesces to her role as peace pledge only after her marriage to Offa," demonstrating "that the success of marital exchanges depends upon the willingness and capability of the woman to assume a diplomatic position in her husband's court" (25). Jamison stresses that female characters in *Beowulf* and the other literary works she considers express manifold responses to their role in marital exchanges, often "asserting their influence as mothers and diplomats by king-making, or king-breaking, in their new husbands' homes" (31).

Thomas L. Wymer and Erin Labbie discuss "Civilized Rage in *Beowulf*," *Heroic Age* 7 (Spring), n.p. (online), pointing out that the poet three times uses the past participle *gebolgen* 'swollen with rage' of the normally restrained hero in lines 709a, 1539b, and 2401b,

to show his ability to call up sufficient anger when it is needed to counter the uncontrolled rage of his monstrous opponents. In addition, the collocation in line 1564a *hreoþ ond heorogrim* ‘fierce and sword-grim’ suggests to the authors that Beowulf finds within himself an even greater force of “desperate rage” that gives him enough strength to wield the massive sword of the giants. The hero expresses this level of anger only when challenged by potent monsters that threaten the community from without, in contrast to other human characters in the poem, like Heremod (lines 1713–19a), whose anger is directed against his own people and with whom Beowulf is clearly contrasted in lines 2177–83a. Controlled rage thus plays a key role in the protection of civilized institutions, but the authors suggest, adapting the psychosocial theories of Norbert Elias (1982 and 1994), that successful state-formation “paradoxically requires leaders less scrupulous and more ruthless than Beowulf, more concerned with exerting and expanding power over others rather than the kind of self-mastery exhibited by Beowulf. Thus Beowulf fails to effect any lasting change on his society.”

Judy Anne White, in *Hero-Ego in Search of Self: A Jungian Reading of “Beowulf”* Studies in the Humanities: Literature–Politics–Society 26 (New York: Peter Lang), analyzes the poem according to the theories of Carl Gustav Jung, following Helterman (1968), who identified Grendel and his mother as manifestations of two Jungian archetypes, the Shadow and the Anima, respectively; and Foley (1977), who saw in *Beowulf* a recapitulation of “the process of individual psychological growth and the development of universal human consciousness” (1). White takes the dragon as an archetypal image of the adult Self, which the aggressively selfish ego must confront before achieving a fully integrated and self-aware identity. The near simultaneous deaths of hero and dragon imply a merging of this immature ego into the mature Self, in which the former “gives up its status as the center of the personality,” marking “a final step in the process of individuation” and bringing into balance “egotism and altruism,” “private and public selves,” and “mortal and eternal selves” (110).

In “Fearing My Neighbor: The Intimate Other in *Beowulf* and the Old English *Judith*,” *Comitatus* 35: 1–21, Kate Koppelman analyzes the young hero’s monster-fights and Judith’s decapitation of Holofernes according to theories of identity formation derived from Deleuze and Guattari (1987) and Lacan (1992), which stress the psychosocial dynamic of very close contact or “alliance” between an individual and a neighboring but

alien Other. On the one hand, the defeat of this closely threatening enemy secures the protagonist’s heroic identity. However, by pushing “the monster away from the center, to the edge,” the hero or heroine moves “closer to that edge” him- or herself (8). Even earlier, Beowulf and Judith had been marked out as very different from other people of their own kind. But after defiling themselves in bloody intimacy with the enemy, their former identity dissolves into a hybrid of opposed principles. For the monstrously powerful Beowulf, “the soldier and the monster align to make a Hero” (18). The fiercely chaste Judith preemptively violates the would-be rapist’s own body. She must fight like a demon to kill a demon and thus takes away with her “a part of that demonic identity” into her new anomalous role (20).

Janice Hawes also believes heroes like Beowulf are “liminal figures, and their exceptional abilities place them beyond the human norm,” in “Monsters, Heroes and Social Identity in Medieval Icelandic and English Literature,” Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of California, Davis, *DAI* 65, no. 09A: 3377. “[A] hero can very easily become an outcast ... because his abilities have made him a threat[,] a ‘monster’ to his society.” Yet compared with the Icelandic heroes Gunnarr of *Njáls saga*, Barðr of *Barðar saga*, and Grettir of *Grettis saga*, the Old English Beowulf shows the necessary “wisdom and restraint that keeps [him] within his human community.”

Psychological approaches to *Beowulf* are also undertaken in two other doctoral dissertations. Anne H. Lambert, in Chapter 1 of “The Wild Woman and Her Sisters in Medieval English Literature,” Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Florida, 2003, *DAI* 64A: 4456, identifies Grendel’s mother as a particular subtype of the Wild Woman she calls the “Terrible Mother, ... a figure from the depths of the psyche, ‘both subhuman and superhuman.’” The hero Beowulf reveals and confirms his male “psychological makeup in his confrontation with this being.” In “The Growth of a Self: A Psychoanalytic Reading of *Beowulf*,” Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Cincinnati, 2004, *DAI* 65A: 1772, Susan Hathaway Boydston draws upon the work of Melanie Klein, Erik Erikson, and other psychologists to argue that the poet symbolizes the pre-genital (that is, oral and anal) phases of male development in the story of Scyld Scefing and the three monster-fights. In particular, the figure of Scyld is used to represent the happy dependence of an infant son upon his powerful mother until he must separate his individual consciousness “from the paradise of the preambivalent unitary dyad.” Beowulf’s monster-fights represent the “rage and anger” experienced by a male

child during “the traumas and conflicts” inherent in the early stages of individuation.

Lauryn S. Mayer uses the analogy of recombinant genetics to describe “The Anglo-Saxon *Chronicle* Manuscript Family and Heroic Poetry,” in Chapter 3 of her *Worlds Made Flesh: Reading Medieval Manuscript Culture* (New York: Routledge), 75–119. In this model, texts descended from the same sources reveal unique restatements of related material that offer alternative perspectives when compared closely with each other. For instance, the poetic account of the battle of Brunanburh celebrates this “isolated victory” in order to express a generically different response—very positive—to the troubles surrounding the year 937 as recounted in the prose *Chronicle* entries. *The Battle of Maldon* similarly transforms the disaster of 991 into a statement of “defiant unity” (96), in clear contrast to the less inspiring depiction of events in the prose *Chronicle*. Mayer believes that the case of *Beowulf* is similar, though more complicated. This poem serves to displace the distress and humiliation Anglo-Saxons suffered in the constant internecine warfare of their political lives “onto a series of analogous groups [Danes, Geats, and others] whose chronological and geographical distance provides a place” for the poet to voice “the unspeakable” (96), that is, to portray imaginatively the repeated failure of his culture’s heroic ideals in the many historical instances of “defeat, treachery, or cowardice” (98). (Mayer would place the composition of the poem anywhere between the 700s and the time its extant manuscript was copied ca. 1000, since the same kind of mortifying political turmoil characterizes this whole period.) In conclusion, Mayer argues that the poem “reveals history itself as something monstrous, a power lurking in the shadows that can strike at the heart of the hall” (109), the inevitable result of social values like heroic honor and the duty of revenge that drive human groups to such destructive—self-destructive—violence. The poem’s “narrative structure cannot but help to provide the fuel for the very practices it questions, and its only solution is to lay its own practice open to question” (110).

Alexandra Bolintineanu’s “On the Borders of Old Stories’: Enacting the Past in *Beowulf* and *The Lord of the Rings*,” *Tolkien and the Invention of Myth*, ed. Jane Chance (Lexington: UP of Kentucky), 263–73, examines episodes of an earlier mythic or legendary past that are recounted in the main narrative of both works, stories which “often [echo] the situation in the fictional present” (264). She notes that while this narrative present is often seen itself as a legend in the making, the

stories of the past can also influence characters’ decisions as they choose their own course of action “based on the desirability or undesirability of fully reenacting the past in their own lives” (268). However, Bolintineanu also observes that, “even when the characters do not consciously use legendary narrative as a guide for present actions, they enact it nevertheless. In both texts ‘history’ repeats itself, as present actions fulfill the same universal patterns of fratricide or heroic sacrifice or transience that inform the legendary episodes” (268). The deaths of the kings Hrethel and Ongentheow anticipate *Beowulf*’s own, for instance, while the stories of Isildur, Eärendil, or Beren and Luthien, echo aspects of the main story of *The Lord of the Rings*. The author concludes that, “when legend and principal narrative run in parallel, they explain each other and enrich each other’s significance” (272).

Matthias Eitelmann describes “The Construction of the Hero in *Beowulf* and the De-Construction of the Heroic Concept in John Gardner’s *Grendel*,” *The Image of the Hero in Literature, Media, and Society: Selected Papers [of the] Society for the Interdisciplinary Study of Social Imagery, March 2004, Colorado Springs, Colorado*, ed. Will Wright and Steven Kaplan (Pueblo: Colorado State Univ.), 358–64. For *Beowulf*, Eitelmann argues that one of the main ways the poet develops his noble hero is “by contrasting him with his monstrous opponents and his other human antagonists” (361), especially “Grendel, the ideal anti-hero” (359). In Gardner’s *Grendel* (1971), on the other hand, the conflict is not between a protective hero and a threatening monster, but between competing philosophies, in which Grendel is made to voice a “post-modern/poststructuralist” view of reality, which “assumes that the world is merely constructed by language,” while the hero insists on the existence of “a world beyond the word” (363). “*Beowulf* forces Grendel to discard his solipsistic stance” by banging his head against the hard walls of Heorot, but does not thereby become the hero of the story. In fact, the death of the monster is represented by Gardner simply as a “pointless accident” (cf. *Grendel*, p. 28), when the creature “slips and falls, only thereby giving *Beowulf* the opportunity to defeat him, which is not really the heroic act” depicted in the Old English poem (364). “Grendel’s fate” in the novel, Eitelmann concludes, simply dramatizes “the potential destiny for all those who might also get trapped in their solipsistic world-views. Grendel’s final words are a curse and a warning” for all post-moderns who believe that the world we perceive is an illusory construct of language: “Poor Grendel’s had an accident. *So may you all*” (*Grendel*, p. 174; Eitelmann, 364). This



intellectual monster, seduced into disaster by his own mistaken theory of language, thus becomes “a tragic hero, a hero of the twentieth century” (364).

In “Critiquing Privileged Spaces: Seeing and (Re)-envisioning the ‘Technologies’ of *Beowulf* and Anglo-Saxon Studies,” Ph.D. Diss., Purdue Univ., 2003, *DAI* 64A: 4044, Steven T. Benninghoff laments that scholarship on Old English language and literature has become “a self-isolating field” whose broader appeal, “[t]hanks to the work of J. R. R. Tolkien and a generation of science-fiction and fantasy literature, . . . is largely escapist.” He offers Andrew Feenberg’s “critical theory of technology” as a way to readjust “the focus, audiences, and purposes” of Anglo-Saxon studies so that the field can engage more fully contemporary social, political, and technological issues. Chapter 4 considers how this new model might be applied in the teaching and study of *Beowulf*.

#### *Translations and Translation Studies*

Alan Sullivan and Timothy Murphy’s translation of *Beowulf*, ed. Sarah M. Anderson, A Longman Cultural Edition (New York: Longman) is designed to situate the poem in several of its contexts with generous selections translated from other works of Old English poetry and prose; from the Latin of the Vulgate Genesis, Tacitus, Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, the *Liber monstrorum*, Bede, Alcuin, Nennius, Asser, Æthelweard, William of Malmesbury, Sven Aggesen, and Saxo Grammaticus; and from the Old Norse of the *Poetic Edda*, *Grettir’s Saga*, the *Saga of the Ynglings*, the *Saga of King Hrolf Kraki*, and other pieces. The place of the poem in its manuscript context is noted as well and nine translations of the first twenty-five lines are compared, from that of Sharon Turner (1805) to Ruth Lehmann’s “imitative” rendering (1988). The editor also supplies a plot summary, glossary of names, table of dates, genealogical charts, maps of the geography of the poem and of seventh-century Anglo-Saxon England, and a full, up-to-date list of further readings. The translators have sought four basic principles in their rendering: (1) a four-beat line; (2) “a loosened variant of the Scop’s Rule, alliterating three times in most lines, but using other patterns of alliteration as well”; (3) “modern syntax, with some inversion for rhetorical effect”; and (4) a preference for words of Germanic rather than Latin origin whenever possible (xviii). Sullivan and Murphy render the first eleven lines of the poem as follows, varying Seamus Heaney’s 1999/2000 rendering of the opening *Hwæt* with an exclamation mark:

So! The Spear-Danes in days of old  
were led by lords famed for their forays.  
We learned of those princes’ power and prowess.  
Often Scyld Scefing ambushed enemies,  
took their mead-benches, mastered their troops,  
though first he was found forlorn and alone.  
His early sorrows were swiftly consoled:  
he grew great under heaven, grew to a greatness  
renowned among men of neighboring lands,  
his rule recognized over the whale-road,  
tribute granted him. That was a good king!

Thereafter, the translators progressively abbreviate the number of lines in their rendering to yield a total of 2800 for the 3182 lines of the Old English text, a twelve percent reduction in overall length, without supplying a key by which readers can conveniently coordinate a translated passage with the original.

Frederick Rebsamen offers *Beowulf: An Updated Verse Translation* of his prior renderings of the poem from 1971 and 1991 (New York: Perennial Classics). Like Sullivan and Murphy, Rebsamen has sought to replicate as closely as possible the four-stress alliterative long line of the original, but altered syntax where necessary for clarity in Modern English. He supplies a slim but efficient critical apparatus of Introduction, Genealogies, Selected Proper Names, and Suggested Readings, as well as prose summaries before the major episodes of the narrative. Rebsamen punctuates lightly, sparing the commas and semicolons in particular. He suggests that the “best way to understand this translation is simply to read slowly with pauses between verses when it seems natural” (vii). The opening eleven lines of the poem go as follows:

Yes! We have heard of years long vanished  
how Spear-Danes struck sang victory-songs  
raised from a wasteland walls of glory.  
When Scyld Scefing shamed his enemies  
measured meadhalls made them his own  
since down by the sea-swirl sent from nowhere  
the Danes found him floating with gifts  
bound to their shore. Scyld grew tall then  
roamed the waterways rode through the lands  
till every strongman each warleader  
sailed the whalepaths sought him with gold  
there knelt to him. That was a king!

In *Seamus Heaney on the New Beowulf* (Princeton, NJ: Films for the Humanities and Sciences), the Northern Irish poet discusses his translation in an interview

with Elizabeth Farnsworth on *The News Hour with Jim Lehrer*, originally broadcast in 2000, and preserved here in DVD. Farnsworth questions Heaney about the cultural background of the *Beowulf* poet and the relation between Old English and the variety of English spoken in rural Ireland. The poet remarks on how he tried to find a voice between the “sturdy, stressed language,” the “country-speak” of his father’s cousin, who though uneducated spoke in a very dignified formal way, and the “learned-speak” that he encountered in his later study of the poem. As a teenager Heaney had become acquainted with the shorter Old English poems, but *Beowulf* was the monster lying in wait for him at university (Queen’s, Belfast). He then reads from his rendering of lines 86–98, on Grendel’s prowling in the darkness as Hrothgar’s scop sings of the creation of the world, followed by a few lines in Old English from the beginning of the passage. Heaney describes and illustrates how he sought to replicate the meter and alliteration of the poem in several lines of his translation that appear in written form on the screen. When Farnsworth suggests that the culture of vengeance in the poem was especially relevant to the poet’s own Northern Ireland, Heaney demurs, insisting that revenge is not a value of his Ulster culture and that the revival of ethnic grievances in the former Yugoslavia is perhaps a more apt and immediate analogy. In fact, far from expressing a thirst for vengeance, Heaney finds the poem’s emotional core in the grief and fear of the woman’s lament by *Beowulf*’s pyre. This is the moment most expressive of a universal experience of loss, suffering, and atrocity. The *Beowulf* poet offers a veteran’s view of life, Heaney says, a sense that the world is untrustworthy. Heaney concludes his conversation by remarking that poetry does not have a past or a present, that there is a fundamental truthfulness in poems like *Beowulf*, an insight into human reality, that speaks directly to us today.

In “Translating *Beowulf*: Translators Crouched and Dangers Rampant,” *Medieval and Early Modern English Studies* (Seoul, Korea) 12.1: 5–41 (online), Jana K. Schulman discusses in detail six specific examples of ambiguity in *Beowulf*, accompanying each with an appendix showing how thirty different translators rendered those lines. For example, she notes that it is unclear whether the *æ* in *gæst* of line 86a is long or short, the former yielding “ghost, spirit,” the latter “guest.” She would translate *ellengæst* here as “powerful visitor,” rather than the over-specific “fierce spirit, demon,” because she believes that the momentary ambiguity as to the intended meaning of the compound is an artistic effect calculated to enhance suspense. However, Schulman’s

purpose is not merely to offer her own readings of the six ambiguous passages she selects for discussion, but to insist in general that the disambiguated translation of such words and phrases is not an acceptable aesthetic choice on the part of a translator or editor, whose fundamental responsibility is to render the original text as accurately as possible, including “ambiguity at its smallest level—that of puns, of pronouns, of substantivized adjectives, of foreshadowing.” Schulman concludes that the ambiguities in *Beowulf* create “a richer and more nuanced poem” and are thus to be preserved as such, rather than clarified.

In *PN Rev.* 31.2: 47–51, Chris Jones records “Edwin Morgan in Conversation” from an interview of 21 January 2003, shortly after the re-publication of the poet’s translation of *Beowulf* on the fiftieth anniversary of its first appearance in 1952 (Manchester: Carcanet, 2002). Jones observes that half a century “is the period of time the poem allots to the greatness of a man’s lifetime achievements” (47) and asks Morgan, like Hrothgar or *Beowulf*, to reflect on his youthful enterprise of fifty years earlier. When he first read *Beowulf* with the strict grammarian Ritchie Girvan at the University of Glasgow in the late 1930s, Morgan says, he found himself most moved by the psychological conflicts of the poem, its “tangle of loyalties” (47), that had special relevance for a pacifist student in those years. After his studies were interrupted for five years by WWII, translating *Beowulf* became the aspiring poet’s “unwritten war poem in a way” (48), giving expression to “themes of conflict and danger, voyaging and displacement, loyalty and loss. *Inter arma musae tacent* [‘the Muses are silent in the midst of arms’], but they are not sleeping,” as he says in the Preface to his new edition (ix). Morgan found the scenes of violence in the poem to be very compelling, but was also struck by the poet’s sympathy for the victims of conflict, his melancholy and sense of tragedy: “he’s quite a strange, subtle poet, enigmatic in many ways,” Morgan remarks. “No one knows exactly what he believes” (49). In terms of style, Morgan was the first translator of the poem to seek a more modern diction, as he stated in his long introductory essay criticizing previous translators for the archaism of their renderings. Yet, he admits that he likes and kept many of the old poetic compounds after all, as well as the four-stress line, both of which appear in his own later poetry. When asked what he would change in his translation, Morgan says he would now stress “the voice” of the poet, “the actual spoken element,” that he would work harder to make his rendering “more speakable” to an audience of listeners rather than leaving it so tightly

composed for the page (49). On this very point, when asked directly by Jones whether he had enjoyed Seamus Heaney's widely celebrated recent translation of the poem, Morgan politely compliments the "rival version" not for its voice, which the Irish poet made a point of modeling on the speech of his "big-voiced" Ulster relatives, but for its readability on the page. Morgan twice states his belief that Heaney's *Beowulf* will be "widely used" as a "great educational tool" (51), which is, after all, what his publisher (Norton) intended it to be. Morgan himself doubts, however, whether Heaney "has got the really deep interest in that [Anglo-Saxon] society and period which I have—I don't quite get that feeling of the kind of darkness—perhaps [Heaney's version] makes [the poem] a little bit more accommodating to the contemporary reader" (51).

Hideki Watanabe reviews the "the 'The Five Japanese Translations of *Beowulf* in the 1990s," *Studies in Language and Culture* (Osaka Univ.) 289 (2003): 435–54 (in Japanese, with a summary in English), beginning with the very first rendering by Kuriyagawa Fumio in 1931–32, who used an archaic but very graceful prose style based upon a thorough scholarly understanding of the poem in Old English. Subsequent translations were offered by Nagano Sakari (1966), Oba Keizo (1978), Hazome Takekazu (1985), and Oshitari Kinshiro (1990), whose rendering replaced the out-of-print Kuriyagawa in Iwanami's Classical Library as the standard version of *Beowulf* in Japanese. Yet, the 1990s produced several further translations, bringing Japan's total to ten, a silver medal for renderings of the Old English poem into a foreign language, only surpassed by fifteen translations into German as of 1996. In 1993, Ogawa Kazuhiko experimented with a dynamic diction that combined both archaism and contemporary slang, and used a traditional syllabic meter to render the half-lines of the original poem. Fujiwara Yasuaki (1995–96) employed an idiom of "plain Japanese," while Hasegawa Hiroshi published installments of an edition and translation, reaching line 2883 by 1996. Hiroshi indicates the etymological roots of most of the proper nouns in the poem by using Chinese ideograms with phonetic transcriptions into Japanese, sometimes also offering Japanese renderings of the name. Karibe Tsunenori (1989–93) has collated the texts of Klaeber (1950), Dobbie (1953), and Wrenn and Bolton (1973) to produce a facing-page edition and readable translation with notes that are thoroughly up-to-date with current critical views of the poem. In contrast, another facing-page edition and translation by Yamaguchi Hideo (1995), is primarily linguistic in focus with a weighty apparatus of citations to

standard grammars like Quirk and Wrenn (1957) and Mitchell (1985). Watanabe judges this last volume to be the single most important contribution to *Beowulf* studies in Japan during the 1990s, but would ideally recommend the use of both Karibe's and Yamaguchi's editions in order to derive maximum benefit from their respective literary and linguistic approaches.

#### *Teaching 'Beowulf'*

In "Identity Politics and the Fragility of Civilization: Teaching *Beowulf* in the Context of General Education," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 11.2: 7–17, Russell Rutter suggests that, in order to teach *Beowulf* effectively to Gen Ed students, who are unlikely to "think that studying *Beowulf*—even in translation—will help them reach their career goals," one must connect aspects of Old English culture to the students' own lives (7). He observes that many students "seem to find something that speaks to them in that culture of long ago which so emphasizes the qualities of friendship, of the group, of belonging" (9). But Rutter believes the poem can also be used to explore the price of belonging, noting that "[t]he comfort that the Geats may have derived from their unity under a great leader has come in part from a corresponding hostility to those who are not Geats" (14) and "[c]ommitment to any sort of identity politics—whether among Old English people or among folks in Illinois in 2003—means, or can mean, having to reject other people" (15). Because students can see the connections between their own problems and those in Old English literature, Rutter feels that "*Beowulf* offers a secure space in which ... not only to meditate on the fragility of friendship, bright lights, and civilization itself, but also to consider how many things humankind has always done—in the name of tribalism, groupthink, or identity politics—to squander its resources and its lives in acts of hatred committed in the name of loyalty and camaraderie" (15).

J. Beth Haase Menzies, "The Epic inside Us: Using Intuitive Play to Teach *Beowulf*," *English Jnl* 93.4: 70–75, describes a classroom experiment in which students created sculptural images of evil in order to discover how they themselves would symbolize good and evil after having read the *Beowulf* poet's depiction of evil monsters in the poem.

CRD & EM

(Warm thanks to Emily Merrill for her assistance with all aspects of this review.)

*Works Not Seen*

S. R. Jensen, *Beowulf and the Battle-Beasts of Yore*. Narrabeen, NSW., Australia: ARRC Publishing. 105 pp., ill.

**d. Prose**

Lisi Oliver provides a useful pedagogical tool in "The Laws of Æthelberht: A Student Edition" (*OEN* 38.1: 51–72), which is adapted from her *Beginnings of English Law* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2002). A concise seven-page introduction covers "Historical background," "The manuscript," "The language," "Chronological layering," "Selected editions and English translations," "Notes on the edition," and "Editorial conventions." The OE text takes up four pages and includes textual notes at the bottom; another four pages of explanatory notes geared to students then follow. The edition concludes with a five-page glossary and seven useful "Questions and projects" for students. Oliver has produced an exemplary model for other small-scale pedagogical projects that will give instructors a greater number of choices when designing Old English classes.

R. D. Fulk takes up the question of "Male Homoeroticism in the Old English Canons of Theodore" (*Sex and Sexuality in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Pasternack and Weston, 1–34; see section 2). In a painstaking, measured, and methodical fashion, Fulk asks what sorts of information about male homoeroticism can be gleaned from the Old English penitentials; he interrogates the relevant textual and lexical evidence, sensitive at all times to the myriad problems of using the penitentials to draw conclusions about social behavior. He includes detailed discussions of the key words *sodomita*, *mollis*, and *bædling*. He concludes that an analysis of the nomenclature of active and passive sexual types reveals that the peculiar OE word *bædling* was used to define a distinctive sexual identity. *Bædling* is a noun and thus "its origin in nominal derivation bespeaks the perception of a particular cultural identity of some kind at the prehistoric date of the word's creation. That is, unlike *mollis*, the word *bædling* does not merely draw a comparison between a person and an object, but actually assigns a person to a category of similar persons, a category with enough cultural salience to merit a name" (29). The status of *bædling* as a distinct sexual category changes over the course of the Anglo-Saxon period, but this native, specifically sexual word means that Old English had "a noun to designate a category of men based on effeminacy or homoeroticism" (29). Thus

"[t]he term seems to demand the assumption of some sort of cultural status that demands a permanent identity rather than a variable role in a sex act" (30); this permanent identity would thus be a "recognizable type" (30). Such a definite, essentialist vocabulary is unusual before the early modern period.

*Apollonius of Tyre*

In a witty, carefully argued article, "The Naked Truth of the King's Affection in the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*" (*Jnl of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 34: 173–95), David Townsend examines the intersection of "gender, desire, personal status, and imperial authority" (176) in the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*. He turns from the more obvious heterosexual concerns of the text (e.g., King Arcestrates's incest) and instead looks to the text's articulation of homosocial relationships. Throughout the study he compares the Old English text to its Latin source in a close reading that promotes the cultural agency of translation by interrogating the unresolved tensions found in the text's dominant discursive ideologies. Townsend begins by looking at class, showing how the early chapters of the tale explore the social bonds between men, particularly through the prism of relative social status. Then the central section of the article examines the bathhouse scene (Chapter 13 in the OE version). Here the destitute, shipwrecked, and anonymous Apollonius works to catch the favor of King Arcestrates during a bathhouse encounter. Apollonius first displays his skill at playing ball in a game with the king and his attendants; this duly impresses the king, who praises the young man's skill. In response, Apollonius then gives the king a massage, which pleases the king greatly, making him feel like a new man and disposing him favorably to the impressive stranger. Apollonius's fortunes in the rest of the text ascend from this turning point. Townsend asks of this scene: "what context would eleventh-century English readers have had for a representation of the social expectations that were specific to Greco-Roman public bathing?" (181). In the course of teasing out the answers to this question, Townsend covers classical and patristic references to bathing culture as well as any Anglo-Saxon knowledge that might have been gleaned from the physical remnants of the bathing houses of Roman Britain. Townsend also closely tracks the translator's choice of lexical terms in this scene; he demonstrates the erotic potential of the Latin text and the subsequent anxious response to that eroticism displayed in the translation. He argues that a complex homoerotic suggestion of masturbation charges the dynamics of the scene.



In “The First English Love Romance without ‘Love!’ The Old English Apollonius of Tyre” (*SELIM* 12 [2003–04]: 109–25), Carla Morini argues that the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*, which at first glance seems an odd fit in its manuscript context (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201b, a mix of devotional and legal texts), does nevertheless make a natural companion to other texts of the manuscript because the translator has chosen to emphasize the legal (and illegal) nature of the protagonists’ behavior. Thus the Old English translator’s intention was to create “an exemplary text on matter of law” (110): “[*Apollonius of Tyre*] makes through the translator’s modifications a clear distinction between deceitful and immoral love, prohibited by religious and lay law ... and honest love, which ends in marriage” (110). Morini thus argues that there is “a relationship between some of the juridical and religious statements handed down in MS CCCC 201 and the contents of the fragments of the romance” (112). She asserts that the translator’s additions and subtractions emphasize the illegality of Antiochus’s incest, and she notes the concurrent deliberate de-emphasis on romantic love in the text, arguing that this is part of the work’s meditation on the legal dimensions of marriage: “Basically, it appears clear that the translator reacts prudishly to lust and sexuality, colours with diminished intensity the description of heterosexual love and reproduces only paternal and filial love” (120). The Old English *Apollonius* is thus an interpretation of the Latin original through the eyes of someone interested in the law: “In my opinion, the fragments of the *Apollonius*, with its enlarged and cut parts, are to be considered as *ex[cer]pta* from the entire Latin work in order to offer an *exemplum* of the legal/illegal way to view marriage and love, the legal/illegal behaviour of a father” (121).

#### *Alexander’s Letter to Aristotle*

Robert D. Stevick continues his work on the implications of spacing in manuscripts in “Graphotactics of the Old English ‘Alexander’s Letter to Aristotle’” (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 40: 3–13). He argues that print editions of Old English prose and poetry obscure significant messages deliberately transmitted by scribes in spaces of varying sorts between words and other elements of the manuscript page: spacing records “something more than lexical demarcations” (3). He uses examples from Ælfric’s *Grammar*, the Parker Chronicle, and more extensively, from *Alexander’s Letter to Aristotle*. Stevick assigns numerical values to different degrees of spacing found in texts: 0 for “No” Space, 1–2 for “Little” space, 2–4 for “Some” space, 4–7 for “Much”

space (7). He then argues that when texts are annotated and analyzed according to this system, significant patterns can be discerned. He asserts, for example, that syntactically parallel phrases in the same text, at some distance from each other, nevertheless may exhibit roughly the same proportions and sequence of “much,” “some,” “little” or “no” spacing. The article affirms that evidence for syntax, phonology, meter, and oral delivery “encoded in the spacings between letter-groups” (8) has been ignored by philologists and linguists. Thus the very spaces between words are not haphazard, but rather a system of deliberate design, “carefully and coherently placed, in a manner consistent with design of the finest page illuminations and the design of stone crosses and fine metalwork in the Hiberno-Saxon world” (12).

#### *Alfredian Literature*

For Malcolm Godden’s “Translations of Alfred and His Circle, and the Misappropriation of the Past” (H.M. Chadwick Memorial Lectures 14, Dept. of Anglo-Saxon, Norse, and Celtic, Univ. of Cambridge, 2003), see the 2003 *Year’s Work in Old English Studies: Prose*.

Richard Scott Nokes tracks the complex textual history of Bald’s *Leechbook* (Ms. British Library Royal 12. D. XVII) in “The Several Compilers of Bald’s *Leechbook*” (*ASE* 33: 51–76). Nokes presents a complex textual argument in a very clear and engaging fashion. He argues for four different stages in the creation and transmission of the text. First, a team of at least two “compilers” (all these distinctions are Nokes’s) collected and organized the medical remedies and charms. Second, the “writer(s),” who may or may not have overlapped with the compilers, copied out the compiled remedies into coherent chapters, in two books. These books then went through a “period of transmission” (51); sometime during this period the two books were separated. Typical errors and corruption occurred during this third phase as the text changed in the hands of “redactors.” And then finally, in the fourth stage a “scribe” reunited the two books (and added a third) as he copied the text into Royal 12. D. XVII.; three other hands added marginal notes and glosses. Nokes argues for an Alfredian context during the first phase of the text’s genesis, in which the team of compilers assembled the remedies and charms: “... the sum of the evidence very strongly suggests that Bald’s *Leechbook* was produced in the intellectual climate of the Alfredian renaissance, perhaps at the instigation of King Alfred himself” (54). He also examines in detail the style of the written composition, concluding that “at least two people who may or

may not have been involved in the compilation process, wrote out the remedies in a clear and organized fashion once they had been assembled" (55). He concludes that the *Leechbook* is not an "object of popular folklore" but rather "the product of official efforts in both church and state," and that the Alfredian court "was involved either directly or indirectly in the compilation of the original text" (73-74). He also concludes that the textual history of the *Leechbook* points to the presence of "a body of professional leeches" in Anglo-Saxon England, with the book as a practical, officially sanctioned textbook, rather than a holdover of Anglo-Saxon pagan magic lore (74).

In her continuing work on King Alfred, Nicole Guenther Discenza offers "The Paradox of Humility in the Alfredian Translations" (*SN* 76: 44-52), a treatment of Alfred's understanding of humility; she posits the subject as a case study of the negotiation between heroic and Christian values in the king's translational program. Discenza meticulously surveys the lexicon of pride and humility in Alfred's work, arguing that "Alfred's own works make very careful use of the idea of humility, often invoking it as it appears in the Latin Christian tradition, but fine-tuning the word to avoid suggesting that kings must humble themselves before other men. While the resulting texts go much further than Old English heroic poetry in advocating humility, they do restrict its public appearances" (44). She notes the paradox that Christian texts generally extol humility as a virtue, but excessive humility in an Anglo-Saxon king would be unseemly. She tracks how Alfred negotiates this dilemma, examining how he carefully circumscribes the representation of humility. The upshot is that Alfred approves of humility as a private virtue, between an individual (king) and God, but plays down the notion that a king should be humble publicly, before his people. He is careful to explain that the Christian model of humility does not limit a king's power: "Humility in the abstract, and especially before God, is important enough for Alfred to add it to his sources, but before men it can pose a problem. Humility, for Alfred, has its proper place: in the mind of the ruler, and in the behavior of subjects. The ruler should think of himself as the equal of his subjects, but he must be careful to retain his authority so that he can wield it against wrongdoers" (48).

AS

Hildegard L.C. Tristram revises and translates a 1999 piece (in *Adaptation und Akkulturation*) into "Bede's 'Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum' in Old English

and Old Irish: A Comparison" (*Nova de veteribus: Mittel- und neulateinische Studien für Paul Gerhard Schmidt*, ed. Andreas Bihrer and Elisabeth Stein [Munich/Leipzig: Saur], 193-217). Bede's Latin text had both educational and moral agendas, and his emphasis on one *gens Anglorum* provides a clear motive for Alfredian translation: building a unified national identity. (Tristram once refers to the text as "Alfred's translation," 196, but the *Bede* is generally now ascribed to an anonymous Mercian translator.) Bede's attitude towards Celts ranged from ambivalence (the Irish as great scholars but holdouts against Roman Easter) to outright distaste (the Britons resisting both the Roman Church and the Anglo-Saxons). Yet the genre of *origo gentis* was popular in Old Irish, and Bede's work provides a universal framework in which to understand other narratives of the Irish people. By rendering the work only to 633 (through the first two books), the Irish translator retains the most cosmopolitan parts but avoids the clash between Celtic and Anglo-Saxon Christians. In the second part of her article, Tristram compares the translations' styles, especially in the passage on Gregory's encounter with the English slaves. The OE removes or simplifies some abstract or complicated phrases, replaces hypotaxis with parataxis, simplifies speeches, and loses some Latin puns, while it adds information and ornamental word pairs. For Tristram, this combination of simplification and elaboration indicates "auditory reception" (207)—a text to be read to the less learned, with some manuscripts simplified more than others. The Irish text, in contrast, is highly abridged, with most passages annalistic. The story about Gregory is one of only two developed narratives, yet its sentences are shortened, embellishments removed, and some wording changed. Heavy use of direct discourse and rapid-fire dialogue highlight speech. Three Latin phrases appear in the brief Irish passage—one formulaic and not Bede's but the translator's. This heavily abridged style cannot be intended for oral reception, though changes in proper nouns indicate dictation may have been part of the composition process. The Irish translation was for an elite audience, to further Irish learning. The English translation, with its political goals, aimed for a more popular audience and hence employed a more embellished style, as sermons would.

Antonina Harbus examines "The Presentation of Native Saints and Their Miracles in the Old English Translation of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*" (*Miracles and the Miraculous in Medieval Germanic and Latin Literature*, ed. K. E. Olsen, A. Harbus, and T. Hofstra; *Medievalia Groningana* n.s. 6; *Germania Latina* V

[Leuven: Peeters], 155–74). Most studies of the OE *Bede* have been linguistic, but Harbus emphasizes the translation as an adaptation to new social contexts nearly two centuries after the Latin composition. The translator's methods include shortening the text, sometimes adding brief explanations, and introducing hundreds of doublets. Some changes focus attention on England, and Harbus examines particularly the omission of foreign saints and the development of the lives and miracles of English ones. Though the text as a whole is abridged, fifty of the fifty-one miracles involving English saints remain, making these holy men and women loom larger in the condensed text. Some omissions do occur: criticism of Aidan's unorthodox dating of Easter and potentially digressive comments on various saints both disappear in translation. Brief additions add weight, especially in the account of Cuthbert, where added topographical details stress the Englishness of the saint. Similarly, the inclusion of Cædmon's Hymn in the main text and small additions to Bede's story of the poet emphasize this English miracle. The translator demonstrates more interest in oral composition and the limitations on Cædmon's teachers than Bede does. His use of *her* ('here') for England and his poor grasp of Roman history again stress insular interests. Finally, stylistic techniques, particularly the extensive use of doublets, emphasize saints' tales. In some cases, the translator may use additional information from oral traditions to expand the text, and his alterations may support local cults and English pilgrimage; the changes "indicate the perpetuation and enhancement of the cults of these local figures, and communicate their continued importance outside specifically local ecclesiastical politics" (173).

Graham P. Johnson analyzes the "Mistranslation of *classica saeva* in the Old English *Boethius*" (*ANQ* 17.2: 12–18). Alfred mistakenly renders "*classica saeva*" (*De consolatione philosophiae* II met. 5.16) as *sciphere* ("fleet," 34.2) instead of "fierce trumpet." Almost sixty years ago, Zandvoort explained the error as a confusion of *classica* and *classis* encouraged by the king's own experience of Viking fleets. Johnson points out that *classica* can indeed mean "fleets," as attested by the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*. Even modern scholars err thus; Souter's *Glossary of Later Latin* mistakenly cites Ennodius's usage of "*classici*" in a letter as "fleet" instead of "class." While the line makes more sense if *classica* means bugle than fleets, Alfred's rendering of *classic-* fits his own experience of savage Viking fleets and does not indicate poor Latin skills but "a common mistranslation of an uncommon word" (16).

Paul Grimley Kuntz's *Ten Commandments in History: Mosaic Paradigms for a Well-Ordered Society* (ed. Thomas D'Evelyn; Emory Univ. Studies in Law and Religion [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans]) includes "King Alfred: The Decalogue and Anglo-American Law" (46–49). This brief chapter forms part of a larger argument about religion and law in society for a general audience and contains no footnotes or citations. Kuntz argues that all European law derives from the Mosaic Decalogue, and he cites Alfred's melding of Roman concepts of written law, Germanic notions of customary law, and the tradition of the Ten Commandments. He claims that due to the Gospels' influence, Alfred modifies Mosaic *lex talionis* with "mild and encouraging precepts based on mercy" (47), which Kuntz does not specify. He demonstrates that other Europeans took Mosaic Law seriously with an anecdote of a seventeenth-century Venetian tried repeatedly by the Inquisition for, among other charges, denying the divine inspiration of the Decalogue.

Susan Irvine edits *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition, Volume 7: MS. E* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer) with the care readers have come to expect from the *Collaborative Edition* (ASC-CE) volumes. Her meticulous introduction begins with the history of the Peterborough Chronicle, a manuscript description, and details about the two scribes and their practices. She examines the text's complex relationships with other manuscripts of the *Chronicle* and other chronicles in such detail that a summary cannot do justice to her work, but major points include: E draws on the first compilation to 892 but in many places also uses the northern recension and two archetypes of E. E and C share a source for 1022 and E 1042–3 (C 1043–4); E and the bilingual F share a source up to 1043. Entries for 1043–63 draw upon a Chronicle continuation from St. Augustine's, Canterbury, and show little relation to C and D but close ties to F. The 1081–1121 entries focus more on the south than the north, sharing an exemplar with the Waverley Annals and the works of Henry of Huntingdon, John of Worcester, and William of Malmesbury. Thirty-eight Latin entries are interspersed throughout E; all but three utilize annals from late-eleventh-century Rouen upon which F also drew. Irvine then discusses the Peterborough Interpolations and material from Hugh Candidus's Latin chronicle. In the next section, Language, Irvine notes that E provides a window on the transition between Old and Middle English and details the orthography, phonology, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary of each scribe. A bibliography follows. In accordance with ASC-CE practice,

Irvine employs modern capitalization and adds light modern punctuation; she sometimes follows scribal punctuation in placing sentence breaks. Verse passages are lineated as verse, and Peterborough interpolations are indicated with smaller type. Footnotes record features such as capitals and erasures, while standard conventions indicate emendations in the text itself. Personal Names (divided into General and Insular), People-names, and Place-names each have their own indexes. This volume completes the set of major Chronicle manuscripts in the ASC-CE.

Patrick W. Conner's review essay, "Editing the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle" (*JEGP* 103: 369–80) treats Peter S. Baker's *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition, Volume VIII: MS. F* (Cambridge, 2000) and Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe's *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition, Volume V: MS. C* (Cambridge, 2001). Conner notes the importance of the editions and suggests that instead of the planned general editors' response to the volumes, the final volume feature essays by the various editors reflecting on their own and others' contributions. He turns first to Baker: though the bilingual F Chronicle had a well-documented manuscript history, the disastrous state of the manuscript long hindered editing. Baker's painstaking edition begins with "a truly excellent introduction" (372) where he argues, *pace* Plummer, that MS F does not unite two separate chronicles but was originally conceived as a bilingual text. Baker also shows the F manuscript's connections to the root manuscript of E and a number of interventions the F-scribe made in A. Though Baker does not credit the F-scribe with the "Latin Acts of Lanfranc," he does attribute a number of interventions to him and simplifies Bately's complex list of scribes of MS A by identifying her hands 8a–g and 10 as variations of the F-scribe over time. The edition favors clarity of punctuation over following the style sheet and offers concise notes, and it includes the "Canterbury Annals" of Cotton Caligula A.xv as an appendix. Conner wishes this volume, like others in the ASC-CE, had a frontispiece reproduction of a leaf, but he compliments Baker's addition of an abbreviations list before the bibliography and hopes other volumes will follow suit. Conner turns next to O'Brien O'Keeffe's edition of MS C, where he engages her argument about Abingdon involvement, often with reference to his own *Abingdon Chronicle* (ASC-CE 10). O'Brien O'Keeffe, using a new edition of *The Chronicle of John of Worcester* (ed. Darlington and McGurk, Oxford 1995) unavailable when Conner did his edition, showed the weakness of parts of Conner's argument about a "house narrative."

Conner acknowledges the new evidence but nevertheless denies that Sidemann's wish to be buried at his own see rather than Abingdon is a slight. He maintains that MS C's great interest in Abingdon still begs for further investigation. He finds the edition's punctuation helpful, and he praises O'Brien O'Keeffe's introduction, which describes the manuscript, offers detailed analysis of scribes (she finds two, with Ker and against Conner), and provides extensive linguistic analysis. Conner concludes that both Baker and O'Brien O'Keeffe's editions are great accomplishments that offer authoritative bases for much further scholarship.

Juan Camilo Conde Silvestre seeks "The Limits of History and Fiction in the 755 Entry of The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle" (*Voices on the Past: Studies in Old and Middle English Language and Literature*, ed. Alicia Rodríguez Álvarez and Francisco Alonso Almeida [La Coruña, Spain: Netbiblo, S.L.], 165–72). The 755 "Cynewulf and Cyneheard" entry has been called the first English connected prose or even the first English story. Scholars deem it literary, and some doubt its historicity; it exemplifies Germanic heroic ethos, paralleling sagas (as noted by McTurk and Wrenn). Stylistic features shared by this ASC episode and sagas include ambiguous pronouns; sudden shift from indirect to direct discourse; and a concise narrative until the climax, where more details appear. Conde Silvestre argues that no one aspect marks the episode as literary rather than factual, but as a unity, it offers "a benchmark to explore the fading limits between factual and fictional narratives" using contemporary theory and medieval thought (167). Semantic and textual levels offer little help distinguishing between history and fiction. Pragmatically, fictional characters seem to be real, but readers know they are not, while historical figures have objective reality. Characters from this story appear in charters, but this specific episode involving Cynewulf and Cyneheard exists nowhere besides the *Chronicle*, leaving us still uncertain. Pragmatics also points to an identification of narrator and author in history, but then, Conde Silvestre notes, such identification itself may be fictive. In his third section, Conde Silvestre quotes Gervase of Canterbury's twelfth-century distinction between annals and narrative history, then cites Barthes and Hayden White on the human need for narrative that turns every event into a story, even while such storytelling "hardly ever manages to naturalize its discourse and its message" (170). The harmonious, poetic structure of the Cynewulf episode has won it modern appreciation. Conde Silvestre concludes (*pace* Hill) that we cannot know the historicity of the



story; the episode demonstrates the blurring of history and fiction and sustains contemporary theory's position that "things are made true or false in the eyes of readers" (170, translating Pozuelo Yvancos).

#### *Byrhtferth*

Anglo-Saxons showed great interest in the Christian creation narrative, Philippa Semper observes in "Doctrine and Diagrams: Maintaining the Order of the World in *Byrhtferth's Enchiridion*" (*The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England: Approaches to Current Scholarship and Teaching*, ed. Paul Cavill, Christianity and Culture: Issues in Teaching and Research [Cambridge: Brewer], 121–37). Christian authors also had Greco-Roman concepts of nature and science on which to draw, however, and Anglo-Saxon accounts of creation reveal "ideological conflict" (124) by presenting ideas as varied as the Genesis account and the Aristotelian four elements together. Classical learning had potential to undermine Christian cosmology, so writers such as Byrhtferth organize information in ways that promote specifically Christian interpretations. Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion*, ca. 1011, aims to teach computus even to the least educated priests. Byrhtferth uses "mnemonic shapes" (128) to confine learning to Christian forms. Repeated circles (common in early medieval diagrams) figure the zodiac, but listing the months outside the particular signs and including OE labels subordinate the classical scheme to the cycle of the year. Byrhtferth uses crosses (*not* common in diagrams) in some figures, putting solstices and equinoxes, the elements, and the ages of man into a Christian context where God and man are central, as represented in one diagram by a cross bearing the letters A D A M and D E U S. Even reading these names traces "an oracular blessing" (131). The *Enchiridion* also employs unusual tables resembling canon tables or architectural frames, thus providing ready-made "memory places." Crosses and columns make spaces specifically Christian, even church-like, subordinating classical concepts and nature itself to an order maintained by the Christian God. Even so, moments of tension appear: the Latin label "the authority of the grammarians permits" (135, Byrhtferth 87-8) in a diagram of Christian virtues exposes anxiety about authority and competing sources. Semper concludes that the diagrams contain potential disorder by presenting information within specific interpretive frameworks. She closes by noting the heterogeneity of "Christian tradition" itself and exhorting further study of works such as computus texts, often avoided by scholars as too recondite.

Éimear Williams finds unexpected parallels in "*Aislinge Meic Con Glinne*, Apples, and Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion*" (*Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 48: 45–73). The Middle Irish *Aislinge Meic Con Glinne* exists in an early fifteenth-century manuscript, *Leabhar Breac*, and the sixteenth- or seventeenth-century Trinity College Dublin H.3.18. In one episode, Cathal Mac Finguine, King of Munster, harbors a gluttonous demon that the hero, Aníer Mac Con Glinne, seeks to drive out. He asks Cathal for apples, one after another, to force him to share, and each request carries numerological justification (three for the Trinity, four for the Gospels, etc.). References to original sin show theological sophistication. The two manuscripts differ at a few points; two of *Leabhar Breac's* explanatory comments are both unique and obscure, and Williams suggests the writer may have an imperfect grasp of Irish. Both manuscripts explain ten as "the tenth order," apparently referring to the patristic idea that man completes the angelic orders by replacing the fallen angels and extrapolating from pseudo-Dionysius's nine orders of angels. *Leabhar Breac* seems to make the tenth order men on earth, but H.3.18 refers to the "church in heaven," i.e., the communion of saints. *Leabhar Breac* demonstrates advanced theological knowledge in its mention of seven prophecies about Christ's life (probably influenced by commentaries on the Apocalypse) vs. H.3.18's more ordinary seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. *Leabhar Breac* also has its own explanation for six as the first number to consist of a combination of its parts, which draws on but does not exactly match Augustine. No other Irish numerological compilations share more than five correspondences with the versions of *Aislinge Meic Con Glinne*. Byrhtferth's eleventh-century *Enchiridion*, however, composed in English and Latin, has at least eleven correspondences in common with the two. Williams identifies four possible explanations: 1) coincidence; 2) common sources; 3) use of the *Enchiridion* by the author of *Aislinge Meic Con Glinne*; 4) common Insular thinking. Noting the limited circulation of the *Enchiridion*, Williams thinks option 3 unlikely. The computistical manuscript Oxford, St. John's College 17, uses ogam twice in a diagram and also lists the Irish names for days of the week, suggesting option 2 or 4, but Williams does not explicitly champion either. Irish numerology tended to be didactic and agglomerating; *Aislinge Meic Con Glinne* shows great restraint in its numerology. While some scholars have seen the apple scene in the Irish text as parody, Williams judges it "understated" rather than "overstated" (66). Williams concludes that we cannot dismiss as parody a text that demonstrates sophisticated theology and perhaps true, not sarcastic, piety.

*Monastic Rules*

Michael D.C. Drout engages in “Re-Dating the Old English Translation of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang: The Evidence of the Prose Style” (*JEGP* 103: 341–68). Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 191 contains an English translation of this eighth-century rule. The names of specific monks at Old Minster during Ælfric’s bishopric have aided in the conventional dating to the late tenth century, but Drout notes they may have been inserted by a later copyist. Mechthild Gretsch has argued from the mix of Winchester and non-Winchester vocabulary that Æthelwold translated the Benedictine Rule while he was at Glastonbury; Drout extends her argument to the OE Chrodegang’s Rule because of its vocabulary, style, and politics. He uses several different figures of repetition to date the text. Alliteration, sometimes with established formulas, appears in sixteen or seventeen examples, indicating acquaintance with OE formulaic tradition. Polypoton and derivational polypoton (the repetition of the same lexeme or two related lexemes) appears in ten or eleven examples. Bately and Huppé found such repetition in Alfred’s *Pastoral Care*, and Drout argues that Alfredian practice differs from Ælfric and Wulfstan’s rhythmic prose alliteration, with the Chrodegang translation matching Alfredian style. After some examples of paronomasia, he turns to a specific repetition, the use of *creasnyss* to render two different Latin senses; he connects both traits to the Reform movement and specifically Glastonbury, finding similar usages in Aldhelm glosses. If the results displayed in the table on p. 365 do not result from printing errors, however, they do not support Drout’s argument. (Every mark in the Alliteration column has a corresponding mark in the Polypoton column, though there should be many fewer cases of the latter; several other such problems can be found.) Drout concludes that stylistic embellishment occurs most in key chapters that the translator might have known best, and in any case the translator had excellent command of both languages and of styles from both Alfredian prose and early Benedictine texts. He sees the OE Rule of Chrodegang as an important early step in the Benedictine Reform.

NGD

*Wulfstan*

A number of related studies appear (as one would expect) in the excellent collection edited by Matthew Townend for Brepols’s *Studies in the Early Middle Ages* series: *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York* (Turnhout). A

groundbreaking study of two key figures in late Anglo-Saxon England is offered by Malcolm Godden in “The Relations of Wulfstan and Ælfric: A Reassessment” (353–74). While scholars have generally viewed the two late products of the Benedictine Reform as having a close, compatible working relationship, Godden’s examination raises the possibility of a decidedly different scenario. The first evidence of contact between archbishop and monk comes between 1002 and 1005 with Ælfric’s *Latin Letter to Wulfstan*, in which, Godden says, Ælfric’s “rather cool and perhaps arrogant” reply dismisses Wulfstan’s first question in “caustic tones” before attacking bishops in general and Wulfstan in particular for negligence and corruption in the administration of justice (354–55). While Wulfstan may have taken Ælfric’s approach as a literary convention—Godden cites examples from Bede and Alcuin of sharp criticism of bishops, as well as letters from earlier in Ælfric’s career—Ælfric’s manner then and thereafter “may never have been very friendly” (372). Ælfric did supply Wulfstan with pastoral letters in Latin and Old English to use in instructing his bishops and clergy, and Godden lists a series of other Ælfrician works on which Wulfstan drew or may have drawn; aside from his five letters, however, we know of no other material that Ælfric sent the archbishop and have no evidence that they were in contact before or after ca. 1002–1006. Godden notes a number of issues, moreover, on which the two figures differed: clerical chastity, clerical participation in secular affairs, the procedure for celebrating mass, the origin of human sinfulness (free will versus demonic temptation), and the wider view of history (a single cycle of fall and redemption versus cyclical sin and punishment). Just as Wulfstan was happy to rewrite Ælfrician works in his own style, he was not averse to modifying Ælfric’s teaching when their viewpoints diverged: Godden argues that Wulfstan edits out Ælfric’s condemnation of clerical involvement in secular justice in copies of Ælfric’s Old English pastoral letters. Given Ælfric’s well-known objection to others modifying his works, moreover, Godden suggests either that Ælfric was unaware of Wulfstan’s actions or that, if he knew, his horrified reaction might explain the lack of evidence of communication following his composition of the pastoral letters. Either way, far from Ælfric supplying Wulfstan with copies of his collected works or other research materials, Godden contends that Wulfstan obtained most of his Ælfrician source-material third hand from limited selections perhaps at some remove from Ælfric such as those found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 178, and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 115—a proposition that might re-date

Wulfstan's eschatological homilies (Bethurum Ia–V) to later in his career. In the end, Godden's reassessment posits a strained rather than harmonious relationship: a recognized authority of little advancement in church ranks writing cautiously for a hugely successful ecclesiastical figure who may yet demonstrate "some sense of insecurity ... about his own grasp of doctrine, canon law, and theology, and perhaps of Latin" (374).

Another account of differences between the two homilists is offered by Eric Stanley's study of "Wulfstan and Ælfric: 'The True Difference between the Law and the Gospel'" (*Wulfstan*, ed. Townend, 429–41). While acknowledging that it would be oversimplistic to associate Wulfstan with law and Ælfric with grace—the former viewing the administration of justice, for example, as a foundational expression of true Christianity—Stanley does identify ways in which their vocabulary and teaching on the subjects diverges. Wulfstan's *Godes gerihta*, for example, may be translated "God's dues," but it encompasses not simply a financial debt but the rightful service owed to the supreme administrator of justice. For Ælfric, such service results in *wundor*—not simply the historical miracles of God and the saints, as Wulfstan would have it, but a joyous appreciation by Christians at the ongoing miracle of their sanctification. Ælfric speaks of law (*æ[w]*) as the divine commandment which Adam and his descendents transgress; Wulfstan condemns in strident terms the unrighteousness lawbreaker while exhorting believers to love God's law (*lagu*). Wulfstan thus emphasizes the laws of kings as an extension of the laws of God, viewing along with his counterpart heartfelt law-keeping to be central to Gospel living: as Stanley says, "whoever seeks to exalt God's glory must praise his justice" (440).

Audrey L. Meaney's "And we forbeodað eornostlice ælcne hæðenscipe": Wulfstan and Late Anglo-Saxon and Norse 'Heathenism'" (*Wulfstan*, ed. Townend, 461–500) pieces together Wulfstan's vague references to pagan practice in an attempt to clarify whom he considered "heathen" and what he considered "heathenism" to be. As regards the first question, Meaney shows that Wulfstan uses *hæþen* to refer to both Gentiles from before the time of Christ and to as yet unconverted Vikings. One reference from the *Sermo Lupi* Meaney finds particularly intriguing, as Wulfstan contrasts lukewarm Christians with pagans who dare not withhold their offerings or ill-use their priests—a statement which Meaney takes to imply "knowledge of a public and established heathen cult" (467). Having determined that the presence after 1002 of such a cult in York is unlikely, she then

considers means by which Wulfstan may have gained knowledge of pagan practice in the south, either during negotiations with Viking invaders, converse with Danish leaders resident in southeast England, or discussions with English missionaries returning from Scandinavia. Turning to Wulfstan's view of *hæþendom* or *hæþenscipe*, moreover—terms preferred by him respectively early and later in his career—Meaney shows how Wulfstan condemns the "heathen practices" of sinful Christians. Much was encompassed under these labels. Drawing likely on such texts as the so-called *Penitential of Pseudo-Egbert*, Wulfstan speaks against superstitious devotion to countryside shrines centered around trees, springs, and stones; the practice of divination or witchcraft; and mortal sins such as murder, adultery, robbery, and the like. In the end, however, Wulfstan's general denunciations lack the detail needed to make precise deductions about his knowledge and understanding of pagan practice.

Andy Orchard presents new evidence as to the value of manuscript punctuation in "Re-Editing Wulfstan: Where's the Point?" (*Wulfstan*, ed. Townend, 63–91). Noting various shortcomings of Dorothy Bethurum's standard 1957 edition of Wulfstan's sermons—its incompleteness, inaccuracy, "rudimentary" analysis of Wulfstan's rhetorical techniques, and stemmatic approach that buries evidence of (even authorial) rewriting in pursuit of pure "original" texts (64–65)—Orchard argues not simply for the need of a new edition but one that takes due account of manuscript punctuation. Acknowledging the dangers of inconsistent or idiosyncratic scribal practice, as well as the difficulty of assigning punctuation marks to an original scribe or later reader, he argues that Wulfstan's own attitude to punctuation might most safely be established by examining in turn (1) manuscripts known to have been written and punctuated by Wulfstan, (2) manuscripts produced under his supervision and often annotated by him, and then (3) copies of Wulfstan's works produced after his death. His own study involves the first and second of these, an autograph passage in Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, G.K.S. 1595, and the copy of the "utterly characteristic sermon" Bethurum Xc found in London, British Library, Cotton Nero A. i, a manuscript containing numerous Wulfstanian annotations. In each case, Orchard demonstrates that punctuation—punctuation that is fairly consistent if not everywhere present—regularly parallels and throws into relief rhetorical and stylistic devices that organize and link verbal units in the sermon: paronomasia or word-play, verbal repetition, alliteration, rhythm, theme, and so on. The

combination results not only in the two-stress phrases and binary structures commonly associated with the archbishop, but in the rhythmical prose more identified with Ælfric and in tripartite structures woven neatly into the homiletic whole. In conclusion, Orchard suggests, the corroborative role played by manuscript punctuation in determining line division and narrative flow argues strongly for the need for future editions of Wulfstan to take such evidence into account.

In the first of three treatments of the works of Wulfstan, Joyce Lionarons considers "Napier Homily L: Wulfstan's Eschatology at the Close of His Career" (*Wulfstan*, ed. Townend, 413–28). Napier L is a treatment of political and legal ideas woven together with themes recycled from the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* and earlier eschatological homilies; Lionarons posits that the text may have been written to be preached before the Oxford council that produced Cnut's 1018 law code, "perhaps as a preliminary announcement of the laws that Wulfstan wanted to be enacted" (419). While Dorothy Bethurum excludes it from her edition of *The Homilies of Wulfstan* as being more a series of notes than a sermon proper, Lionarons argues that distinctions between "homily, religious or political tract, and law-code based on content rather than form ... are both artificial and thoroughly anachronistic when applied to Wulfstan's writing" (415). Lionarons examines Napier L in its unique manuscript context, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 421, noting that the opening to the sermon that follows (Bethurum III) has been emended so as to allow the two homilies to be read as one, heightening yet further the eschatological emphasis of the whole. Even within Napier L, however, various components prepare for its eschatological ending: comparing the work with its sources, Lionarons shows how exhortations regarding clerical celibacy derive from texts treating the Last Judgment, and how warnings against hypocrisy and deceit call to mind the arch-deceiver Antichrist. The portrait that results may suggest a change in the archbishop's understanding of the end times: now an aging survivor of Danish conquest rather than an impassioned firebrand warning of coming invasion, Wulfstan may have matured from his early sense of imminent apocalypse into a longer view of the cyclical movement of history, encompassing both hope for leaders' ability to shape a godly society and an unwavering belief in the certainty of society's end.

Lionarons's "Textual Appropriation and Scribal (Re) Performance in a Composite Homily: The Case for a New Edition of Wulfstan's *De temporibus Anticristi*"

(*Old English Literature in Its Manuscript Context*, ed. Lionarons, 67–93; see section 4.a) continues the challenge posed by modern textual criticism to notions of medieval authorship and the literary text so central to traditional editorial practice. Rather than seeking to recover uncorrupted, original products of individual writers, she promotes a view of medieval works as derivative "performances" unique in every telling or act of copying. Taking Wulfstan's *De temporibus Anticristi* (Bethurum IV) as her point of reference, she contrasts Dorothy Bethurum's admirable, standard edition of the work that seeks to present the "best authorial text" with the three versions of the sermon as found in the manuscript evidence. She notes Wulfstan's tendency to rework or "reperform" his own compositions as well as to appropriate material from vernacular and Latin sources, and then shows how *De temporibus* re-performs an Ælfrician work that itself derives from a discussion of Antichrist by Adso of Montier-en-Der. Where Ælfric alters and "corrects" Adso's depiction to underscore the danger of theological error or *gedwyld*, Wulfstan adapts both Ælfric and Adso to emphasize Antichrist's power to deceive. Lionarons notes, however, that the two earliest witnesses to *De temporibus* incorporate a long *exemplum* involving Simon Magus and the apostles Peter and Paul. After discussing the story's appearance in Blickling XV and Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* I.26, and the typological link between Simon and Antichrist, Lionarons argues that its incorporation into Wulfstan's homily adds power to the narrative: by pointing to Simon Magus as well as Antichrist, it conveys the urgency for present righteousness in the face of past and future danger; and by adducing Peter and Paul as well as Enoch and Elias, who oppose Antichrist, it offers two sets of godly figures whose martyrdom underscores the nature of true Christian victory. In conclusion, Lionarons offers an edition of a single performance of *De temporibus*, that found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113, seeking therein "to walk a fine line between a simple manuscript transcription and a version ... edited for easy accessibility to the modern reader" (89).

Finally, Lionarons turns to consider "Textual Identity, Homiletic Reception, and Wulfstan's *Sermo ad Populum*" (*Review of English Studies*, n.s. 55: 157–82). She begins by contrasting three types of editorial practice: traditional editing, which attempts to conflate versions of a text into what is argued to be the best approximation of the "original"; diplomatic or semi-diplomatic editing, which strives to present the text as found in individual manuscripts; and the modern move to print



divergent versions as discrete texts in their own right. Working from the third perspective, Lionarons argues for the need to evaluate multiple versions in their manuscript context in order to understand (a) the text(s) as received by readers of specific manuscripts, (b) the *mouvance* or changing nature of the text(s) over time, and (c) the textual identity of the work—the text(s) as set forth in print by an editor. Using Wulfstan's *Sermo ad Populum* as her example, Lionarons examines the five manuscripts in which the text appears. Giving their origin and date where known and situating them in context of the *Sermo*'s dissemination, she identifies ways in which copies differ from each other. She then moves to the editions of the text by Arthur Napier and Dorothy Bethurum, discusses their guiding editorial theories and principles, contrasts the two, and points out details which they alter or omit from the manuscript versions. Next, she approaches the question of the *Sermo*'s textual identity by looking at the sub-sections of the homily, independently rubricated in four of the manuscripts and printed by Napier as a series of independent works. She concludes that what has been preserved is in fact two homilies and a series of related homiletic fragments: an earlier homily found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 419; an expansion (arguably by Wulfstan himself) into a pastoral letter with intermediary rubrics, represented by Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113 and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201; and four texts appended to the *Sermo* in CCCC 201, which may have been compiled not for preaching but as "an anthology of material useful for various ecclesiastical and legal purposes and possibly a teaching volume" (173). In two appendices, Lionarons then offers editions of the two main versions, one drawing on CCCC 419 and the other on a combination of Hatton 113 and CCCC 201. While she suggests, moreover, that a useful supplement to these editions would print the *Sermo* as a series of separate but related units, such as offered by Napier and as found in London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. iii (a descendent of CCCC 201), she leaves such a supplement to future Wulfstan scholarship.

Jonathan Wilcox examines the manuscript context and textual tradition of one of England's most famous sermons to discuss "Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* as Political Performance: 16 February 1014 and Beyond" (*Wulfstan*, ed. Townend, 375–96). Wilcox analyzes the conflicting evidence of the surviving rubrics to the sermon to confirm its traditional date of 1014, reviews the tumultuous events culminating in Swein's triumph in 1013 and Æthelred's subsequent flight, and then

identifies the initial preaching of the *Sermo Lupi* with the meeting of the *witan* on 16 February 1014—a meeting he argues had been arranged for the purpose of conferring the crown on Swein, but which resulted in the recall of Æthelred following Swein's unexpected death on 3 February. On this occasion, Wilcox suggests, Wulfstan consecrated Ælfric as bishop of London, probably preaching Bethurum XVlb to his audience on episcopal responsibility; thereafter, following a statement acknowledging his own responsibility to preach—a statement that leads from Bethurum XVlb to the *Sermo Lupi* in one manuscript and that introduces the *Sermo* in two others—Wulfstan went on to deliver his Sermon to the English. Wilcox points to a number of elements that particularly fit the context of February 1014. Speaking of the present time (*her*) and the present place (*on lande*), Wulfstan condemns traitors who have betrayed their lord and driven him from the country. He also laments the English impotence before and payment of tribute to those whom they ought to resist, an attitude "shared by the chronicler in his account of the rapidity of English capitulations in 1013" (384). Furthermore, he argues that embarrassment or shame ought not prevent men from doing what is right—a timely exhortation to a group considering recalling the monarch for whose exile they were responsible. In addition to this initial context, Wilcox goes on to trace the textual history of the sermon. He argues that the longest version (present in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113 and London, British Library, Cotton Nero A. i) is closest to the text composed for February 1014, that the middle version (present in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201) reflects an abbreviated sermon preached between 1014 and 1016, and that the shortest version (present in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 419 and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343) stems from the years after 1016 if not 1018, each version omitting specific references no longer appropriate to the changing political climate. (This sequence of composition echoes that proposed by Stephanie Hollis but runs counter to the views of Bethurum, Dorothy Whitelock, and Malcolm Godden, whose arguments he addresses.) Wilcox then offers the following order for Wulfstan's reuse of this material: after Cnut's ascension, Wulfstan composed the "massively abbreviated" Napier XXVII, tinkering with its form so that it survives with two different endings (392–93); he then incorporated parts of Napier XXVII into Napier L, before returning again to the *Sermo Lupi* for elements of the first half of Napier XLVII (the second half being a work by Byrhtferth grafted to Wulfstan's piece by a compiler). Throughout, Wilcox shows Wulfstan changing his tenses from present to past and

back again, trying to keep relevant his warnings of national disaster in the years under Cnut.

AK

Alice Cowen places Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* firmly in the context of penitential literature in "Byrstas and bysmeras: The Wounds of Sin in the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*" (Wulfstan, ed. Townend, 397–411); she focuses on how the text is an emphatic penitential diagnosis of and prescription for the sickening wounds of English sin. Cowen examines "the way the Vikings and their violence function as topic and imagery within the structure of a call to repentance"; she argues "that Wulfstan's treatment of the violence of Vikings against the English can be linked to a metaphor common in penitential texts, that of the wounds of sin" (397–8). She posits Wulfstan's audience as a "collective body—the body of the nation" (404), in need of spiritual healing through the shame and guilt of repentance. In the course of her reading she pays particular attention to the vocabulary of wounds, sin, sickness and shame, adducing parallels from penitential literature.

Building upon the work of Donald Chapman, Sara M. Pons-Sanz examines Wulfstan's use of compounding in "For Gode and for Worolde: Wulfstan's Differentiation of the Divine and Worldly Realms through Word-Formation Processes" (*ES* 85: 281–96). She explores Wulfstan's use of compounds when discussing one of his favorite binary oppositions: the worldly sphere versus the divine sphere. She "aims to show that Wulfstan did not only express the dissimilarity between the two realms lexically but also morpho-syntactically, through their different modes of participation in the creative processes to which he submitted his vocabulary" (283). Compounds are useful and important for Wulfstan when discussing the sublunary realm, but when he turns to the divine realm, he tends to use phrasal structures. Wulfstan exploits the freedom of phrasal structure to make the message more powerful and complex; the rhetorical freedom of the phrasal structure allows him to expand on his meaning in sophisticated ways. She concludes: "The analysis of the use of phrasal structures and compounds to refer to the divine and worldly spheres presented in this paper has shown that, while remaining within the limits of general Old English usage, Wulfstan kept his morpho-syntactic structures for the two realms at opposite ends, hence mirroring structurally their essential contrast" (295).

Stephanie Hollis's article "'The Protection of God and the King': Wulfstan's Legislation on Widows" (Wulfstan,

ed. Townend, 443–60) centers around Wulfstan's legislation about widows in a small section of Cnut's law code (II Cnut 69–83); these tenets are "the only sustained and considered piece of legislation on women to be found in the Anglo-Saxon law-codes" (443). She argues that the extant legislation concerning widows, which gives them some degree of personal and economic autonomy and protection in the aftermath of their husbands' death, is not simply Wulfstan's direct thoughts on the issue, but rather a compromise version of his own, more hard-line views recorded elsewhere in his corpus. In contexts outside of II Cnut, it is clear that Wulfstan was concerned that widows not re-marry prematurely; in fact, he wanted them, generally speaking, to remain chaste. The extant legislation, however, is a bit contradictory, since the law exacts inheritance forfeiture upon widows who remarry too early (before a year has passed), yet the surrounding legislation about widows generally upholds their right to inheritance and right to have a voice in their remarriage. Hollis explains that this apparent contradiction shows that this part of the code does not present Wulfstan's unadulterated thoughts on the matter, but rather that Wulfstan should be considered the drafter rather than the author of this legislation; II Cnut 69–83 is thus a product of compromise, political "committee work," and accommodation to secular views, since protection of inheritance was a preoccupation of the secular world and other churchmen. In her words: "the legislation on widows in II Cnut marks the extent to which Wulfstan found it necessary, in a secular law-code, to compromise the moral absolutes and hortatory ideals of his ecclesiastical pronouncements" (458). The extant legislation "incorporates modifications imposed on Wulfstan's pursuit of moral imperatives by Cnut's other advisors, particularly by his secular advisors, but possibly also by some of his ecclesiastical advisors, and even, perhaps, by Queen Emma..." (459).

AS

#### *Anonymous Homilies*

In "Selves, Souls, and Bodies: The Assumption of the Virgin in Anglo-Saxon England" (*Miracles and the Miraculous in Medieval Germanic and Latin Literature*, ed. K. E. Olsen *et al.*, 141–54; see section 4.a), Jennifer Neville challenges the modernist and post-modernist proposition that the idea of the self was a discovery of the Renaissance. This modern self, she says, has been defined as having a first-person point of view, an emphasis on emotion, a sense of inwardness or opposition between the inner person and external

world, self-exploration, self-consciousness, and personality; all these traits, however, she finds in the portrait of the Virgin in the late-tenth or early-eleventh-century Blickling Homily XIII. Neville summarizes the story of the Assumption, which the homily treats; sketches the historical debate over its orthodoxy; shows how the homilist's poor knowledge of Latin problematizes the resulting narrative; and argues that his linguistic infelicities actually emphasize characteristics reflective of the modern concept of self: the iconic handmaiden whose soul magnifies the Lord becomes a self-conscious, peremptory figure commanding God to magnify her soul—and so on. In addition, however, Neville notes ways in which the homilist's depiction diverges from modern expectations of the self: in this account, for example, Mary is not an autonomous, experiencing agent but the passive focus of others' experience. How precisely she experiences inwardness, moreover, is difficult to pin down: her passive and unspeaking soul is far less the center of thought than is her body, which speaks and shows self-awareness even after the soul's departure. Even so, Neville maintains, to say that the text presents a different idea of the self does not mean that it presents no sense of the self at all; in fact, "the relationship between the Virgin's self, soul, and body anticipates the conflicted nature of identity analyzed by post-modern and feminist theories" (141).

In "*Hit Segð on Halgum Bocum: The Logic of Composite Old English Homilies*" (PQ 81 [2002]: 383–419), Nancy M. Thompson offers a fresh perspective on the inconsistencies that often characterize anonymous Old English homilies and thus trouble the modern reader. Rather than simply ascribing such absurdities or internal contradictions simply to a homilist's misunderstanding of his source, Thompson suggests that homilists were influenced by traditional principles of biblical interpretation. Drawing on examples from sermons by Ælfric and Wulfstan as well as anonymous writers, Thompson underlines the high view they had of teaching conveyed by books: in contrast to Latin commentators, these authors went out of their way to stress their reliance on books, sometimes ascribing extra-biblical texts to divine authority and often blurring the line between the Bible itself and later commentaries on it. Ælfric may show more caution than many anonymous homilists in translating the text of Scripture, but even he refers broadly to authoritative books of various kinds as *sancta scriptura* or *godspellican lare* ('holy writings' or 'gospel teaching') and is not always literal when quoting from the Bible proper. While scholars have sometimes looked to classical rules when attempting to understand

Anglo-Saxon methods of translation, noting the Ciceronian principle of reproducing texts sense for sense that subsequently was adopted by Jerome, Bede, Alfred, and Ælfric, Thompson argues that for composite homilists a greater influence was the tradition of scriptural interpretation. Accepting uniformly the teaching of books, Thompson says, these writers accepted uncritically diverse teaching therein: whether sources were biblical or not, the fact that they could bear multiple levels of meaning meant that apparent inconsistencies on a literal level might be resolved in a spiritual sense, allowing the composite whole to attest harmoniously to the truth. In consequence, both compiler and informed reader of composite Old English homilies would have found in them not contradiction, but complexity.

A strategic choice of subject matter is found in Samantha Zacher's "Sin, Syntax, and Synonyms: Rhetorical Style and Structure in Vercelli Homily X" (*JEGP* 103: 53–76). Surviving in whole or in part in nine copies, Vercelli X is one of the most widely circulating Anglo-Saxon sermons known. A condemnation of greed and excess wealth, the text offers "free vernacular renderings" (54) of three Latin works on this theme by Paulinus of Aquileia, Pseudo-Augustine, and Isidore of Seville. Zacher begins her analysis with the first two sources, showing that the homilist assimilates his disparate borrowings by weaving thematic, verbal, and aural echoes into his translation: the incremental repetition of phrases or single words, paronomasia or verbal puns, sound-play such as rhyme, and envelope patterns all serve to join various passages in the sermon together. Such stylistic contributions are seen all the more in the homilist's adaptation of Isidore's *Synonyma*. Here, in contrast to other, more straightforward vernacular renditions of Isidore's work, the writer offers complex patterns of alliterative sound play, multifaceted paronomasia, and structural changes to the Latin that, far from misconstruing the source, improve the organizational flow of the Old English translation. The result, Zacher suggests, is a far more nuanced text than has been previously recognized, revealing an author confident in his understanding both of his sources and his prose style, skillfully adapting to his purposes devices traditionally associated with Old English poetry.

#### Ælfric

Margaret Hostetler returns to a subject explored in Mary Clayton's "*Ælfric's Judith: Manipulative or Manipulated?*" (*ASE* 23 [1994]: 215–27) in her "*Nimað eow bysne be þyssere Iudith: Deictic Shifting and*

Didactic Christian Discourse in *Ælfric's Judith*" (SN 76: 152–64). In his *Judith*, Ælfric (a) paraphrases the biblical story, (b) defends the book's canonicity and presents Judith as a type of the pure Church, and (c), addressing a group of female religious readers, condemns women who break their vows of chastity and urges his audience to heed Judith's chaste example. Focusing on deictic markers in (b) and (c)—pronouns, for example, whose meaning is defined by the context—she shows how Ælfric uses them to draw his audience into the story and to make its lessons individually relevant. Ælfric facilitates personal application by shifting from a third-person discussion of Judith to commentary on certain sinful women using a second-person plural exhortation: *Nimað eow bysne be byssere Judith* ("You take example from this Judith" [line 434]). The process involves deictic shifting, Hostetler notes: from being immersed in the world of the biblical narrative, audience members are forced to emerge partially from it to evaluate their own conduct against both Judith's actions and those of the sinful women. In speaking of "this Judith," moreover, Ælfric refers to a mini-portrait of the saint which immediately precedes his discussion of sinful women, in which Ælfric praises Judith for eschewing the spoils of her victory over Holofernes. The transition is abrupt: Ælfric gives no explanation as to the connection between the sexual misconduct he deplores and Judith's shunning of *gyrlan* ("war-gear" or "clothing") which he urges women to imitate. Hostetler argues, however, not only that connections between the two may be made—"Judith's refusal of Holofernes' 'gyrlan' is a refusal of adornment, sexuality, pollution and sin, which asserts Judith's Christian identity as a polyvalent example for Ælfric's female readers" (159–60)—but that Ælfric deliberately and skillfully leaves such connections unexpressed in order to force his audience to think through and internalize the moral implications for themselves. In so doing, "Ælfric makes central his readers' interpretive practices; he hails them as an interpretive community, pushing them up one deictic level to view their own practices" (160). Addressing first the group (*eow* ["you"]) and then an individual member (*min swustor* ["my sister"]) before including himself in the corporate whole (*we*), moreover, he creates a personal bond with his audience that invites them through individual examination to participate in Christian communal belief.

Stacy S. Klein offers another example of ways in which Anglo-Saxons commented on contemporary circumstances through accounts of the past in "Beauty and the Banquet: Queenship and Social Reform in

*Ælfric's Esther*" (JEGP 103: 77–105). Ælfric's paraphrase of the biblical story of Esther, now surviving only in a transcription by William L'Isle (c. 1569–1637), is said to date from the years 1002–1005; in consequence, it belongs to the "later, more socially and politically engaged, phase of his career" (80) and to a historical period that saw queens play more active roles in secular affairs. Klein suggests that Ælfric viewed Old Testament figures not merely as typological foreshadowings of the Christian age but as exemplars that "could be mobilized to instantiate stricter ideas of faith and domestic social order" in the face of Danish peril (81). Ælfric's portrait of Esther augments his Latin source by emphasizing her personal piety and direct responsibility for her husband's righteous works and belief in God—in other words, by depicting her role as spiritual intercessor rather than political adviser. Such a depiction harkens back both to the golden age of Bede and to that of Edgar's reign, when monasteries flourished in the absence of Danish attack and under strong royal patronage; it also reflects Ælfric's growing distrust of royal authority—Æthelred's lack of monastic support and failure to protect his people—seen by extension in the increasing autonomy of the queen. In sharp contrast to contemporary queens such as Ælfthryth and Emma, who participated in councils administering royal lands and whose signatures appear on land-grant charters, therefore, Ælfric excises biblical references to Esther transferring land or authority to her uncle Mordecai. Klein notes, moreover, that Ælfric's portrait would have been directed not to the ruling queen alone but to a much broader Anglo-Saxon audience; it is their expectations of queenship, as well as hers, that he thus seeks to influence. Finally, Klein examines Ælfric's handling of two problematic issues in the biblical story itself. On the one hand, she points out, the king's dismissal of his first wife Vashti and his subsequent marriage to Esther would have run directly counter to Ælfric's firm proscriptions regarding divorce and remarriage. Klein argues that Ælfric overcomes this concern by describing the wives' relationship to the king as that of vassals to their liege-lord: Vashti's defiance of her husband violates expectations not just of wifely submission but of a subject's obedience, and as such merits exile from the community. On the other hand, sensual elements in the biblical account would also have posed a challenge to a Benedictine reformer—not only the king's harem of concubines, which Ælfric omits to mention, but the beauty of Vashti as against that of Esther. Ælfric distinguishes between the two by his choice of vocabulary, intimating that the attractiveness of the disobedient queen is confined to the surface, while Esther's



appearance reflects her qualities of character. Taken together, Klein suggests, Ælfric's alterations seek to promote ideals of queenship that in turn might improve the spiritual health of the nation.

In her 2003 Western Michigan doctoral dissertation, Rhonda L. McDaniel considers "Male and Female He Created Them: Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* and Patristic Theories of Gender" (*DAI* 64A, 2482). Beginning by surveying modern scholarly perceptions of the role and status of women in Anglo-Saxon England, McDaniel then examines the teachings of the Latin Doctors—Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory the Great—on virginity, the Trinity, and the Creation and Fall of humanity to determine their views on gender. Through this analysis, she seeks to challenge "the scholarly stereotype of misogyny and anxiety about women" in these patristic writings and to establish an orthodox benchmark to which to compare the depictions of male and female characters in Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*. Still focusing on virginity, the Trinity, Creation, and the Fall, she then traces how these ideas are transmitted from the Latin Fathers through the writings of Aldhelm, Bede, and Alcuin, noting which ideas were or were not deemed acceptable by these early Anglo-Saxons. Coming to Ælfric, McDaniel identifies ideas that appear to have influenced the monk's views of women and gender; by comparing Ælfrician *Lives* with their Latin sources, moreover, she attempts to set forth a more "culturally contextual understanding" of Ælfric's teaching on men and women—that is, an interpretation reflective of the patristic and Anglo-Saxon intellectual traditions that shaped Ælfric's thought.

In "For Pastoral Care and Political Gain: Ælfric of Eynsham's Preaching on Marital Celibacy" (*Traditio* 59: 39–78), Robert K. Upchurch offers a rich and systematic examination of Ælfric's teaching on celibacy, his adaptation of sources, and possible motivations for his multi-layered stance on the issue. Using Ælfric's second Christmas sermon (*CH* II.1) as his starting point, Upchurch argues that Ælfric asked his audience to understand his comments on *clænnyss* ("chastity" or "purity") on three levels consonant with themes reiterated throughout his career. First, there was literal abstinence for married laity. On the one hand, in keeping with patristic and canonical admonitions, Ælfric enjoined temporary restraint during liturgical periods such as Lent and Ember fasts, which would facilitate humility and penitence, and during menstruation and pregnancy, when intercourse would not lead to propagation. On the other hand, in an unusual if not

a unique position, he exhorted laity to permanent celibacy as well—for married couples after menopause, for spouses wishing to separate and live chastely, and for couples wishing to marry (given parental pressure concerning inheritance, for example) and live continently in secret. One key source for the first may have been Augustine's *Contra Iulianum*, in which he recommends celibacy after menopause, a principle Ælfric presents not as a preference but as a rule. Upchurch suggests that saints' lives rather than patristic writings may have furnished Ælfric with needed precedence for his approval of spousal separation, whereas he finds no official sanction for Ælfric's support of secret chaste wedlock. In addition to this emphasis on literal abstinence, a second way Ælfric's comments on *clænnyss* were to be understood was as an exhortation to spiritual purity: earlier in his Christmas sermon as elsewhere in his writings, using the biblical imagery of virginity surrounding the Church, Christ's bride, Ælfric calls Christians to spiritual purity through steadfast belief. Moreover, just as the Church, like Mary, is both virgin and mother, Ælfric calls believers to propagate spiritually by teaching others and bringing them to faith. In the process, he "create[s] points of contact between lay folk and reformed clergymen," aligning lay concerns with those of the Benedictine Reformers (76). This alliance is the point of the third level of Ælfric's comments on *clænnyss*: in affirming the importance of celibacy for laity as well as monks, he offers a public if implicit critique of married secular clergy. It is this disdain for married clergy (i.e., the desire to preserve the purity of those serving at the altar), Upchurch suggests, that partly accounts for the prominence of the emphasis on *clænnyss* through Ælfric's works; in addition, however, is that "observant lay folk are indispensable to his vision of an English church that is able to secure in this world the peace and prosperity its members are assured of in the next" (71).

A number of the same themes appear also in Upchurch's study of "The Legend of Chrysanthus and Daria in Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*" (*Studies in Philology* 101: 250–69). Upchurch considers how this tale of chaste marriage may have been not only relevant to Ælfric's lay-patrons Æthelweard and Æthelmær, but of particular importance to Ælfric, given that Ælfric had planned (before Æthelweard insisted on the inclusion of the *Life of Thomas*) on using it as the conclusion to his hagiographic collection. Upchurch suggests that Chrysanthus and Daria offer models of fidelity on both literal and figurative levels: on the one hand, as elsewhere in Ælfric's writings on the subject, the narrative exhorts

laity to *clennyss*—to temporary and then permanent literal abstinence; on the other hand, as a type of the Church, the virgin Bride of Christ, the couple encourages spiritual chastity among the laity—steadfast belief in (and thus faithfulness to) God. Given, moreover, that the Church is both virgin and mother, believers are exhorted to spiritual fertility as well as chastity inasmuch as they are commissioned to bring new believers to the faith. Ælfric gives emphasis to such themes through his adaptations of his Latin source. He highlights the conversions, not simply the vows of celibacy, that result from the couple's example. He calls Chrysanthus's father an idolater rather than a *uir illustrissimus* ("most celebrated man") and the learning which Chrysanthus rejects *hæpene bec* ("pagan books") rather than the wisdom of the liberal arts. His vocabulary underscores the couple's constancy amidst the attempts to turn or entice them from the faith. The couple thus embodies for Ælfric both the fidelity and fruitfulness of the Church (262), and as a result serves as a model not of idealistic principles but of qualities vital to devout lay believers.

AK

In "Beggars' Saint but no Beggar: Martin of Tours in Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*" (*Neophilologus* 88: 461–75), Karin E. Olsen examines the changes Ælfric made to his sources when composing his life of Martin of Tours for the *Lives of Saints* collection. She argues that Ælfric, like King Alfred, found excessive humility to be problematic in an authority figure; Ælfric moderates the emphasis on Martin's humility in order not to compromise or degrade the authority and dignity of the office of bishop, as those are defined by early eleventh century standards of social and ecclesiastical decorum. Ælfric responds to the problem "with his consistent omission of details that could compromise Martin's worldly authority, and in this way adapts the portrait of the saint both to the spiritual and political climate in late Anglo-Saxon England" (462). When compared to the Latin source, Ælfric omits things such as excessive prostration, overly shabby (and therefore humble) appearance, and so forth. Ælfric shows sensitivity not only to the saint's spiritual authority, but also his social status when measured against the high social status of a bishop in early eleventh-century England.

Andrea Rossi-Reder emphasizes the political, nation-building resonances of hagiography in "Embodying Christ, Embodying Nation: Ælfric's Accounts of Saints Agatha and Lucy" (*Sex and Sexuality in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Pasternack and Weston, 183–202; see sec-

tion 2), as she argues that Ælfric chooses to translate the lives of female martyrs Agatha and Lucy for "nationalistic reasons" (183). In her words: "Using postcolonial notions of gender and nation, I argue that patterns and details found in women martyrs' stories lend themselves to nationalistic symbolism and interpretation in a way not possible in most accounts of male martyrdom, where the focus is not on the sexual exploitation of the body as it is in women's stories" (184). Using the work of Homi Bhabha, Trinh Min-Ha, and Gayatri Spivak, Rossi-Reder draws attention to language that describes the female martyrs in terms of landscape; she develops an analogy between the female martyrs' bodies and the "body" of the English nation: "the female saint is symbolic of the *patria*, and the highly sexualized bodily sufferings she endures mirror the imperialistic violations exacted upon her country: she is both land and native people" (185). She then develops an analogy between the trauma inflicted on these female bodies and the historical trauma of Viking invasions during Ælfric's lifetime: "Not only are Agatha and Lucy models of devotion to Christ, but they are also symbols of perseverance and loyalty to one's country, particularly in the face of foreign rule" (191). The saints' bodies are a template for working out anxieties over war, invasion and conquest: "The attention given to details of the saints' bodies—often piece by piece—mimics the apportioning of the land through the processes of war, colonization, and imperialism" (200). In her final words, "Female martyrs thus overcome not just bodily and spiritual oppression, but political oppression as well. Martyrdom becomes an act of holiness and of nationalism" (202).

Robert Faerber also examines the dynamics of Ælfric's translations by focusing on a small, well-defined sample in "Les *Acta apocryphorum apostolorum* dans le corpus homilétique vieil-anglais (Xe–XIe s.); Ælfric: *De passione apostolorum Petri et Pauli et Cathedra Petri*" (*Apocrypha* 15: 259–92). Faerber begins by surveying the use of the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles in the Old English homiletic corpus, with special reference to Ælfric, paying particular attention to the difficulty of accurately assessing direct Latin sources for Ælfric and these texts. He includes general background on Ælfric, in particular on his anxiety about the use of apocryphal sources as recorded in various prefaces, and a survey of Ælfric's use of the apocryphal acts in the *Catholic Homilies* and the *Lives of Saints*. Faerber then moves to his two main texts: the homily in the First Series of *Catholic Homilies* (*Passio Apostolorum Petri et Pauli*, CH I.26), and the item *Cathedra Sancti Petri* in the *Lives of Saints*;

he provides a full translation (into French) of each text. Faerber compares Ælfric's version to the Latin source in the Pseudo-Marcellus *Passio sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli* and argues that Ælfric's anxiety in using the source is overridden by his desire to use the narrative for spiritual edification in a time of trouble. He thus argues for the social engagement of Ælfric's use of the apocrypha in a late tenth-century context, as he tracks the complex way Ælfric had to adapt the miracles and legends of apocryphal saints to a more public, homiletic milieu. His interest in the apocrypha was primarily in ethical examples; this concern, in this case overrides his qualms about the veracity of the narrative.

In her study of "Ælfric's English Grammar" (*JEGP* 103: 106–24), Melinda J. Menzer argues against the scholarly consensus in asserting that while Ælfric's text certainly teaches Latin, it also at the same time, in effect, a grammar of English. While the text has been primarily read for its information about the teaching of Latin, it also served to foster a systematic linguistic consciousness about English as a language for its original readership. Ælfric is "making it possible for students to talk about their language [English] grammatically" (110). She argues that this grammatical self-consciousness is an important constituent element of the *Grammar*. Menzer first compares Ælfric's work to Donatus's *Ars Minor* in order to broaden the category of medieval grammar. In this comparison, she argues that Ælfric's *Grammar* "introduces his readers to the art of grammar and to the idea that English has a grammar" (114). Menzer then analyzes the text for evidence of specifically English grammatical preoccupation: focuses on "a description of pronouns, the explanation of the semantic relationship between words, and as discussion of English patronyms" (117). She then goes on to discuss the English slant found in Ælfric's discussion of certain parts of speech (nouns, adverbs, conjunctions, interjections). Third, she ends with some summary comments about the use of the text. In this concluding section

she argues that the *Grammar* in essence functions as an early primer of English literary criticism and interpretation; in Ælfric's concern for correct interpretation, one of the fundamental things needed was a sense that English was a part of the discipline of *grammatica*.

Jane Roberts offers a brief note on Ælfric's *Life of St. Basil* in "The Rich Woman and Her Sealed Letter" (*ANQ* 17.2: 3–6; this is a corrected version of the note by the same name appearing in *ANQ* 17.1: 6–9). Roberts makes a minor emendation to Skeat's text (*me* to *ne* in line 537); thus, when the rich woman in question offers up the letter she has composed with her sins recorded upon it, she does not beg Basil "to unloose *for me* this seal, and blot out the sins," but rather she asks him "*not* to release this seal but to blot out the sins." Roberts briefly discusses how this change better fits the narrative logic of the text: only when the woman "has at last made open acknowledgement of her sinfulness" (5) can the letter be unsealed in a fitting climax after Basil's death, finding the words miraculously blotted out.

For more on Ælfric see the comparative studies by Godden and Stanley reviewed above, under the sub-heading *Wulfstan*.

AS

*Works not seen:*

Tamás Karáth, "Quaedam catholicae fidei contraria: The Platonic Tradition in the Early Medieval Commentaries and Translations of Metre III. 9 of Boëthius' *Consolatio Philosophiae*." *What Does It Mean?* Ed. Kathleen E. Dubs. *Pázmány Papers in English and American Studies* 3 (Piliscsaba, Hungary: Pázmány Péter Catholic U, 2003–4). 57–77.

S. Sato, "Wyrð and Fortune in King Alfred's and Chaucer's Translations of The Consolation of Philosophy: A Comparative Study," M.Phil. Thesis, U of Sheffield, 2003; *Index to Theses* 53 (2004): 12213.

## 5. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works

### a. Celtic Latin

Ora Limor investigates two travelogues of pilgrimages to the Holy Land—that of Arculf and Willibald—in "Pilgrims and Authors: Adomnán's *De Locis Sanctis* and Hugeburc's *Hodoeporicon Sancti Willibaldi*," *RB* 114: 253–75. Limor concentrates on the process of these stories being written down not by the travelers themselves but by a third party, Adomnán and Hugeburc, asking

questions concerning the cooperation between traveler and writer such as "how much influence did the writers have on the stories told them," and "to what extent did they introduce emendations, rework the stories, or interpolate further information from outside sources?" (257–58). In partial answer Limor introduces the notion of the relative authority of the interlocutors, noting that Adomnán, as bishop and famed writer, exercised a position of authority over Arculf that reveals itself in

Adomnán's dominance in the construction of the text, while Hugeburc's relatively inferior position allows Willibald to take center stage in the story, which is more about his life than about the Holy Land itself.

Michael Herren revisits some basic questions of authorship and audience in "The 'Cosmography' of Aethicus Ister: Speculations about its Date, Provenance, and Audience," in *Nova de veteribus: Mittel- und neulateinische Studien für Paul Gerhard Schmidt*, ed. Andreas Bihrer and Elisabeth Stein (Munich: K. G. Saur), 79–102. Herren takes *My Fair Lady's* Professor Higgins as his model for reanalyzing the successive layers in the Cosmographer's dialect. Rather than seeing him as an Irishman who traveled to the continent, he asks "wasn't our author going the other way?" (85). Herren shows how the language of the text reveals a substrate of the Latin one would expect of a seventh- or eighth-century Frank, with an overlying accent of the more "baroque" style of Irish Latin, mostly in the use of Greek and formation of neologisms. Finally, he suggests a sojourn in Canterbury where his satire may target Theodore, who perhaps "felt that a posting among these semi-savage peoples was the equivalent of exile to Tomi" (95). Herren suggests the piece is an "elaborate and well-constructed joke" intended "to entertain a sophisticated 'international readership'" of Irish, English and Franks who "might have enjoyed the tongue-in-cheek references to the glory that was Greece," especially as parodied here.

Charles D. Wright and Roger Wright, "Additions to the Bobbio Missal: *De dies malus* and *Joca monachorum* (fols. 6r–8v)," in *The Bobbio Missal: Liturgy and Religious Culture in Merovingian Gaul*, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Rob Meens; Cambridge Studies in Palaeography and Codicology (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), 79–103 begins with Charles Wright providing a complete introduction to the manuscript transmission of these two works found in the *Bobbio Missal*, as well as a semi-diplomatic transcription with translation and a full commentary on various peculiarities of spelling, abbreviation and variant readings, followed by a critical edition. In part II, Roger Wright provides a linguistic analysis of the texts. Since these texts were left by the scribe in a rather non-formal register, rather than polished up as were other texts, Roger Wright suggests that the scribe may have not intended for others to read them.

François Kerlouégan briefly considers the phrase *nec quadratum agmen neque dextrum cornu* in "Un nouvel

hispérisme dans le *De Excidio Britanniae* de Gildas," in *Corona Monastica: Moines bretons de Landévennec: histoire et mémoire celtiques; Mélanges offerts au père Marc Simon*, ed. Louis Lemoine and Bernard Merdrignac in collaboration with Annick Richard-Calarnou; Collection "Histoire" (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes), 193–94. Although the phrase has been interpreted before as "nor a marshalled army or right wing," Kerlouégan makes a convincing suggestion that Gildas is drawing a distinction between infantry and cavalry. He suggests that use of these terms reflects the standard hisperic feature of substituting specialized terms (*quadratum agmen* and *dextrum cornu*) in place of more banal, general terms (*pedites* and *equites*).

The influence of Gildas is found in the Welsh poem *Canu Aneirin* by Graham R. Isaac in "Canu Aneirin Awdl LI Revisited," *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 54: 144–53. He finds in the use of Gildas as a source more evidence to help us "move away from vestigial romantic notions of the semi-pagan Celtic bard chanting his lays out of the swirling mists of hoary, barbarian antiquity" (150). Instead, he sees the poem as concerning the founding of Gwynedd and the preservation of Western Roman civilization.

In "Diogenes the Cynic in the Scholastic Dialogues Called *De raris fabulis*," *ANQ* 17.1: 3–6, Scott Gwara draws a connection between a passage in the *De raris fabulis* and the response of Diogenes to Alexander the Great that he not block the sun. While Diogenes was responding to Alexander's offer of a gift, in *De raris fabulis*, the monk who has himself asked for a favor is met with the reply not to stand in the light, suggesting perhaps a lack of familiarity with the original story. Gwara suggests that the story of Diogenes's response was generally unknown in Anglo-Saxon England except for the far west: he notes that when Ælfric Bata uses this same passage as a source for his more famous colloquy, the request not to block the light comes from someone who needs enough light to urinate!

## b. Aldhelm and Early Anglo-Latin

Augustine Casiday has two articles on Aldhelm, both examining his use of earlier writings. In "St Aldhelm on Apocrypha," *Journal of Theological Studies* 55: 146–57, he asks what Aldhelm's position on the acceptability of apocrypha was, given his apparent condemnation of them in Ch. 54 of *De virginitate*. Casiday examines his use of apocryphal writings in the sections on John the Evangelist, Didymus, Paul, and Melchisidech and finds



that Aldhelm was in fact ambivalent in his attitude. Where apocryphal sources did not contradict Scriptures or the writings of the Fathers, he felt free to accept them, as he did in the chapters on John and Dydimus. On the other hand, if the writings contradicted Christian teachings, as in the Jewish identification of Melchisidech with Noah's son Shem, or the descriptions in the *Revelation of Paul* of the vision that Paul himself said was ineffable, then Aldhelm condemned "the inanities of apocrypha and the untrustworthy fables of absurdities." Casiday turns to Aldhelm's use of the Fathers, specifically their comparison of monks to bees, in "St Aldhelm's Bees (*De virginitate prosa* cc. iv-vi): Some Observations on a Literary Tradition," *ASE* 33: 1-22, Casiday shows how Aldhelm adapts this traditional analogy to his own ends. For example, the bee's industry applies not just to the hard manual labor of the monk but to the nuns' diligent practice of scriptural exegesis, reading, and gathering bits of lore from the Bible and the Fathers, and the "spiritual honey" they produce. More intriguing perhaps is Aldhelm's avoidance of using the supposed chastity of bees as a model for the nuns, as Ambrose does, but his application of the chaste bee as a symbol for the Church itself.

In "The Sexual Practices of Virginitate and Chastity in Aldhelm's *De Virginitate*," in *Sex and Sexuality in Anglo-Saxon England: Essays in Memory of Daniel Gilmore Calder*, ed. Carol Braun Pasternack and Lisa M.C. Weston, MRTS 277 (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies), 93-120, Carol Braun Pasternack sets Aldhelm's treatise on virginitate in the context of the recent conversions to Christianity, analyzing how "it participates in the process of cultural conversion" by introducing a new model of sexuality—i.e., virginitate—"based on Roman models and altered to suit its present audience" (94). She examines how Aldhelm co-opts the language of procreation associated with the bodily family to describe the Church's creation of virgins "through the seed of the spiritual word." Pasternack ranges throughout the *De virginitate*, showing how Aldhelm's text "promotes a sublimation of desire for sexual reproduction and motherhood (or for the mother) through transferring this desire to the ideal represented by the Church, and it promotes a revolution for the social institutions of marriage and family, attempting to subdue heterosexuality in favor of a virginal sexuality that is the same for men as it is for women" (110).

Since Theodore's most popular and influential works, his penitential and exegetical teachings, were written

down by his students rather than by him, they often survive in numerous, quite diverse recensions. Roy Flechner attempts to sort out the recensions of his penitential works in "The Makings of the Canons of Theodore," *Peritia* 17-18 (2003-2004): 121-43. Flechner establishes a chronology of their development from their oral beginnings to "the emergence of the recensions, the relative chronology of some of them, and aspects of their early reception" (123), including the efforts of the eighth-century *Discipulus Umbrensius* who himself attempted to sort out the original Theodoran material from later accretions through his own "interventionist editorial policy" (128). Perhaps the most interesting part of Flechner's study is his demonstration of the relationship between Theodore's teachings and the Penitential of Cummean and Gregory's *Libellus responsionum*. Flechner reverses the now-standard theory of Deanesly and Grosjean that the *Libellus* was in fact an eighth-century Canterbury work that drew on Theodoran as well as Gregorian material. Flechner compares responses in the *Libellus* with canons in Theodore's Penitential and proposes instead that Theodore drew on the *Libellus*, accepting some of its rulings, modifying others, and even rejecting some. Flechner sees the same process occurring with the Penitential of Cummean. Thus, "the assimilation of modified rulings from these texts into the Canons of Theodore marks the final phase of a dialectical process that transformed existing canonical and penitential prescriptions into new precepts" issued under the name of Theodore, who became the new canonical authority (139).

In "Zu den Bibelkommentaren von Theodor und Hadrian," *Eranos* 99 (2001): 34-37, Bengt Löfstedt gives a brief review of the edition of *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School* by Bischoff and Lapidge. Löfstedt restricts his comments primarily to questions of Lapidge's choices of emendation and corrects a few translations.

The four octosyllabic poems by Æthilwald, who may perhaps be identical with Aedeluold, Bishop of Lindisfarne and author of an acrostic prayer found in the Book of Cerne, are the subject of a new edition by Brent Miles, "The *Carmina Rhythmica* of Æthilwald: Edition, Translation, and Commentary," *Jnl of Medieval Latin* 14: 73-117. Readers of previous work by David Howlett will find more of the same in his "Early Insular Latin Poetry," *Peritia* 17-18 (2003-04): 61-109. Here he ranges from early Romano-British inscriptions to Welsh and Irish Latin texts before turning to concentrate on Anglo-Latin poetry.

### c. Bede

Scott DeGregorio puts another nail in the coffin of the view that Bede's commentaries are simply compilations of the thoughts of the Fathers, with little or no contribution of his own. In "Bede's *In Ezram et Neemiam* and the Reform of the Northumbrian Church" (*Speculum* 79: 1–25), DeGregorio shows that "*In Ezram* is a deeply reformist work, concerned as much with critiquing the Northumbrian present as it is with interpreting the biblical past," and is especially concerned with "corruption of monastic life and neglect of pastoral care" (3). Crucial to this view is Bede's overtly polemical Letter to Ecgbert, written in 734, which explicitly condemns many of the problems more allusively referred to in the commentary.

Eric Knibbs, "Exegetical Hagiography: Bede's Prose *Vita Sancti Cuthberti*," *RB* 114: 233–52, turns away from the standard historical discussions of Bede's Life of Cuthbert and instead examines the text in light of his biblical commentaries. Concentrating primarily on passages where Bede has changed the emphasis from his source text, the anonymous Life, Knibbs uses Bede's commentaries on Samuel, Luke, and the seven Catholic Epistles to explain Bede's aims in specific passages.

In "Bede and the 'Versus de die iudicii'" (*Nova de veteribus*, ed. Bihrer and Stein, pp. 103–11), Michael Lapidge revisits the question of the authorship of this text. Many scholars, himself included, have been hesitant to ascribe this work to Bede in spite of the manuscripts' attributions. Bede does not mention it in his list of works in the *Historia ecclesiastica*; even more damning are the numerous metrical faults that Bede, as the author of a metrical treatise, would presumably not have made. Through a detailed comparison of the work with Bede's metrical *Vita S Cuthberti*, Lapidge shows convincingly that these doubts are groundless: not only are the preferences of hexameter patterns almost identical, but so is the use of elision and the avoidance of hiatus. Furthermore, the errors that have given scholars so much pause are not those of found in the manuscripts but rather were made by Fraipont, editor of the 1955 CCSL edition. Fortunately, a new edition is being prepared by Lapidge.

PGR

Brendan McGroarty ("Bede's Ecclesial Vision for England," *Downside Review* 122: 211–34) attempts to demonstrate that Bede wrote his *Historia ecclesiastica* "in order to connect the lives of his English contemporaries with

salvation history" (212). To do so, McGroarty divides his investigation into five main sections: the political setting of the *HE*; secular and non-secular loyalty in early eighth-century Anglo-Saxon England; monastic influence on Bede; St Peter and relics; and eschatology and history. Politically, Bede can be seen to be responding to the situation of his day. For example, McGroarty considers the famous opening passage about the five languages in Britain and Bede's opinion of each vernacular culture, noting also the unusual chronology of the Pictish conversion later in the narrative. McGroarty decides that Bede's main aim is to show that the expression of Christian (Latin) truths in the vernacular languages symbolizes the redemption of each culture; in the same way, the relationship of Latin to the vernaculars is a useful way of considering Bede's conception of the relationship of the church in Rome to the English church. In terms of loyalty, McGroarty suggests that secular expressions of loyalty and vassalage influenced the organization of the Anglo-Saxon church, even to the extent of comparing "fosterage" with Bede's donation to Wearmouth-Jarrow at the age of seven. Bede's writing tends to blur distinctions, or to create connections, between action and contemplation, for example, or between cathedral and abbey, kings and bishops, or even between fidelity to Rome and to the "Celtic missionary spirit." "Bede," McGroarty asserts, "wrote to forge an identity for the English by articulating their mission as a people" (219) in the larger Christian community and in salvation history as a whole. Connections are forged and realized through knowledge and veneration of St. Peter, and of relics, which act as a link between the world of the saints (in heaven) and the world of the common man on earth. Miracles effected through relics and through faith, at the same time (almost paradoxically) attract people to the faith. McGroarty even links the books of the *HE* to the first five ages of the world (or the books of the Pentateuch). The present sixth age occurs simultaneously with the seventh, and thus McGroarty connects Bede's contemporary description of the English church with the "eschatological tension" between Augustine's "two cities." Overall, Bede felt that "[t]o be truly English meant to be truly Christian" (229).

If God communicates with mankind via miracles (here defined as "miraculous deviations from or coincidences within the usual course of nature"), what might be the narrative contexts in which such miracles ought to be interpreted? Brian McFadden ("The Elements of Discourse: Orality, Literacy, and Nature in the Elemental Miracles of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*," *American*

*Benedictine Review* 55.4: 442–63) argues that in the miracles of the *Historia ecclesiastica* Bede emphasizes the four elements (earth, air, water, fire) “in order to provide a narrative context that both contains the uncertainties inherent in oral report and makes his interpretations of the miracles more theologically secure” (442). In other words, elements in the miracles provide a means by which Bede is able to shape his material in a way that appeals to and can be understood by both “oral and literate audiences” (the “auditor” and “lector,” but also the oral and literate sources which Bede acknowledges). McFadden begins by examining relative standards of truth in oral and literate discourse via Bede’s preface to the *HE*, noting how each are part of the *uera lex historiae*, even though they generally differ as narrative, both in style and in standards of “truth.” McFadden discusses how oral cultures transmit abstract truths via narratives of concrete examples and suggests that Bede also shapes his (orally derived) miracle narratives in terms of “known narrative pattern[s]” in order to “authorize” them. Invoking Paul Ricoeur, McFadden examines the mutual dependence of temporal order and narrative, suggesting that “temporal humans” can only interact with an eternal God via temporal events; humans must then “fit the event into the context of Christian narrative to discern what God means for them to do” (452). McFadden discusses the appearance of storms, fire, earth, and water in Bede’s miracles and shows how these function on a literal level (for an oral audience) and also “point out to the literate the spiritual relationship of these miracles to the Christian narrative” (462). Overall, the effect is to invite the reader of the *HE* to view history from the point of view of the eternal, and to insert him- or herself into the narrative and “thus to encounter divinity” directly (463).

In 1895, J. Rendel Harris observed nine “curious” parallels between Ephrem the Syrian’s commentary on the *Diatessaron* and Bede’s *In Lucam*. Harris’s explanation was to propose a “Targum of the Presbyters,” a hypothetical source for Ephrem, Origen, Gregory and others, a source which could explain “coincidences in interpretations and glosses between Eastern and Western, and Syrian and non-Syrian fathers.” William L. Petersen (“Ephrem Syrus and the Venerable Bede: Do East and West Meet?” *Studia patristica* 34 [2001]: 443–52), noting that “little has been done” since, undertakes a more thorough examination of Ephrem and all of Bede’s commentaries on the Gospels. Emphasizing that his method focuses on efficiency rather than completeness, Petersen nevertheless identifies at least five new parallels. Classing Harris’s nine and his five parallels as “brief

exegetical glosses,” Petersen posits that the link, which was unavailable to Harris, is the Canterbury school of Theodore and Hadrian. Though the Canterbury glosses “were not the source of the common readings between Ephrem and Bede,” it is “likely that Bede acquired some of his parallels with Ephrem from a document akin to the Cambridge commentaries” (451–52).

Jean-Michel Picard (“Bede and Irish Scholarship: Scientific Treatises and Grammars,” *Eriu* 54: 139–47) “revisits the question of Bede’s debt to Irish scholarship,” focusing particularly on Bede’s use of *De ordine creaturarum* in his *De natura rerum* and his use of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus’s *Epitomae* in *De orthographia*. Picard notes that *De ordine creaturarum* is in fact Bede’s most-used source in *De natura rerum*, surpassing even Pliny’s *Historia naturalis*. Through three illustrative examples, Picard shows that Bede uses *De ordine* in different ways, sometimes summarizing, sometimes expanding, and always with an awareness of other sources and ideas. In his section on tides, Bede also uses Philippus’s commentary on Job, a work Picard suggests Bede knew “through the mediation of Irish scholars.” In the composition of *De orthographia*, Bede often refers to “Irish grammars,” particularly the *Epitomae*, which, however, Bede often quotes “out of context,” seemingly unaware of the nature of his source text. As Picard puts it, “it is quite remarkable that the *De orthographia*, which is presented as a serious reference book for the use of students, reproduces Virgilius Maro’s jokes without any warning” (146). Overall, though Bede’s attitude toward the Irish has sometimes been the subject of discussion, Picard suggests that Bede treats Irish authors much as he treats his other sources: “all relevant information was included.” That Bede often cites Irish works and authors without explicit acknowledgement does not reflect a treatment peculiar to Irish sources.

According to Arthur G. Holder (“The Patristic Sources of Bede’s Commentary on the Song of Songs,” *Studia patristica* 34 [2001]: 370–75), Bede read the Song of Songs as “a theological allegory of world history focused on the Incarnation of the Word” (370). In his commentary on the biblical book, Bede mentions three sources by name: Julian of Eclanum, Apponius, and Gregory the Great. Holder notes that this list omits Origen’s commentary and homilies on the song (which could have been available in the translations of Rufinus and Jerome), and that the evidence of the commentary itself (despite echoes of Origen signalled by David Hurst in his edition of Bede) suggests no “direct dependence” by Bede on Origen. Other likely sources—Ambrose’s

*De Isaac uel anima* and Jerome's letter to Eustochium—are also not in evidence. Holder sketches the influence of Julian and Gregory, noting that borrowings from Gregory show no evidence that Bede knew Gregory's commentary on the Song, before settling on Apponius (himself mainly dependent on Origen) as the most important source for Bede's work. Though "the grand design for the commentary" (372) comes from Apponius, "Bede's use of Apponius is rather subtle, and not readily apparent" (373); Bede is characteristically judicious and selective as he follows in the footsteps of Apponius and his masters.

Calling Bede "the first great English patristic scholar," Joseph F. Kelly ("Bede's Use of the Fathers to Interpret Infancy Narratives," *Studia patristica* 34 [2001]: 388–94) examines how Bede uses "the Fathers in his exegesis of the gospel infancy narratives, specifically in his commentary on Luke and in his homilies for Advent and Christmas" (388). Kelly attributes Bede's concentration on Luke to his interest in Acts, a narrative in which Bede saw parallels to the early history of Christianity in England, and also to questions of Bede's intended audience. Ambrose was Bede's "preferred source" for *In Lucam*, and "to a lesser but considerable extent for the homilies" (391), usually for theological questions. He did not, however, use Jerome's commentary on Matthew in the context of the infancy, but rather Jerome's *De nominibus Hebraicis* and, somewhat strangely, his *Aduersus Heluidium* for the question of Mary's perpetual virginity. Overall, given the importance of the infancy narratives, Bede's exegesis of them is a suitable place to evaluate, as Kelly does, Bede's approach to the Fathers: "respectful yet independent, traditional yet original" (394).

Melissa Ann Payne's "Vera lex historiae: Saints and Miracles in Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*" (unpubl. MA thesis, University of Louisville) suggests that Bede's great historical work is "a new kind of history," an "exegetical epic" with the *gens Anglorum* as hero, a work which connects history and hagiography in a "moral-pedagogical tale." Payne deals extensively with hagiography and historiography in her first three sections, moving from general introductory material on the cult of the saints to connections between saints and miracles and the writing of saints' lives. Payne places Bede's *HE* in the tradition of hagiography and history, beginning with Levison's notion of the importance of chronology and hagiography as Bede's starting points, and examining anew the perceived difficulty of the miracles. Bede's possible models are discussed,

and Payne notes (as McFadden, above) the parallels between scriptural events and Bede's miracles. The thesis moves naturally from miracles performed by living saints to miracles effected via relics of the saints, and suggests that miracles are to be seen as tools of conversion and correction. Among the former, Payne would include the saint as a Christian version of the Germanic hero; the hero fighting off the monster evolves into the saint fighting off a demon. In her final section, Payne rehearses the appearances of prominent saints in each book of the *HE*, suggesting finally that they might, on the basis of their importance and standing in and even above or outside the narrative, be considered "rubrics." Payne concludes that the *HE* "represents the interconnectedness of history and hagiography"; that "miracles within the narrative were literal, figurative and didactic"; and that saints in the *HE* were "heroic individuals that laid the foundations of the Anglo-Saxon church" and "historical model[s] of piety and virtue" (100).

Giovanni Caputa's *Il sacerdozio dei fedeli secondo San Beda: Un itinerario di maturità cristiana*, Monumenta Studia Instrumenta Liturgica 16 (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2002) begins with the *status quaestionis* of the topic and an introduction to Bede before examining the terms *sacerdos*, *sacerdotium* and *sacerdotalis* in Bede's works. Caputa moves in chronological fashion, moving from the early *Explanatio Apocalypsis* in the first chapter, to *In epistolam Petri primam* in the second, to a range of works in the third (710–720; Luke, Samuel, the *Retractatio*, and Kings), to *De tabernaculo* and *In Ezram et Neemiam* in the fourth, and concludes the first section of the book by looking at the commentary on Mark and *De templo*. The second section of the work examines related terms and attempts to bring the study together. Caputa discusses such terms as *Christus* and *oleum effusum*, the life of Christ and the sacraments, including the sources and idiosyncrasies of Bede's thought, before looking at the Word incarnate, mother Church, and generally at how it all relates to everyday life. An appendix examines the "paternity" of Bede on Kings and sets out parallels between Ps-Eucherius and Bede's *De templo*.

#### d. Alcuin and the Carolingian Period

The largest collection of essays on Alcuin ever to appear is contained in a special volume of the journal *Annales de Bretagne et des Pays de l'Ouest* (111.3), edited by Philippe Depreux and Bruno Judic and entitled *Alcuin de York à Tours*. The papers mainly arise from a conference at the Université François-Rabelais marking



the twelfth century of Alcuin's death. Divided into five main sections, the volume contains twenty-nine contributions, as well as a separate translation (into French) of Alcuin's Ep. 136 and a selection of sources and bibliography. The first section of the text considers Alcuin's setting and environment: Stéphane Lebecq ("Alcuin sur la route," 15–25) examines what we know of Alcuin's travels, mainly after his move to Francia. Lebecq argues that Alcuin traveled extensively while he was well enough to do so, and then let his letters do his traveling for him during his last years at Tours; Sho-ichi Sato ("Remarques sur les exploitations rurales en Touraine au haut Moyen Âge," 27–36) looks more generally at the situation of land-holding in the Touraine; and Henri Galinié, Élisabeth Lorans, and Élisabeth Zadora-Rio ("Tours et la Touraine au temps d'Alcuin: état des questions," 37–52) show how archaeological evidence supplements the written sources and suggests that there does not seem to have been a decrease in population in the eighth and ninth centuries.

The second section of the text focuses on St. Martin's at Tours. Two articles here really have very little to do with Alcuin directly (Philippe Depreux, "La tradition manuscrite des 'Formules de Tours' et la diffusion des modèles d'actes aux VIIIe et IXe siècles," 55–71; and Mark Mersiwksy, "Saint-Martin de Tours et les chancelleries carolingiennes," 73–90). Martina Hartmann ("Alcuin et la gestion matérielle de Saint-Martin de Tours," 91–102) reminds us that, though Alcuin is traditionally discussed only in the context of Tours, he was also responsible—and actively so—for five other abbeys (Ferrières, Flavigny, Saint-Josse-sur-Mer, Saint-Loup, and Berge), suggesting that Charlemagne perhaps relied on Alcuin to provide a model for the administration of churches and monasteries. To Hartmann's list, Annick Chupin ("Alcuin et Cormery," 103–12) adds Cormery, which had been established by Alcuin's predecessor at St. Martin's and which remained under its control, and to which many grants were made toward the end of Alcuin's lifetime and later. Hélène Noizet ("Alcuin contre Théodulphe: un conflit producteur de normes," 113–29) considers the affair of the escaped convict, looking at how the evidence of the related letters and of capitularies might shed light upon the making of the law and our idea of a Carolingian *renouatio* or *correctio*.

The next group of essays ("Alcuin et les enjeux de l'écriture") begins with Louis Holtz's analysis of the *Dialogus Franconis et Saxonis* ("Le dialogue de Franco et de Saxo," 133–45). Holtz suggests that the structure of

the dialogue reflects Alcuin's experiences at home and abroad. As a *libellus manualis*, the document presents material from Priscian, but in a structure familiar from Donatus, though the manner in which sources are used suggests a thorough knowledge of the material. Alcuin's presence is felt through the dialogue, and Holtz discusses passages in which he intervenes. Pierre Swiggers also takes up the issue of Alcuin *grammaticus* ("Alcuin et les doctrines grammaticales," 147–61), primarily again through the *Dialogus Franconis et Saxonis*. Swiggers examines the "intertextuality" of the work, from the point of view of its relationship to Alcuin's other works, his interest in classical Latin literature, and the network of sources from which Alcuin draws. The *Dialogus* is a work of extreme cultural importance, argues Swiggers, and its great virtue is its intelligent synthesis of antique grammatical knowledge. Brigitte Englisch ("Alcuin und das Quadriuium in der Karolingerzeit," 163–74) expands the analysis to the quadrivium as a whole, and suggests that the *Propositiones ad acuendos iuuenes* is his most significant work in the field and, in fact, the most important early collection of mathematical problems and riddles. Englisch urges a broader consideration of the work as having direct relevance to issues of Alcuin's day and a fundamental role in the development of the medieval system of education. Beginning from the clear statement that "Alcuin n'est pas un historien," Michel Sot and Yann Coz ("Histoire et écriture de l'histoire dans l'œuvre d'Alcuin," 175–91) proceed to examine how Alcuin regarded history in his writings. Alcuin's *Dialogus* defines *historia* as "narratio rei gestae" (likely via Isidore's *Etymologiae*); the *Disputatio Pippini* has Alcuin call "littera" the "custos historiae." Sot and Coz begin with Alcuin's York poem, discussing influences and models in evidence there, before moving on to other uses of *historia* and *historicus* in Alcuin's writings. Finally, is the poem a rewriting of history or a rendering in verse of a history in line with Bede? Sot and Coz suggest the former: Alcuin rewrites the history of Northumbria in new way, doing such things as writing the Irish out and highlighting the influence and importance of Rome. Christiane Veyrard-Cosme ("Les motifs épistolaires dans la correspondance d'Alcuin," 193–205) looks at Alcuin's letters in the final piece of the section. Veyrard-Cosme notes the definition of the letter as a conversation between those absent (the motif of the *absentia corporis*), again discusses "le syndrome d'Habacuc" in Alcuin's letters, especially to Arn, and examines motifs which relate to the question of identity before moving to Pauline motifs (Alcuin's letters contain 149 direct Pauline quotations) and issues of "eschatological space."

The Bible links the penultimate gathering of essays. Guy Lobrichon ("Le texte des bibles alcuiniennes," 209–19) offers a short history of the biblical text prior to Alcuin, assesses the state of the Bible toward the end of the eighth century, and then discusses the so-called "edition" of Alcuin and the influence of Tours. Lobrichon concludes that the Alcuinian edition may not have been all that significant. Michel Lauwers ("Le glaive et la parole; Charlemagne, Alcuin et le modèle du *rex praedicator*: notes d'écclésiologie carolingienne," 221–44) revisits the discussion of Alcuin's Ep. 136 to Charlemagne and the two swords problem (Luke XXII.36–38 and Matt. XXVI.51–52), specifically from the point of view of Charlemagne as *rex praedicator*, wielder of both the material and the spiritual sword. Raffaele Savigni ("Le commentaire d'Alcuin sur l'Épître aux Hébreux et le thème du sacrifice," 245–67) examines Alcuin's commentary on Hebrews, assessing everything from the authenticity of the commentary to Alcuin's sources and, of course, the theme of sacrifice. Savigni's article helps to unravel the difficult problem of the sequence and relationships of all the ninth-century commentaries on Hebrews. Alain DuBreucq ("Autour de *De uirtutibus et uitiis* d'Alcuin," 269–88) discusses the purpose, composition, and sources of *De uirtutibus* (another *liber manualis*) before moving specifically into the vices as they appear in Alcuin's predecessors and successors. DuBreucq like Lauwers (above) links monastic models of a spiritual battle between virtues and vices with the material fight Charlemagne faces as emperor of the Christian empire, and argues that the influence, in fact, goes both ways. Like Savigni, Olivier Szerwiniack ("Les *Interpretationes nominum Hebraeorum progenitorum Iesu Christi* (ALC 62): une œuvre authentique d'Alcuin," 289–99) is concerned with the authenticity and sources of one of Alcuin's less accepted works. Szerwiniack, contra Michael Gorman, argues that Alcuin's *Interpretationes nominum* is genuine: he briefly describes three manuscripts and offers an "edition" of the opening verse that is found in each. Evidence suggests the verses and the commentary must be Alcuin's. Though Jerome is the primary source, Szerwiniack notes and discusses the influence of Aileran's *Interpretatio mystica*, one of Alcuin's more intriguing influences, and suggests that Alcuin might have composed his *Interpretationes* on a return trip to York (790–793), where he would have found the relevant manuscripts. Brigitte Kasten ("Alkuins erbrechtliche Expertise für Karl den Großen?," 301–15) examines the document known as the *Capitula quae tali conuenit in tempore memorari*, which is printed as Dümmler's Ep. 132. Kasten supports Donald Bullough's classification

of the work among the *spuria*, and argues that it is in fact later, possibly (though not likely to be) the work of Hincmar of Rheims, but certainly not Alcuin's.

The final section of the volume considers Alcuin's "networks" and the formation of European culture. Mary Garrison ("Les correspondants d'Alcuin," 319–31) begins by assessing the wide net of Alcuin's correspondents, both on the continent and in England, noting that the range (ecclesiastical; lay; royal; female) is similar in each case. Garrison suggests that Alcuin's correspondence is unusual for the surviving number of series of letters to individuals, and for one particular kind of correspondence, the letter of "instruction and admonition." Michael Jean-Louis Perrin ("La poésie de cour carolingienne, les contacts entre Alcuin et Hraban Maur et les indices de l'influence d'Alcuin sur l'*In honorem sanctae crucis*," 333–51) suggests that it was Alcuin, himself a practitioner, who was responsible for introducing Hrabanus Maurus to the poetry of Optatianus Porfyrius. Moreover, much of the vocabulary of Hrabanus Maurus's poetry is Alcuinian, though, importantly, Bede is used without explicit citation in *In honorem* for Hrabanus's "intellectual material." Alcuin was also active in the field of epigraphy, as Cécile Trefort ("La place d'Alcuin dans la rédaction épigraphique carolingienne," 353–69) points out. Alcuin not only wrote epigraphs, but epigraphical phrases and expressions crept into his other poetry, and, in turn, his poetry after his death influenced later writers of epigraphs. Although the *Vita Alcuini* records that Alcuin wrote a work entitled *De musica*, no trace of such a treatise has survived. Nevertheless, points out Jean-François Goudesenne ("De Tours à Rome: le corpus musical martinien au temps d'Alcuin," 371–85), Alcuin's role in the "problem of Gregorian chant" may be analyzed via his *Vita sancti Martini* and the liturgy: Alcuin and his time provide "essential testimony" for the history of music. Alcuin's *De laude Dei* is another important work in the context of the liturgy and music, and David Ganz ("Le *De laude Dei* d'Alcuin," 387–91) comments briefly on the manuscripts, contents and sources of this largely unpublished work. Marie-Hélène Julien ("Alcuin et l'Italie," 393–406), beginning from the question of Alcuin's possible models in the revision of the Gospels, assesses possible Italian influence. Julien particularly studies London, British Library, Harley 1775 for its influence, but notes that other Italian connections are highly likely. Wojciech Falkowski ("*Barbaricum* comme devoir et défi du souverain chrétien," 407–15) considers the role of the Christian sovereign via the letters of Cathulf (the eight proofs of blessedness

and eight columns of good government), Clemens Pergrinus, and Alcuin, suggesting that Alcuin relied on a framework which had already been established in the former writers to his notion of the mission of the Christian emperor. The missionary movement is the focus of Beatrix Dumont ("Alcuin et les missions," 417–29), who credits Alcuin with the preservation of much that we know about eighth-century missionary activity. In fact, Alcuin seems to have redefined the idea of the mission, with such sage advice as to be *praedictores* rather than *praedatores*, and to have felt able to criticize Charlemagne whenever necessary about his approach to conversion. On a perhaps lighter note, Alban Gautier ("Alcuin, la bière et le vin: comportements alimentaires et choix identitaires dans la correspondance d'Alcuin," 431–41) looks to Alcuin's letters for the source for the later medieval stereotype of the English as heavy drinkers, but also for evidence of how Alcuin shaped his identity and that of those around him, as he spoke of wine using scriptural references. Finally, Matthias M. Tischler ("Alcuin, biographe de Charlemagne. Possibilités et limites de l'historiographie littéraire au Moyen Âge," 443–59) observes that the fact that even a well-known work like Einhard's *Life of Charlemagne* could be attributed to Alcuin in later medieval manuscripts is itself worthy of investigation as we attempt to understand medieval historiography.

A volume of collected essays on Archbishop Arn of Salzburg (*Erzbischof Arn von Salzburg*, ed. Mera Niederkorn-Bruck and Anton Scharer, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 40 [Vienna: R. Oldenbourg]) contains several contributions of interest. Maximilian Diesenberger and Herwig Wolfram offer an assessment, based mainly on epistolary evidence, of that relationship which has been the subject of more than a little speculation, Arn and Alcuin's friendship ("Arn und Alcuin 790 bis 804: zwei Freunde und ihre Schriften," 81–106). Diesenberger and Wolfram trace the relationship closely and sensitively, suggesting that the similarity in the ages of Alcuin and Arn made them like brothers, but like brothers whose careers had taken much different paths. Many clues, particularly about Arn's life, lie embedded only in Alcuin's letters, and Arn's travels and activities are clarified via reference to the letters, which reached a highpoint in "quality and quantity" in 798 and 799. Diesenberger and Wolfram extensively discuss the two great collections (and particular letters in them) which date from Alcuin's lifetime: Vienna, ÖNB 795 and, to a lesser extent, Vienna, ÖNB 808. Mary Garrison also considers Alcuin and Arn, this time focusing on their

respective nicknames ("*Praesagum nomen tibi*: The Significance of Name-wordplay in Alcuin's Letters to Arn," 107–27). Garrison cautions that the interpretation of the letters is more difficult than it might at first appear, and points out the unusual distribution for evidence of the Alcuin-Arn correspondence. Only two letters by Arn survive, neither addressed to Alcuin, but, likely because of Arn's "sponsorship" of the two manuscripts discussed by Diesenberger and Wolfram (above) we have almost forty letters (more than a tenth of those which survive!) written by Alcuin to Arn. Garrison discusses the bird and animal language in the letters, noting a nexus of associations beginning with Arn (*Aquila*, the "eagle"), including biblical influences, and extending to the role of the bishop (as *speculator*), fishing (the *piscator*) and the flight of Habbakuk, which Garrison notes derives from Jerome's letter to Rufinus (though *amplexans* comes instead from Jerome's *Liber interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum*), and which, therefore, does not "require an erotic interpretation" (121) at least on the basis of the language alone. Garrison concludes: "The rhetorical play on *aquila* and its associations, then, appears to be an idiom particular to Alcuin and Arn, one which could evoke a special *amicitia*, purvey reminders of episcopal duty, and shade off into an animal code-language of parental concern for shared pupils" (127). Finally, Donald Bullough begins precisely where Garrison leaves off, with Alcuin's *amplexans* letter to Arn, noting that he too feels the letter was not intended to express need "in a sexual sense" (128). The focus of the article, however, is how one can, with recourse to the letters as a group, reconstruct in some detail the Psalter-text, canticles, Gospel-text and Epistle-text and antiphons sung in the cathedral liturgy. Bullough suggests it is clear that Alcuin's mass-book was of the "Gelasian" variety, but that there is no evidence for the creeds *symbola*, *confessiones fidei* which he might have known at York. Alcuin's *De laude Dei*, his "earliest known florilegium" (which Bullough obviously accepts as Alcuin's), provides additional evidence in many cases. Bullough shows how Dom Bernard Capelle's assertions about the creed and how it became a standard part of the mass are almost certainly wrong (that the "Stowe Missal" is representative of the mass-book popular in eighth-century Ireland, and that such a mass-book must have reached Alcuin at York early in the century), and later adds that Capelle's dating of the *delectio* of Felix (after which, says Walahfrid Strabo, the *symbolum* began to be recited in the mass after the Gospel) is also wrong. As far as the creed goes, "Alcuin ... had no standard text at hand and/or was indifferent to the formulations supplied by others" (131). When, in June of 799, Alcuin

debated with Felix and Felix renounced his views, it may be that there was a “mass in the Palace chapel at which the creed in Paulinus’s version, complete with *filioque* clause, was sung for the first time” (133). Bullough notes that Arn was never sent Alcuin’s first *libellus* against Felix, but rather the earlier, shorter letter to Felix, and closes by suggesting that Arn’s intellectual interests may have been mainly in the field of canon law, and by taking up Harald Willjung’s suggestion that Arn was responsible for the anonymous *Testimonia ex sacris uoluminibus collecta*. The evidence of the creeds in that text is not helpful to Willjung’s case.

Christiane Veyrard-Cosme (“Saint Jerome dans les lettres d’Alcuin: de la source matérielle au modèle spirituel,” *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 49 [2003]: 323–51) considers, as the title of the article suggests, the place of Jerome as a physical source and a spiritual model in the letters of Alcuin. Veyrard-Cosme emphasizes that Alcuin’s letters are polymorphic, multi-functional, and thus can be approached in a variety of different ways (historically, ideologically, linguistically, and from a literary point of view). Jerome, in the first instance, provides a model of letter-writing, and Veyrard-Cosme examines the private letters of each, those destined for “interlocuteurs privilégiés” as part of a “discourse of absence,” often in a spirit of play. Motifs of the epistolary genre are also similar, and, for example, Veyrard-Cosme shows how both Jerome and Alcuin often discuss the theme of friendship. The fact that both write often to women is significant, and begins to suggest that Alcuin was perceived as another Jerome, also imitating what Veyrard-Cosme calls the “typology” of the letters. Jerome, however, also provided a kind of repository of quotations for Alcuin, so much so, in fact, that one might question the extent to which Alcuin had actually read a classical author like Vergil, given that so many of his Vergilian quotations in the letters actually arrive via Jerome. Further, the very source of Alcuin’s nickname “Flaccus,” which is generally thought to be borrowed directly from Horace, may in fact go back to Alcuin’s thorough knowledge of Jerome. On the basis of the letters, Veyrard-Cosme concludes: “Instead of delivering an autobiographical truth, the letters of Alcuin reveal the development of a self-portrait of Alcuin as a Jerome and also reveal the links which are established between patristic culture and the Frankish world, both in spiritual and literary terms” (350).

MF

In “Alcuin’s *Disputatio Pippini* and the Early Medieval Riddle Tradition,” *Humour, History and Politics in Late*

*Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Guy Halsall (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002), 157–78, Martha Bayless provides a thorough overview of the prose riddles in Alcuin’s *Disputatio*. She sets the work, which she dates to 790–793, in the contexts of other riddle collections and wisdom literature and relates it to other didactic works by Alcuin. Bayless provides a text, translation and brief commentary on the riddles at the end.

Rob Meens presents an edition and study of a previously unexamined penitential in “Aliud benitenciale’: The Ninth-Century *Paenitentiale Vindobonense C*,” *MS* 66: 1–26. Meens examines in detail the five groups of canons found in this text, relating each to other penitential texts, before turning to the overall character of the penitential itself. It oddly omits the standard canons on homicide, adultery, gluttony, and other sins found as the core of most penitentials, concentrating instead on topics such as purity of the clergy. This omission suggests to Meens that it was probably meant as a supplementary collection rather than the primary penitential. Although the manuscript itself was written in southern Germany, Meens tentatively suggests Northern Italy in the mid-ninth century for the composition of the text.

I Deug-Su’s examination of the sources for the *Vita* of Leoba finally appear in book form in *L’eloquenza del silenzio nelle fonti mediolatine: Il caso di Leoba ‘dilecta’ di Bonifacio Vinfrido*, *Millennio Medievale* 47, *Strumenti e Studi* n.s. 7 (Florence: SISMEL Edizioni del Galluzzo), along with an article “*Ut merear te in fratris locum accipere*: un appello di fratellanza di Leoba a Bonifacio Vinfrido,” in *Nova de veteribus*, ed. Bihrer and Stein, 112–31 (see section 2).

#### e. Ninth to Twelfth Centuries

Two books appeared on Abbo of Fleury in 2004, a biography and a study of his computistical work. In *Abbon de Fleury: un moine savant et combatif (vers 950–1004)* (Turnhout: Brepols), Pierre Riché presents a biography of Abbo, concentrating primarily on the conflicts he had with various opponents. A.M. Peden presents a new edition of Abbo’s Computistical Commentary with discussion of Abbo’s career in England in *Abbo of Fleury and Ramsey: Commentary on the Calculus of Victorius of Aquitaine*, *Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi* 15 (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003).

In “A Verse Translation of Abbo of St. Germain’s *Bella Parisiacae urbis*,” *Journal of Medieval Latin* 14: 1–68, A. G. Rigg and Anthony Adams provide a clear and readable



translation of all three books of Abbo's difficult poem. The introductory material is somewhat brief but promises the future appearance of a larger study and new edition by Adams. For now the introduction concentrates on the historical background of the first two books: the viking incursions into Francia in the late ninth century. Somewhat less attention is paid to the far more popular third book, which is distinct in style and subject matter, consisting of various maxims and moral advice to a monastic or clerical audience. They suggest that this book of the poem was popular not because of the content, however, but rather because of the idiosyncratic vocabulary, made up largely of glossary words and Grecisms, though this point perhaps reflects more our own interest (or lack thereof) in the subject matter than a contemporary audience's. According to the translators, Abbo is attempting to engage the reader here with numerous levels of meaning through wordplay, dual meanings, allegory, and glosses. Hopefully, the new study in preparation by Adams will reveal much more of Abbo's genius in this part of the poem and why it was so popular in late Anglo-Saxon England.

Christopher Jones examines Wulfstan's interest in liturgical matters in "Wulfstan's Liturgical Interests," *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference*, ed. Matthew Townsend (Turnhout: Brepols), 325–52. Since we do not have a wealth of service books associated with Wulfstan, nor did he leave behind a customary as Æthelwold did, Jones turns to what he calls "paraliturgical" items—expositions of the liturgy, prayers, etc.—found in his commonplace books. He then examines the one service book that can be confidently connected with Wulfstan, the Claudius I Pontifical. Jones finds in these manuscripts quite a collection of liturgical resources, many apparently recent imports from the continent, that serve to function both for Wulfstan's interest in pontifical services but also for didactic purposes, that is, making the often ambiguous details of the rituals of the mass clearer to the clergy. One of the more interesting features Jones points out is the overwhelmingly non-monastic character of the liturgical materials, bringing up questions of Wulfstan's connections, or lack thereof, with the reform movement of the tenth century.

In the same volume, Thomas N. Hall looks at Wulfstan's preaching of sermons in Latin in "Wulfstan's Latin Sermons" (*Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, 93–139). As Hall notes, Wulfstan's "authorship of sermons in Latin is a topic that has only recently begun to be examined in any detail." Thus, "we are left with an unbalanced view

of Wulfstan's career and an incomplete understanding of his talents as an author and preacher" (93). To remedy this problem, Hall presents a handlist of fifteen sermons (nine of which are edited here for the first time) with brief comments on the sources of each and their relationship with other Wulfstan texts. It seems that it was Wulfstan's habit to assemble material on certain topics first in Latin and then to revise and polish them in Old English, so many of these Latin sermons can be directly paired with his works in Old English. Hall then gives an edition and translation of a new sermon, entitled *Admonitio episcoporum utilis*, found in three manuscripts of Wulfstan's Commonplace Book, and makes a convincing case for Wulfstan's authorship. Its importance is that, unlike the other Latin works mentioned, it seems to be "a finished product to be delivered in Latin to an audience composed of senior clergy, most likely on a formal occasion such as an ecclesiastical synod or a service for the ordination of bishops" (108). He ends by printing "with minimal editorial intervention" the nine previously unpublished sermons mentioned above. Hall has laid out clearly all the groundwork here for future studies of Wulfstan's Latin works, and suggests the numerous other unpublished materials in manuscripts associated with Wulfstan should reveal even more works by him to complete our picture of his talents as author and preacher.

The relationship between preaching in Latin and preaching in English in late Anglo-Saxon England is complicated by the publication by Mechthild Gretsich of four newly discovered manuscript fragments recently found in the Somerset County Record Office: "The Taunton Fragment: A New Text from Anglo-Saxon England," *ASE* 33: 145–93. The two bifolia preserve portions of four sermons for the fifth through the eighth Sundays after Pentecost. Perhaps the most interesting facet of these sermons is their bilingual layout: each Latin sentence is followed directly by an Old English translation. Much of Gretsich's discussion is taken up with the language of the Old English translations, which is far from the standard Old English found in many other eleventh-century manuscripts. Gretsich, who portrays the non-standard morphology and phonology of the language as "wrong," and as "violations of correct Old English," can explain many of the forms as dialectal or as early examples of characteristics found in Middle English, but she notes that these explanations cannot provide a satisfactory explanation of all the text's oddities; thus, she comes up with an ingenious if unprovable solution: the composer of the text was not a native Anglo-Saxon but rather a foreigner, perhaps

from Germany. Gretsche gives a brief layout of the contents of the sermons and points out that the manuscript from which the fragments come “formed part of a book which provided homilies for all the Sundays and major feast days during the church year” (189). The existence of such a large collection of homilies in alternating Latin and Old English brings up many questions concerning the intended audience of the work and the relationship between preaching in Latin and in Old English in late Anglo-Saxon England.

Virginia Blanton examines the growth of the cults of Æthelthryth, Wihtburg and Sexburg around Ely in “King Anna’s Daughters: Genealogical Narrative and Cult Formation in the *Liber Eliensis*,” *Historical Reflections / Réflexions historiques* 30: 127–49. She is especially interested in how peripheral narratives, like those on Wihtburg, who seems to have been invented out of whole cloth, bolstered the status of Æthelthryth as royal founder of Ely. She turns near the end to consider the rood screens on which Wihtburg appears, suggesting a difference in how the saint was received in Ely compared to the more rural locus of her cult.

2004 was an especially productive year for Goscelin studies, especially on his lives of women. In *Goscelin of St Bertin, The Hagiography of the Female Saints of Ely*, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Oxford UP) Rosalind Love has produced an excellent and scholarly edition of his writings on the saints Æthelthryth, Werburgh, Seaxburgh, Wihtburgh, and Eormenhild. Love briefly recounts the history of Ely and Goscelin’s work there before discussing the writings themselves and their manuscript transmission. The editions of the lives and *lectiones* are helpfully accompanied by a facing-page translation.

Two translations of Goscelin’s *Liber confortatorius*, written for his disciple Eve after she left the community at Wilton to become an anchorite in France, were published in 2004. The first is Monika Otter, *Goscelin of St Bertin; The Book of Encouragement and Consolation [Liber Confortatorius]: The Letter of Goscelin to the Reclusive Eva*, Library of Medieval Women (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer). The second translation of the *Liber confortatorius* has been made by W. R. Barnes and Rebecca Hayward and is included in a book devoted to Goscelin and the Wilton community. In addition to the *Liber confortatorius*, the book *Writing the Wilton Women: Goscelin’s Legend of Edith and “Liber confortatorius,”* ed. Stephanie Hollis, *Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts* 9 (Turnhout: Brepols), contains a translation of the *Vita* and the *Translatio* of Edith by

Michael Wright and Kathleen Loncar and a series of essays by Hollis, Hayward, and Barnes. In “Goscelin’s Writings and the Wilton Women” (217–44), Hollis provides an account of Goscelin’s life, his relationship with Eve, and the circumstances involved in the writing of the *Life of Edith*. Hollis concentrates here on the differences between the two manuscript versions, suggesting that one was revised for the Wilton community itself. Hollis focusses more attention on the historical details in Edith’s life in “St Edith and the Wilton Community” (245–80), and then on Goscelin’s presentation of her in “Edith as Contemplative and Bride of Christ” (281–306). Here she explores Goscelin’s theology of the individual’s quest towards union with the divine in anticipation of twelfth-century Cistercian mystical writings. Finally, in “Wilton as a Centre of Learning” (307–38), Hollis turns to the community itself to suggest that it played a role in the education of aristocratic women. She examines the education of Edith and Eve, the library as evidenced by Goscelin’s writings, and suggests that Edith was a secular member of the community, not a professed nun.

The next series of essays focuses on the *Liber confortatorius*. Rebecca Hayward’s “Spiritual Friendship and Gender Difference in the *Liber confortatorius*” (341–53), seeks to answer an oft-asked question: what type of love is Goscelin expressing for Eve? After a review of earlier literature that either seeks to absolve or to accuse Goscelin of “dangerous” feelings that Eve may have been attempting to escape, Hayward follows Mark Williams in applying Stephen Jaeger’s concept of “ennobling love.” Although his sense of longing for Eve is expressed in physical terms—through sighs, tears, weakness—it is a longing for spiritual rather than erotic gratification. Hayward follows this argument with one suggesting that Goscelin is attempting to create a sense of mutuality in their feelings in “Goscelin’s *Liber confortatorius*: Complaints and Consolations” (355–67). The work is thus not just a consolation for Eve, but for Goscelin too, one that can best be relieved by her reading the work, thereby allowing him to continue in his role as her spiritual advisor. Through the text he reformulates their respective roles, though always along gender and familial lines, as father-daughter, brother-sister, and even with him as the nourishing mother.

In the next two essays, Hayward and Hollis team up to continue their discussion of the *Liber confortatorius*. First, in “The Anchorite’s Progress: Structure and Motif in the *Liber confortatorius*” (369–83), they examine Goscelin’s use of the Exodus from Egypt and search for

the Promised Land as an image for Eve's flight from this world and her spiritual battles, first against desires and then against the tedium of the reclusive life. Next, they discuss Goscelin's use of stories of biblical women and female saints as an accommodation to the gender of his female audience.

The collection ends with an essay on "Goscelin's Greeks and Romans" (401–17) by W. R. Barnes, one of the translators of the *Liber confortatorius*. This piece, which seems somewhat out-of-place though quite informative in its own right, explores Goscelin's knowledge of classical Latin literature, admittedly confined to what is revealed in the *Liber confortatorius*. Not surprisingly, there are more quotations from Vergil than from all other authors combined, but we also find phrases borrowed from Catullus, Seneca, and even perhaps Aulus Gellius. Barnes also draws a distinction between Goscelin's use of Vergil and of other authors, finding that of the pagan authors he applies only the works of Vergil to his own or Eve's situation. This more complex use of Vergil may suggest that Goscelin assumed that Eve would understand the allusions to the story of Aeneas, as it seems to be central to the development of his theme, as Hollis notes in the afterword (419–30).

PGR

#### Works Not Seen

Biedermann-Pasques, Liselotte. "Préhistoire du modèle: Alcuin, remarqueur du protoroman (autour de 800)." *Les remarqueurs sur la langue française du XVIe siècle*

*à nos jours*. Ed. Philippe Caron. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2004. pp. 75–88.

Bohn, E. M. E. "Alcuin's Heirs: The Early Reception of Alcuin's *De rhetorica* and *De dialectica*." Ph.D. Thesis, U of Cambridge, 2003. *Index to Theses* 53 (2004), 7696.

Bücker, Andreas. "Christianizing the Arts: From Augustine's *De ordine* to Carolingian Thought." *Signs of Change*. Ed. Petersen et al. pp. 173–89.

Grassi, J. L. "The *Vita Ædwardi Regis*: The Hagiographer as Insider." *Anglo-Norman Studies* 26 (2004 for 2003), 87–102.

Gwara, Scott. *Education in Tenth-Century Cornwall: The Evidence of 'De raris fabulis'*. Kathleen Hughes Memorial Lectures on Mediaeval Welsh History 4. Cambridge: Dept. of Anglo-Saxon, Norse, and Celtic, 2004. iv, 37 pp.

Hamann, Stefanie. "Die *Vita Fursei* als chronologische Quellen." *AB* 122 (2004), 283–98.

Heikkinen, Seppo. "Bede's *De arte metrica* and the Origins of Early Medieval Metre." *Latin vulgaire—latin tardif. VI. Actes du VI<sup>e</sup> colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Helsinki, 29 août–2 septembre 2000*. Ed. Heikko Solin, Martti Leiwo, and Hilla Halla-aho. Hildersheim, Zurich, and New York: Olms-Weidmann, 2003. pp. 173–82.

Robertson, N. J. "Sanctity in Tenth-Century Anglo-Latin Hagiography: Wulfstan of Winchester's *Vita Sancti Æthelwoldi* and Byrhtferth of Ramsey's *Vita Sancti Oswaldi*." Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Leeds, 2003. *Index to Theses* 53 (2004), 9597.

Vaciago, P., ed. *Glossae Biblicae*. 2 vols. *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis* 189A–B. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004. viii, 574 pp.; 698 pp.

## 6. Manuscripts, Illuminations, and Charters

Oliver M. Traxel, *Language Change, Writing and Textual Interference in Post-Conquest Old English Manuscripts: the Evidence of Cambridge, University Library Ii.1.33*, Münchener Universitätschriften, Texte und Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie 32 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2004), was reviewed (twice, originally) in the issue for 2003. I thought of reviewing it again and having my colleague in this section do likewise, thus establishing it as the most-reviewed book in *OEN* history, but I feared inciting competition in the hearts of the reviewers of other sections. God knows what sort of multivolume monstrosity we might end with if that happened: I forbore, therefore, for the good of posterity.

Rejoicing the eyes of medieval palaeographers, 2003 saw the publication of P. R. Robinson, *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 888–1600 in London Libraries*, 2 vols. (London: The British Library). As usual, the second volume consists wholly of chronologically arranged plates, in high resolution black-and-white, corresponding to the entries in volume 1, which are alphabetized according to their modern shelfmarks. The introduction includes a short overview of the relevant London libraries and their histories (3–16), as well as a summary of the distribution of dates and origins (2–3). The entries themselves provide physical descriptions, information on the contents and colophons, and brief histories and bibliographies. Of most immediate

relevance to Anglo-Saxonists will be the four oldest books: nos. 97 (plate 1: Lambeth Palace 1370, the MacDurnan Gospels); 87 (plates 2 and 3: Lambeth Palace 489, a collection of Old English sermons written at Exeter during Leofric's episcopate); 126 (plates 4–6: Public Record Office 31/1, the Little Domesday Book) and 127 (plate 7: Public Record Office 31/2, the Great Domesday Book). Ten twelfth-century manuscripts, including several from England, are also included, among them the *Liber niger* of Peterborough (no. 149, plate 11 [showing Old English text]: Society of Antiquaries 60).

The work of antiquarians forms a major theme in this year's bibliography. Colin G. C. Tite, *The Early Records of Sir Robert Cotton's Library: Formation, Cataloguing, Use* (London: The British Library, 2003), is a reference work of lasting importance (and it is pleasant to see the press recognize this: the hardcover is durably bound and, as Cotton would have said, "very fayre"). Anglo-Saxonists interested in the post-medieval use of the Cotton books will be able to turn to Tite's work; it is also a vital tool for those tracing the provenance of these manuscripts. As Tite's introduction (1–28) explains:

This book is arranged in two major parts, followed by a number of annexes and indexes. The first part is an edition of the loans lists and memoranda. The second contains entries for all manuscript volumes for which there are references in the various records, together with a number of additional entries such as those for non-manuscript material which happen to appear in the loans lists and memoranda. A system of cross-referencing between the two parts enables information to be extracted in a variety of ways. (3)

All of the loan-lists (edited 29–90; sources are laid out and the editing method explained in the introduction: 5–6) are annotated. Pressmarks, borrowers, and dates are identified wherever possible. Scholars are most likely to turn first to part two, however, in which Tite summarizes the information for the history and use of Cotton's manuscripts in a series of entries arranged by imperial pressmarks (91–242). In addition to a series of "annexes," providing additional material—including contents tables, Cotton's binding instructions, and facsimiles of title pages—*Early Records* contains indexes of printed books, names, and manuscripts cited.

James Carley and Pierre Petitmengin, "Pre-Conquest Manuscripts from Malmesbury Abbey and John

Leland's Letter to Beatus Rhenanus Concerning a Lost Copy of Tertullian's Works" (*ASE* 33: 195–223), investigate the results of Leland's rummagings in the library of Malmesbury. Carley and Petitmengin succeed in dating the antiquary's visit there to 1533 (202), and examine in detail the fate of several manuscripts that Leland must have acquired there. Most consideration is devoted to the Alcuin letter-book, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A.xv (the authors show that discrepancies between this book's readings and Leland's transcripts resulted from Leland's use of William of Malmesbury: 204–6), and the lost Tertullian manuscript of the title. The newly-discovered letter to Beatus Rhenanus (edited and translated in an appendix) helps to document the maneuvers by which Leland's humanist contemporaries on the Continent succeeded in finagling the latter book for printing; it is fortunate, however, that their cunning succeeded, since the manuscript was eventually destroyed in the wars in the Low Countries (220–21).

In "The Barrow Knight, the Bristol Bibliographer, and a Lost Old English Prayer," (*Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 12.4 [2003]: 372–92), Rebecca Rushforth also investigates the interchange of manuscripts between antiquarians—in this case, the means by which the nineteenth-century amateur archaeologist Thomas Bateman of Derbyshire made or acquired the tracing of an Old English prayer from a leaf owned by the remarkable bookseller Thomas Kerlake. The catalogues produced by Kerlake, an antiquarian dealer who supplied the Bodleian and British Libraries as well as private collectors, seem to have been things of beauty from a bibliographical perspective, and from them Rushforth is able to tentatively suggest a book from which the lost leaf might have been removed (381). She also includes the distraught letter in which Kerlake reports the fire that destroyed much of his warehouse (382)—the probable fate of the leaf, as well as many other valuable books. Fortunately, however, the tracing survives in Cambridge University Library, Additional MS 4166 ("an album of fragments and cuttings," 372), and Rushforth provides a facsimile of the leaf, as well as an edition and translation of the text, which the exactness of Bateman's reproduction allows her to assign to "the late eleventh or first half of the twelfth century" (390). As this prayer or creed (the text is somewhat peculiar, and Rushforth suggests it may be imperfect, or an epitome of a longer work: 391–92) is previously unknown and unedited, it revives anew the eternal hope that more Old English texts may be discovered—perhaps among the papers of later antiquarians, if not in the original. It should be mentioned,



though, that some strange glitch has led to the omission of a number of single characters, and sometimes words or even paragraphs, throughout this article—the Tironian “and” <ſ> is especially frequently omitted, lending it at times an air of mystery which I much doubt the author intended.

Nancy Basler Bjorklund, “Parker’s Purposes for his Manuscripts: Matthew Parker in the Context of his Early Career and Sixteenth-Century Church Reform,” in *Old English Literature in its Manuscript Context*, ed. Joyce Tally Lionarons, *Medieval European Studies* 5 (Morgantown: West Virginia UP), 217–41, emphasizes Parker’s scholarship, intellectual engagement, and personal influence upon the newly-formed English church; previous scholars, she writes, have “assume[d] that Parker defended certain ecclesiastical doctrines because his church had adopted them. But it is more accurate to state that his church adopted those doctrines because Parker and other reformers had long defended them” (228). In support of this, she traces evidence in his manuscripts for Parker’s own work (rather than that of his secretaries and assistants) in his quest for historical support for three tenets in particular: the use of Scripture in the vernacular; transubstantiation as a modern, unscriptural innovation; and the legitimacy of clerical marriage. While it is certainly true that “Parker needs to be understood in the context of his own century and the reformation movement that early captured his loyalty” (240), Bjorklund glosses over some of Parker’s peculiarities—not merely his more questionable deductions from his Old English reading, but such quirks as his obsessive dislike for incomplete texts, a point on which modern scholars may very reasonably “fault his handling of the manuscripts” (240).

On this last point, Paul Acker, “Three Tables of Contents, One Old English Homiliary in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 178,” in *Manuscript Context*, ed. Lionarons, 121–37, provides some evidence; the archbishop shifted Ælfric’s translation of the *Interrogationes Sigeuulfi in Genesin* from its former home in CCC 178, an Ælfrician homiliary, to Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 162, a different homiliary, in order to have a neat preface beginning at the top of a page (130–1). The larger picture of Acker’s article, however, is not one of obsessive-compulsion, but rather of a more freewheeling use of CCC 178 through the ages. In the three tables of contents—the first, original to the book, is in Old English and Latin in an eleventh-century hand (122–31); the second, compiled by the “Tremulous Hand of Worcester” in Latin, from a study of the manuscript’s

rubrics (131–4); and a sixteenth-century list by one of Parker’s assistants (134–7). The oldest list is by far the fullest, and allows Acker considerable scope in examining what early users considered to count as a “homily” amongst the various appended texts (126–8), and how Ælfric’s texts were received and transmitted.

A 2001 colloquium at the British Library brought together scholars from a variety of disciplines to discuss the *Liber Vitae Dunelmensis* (London, British Library, Cotton Domitian A.vii); the proceedings have been published as *The Durham Liber Vitae and Its Context*, ed. David Rollason, A. J. Piper, Margaret Harvey, and Lynda Rollason; *Regions and Regionalism in History* 1 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press), and (as might be expected) they contain much of interest to scholars of manuscripts. The publishers have been commendably generous with illustrations, which, though black and white, are very legible; it will perhaps tide readers over until the publication of the planned facsimile. The volume opens with two studies of the book itself: the first, Colin G.C. Tite, “The Durham *Liber Vitae* and Sir Robert Cotton,” 3–15, examines the great antiquarian’s treatment of the book. The illustrations here are a great advantage to the reader, particularly in Tite’s discussion of the allegorical title-page which Cotton had printed and affixed to the volume (6–9). Many aspects of the *Liber Vitae*’s life in Cotton’s library are described here: instructions for its binding; new quire signatures (doubtless part of that process; 5) and a contents list; its place in the catalogue, and use by Cotton’s antiquarian associates (12–14). Unfortunately, Tite’s best efforts have not turned up firm evidence for how or where Cotton acquired the book, although he proposes several possibilities on this important question (14–15). Next in the volume is Michael Gullick, “The Make-Up of the Durham *Liber Vitae*: the Codicology of the Manuscript,” 17–42. Although Gullick begins with the caveat that his study “is only a record of what can be seen and reasonably deduced from the evidence, and certainly not the kind of comprehensive record that might be expected from a detailed examination of a manuscript” (18), it is nevertheless the most complete description yet published of this complex (and fragile) book. Supplementing his discussion with diagrams (which are especially useful for understanding the sequence of foliation, discussed 26–31), Gullick describes in detail the manuscript as it appears now (18–26), which enables him to analyze and reconstruct the oldest core of the manuscript (31–7), and also to provide a history of the manuscript’s binding (39–42). Given that an understanding of the physical makeup of the *Liber Vitae* is essential to

the interpretation of its history and use (and, therefore, the analysis of its contents), this article is an important reference-point for scholars of the manuscript, and is likely to remain so even after the facsimile is released.

In the same volume, and using a variety of evidence, Jan Gerchow, "The Origins of the Durham *Liber Vitae*," 45–61, seeks to illuminate where, when, and why a Northumbrian monastic house decided to produce the *Liber Vitae*. Although it is usually assumed that the book always belonged to the community of St. Cuthbert, Gerchow, considering in particular the interests suggested by the oldest name-lists, looks beyond Lindisfarne for its origin, and writes that "the majority of the arguments (and in my view the best ones), however, are in favour of Wearmouth and Jarrow, but the evidence is not sufficient to permit certainty" (56). In his study of the date of the book's origins, he considers that the "earliest layer of entries in the Durham *Liber Vitae* can be identified and interpreted most convincingly by applying a Continental model" (57): in this case, early medieval *amicitiae*. Gerchow's argument requires the importation into Northumbria of Frankish models for joint ecclesiastical/political peacemaking; he suggests that the commemorative lists may have had their origin in records whose creation was "possibly triggered by the peace confraternity of 679 at York" (61). Another comparison is provided in Simon Keynes, "The *Liber Vitae* of the New Minster, Winchester," 149–63 (derived, as he notes, from his introduction to the extraordinarily expensive facsimile of the manuscript). Keynes lays out his discussion in four main headings: first, that "there was a well-developed culture of liturgical commemoration in Anglo-Saxon England, which was already thriving, as on the Continent, in the eighth and ninth centuries, and which continued to flourish in the tenth and eleventh centuries" (151); next, the close association between the New Minster's *Liber Vitae* and Ælfwine, abbot 1031–57 (153–6); third, that the contents of the book are hardly limited to its two famous pictorial decorations (156–60); and finally, that the book continued to be actively used up to the dissolution of Hyde Abbey, its later medieval home (160–1). Keynes concludes by pointing out ways in which comparison with the Winchester book can help illuminate differences seen in the Durham *Liber Vitae* (161–3). This volume also contains several articles on Continental commemorative books, which may well be of interest to readers of this section.

A variety of other manuscripts have been the subject of individual studies this year. Matthew T. Hussey, "The Franco-Saxon *Synonyma* in the Ragyndrudis Codex:

Anglo-Saxon Design in a Luxeuil-Scripted Booklet" (*Scriptorium* 58: 227–38), takes another look at the battle-scarred 'Ragyndrudis Codex' (Fulda, Bibliothek des Bischöflichen Priesterseminars, Bonifatianus 2), particularly the final booklet containing a text of Isidore of Seville's *Synonyma*. This text was a favorite of St. Boniface, who almost certainly owned the book (229–30), and Hussey sets out the evidence for Anglo-Saxon involvement in the production and use of the manuscript (235–8). After considering the array of writers, scribes, and readers associated with the book, Hussey writes that "the Ragyndrudis Codex represents a confluence of national cultures and intentions and serves as a record of one way these cultures interacted" (238).

Adding to an already distinguished list of annotators (the manuscript also contains marginalia by two English archbishops—Wulfstan of York and Matthew Parker), Roy Flechner, "Paschasius Radbertus and Bodleian Library, MS. Hatton 42" (*Bodleian Library Record* 18 [2003–5]: 411–21), finds that the preponderance of evidence suggests that the inscription *leuitę paschasius* on f. 23r of Hatton 42 does indeed refer to the Carolingian scholar Paschasius Radbertus. Paschasius's name was rare (411), and Flechner shows that he was interested in other Insular material besides the Irish canon collection *Hibernensis* above which the name appears (413). This article also provides a brief history of the manuscript, outlining the evidence for a ninth-century provenance at Corbie or Saint-Riquier, which would have allowed Paschasius access to it.

Close study can often bring to light new information on even the most familiar pages of the most familiar manuscripts, as Timothy Graham demonstrates in "The Opening of King Alfred's Preface to the Old English *Pastoral Care*: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 20" (*OEN* 38.1: 43–50). Graham traces the history of this manuscript's use through the series of scripts visible on the first page, from the ninth-century main text with its scribal corrections (43–5), through the alterations to spelling and punctuation made by Wulfstan: Graham suggests that the "corrections to the punctuation and the rhetorical character of Wulfstan's textual emendations on this page and throughout the rest of Alfred's preface in Hatton 20 raise the tantalizing possibility that the great homilist was marking up the text with the aim of reading it aloud" (46). After the Anglo-Saxon period, the Hatton text of the *Pastoral Care* served as a sort of Old English Rosetta Stone for the Tremulous Hand of Worcester (46–8) and Parker's secretary John Joscelyn (48–9), both of whom left glosses

on the manuscript. Graham reproduces the first page of Hatton 20 (44), which will be useful to students wishing to become acquainted with the hands of this series of famous scholars.

Robert M. Butler, “Glastonbury and the Early History of the Exeter Book” (*Manuscript Context*, ed. Lionarons, 173–215), revisits the important but difficult question of the Exeter Book’s origins, and musters a variety of interesting historical evidence in favor of the abbey of St. Mary at Glastonbury. Butler’s (fairly convincing) close reading of the donation list in the Exeter Book leads him to the conclusion that this book was among those brought by Leofric to Exeter, and thus must have originated elsewhere (178–81). The palaeographical links between Exeter, Dean and Chapter 3501; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 319; and London, Lambeth Palace 149 have been examined often in the course of this long-running debate, and Butler takes for granted that these books are the products of one scriptorium, and probably one scribe (176–8); he therefore mines their colophons for evidence for their origin. The names Æthelweard (from a donor inscription in Lambeth 149), and Æthelwine (scribbled in the margin of the Lambeth inscription page) are squeezed for all the evidence of connection to Glastonbury they could possibly provide (182–95). Butler produces several interesting potential links, but I was haunted by the suspicion that—given the numbers of Æthelwards, Æthelwines, and their spelling permutations—that one could probably do the same for any monastery in the country, particularly any that were as large as Glastonbury and as well-documented by post-Conquest chroniclers. But Butler’s point that Glastonbury under Dunstan was far from hostile to secular literature, and also believed itself to be connected to St. Guthlac (196–204), does make it very appealing as a potential site of origin for the Exeter Book, although (as he admits) the palaeographical evidence for its origin there is neither extensive nor compelling (204–7). Moreover, Butler produces strong evidence that Glastonbury’s eleventh-century abbot Æthelnoth was selling off the abbey’s ecclesiastical furniture at precisely the moment Leofric was trying to restore Exeter’s possessions (208–11)—the idea that the Exeter Book was acquired “at Æthelnoth’s rummage sale” (215) is somewhat peculiar as a mental image, but seems a very neat solution to this longstanding problem. I doubt that this article will settle the debate, but its theory is certainly well worth consideration.

It is interesting to note that Butler seems to accept the Irish influence on the extensive marginalia in Cambridge,

Corpus Christi College 41, whose main text is the B-text of the Old English Bede (211–14); this question must have generated some controversy at the NEH seminar that gave rise to this volume, since Nancy M. Thompson, “Anglo-Saxon Orthodoxy” (*Manuscript Context*, ed. Lionarons, 37–65), argues the view that much of this material, and certainly the *De transitu Mariae*, was probably more characteristic of Anglo-Saxon religious thought than scholars have often assumed. Thompson makes several important points—that Ælfric’s ideas of orthodoxy did not exclude all apocryphal texts (57–9); that his judgments about the orthodoxy or otherwise of certain texts were based on patristic (or pseudo-patristic) authority rather than personal criteria (56–7); and that his beliefs about the use of certain texts by no means extended to the entirety of the English church (50–6, 60–1). Together, these lead her to the conclusion that the frequent assumption that the use of apocryphal material meant a text was “pre-Reform” (62–4) must be discarded, or at least used with extreme caution. The marginal material in CCCC 41 is thus “incongruous only from a modern perspective, and ... what seems to us a bizarre assortment of heterodox materials would have been regarded by its compiler as an anthology of useful religious texts” (40). Also probing this complex manuscript is Sharon M. Rowley, “Nostalgia and the Rhetoric of Lack: the Missing Exemplar for Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Manuscript 41” (*Manuscript Context*, ed. Lionarons, 11–35). Rowley outlines the tendency of scholarship to attempt to look past the B-text, either to the Latin *Historia ecclesiastica*, or to the exemplar of CCCC 41’s Old English text, or to the lost archetype of the Old English translation (13–19). The textual relations of the Old English Bede manuscripts are tangled, as exemplified by the fact that the relations between the (less well-attested) lists of chapter-headings seem to contradict the accepted stemma devised for the main text (20–2). Rowley argues that the stubborn resistance of CCCC 41 to be—or to permit the generation of—a self-authenticating original has led to deep scholarly ambivalence about its value and authority. She examines the treatment of the Cædmon episode (22–8), Drythelm’s vision and the marginal homilies as further evidence of this (28–35), concluding that “the texts are mediated as all texts are ... the patterns and insights generated by CCCC 41 as we have it must be explored further for what they are, rather than for what they are not” (35).

Focusing on part of another Corpus manuscript, Samantha Zacher, “The Rewards of Poetry: ‘Homiletic’ Verse in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201”

(*SELIM* 12 (2003–4): 83–108), examines the generic connections of the poem Fred Robinson called *Rewards of Piety*. Zacher's analysis works toward a specific definition of what makes a poem "seem more 'homiletic,' or, to put it another way, generally more susceptible to generic influences normally associated with prose" (87), and her emphasis on lexical distribution and alliterative patterns allows her to connect the diction and style of *The Rewards of Piety* to the homilies of Wulfstan which form a large part of CCCC 201. She concludes that "the poem *Rewards* in many ways presents a model in miniature of the type of generic hybridization seen throughout CCCC 201" (100); Zacher presents a new edition of the poem with parallel translation (102–4), but also makes a case for an edition of the manuscript as a whole, so that the mutual influences of the generically various texts within it can be seen clearly at last.

Beginning from the premise that the "eclectic choice of material [in London, BL, Cotton Vespasian A.xiv] gives vital insights into Wulfstan's concerns as a pastor and a legislator" (266), Gareth Mann examines the contents and arrangement of the letter-book in "The Development of Wulfstan's Alcuin Manuscript," and emerges with some fascinating insights into the archbishop's preoccupations during his years at York (*Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, ed. Townend, 235–78). Thematic analysis of the selection of Alcuin's letters (which form the bulk of the text), and of the other associated material, show Wulfstan working through the morality and practicality of ecclesiastical finance, as well as looking to the earlier author for "advice on the fundamentals of the archiepiscopal office and words of exhortation in dire times of Scandinavian invasion" (265). Mann's analysis of the book's structure (237–41) enables him to draw distinctions in the chronology of the compilation of the eight Wulfstanian quires, which in turn allow him to show that the Vespasian manuscript's "later accretions, and quire 8 in particular, stem from Wulfstan's reading of the rest of the book" (265–6). This is an extremely interesting and useful article, and it is a pity that the appended edition of Wulfstan's excerpt 'De actiua uita et contemplatiua' (268–78, text at 269) is such a slapdash affair. The text appears on fol. 177v of Vespasian A.xiv, which is reproduced (270); the text is clear and carefully punctuated, and it is apparent that all of the proposed emendations are unnecessary. They may have arisen through over-dependence on the *PL* edition of its ultimate source, Bede's homily for the feast of St. John the Evangelist (the textual relations of the excerpt are discussed 271–5): much of the *PL* punctuation has been substituted for Wulfstan's, leading in one

case to misconstruction (Mann has emended to Bede's *quod in futuro percepturus est, uita...*, where Wulfstan has *quod in futura percepturus est uita* · and the placement of the punctus clearly shows the phrase has been re-parsed). But the reading *egenum et pauperum* is simply wrong; Bede did not write this (surely we would know that even if the online *PL* did not back it up), and the plate shows that Wulfstan wrote *pauperē*, not *paupere*. Perhaps this is nitpicking; but since the text is in Wulfstan's own hand, it is as important for our assessment of his Latinity as the arrangement of the book as a whole, as Mann has shown, is for our understanding of his archiepiscopal concerns.

Susan Rankin, "An Early Eleventh-Century Missal Fragment Copied by Eadwig Basan: Bodleian Library, MS. Lat. liturg. D.3, fols. 4–5" (*Bodleian Library Record* 18 [2003–5]: 220–52), derives a considerable amount of information from two non-conjoint folios containing fragments of the services for Holy Week (Wednesday and Thursday). The missal from which these leaves were taken seems to have been a high-grade and somewhat unusual book; the D.3 fragment contains letters in silver indicating voices for the lection, as well as a tract written for musical notation that was never added (232–3). After showing through detailed analysis of the script that the renowned Eadwig Basan was almost certainly the writer, Rankin is able to demonstrate, by comparison to parallel passages copied by Eadwig in Grimbold Gospels and the Florence Lectionary (given in full in Appendix II), that "in copying a Missal, Eadwig was not bringing together material from different kinds of liturgical books, but probably copying from another Missal, which happened to preserve a set of textual readings not identical to the Gospel books available to him" (237). A reproduction of the fragment and an edition of its contents are also included.

Rebecca Jane Rushforth, "The Eleventh- and Early Twelfth-Century Manuscripts of Bury St Edmunds Abbey," 2 vols., Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Cambridge, 2003 (*Index to Theses* 53: 7254), is an important study of the script and book-production of this East Anglian monastery in the late Anglo-Saxon and early Norman period, prior to Bury's great phase of book-production beginning in the 1120s. Rushforth's methodology is likely to be of interest to other scholars working on smaller Anglo-Saxon centers:

My work on Bury St Edmunds script shows a way to tackle the manuscripts of a foundation which has relatively few surviving



manuscripts; which did not have its own house style of script; and from which a network of manuscripts linked by the work of identifiable scribes does not survive. My work also shows that the examination of such manuscripts can still be productive. By starting with script-specimens which can be securely attributed to Bury St Edmunds, usually on textual grounds, and working cautiously from these to manuscripts with strong links to Bury, and then to those with weaker or disputed links, I hope to have avoided falling into circular argument about the nature of Bury's script. This approach could be used for other houses which have a few script-specimens, perhaps documentary in nature, which can be firmly attributed to them (I, 214).

The structure of the dissertation mirrors this methodology: after establishing a core of manuscripts almost certain to have originated in Bury (14–43), Rushforth then considers a set of books whose early Bury provenance, or link to the cult of St. Edmund, makes them likely to have originated there (44–83). This central group of books enables her to draw some conclusions about Bury work: although there was no “house style” and book production was probably *ad hoc*, the script tended to be very conservative, retaining Anglo-Caroline minuscule well after most other English centers had abandoned it. Bury scribes also frequently used “a very unusual ascender-height form of z with a minim-height crossbar” (84–91 at 84), which seems limited to books with Bury connections, and approaches the level of a diagnostic feature. After considering the effect of the Conquest on Bury book-production, and the importation of Norman books (92–104), Rushforth tackles several manuscripts with Bury connections but controversial origin. Her study of the Bury Psalter (Vatican City, BAV, Reg. lat. 12) in particular (105–45) is an important one, taking in questions of historical, calendrical, and liturgical content as well as script and decoration; she concludes that the book was indeed produced at Bury St. Edmunds, probably during Leofstan's abbacy (1044–65). In the course of her argument, she also demolishes any dependence on the historicity of the traditional account of Bury's foundation by Cnut (119–21). Rushforth also redates the Bury Gospels (London, British Library, Harley 76) to the mid-eleventh century, and attributes them to Bury scribes (146–58). The conclusion (198–215) contextualizes the findings, comparing them in particular to Drage's study of Exeter's scriptorium. The second volume of the dissertation has already been published

as *An Atlas of Saints in Anglo-Saxon Calendars*, ASNC Guides, Texts, and Studies 6 (Cambridge: Dept. of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic, 2002). It is to be hoped that the results of this dissertation will also appear, preferably with better-quality plates; forty are provided (with helpful commentary 244–50) but they are not always very legible.

S.E. Kelly pieces together the scattered remnants of the archive of London's principal ecclesiastical foundation in order to produce a volume invaluable to any scholar attempting to understand the city's rather opaque early history in her edition of *Charters of St Paul's, London*, Anglo-Saxon Charters 10 (Oxford: Oxford UP for the British Academy). Many of the charters edited here are known only from excerpts in the notes of early modern antiquaries. Without the work of Richard James, John Selden, and a series of other seventeenth-century scholars (many of them associated with the College of Arms), Kelly's volume would have been slender indeed. As it is, thirty-two charters are presented, together with translations and full notes; a few associated documents, such as the will of Bishop Theodred, are also appended. The introduction begins with an extremely useful synthesis of London history from the seventh century to the Conquest, including evidence from archaeological as well as documentary sources (1–49); much of this information is epitomized in the list of the bishops of London (107–22). Kelly provides a detailed discussion of the surviving sources, beginning with a history of St. Paul's archive up to the present (50–60) and descriptions of the extant manuscripts (60–74). Virtually none of these are early medieval, and many are fragmentary or excerpted, raising considerable problems of interpretation and reliability which she addresses in a section on “The Authenticity of the Charters” (74–9). In “The Estates and the Bishopric of London and St Paul's” (79–106), Kelly attempts to unravel the history of the cathedral's endowments; a map of its possessions at about the year 1000 is provided. Despite extreme difficulties in the source material, therefore, Kelly has produced another excellent addition to this valuable series; historians (and connoisseurs of anathema clauses) will undoubtedly be grateful.

George Demidowicz, “The Lost Lint Brook: a Solution to the *Hellerelege* Anglo-Saxon Charter and Other Explorations of King's Norton History,” *Birmingham and Warwickshire Archaeological Society Transactions* 107 [2003]: 111–29), challenges Della Hooke's location of the bounds of the *Hellerelege* charter (S64, 699×709) granting three hides of woodland to the bishop of

Worcester. Using a great deal of evidence from rent-lists, mostly from the late medieval and early modern period, he associates the lost *Liontan* of the charter-bounds with a now-nameless (and mostly culverted) tributary of the Rea once called the Lett Brook, and in the process sorts out some tangles in the late medieval manorial tenancies in the area. Demidowicz suggests, moreover, that the personal name "Bishopshill" stemmed from memories of the Anglo-Saxon ownership of the ridge bounded by the clause. A number of maps and tables of name-references are provided.

David H. Higgins, "The Roman Town of Abona and the Anglo-Saxon Charters of Stoke Bishop of A.D. 969 and 984" (*Bristol and Avon Archaeology* 19: 75–86), attempts to use the boundary-clauses of two Old English charters (Finberg 117 and 130: *alias* S1317 and S1346) to reconstruct the configuration of the earlier Roman port. Part of the ruins may well have been visible in the tenth century, and Higgins hypothesizes, for instance, that the *esnig mædwæ weard* mentioned in the 984 charter may refer to an Anglo-Saxon refurbishment of a Roman watchtower (82), and concludes that "Abona was recognised in the tenth century as an ancient military site" (83). As a whole, the article is an imaginative attempt to use these charters to understand how the Anglo-Saxons in Gloucestershire interpreted surviving traces of Roman civilization, and in the process to discern what traces remained to be seen; the author provides a number of maps and plans, as well as several sketches of the reconstructed landscape.

Inscriptions are a potentially useful but complicated source for the early history of Insular book-hands, as G. Charles-Edwards demonstrates in "A Reconsideration of the Origins of Early Insular Monumental Lettering of the Mixed Alphabet Type: the Case of the 'Lapis Echodi' Inscription on Iona," *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 134: 178–81. With a detailed, illustrated analysis, particularly of the method of creating ligatures on the small stone engraved with the phrase "Lapis Echodi"—which is compared to the style of "The Cathach" (Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, "St Columba's Psalter")—Charles-Edwards argues that the cursive-influenced letter-forms of the stone are essentially non-calligraphic, and connected to the sort of informal cursive minuscules that must have preceded the development of Insular half-uncial. The author suggests that this comparison may help to date stone inscriptions from the period A.D. 400–650. Anglo-Saxonists may also be interested in the possibilities this analysis might provide for understanding influences on

early Northumbrian script. Another article of related interest in this volume (not in the 2004 bibliography) is \*Martin Carver and Cecily Spall, "Excavating a *parchmenerie*: Archaeological Correlates of Making Parchment in the Pictish Monastery at Portmahomack, Easter Ross" (*Proceedings* 134: 183–200); the Portmahomack monastery seems to have had "strong links with Iona and Northumbria" (183), and the authors' analysis of the evidence for parchment-making (and, thus, book production) at the site includes both extensive comparison with Northumbrian evidence, and a handy outline of the process of preparing membrane for books and the traces it might leave.

Collecting evidence for the book industry further south is Jane Chesney, "Manuscript Production in Medieval Winchester," (*Reading Medieval Studies* 29 [2003]: 1–18). Chesney's article gathers information from the archaeological and documentary record to assess the evidence for the production of books, and their component materials, in Winchester throughout the Middle Ages. Fortunately, parchment-makers seem to have been a litigious breed (8–10), and their trade left a mark on street-names in the city; most of this information, however, significantly postdates the Anglo-Saxon period.

The subtitle of William Schipper "Digitizing (Nearly) Unreadable Fragments of Cyprian's *Epistolary*," in *The Book Unbound: Editing and Reading Medieval Manuscripts and Texts*, ed. Siân Echard and Stephen Partridge (Toronto: U of Toronto P), 159–68, could be "Fun with Photoshop," since much of the article describes Schipper's array of techniques for coaxing the commercial software into enhancing a severely degraded manuscript to the point of readability. The series of plates provided amply prove that London, British Library Additional 40165A (five partial folios extracted from bindings which constitute an extremely important fourth-century witness to the letters of Cyprian of Carthage) is indeed nearly unreadable, and they illustrate the possibilities for enhancing the folios. As Schipper describes the tools used in some detail, others working on degraded manuscripts may find some handy tips in this article; other pieces in this collection are of a similarly practical bent, so prospective editors are likely to find *The Book Unbound* of considerable interest.

EVT

One of the least understood areas of the construction of medieval manuscripts is the materials and methods

used to create pigments. Repositories seldom allow sampling for chemical analysis, and findings made by direct optical observation have proven unreliable. Recently, there have been significant advances in the identification of pigments and their binding materials using Raman microscopy. At least four articles written this year explain and interpret the results of this method. Katherine L. Brown and Robin J.H. Clark provide a detailed account of methods and results in their “The Lindisfarne Gospels and Two Other 8th Century Anglo-Saxon Insular Manuscripts: Pigment Identification by Raman Microscopy” (*Jnl of Raman Spectroscopy* 35.1: 4–12). Brown and Clark focus on the findings of their analysis of three eighth century manuscripts in the British Library: Royal MS 1.B.vii, Add. MS 40618, and the Lindisfarne Gospels. The article begins with a methodological overview, explaining both the unreliability of previous methods and the specifications and operation of the equipment used in their study. Their analysis was conducted using a remote probe attached to a Raman spectrometer and an optical microscope and filters. The article is supplemented with illustrations and charts that indicate precisely where analysis was conducted on the particular folios of the manuscript. The results Brown and Clark report for the Lindisfarne Gospels differ substantially from the 1956 analysis conducted by Roosen-Runge, published in the 1960 facsimile of the manuscript. The most important difference is the absence of lazurite (a pigment made from the semi-precious stone lapis lazuli), which Roosen-Runge had identified as present. Lazurite was identified in the later, early tenth-century addition to Add. MS. 40618, a pocket gospel book originally produced around 750 in southeast Ireland. The comparative analysis of the original parts of Add. 40618 and Royal 1.B.vii (a Northumbrian Gospel book dating from before 750), suggests a basic conclusion, “the Insular Palette triumvirate, which had been assumed to be orpiment, red lead, and verdigris, is found in fact to include red ochre and vergaut (indigo/orpiment) but not necessarily verdigris” (11).

Brown and Clark extend their findings in a second contribution, “Analysis of Key Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (8–11th Centuries) in the British Library: Pigment Identification by Raman Microscopy,” (*Jnl of Raman Spectroscopy* 35.3: 181–89). This article places the results from the three eighth-century manuscripts described in the previous article in context of analysis of seven additional sources. These additional data-points are taken from some the most important Anglo-Saxon manuscripts held by the British Library, including the Vespasian Psalter (Cotton Vespasian A.1), the Royal

Bible (Royal I.E.vi), the Eadui Psalter (Arundel 155), the Grimbold Gospels (Add. 34890), and the Cotton Prudentius (Cotton Cleopatra C.viii). This set of samples extend the chronological range of the study through the eleventh century. The overall goal is to determine “the palette, how it evolves with time and, in particular, to establish the first usage of lazurite and vermilion on Anglo-Saxon manuscripts” (181). Once again, tables and illustrations supplement and explain the findings presented in the text. Brown and Clark are able to confirm the use of several pigments that were expected to be found (carbon, verdigris, red lead, red ochre, orpiment). Lazurite, a pigment identified by earlier (now recognized as unreliable) observation, is not found in samples before ca. 920 A.D., and vermilion is not found until the twelfth century.

A less scientifically detailed but still very useful description of the same project is provided by Mark Clark in his “Anglo-Saxon Manuscript Pigments,” (*Studies in Conservation* 49: 231–44). Clark reviews the state-of-the-question. He notes the absence of reliable and unambiguous analytical techniques for the identification of pigments and describes the new pilot-project centering on micro-Raman spectroscopy and near-infra-red imaging. As he notes, Raman analysis is an interdisciplinary project. Interpretation of the results involves the compilation of a list of pigments from written sources, comparative analyses of manuscripts from the continent of the same date, as well as evidence from archaeological contexts (raw colorants or colored artifacts). The goal is a compendium of pigments used in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts from the earliest surviving artifacts through the twelfth century. He outlines the results thus far (compare Brown and Clark, above), namely that minium, verdigris, carbon black, and orpiment are the most common pigments and occur in manuscripts from all periods included in the samples; azurite and red ochre appear only in manuscripts from late in the chronological sample. As might be expected, shellfish purple and lead white were used only in the most lavish books. Clark has also published a short article, “Really Don’t Trust Your Eyes to Identify Manuscript Pigments!” *Gazette du livre médiévale* 44: 50–53, where he focuses on the wildly different results obtained by the now suspect direct visual analysis and those derived from Raman techniques for two *de luxe* manuscripts, the Lindisfarne Gospels (BL Cotton Nero D.iv) and BL Arundel 155.

The impact of technology on the study of manuscripts can also be seen in two publications providing facsimile

access to original sources. Michael Wright and Stephanie Hollis have edited another addition to the microfiche facsimile project, *Manuscripts of Trinity College, Cambridge* (Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile 12; MRTS 274). They provide us with descriptions and black-and-white microfiche reproductions of ten manuscripts presently housed in Trinity College, along with two related manuscripts in other repositories. The ten Trinity manuscripts contain a variety of texts, ranging from a copy of the Pauline Epistles (MS B.10.5), two copies of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* (MS R.5.22 and R.7.3), the earliest version of the *Historia Eliensis* (MS O.2.1), and Eadmer's "Vita S. Dunstani" (MS O.2.30). The authors also include descriptions and microfiche facsimiles of the "Liber Eliensis" (Ely Cathedral, Dean and Chapter MS 1/1; currently housed in Cambridge, University Library) and BL, Cotton Vitellius C.viii, a composite manuscript that contains five leaves from Trinity College B.10.5. As important as these microfiche facsimiles are, the contrast in technology to the simulacral digital facsimiles now available cannot be greater. The year 2004 also saw the publication of Bernard J. Muir's *A Digital Facsimile of Oxford Bodleian Library Ms. Junius 11* (Bodleian Digital Texts 1). This electronic facsimile allows its readers to view high-quality digital reproductions of the manuscripts folios in color. The reader/viewer can choose to view the digital images as thumbnails, page-by-page close-ups, or in as an "open book." The interface allows the user to select from "hot spots" that highlight elements of the text, decoration, and illustration; windows open to provide commentary on each illustration. Two other sections provide complete transcripts and translations. Muir also includes a section devoted to "Editorial" matters, a general overview of previous scholarship, including questions of date, provenance, and subsequent history of the manuscript. Previous facsimiles, catalogue descriptions, and major editions are described. Those who know of the manuscript primarily through textual editions or previous reproductions will appreciate the art historical commentaries that provide a general review of the artists, illustrations, initials, and decoration. Discussions of codicology, transcripts and translations, and bibliographies round out this useful re-presentation of one of Anglo-Saxon England's most ambitious multi-media creations.

Without a doubt modern technologies such as Raman analysis and digital facsimiles fundamentally change what we know about medieval manuscripts and access to them. These technologies may also change how we understand manuscripts function as well. In

her *Worlds Made Flesh: Reading Medieval Manuscript Culture* (Studies in Medieval History and Culture; New York: Routledge), Lauryn S. Meyer addresses the differences in medieval and modern conceptions of books and the texts they contain. Manuscripts and medieval texts are too often subject to methodologies developed for the study of modern, printed texts. As Meyer points out, modern readers strive to identify medieval texts through reference to a unifying title (*The Metrical Chronicle*, a family of texts which inspired Meyer's study) or through a concern for the intentionality of a singular author (Chaucer). More often than not, however, medieval texts like the *Metrical Chronicle* vary to a considerable degree in individual instances. Stories found in one version may not occur in another or occur in a different order; textual devices such as capitalization, rubrication, and decoration structure and organize reading in different ways in different manuscripts, creating unique interpretive environments. The modern critical vocabulary that we rely on when analyzing medieval texts and the manuscripts that preserve them is inadequate and misleading, Meyer insists. "Critical theory does not yet have a model for addressing lateral narratives in a single text, nor the resources for exploring collaborative production of meaning across several manuscripts with the same genetic makeup" (4). She decries the "impossibility of carrying on rigorous examination of manuscripts while insisting upon the validity of authorial intention, single meaning, or representative work" (6). She offers a new model through which to understand the differences between manuscript versions while honoring the family relationship between them: recombinant genetics. She argues that "just as the dispersive replication of DNA strands creates a set of replicants, each bearing a family resemblance but irrevocably changed by the act of recombination, a family of manuscripts shares a certain degree of similar material (accounts, manuscript practices such as marginal glosses or paragraph marks) but each manuscript is the unique product of the combination of narrative material and the conventions of scribal culture" (xiii). Using this genetic model she proposed to analyze families of texts in manuscript culture by appropriating from the field of biology the term "template." Meyer explains that the term "denotes a legible system for making connections between materials, a vehicle that will support and distribute material accumulated upon it, and a system for organizing such materials" (13). Medieval manuscripts and the texts they contain are the product of the interaction of two basic templates, she argues, "matter" and "entity." The "matter template" is "an array of material from which to compile a text"



(14) composed of the ever-growing constellation of texts and instances of discourse that can be associated with a subject. “Entity” refers to “the type of arbitrary symbol recognized among a group of users as bearing a recognizable range of significance” (15). For manuscript culture, arbitrary symbols would include “parchment expenditure, initials, paragraph marks, glosses, illumination, rubrication, and *nota* marks...” (15). The bulk of Mayer’s book demonstrates the applicability of this new vocabulary for texts from the later Middle Ages, most notably the *Metrical Chronicle*. Anglo-Saxonists will be most interested in the third chapter of the book, which seeks to explicate the links of the “Anglo-Saxon Chronicle manuscript family” and the heroic poems *The Battle of Brunanburh*, *The Battle of Maldon*, and *Beowulf* which “react to and reproduce conflicts within the Chronicle manuscripts” (76). She explains her conclusions as follows: first, that

chronicle poems cannot be studied responsibly apart from the chronicle entries informing them ... Second that *The Battle of Maldon* cannot be adequately described by the twentieth-century categories of history or fiction nor by any proposed dialectic between these genres. Rather, it destroys these very boundaries ... [and] creates a heuristic history, one that attempts to influence future events by its specific invocation of a recognizable past event.... Third, I argue for a closer relationship between *Beowulf* and the Chronicle manuscripts, as the poem provides space for the unspeakable subjects of cowardice and defeat. (76)

Another view of how contemporary digital environments have the potential for changing our understanding of the relationship between text, image, and context in medieval manuscripts is found in Martin Foy’s “The Virtual Reality of the Anglo-Saxon Mappamundi” (*Literature Compass* 1: 1–17). Foy’s attention is drawn to the oldest known English world map, preserved in the eleventh-century manuscript, BL Cotton Tiberius B.V, fol. 56v. This map, Foy argues, is “a virtual world more analogous to a digital environment than physical geography” (2–3). He then leads us through the familiar layers of textual, historical, and visual “realities” (Orosius and Scandinavian sources, England’s position on the edge of the Roman world, the Christian conception of Jerusalem as the *umbilicus mundi*) that the Anglo-Saxon artist has woven together on the surface of the manuscript page. This encoded information, in Foy’s views, is akin to our contemporary

virtual environments. Such environments possess the potential to “modify one’s perception of what is real by creating geographic representations which emulate primary reality, but are constructed with more of an emphasis on encoded information, data, rather than physical surroundings” (1). But virtual environments, he explains, can “go further than the fundamentals of space or place; they possess the ability to add layers of reality that need not be contained by the laws of physical existence, while still simulating the physical world ... the way in which the Cotton map reproduces several realities within the same geography” (12). More specifically, he argues that the Cotton map “charts a number of struggles between the two realities of England’s marginal locus in the historical record of the known physical world, and of the Anglo-Saxon impulse to recentre the world on their own island” (3).

Foy’s attention to the relationship of text and image resonates with Barbara Raw’s “Picture Books of the Unlearned?” (in *The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Cavill, 103–119; see section 7). Raw reappraises the validity of one of the most famous dicta from the early Middle Ages, Gregory the Great’s statement that, for those who cannot read, pictures substituted for books. Asserting that “this was not the only, or even the main, role for pictures in the early medieval period” (103), Raw briefly surveys the range of visual production in Anglo-Saxon England, with a particular emphasis on manuscript illustration. Pictures could indeed be used for basic instruction (such as the paintings at Jarrow as described by Bede), for literal illustration (the extensive cycles of Old Testament imagery in Junius 11 and the Old English Hexateuch), as well as to promote a sense of personal involvement and meditation (the Gospels of Judith of Flanders and Ælfwine’s Prayerbook). Even what might appear to be straightforward narrative presentations rise above substitutions for texts or “simple reminders of historical events” (108). The placement of pictures in the manuscripts and iconographical details, Raw explains, suggest a series of associations that would be understood only by a viewer who is literate and learned. Therefore, a picture’s relationship to a text is quite often more than that of a mere replacement, as one might expect from reading Gregory’s pronouncement; Raw provides several examples. The imagery in the Æthelwold’s benedictional, for example, must be seen to be pictorial evocations of liturgical themes and biblical exegesis (111). Moreover, the frontispiece to a collection of homilies now in Trinity College (B.15.34, fol. 1r) and the depiction of St. Benedict and the monk from the Eadwig Psalter (BL, Arundel 155, fol.

133r) rely on inscriptions contained within the space of the picture to weave a web of erudite associations that explain and promote the meaning of the picture. Figures depicted within the pictorial spaces can reach out, engage the viewer through look and gesture; likewise, the users of the manuscripts could see themselves enter into and obtain a personal, physical connection with the crucified Christ (the crucifixion scene in the Gospels of Judith of Flanders) or his saints (Ælfwine's encounter with St. Peter in the Ælfwine Prayerbook). Raw concludes that texts are "limited to a linear presentation of material, whereas drawings and paintings can bring together many different ideas in single complex image.... Pictures, therefore show us more clearly than texts the multi-faceted nature of belief" (118).

The critical views of modernist methods for the study of medieval manuscripts and their illustrations offered by Meyer and Raw is matched by Donald Lateiner's "Gestures: The Imagined journey from the Roman Stage to the Anglo-Saxon Manuscript" (*International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 10: 454–64). Whereas Meyer and Raw take a broader, state-of-the-question perspective, Lateiner offers an extended review of one particular study, C.R. Dodwell's *Anglo-Saxon Gestures and the Roman Stage* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 28; Cambridge UP, 2000). In his book Dodwell argues that six distinctive gestures performed by figures in the illustrations in the Old English Hexateuch (Cotton Claudius B.iv) derive from direct knowledge of illustrations of the comedies of Terence. These gestures were known to the Anglo-Saxon artist of the Hexateuch through reproductions of a mid-third century manuscript preserved in a Carolingian manuscript. Lateiner, approaching the question from a classicist's perspective, is highly skeptical. As Lateiner sees it, Dodwell's arguments "depend on both hyperconservative unilinear theories of image transmission and on an extremely radical hypothesis for that original source" (455). As Lateiner points out, Dodwell argues that the third-century manuscripts preserve evidence of actual stage performance, begging the question of when Terence's plays were last produced in front of live audience. What Lateiner objects to is less the dating of the source than to Dodwell's identification and classification of the meaning of the Terentian gestures. Lateiner argues that Dodwell fails to keep in mind the difference between oratorical and theatrical gestures, the cross-over of meaning between common gestures of ordinary life and stage craft, the loss of meaning as gestures are copied by artists unfamiliar with actual stage performance, and an all-to-cursory discussion of "class-determined body

language" (458). This is the basis for Lateiner's criticism that Dodwell's is an "extremely radical hypothesis for that original source." Dodwell's attention to gestures derived from Terence is "radical because it is overly narrow, and this causes him to overlook other sources for the gestures (Benedictine sign language) and to neglect to disentangle gestures that have "double Christian and Terentian tradition (like the thrown-open arm gesture signaling prayer and fear). Lateiner also questions Dodwell's "unilinear theories." Dodwell, in his close focus on the Terentian derivation, does not consider other possible or potential sources. Why, Lateiner asks, would "secluded monastics" decode "earthy" dramas a thousand years older than themselves for their edifying illustrations of divine interference on earth and for mankind"? Especially since the Terentian plays "in which a lover may masquerade as a eunuch in order to gain access to a woman whom he then rapes seem bizarre choices for images of divine activity" (463).

Finally, two important contributions to this year's corpus examine how manuscripts and their illustrations might work as intentional portraits of notable men and women. First, T.A. Heslop's "Art and the Man: Archbishop Wulfstan and the York Gospelbook" (in *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York*, ed. Townend, 279–308) extends his groundbreaking study of Anglo-Saxon *de luxe* manuscripts (published in *ASE* 19 [1990]) by offering an individual case study of Archbishop Wulfstan and the York Gospels. Heslop's 1990 study argued that several identifiable, early-eleventh century manuscripts were made for King Cnut and Queen Emma to be given away to influential men and institutions. The York Gospels (York Minster Library, MS Additional 1) can be shown to have been owned early on by Wulfstan, Archbishop of York and was likely to have been made for him; Heslop here shows how the manuscript may have been "tailored to its intended recipient" and thus tells us about the man and how his contemporaries viewed him. Heslop divides his study into three parts. The first two are derived from close observation of the manuscript. First, Heslop details the evidence that the manuscript was owned by Wulfstan. The last gathering in the manuscript contains unique versions of three texts attributed to Wulfstan that include corrections in Wulfstan's own hand. The material aspects of this gathering (color of the ink and evidence of the stitching, among other things) suggest that around 1020 the Gospelbook was regarded as Wulfstan's property, rather than, for example, belonging to York Minster. Second, Heslop seeks to show that the manuscript was produced for Wulfstan and represents his tastes: Heslop turns his attention to

the production of the manuscript and reviews the evidence for the work as a homogenous effort. Though clearly the handiwork of at least three scribes and an artist can be detected, their work was directed, Heslop argues by one identifiable personality, the famous artist/scribe Eadwig Basan. Whereas others have argued for a delay of up to several decades in the beginning and completion of the project, Heslop argues that the similarity in pigments used in the illustrations and display capitals suggests that it is “unlikely that there was a long hiatus in production” (295). Eadwig “divided the work between members of the team ... the division of labour, perhaps imperfectly coordinated, was nonetheless calculated” (295). Heslop attributes this work to an early phase in Eadwig’s career, which was in point of transition in the scriptorium at Canterbury, a development that supports a dating of the York Gospels to a time contemporary with the production of other documents by Eadwig for King Cnut around 1018. The third section of the article tackles the implications of these findings for the conception of authorship. Heslop calls attention to the unique pictorial aspects of the evangelist portraits in the York Gospels, particularly the absence of evangelist symbols and curtains. These details suggest a particular view of authorship and ways of reading. As Heslop explains, evangelist symbols and curtains are pictorial details that allude to the typological and revelatory aspects of the gospels. Instead, the emphasis in the York Gospels is on the presence of the hand of God. “The basic message seems to me to be clear: that contact between God and the author is direct and unmediated. It presents as claim about the authorship of the Gospels as directly inspired by the deity” (301). Heslop suggests that this is a visual expression of Wulfstan’s own manner of writing and composing, one that focused on the essentials. The Evangelists portraits, he argues, “can be interpreted as the visual equivalent of the ‘back to basics’ approach that he [Wulfstan] brought to writing law-codes and homilies.” (303). Thus, in Heslop’s view, the York Gospels, is a flattering portrait of Wulfstan commissioned by the King and Queen as part of their larger campaign.

Catherine E. Karkov, *The Ruler Portraits of Anglo-Saxon England*, (Anglo-Saxon Studies 3 [Woodbridge: Boydell]), examines five surviving Anglo-Saxon ruler portraits. All five are well known and often reproduced, but until now have not been thoroughly discussed as a group. The five images in question are: Æthelstan presenting a book to St. Cuthbert (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 183, fol. 1v); Edgar presenting the *New Minster Charter* (BL, Cotton Vespasian A.viii,

fol. 2v); the frontispiece to the *Regularis Concordia*, showing Edgar, Dunstan, and Æthelwold (Cotton Tiberius A.iii); Cnut and Emma/Ælfgifu presenting a cross to New Minster (BL, Stowe 944, fol. 6); and the depiction of Emma and her sons from the *Encomium Emma Regina* (BL, Additional 33241, fol. 1v). Karkov situates these royal portraits with an overview of the Roman imperial and early medieval continental traditions. Royal images in England differ distinctly from those found in continental contexts. Carolingian and Ottonian art focus on and heighten the royal majesty, with rulers appearing “enthroned, receiving crowns, or otherwise displaying attributes of imperial power” (4). Anglo-Saxon royal portraits “stress piety over (or at least in careful balance with) secular power” by representing the king and queen in historical settings where they are “donors, recipients, or even co-authors of texts” (4). This royal relationship to texts and books is provided the thematic key for Karkov’s study. She links the royal portraits as a group to the opening entries in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. The *Chronicle*, she argues, combines historical account, genealogy, and a narrative of conquest. She explains, “The genealogy maps the origins of the West Saxon kings from the arrival of Cerdic and Cynric to Alfred, and legitimates their right to rule the land of the West Saxons ... [w]riting here creates an almost prehistoric past on to which the history of the kingdom will be grafted, and the writing may also serve here to mask any uncertainty Alfred might have felt about his hopes for dynastic continuity and territorial expansion” (18). Karkov argues that the five representations of kings and queens work in a similar fashion. “Like the passages from the *Chronicle* quoted above, the ruler portraits of the Anglo-Saxons create a genealogy, this time a visual genealogy, which continually locates and relocates the present in relationship to the past, or even to multiple pasts. In this way they create an image of authority that is above all manifested in the book” (21).

This contextualization of the royal portraits leads to Karkov’s first case study, Alfred the Great. No known portraits of Alfred have survived; Karkov compiles her evidence from a variety of sources, including the Alfred Jewel, Alfred’s coinage, and the “authorial self-portrait” that emerges from Alfred’s prefaces and Asser’s *Life*. This focus on Alfred is justified, Karkov explains, because “just as Alfred provided the framework on which Anglo-Saxon England would be built, so too he provided the image of kingship on which later Anglo-Saxon rulers were to base their own portraits ... most enduring and influential of all will be Alfred’s creation of the image

of the king looking back to the past and inventing a “lost” golden age in the present, the image of the king or queen as boundary figure who bridges and thus unites times, territories, and cultures in his or her own person” (52). The chapters that follow operate as case studies of the five surviving visual portraits. In Chapter 2 we find that what “emerges above all from the image Æthelstan created of himself through his control of the art historical, diplomatic, legal, and numismatic records is the portrait of a king who desired to be remembered as much for his devotion and generosity as for his exalted status and the severity of his laws on thieves” (83). Chapter 3 examines the two surviving representations of Edgar, the frontispieces to the *New Minister Charter* and *Regularis Concordia*. Once again, Karkov embeds her visual analysis within a broad context comprised of Edgar’s laws, coinage, and coronation. Karkov also stresses the importance of newly-emerging representations of powerful women like Æthelthryth, Edgar’s second wife, around whom a powerful new Marian iconography developed, and Edgar’s illegitimate daughter, Edith of Wilton. Chapter 4 focuses on the portraits of Ælfgifu/Emma and Cnut from the New Minster *Liber Vitae* and Emma’s portrait in her *Encomium*. It is quite well known that the new Minster *Liber Vitae* owes an iconographic debt to the early depiction of Edgar in the New Minster Charter, visual evidence for Cnut’s desire to build an image of himself as an upholder of English traditional virtues. But as Karkov argues, his royal self-image adds something new as well: “It was Cnut’s image

of the battle-ready king (who was also aware of his duty to the church) that would be taken up by Edward the Confessor, Harold Godwinson and William the Conqueror” (156). Emma’s powerful position as a legitimizer of Cnut’s rule and powerbroker for her sons were presented visually through portraits that were “probably the ultimate visualization of the relationship between the Anglo-Saxon queen and Mary” (156). Chapter 5 is devoted primarily to the image of King Edward as it emerges from the pages of the *Vitae Edwardi* and from his visual representation on his royal seal and coinage; Karkov also includes a short analysis of the depiction of Edward and Harold in the Bayeux Tapestry. She notes that William may have also been depicted in a conjectural, lost final scene. “The image of the ruler as author, translator, patron, or collector of books that had found no favour with Edward also found no favour with William. The result whether intentional or not, was that at least in art historical terms it remained an image linked specifically with the kings and queens of the West Saxon dynasty...” (172). She concludes, “the purpose of royal genealogies—and regnal lists—was to map relationships not only of kinship but also of kingship... the surviving Anglo-Saxon ruler portraits do the same thing, deliberately borrowing from the iconography and compositions of the portraits that precede them to establish a visual genealogy of rulership, which, like the written version, has its origins in Christ” (175).

BW

## 7. History and Culture

---

### a. General Sources and Reference Works

Trevor Anderson’s “Dental Treatment in Anglo-Saxon England” (*British Dental Journal* 197.5: 273–74) offers a brief overview of statements in Old English medical texts such as Bald’s *Leechbook*, the *Herbarium of Pseudo-Apuleius*, and *Lacnunga* concerning the treatment of dental ailments. Anderson judges the remedies set forth in these texts (most of which are concerned with toothaches) “to be of limited value,” though herbs such as nightshade and henbane “do have narcotic and inebriating powers” (274). Some attention is given to archaeological evidence. Anderson argues that bags of human teeth found with the skeletons of two males “dat[ing] to the Christian Anglo-Saxon period” are unlikely to be evidence of pagan rituals given the probable date of their interment (274). The essay appears to be intended for a non-specialist audience (though it assumes some

knowledge of the language of dentistry), and should be used with some caution as it occasionally depends on other non-specialist literature for its conclusions.

In “An Introduction to the Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England” (*History Compass* 2: n.p. [online]), Alex Burghart provides his readers with a general summary of the PASE project, sponsored jointly by Cambridge University and King’s College London. Designed to catalogue all those named in Anglo-Saxon primary documents between 597 and 1042, PASE provides a free online database of persons, whom they met, and what is known about them. PASE was launched in May 2005 and can be found at <http://www.pase.ac.uk/>.

Peter Fox’s slender *Introduction to Anglo-Saxon Kingship* (Hockwold-cum-Wilton: Anglo-Saxon Books) began as a dissertation written at University College



Northampton. Now marketed for an audience of non-specialist enthusiasts, it considers the theories underpinning early Anglo-Saxon kingship, the implications of conversion on the practicalities of kingship, and whether Christianity was a “passive tool” or a challenge for kings. Fox concludes that the impact of the conversion on Anglo-Saxon kingship was varied.

Jim Hargan’s “The England that Alfred Made” (*British Heritage* 25.4: 34–43) is a charming trifle designed for the non-academic reader, offering nothing to the serious scholar. Written for a popular anglophile glossy, his article offers both the strengths (clarity, a general accuracy) and weaknesses (a tendency towards overstatement and over-simplification) typical of the genre. It will be of interest primarily to those studying modern Anglo-Saxonism in the United States and Great Britain.

### b. Religion and the Church

An extended exercise in prosopography, Julia Barrow’s “Clergy in the Diocese of Hereford in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries” (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 26: 37–53) offers a detailed portrait of what she describes as a “middling” diocese (40) in the late Anglo-Saxon period. In particular, Barrow’s meticulously-researched essay illuminates early traditions of clerical preferment and succession, along with the many challenges to such traditions. Using Hereford as a case study, Barrow asks, “what sort of people became clerics ... in the eleventh and twelfth centuries? Which families did they belong to? How were they educated? How did they obtain preferment? How prevalent was clerical marriage and how did it help them fit into local networks?” (37). Although evidence for the lives of parish clergy and unbenevolent clerics remains scant, she finds sufficient traces of those attached to religious foundations and to the bishops household to draw certain conclusions regarding their lives and vocations. According to Barrow, “among all patrons of churches there was a strong preference for local incumbents, and family networks, even dynasties of clergy, were usually allowed to flourish.... On the whole, bishops preferred to allow the traditional system to prevail as long as they could promote their household clerics; these mostly could be satisfied with the churches in the bishop’s gift, but, where necessary, this pool of patronage could be enlarged by persuading monastic patrons to present episcopal protégés to their own livings” (53).

Julia Crick’s “*Pristina Libertas*: Liberty and the Anglo-Saxons Revisited” (*Transactions of the Royal Historical*

*Society* 14: 47–71) offers a major reassessment of the idea of *libertas* in pre-Conquest England. Though discussions of liberty in our field have been tainted by the Anglo-Saxonism of eighteenth and nineteenth century historians, Crick’s reading of medieval ecclesiastical documents reveals both its importance as a concept and the many differences between medieval and modern understandings of its social role. According to Crick, “the notion of liberty was deployed by English churchmen in defense of monastic freedom from the eighth century onwards, creating an archival legacy which was rewritten and imitated in later centuries” (47). The idea of Anglo-Saxon *libertas* provided an origin myth for ecclesiastical foundations that was later appropriated by other institutions—towns and guilds, particularly—to protect themselves against predatory external influences. As Crick points out, such appropriations of *libertas*, both during the Anglo-Saxon period and subsequently, reveal much concerning medieval notions of textual authority: “liberty was invoked partly because it was licensed by written authority, whether that authority resided in the prescriptive texts of the Christian religion, as used by English churchmen of the eighth and ninth centuries, or whether it was contained in archival material rewritten after the Conquest or rediscovered after the Reformation” (68). Crick concludes with an index of pre-Conquest uses of the term *libertas*. The essay provides a major contribution to the intellectual history of Anglo-Saxon England, as well as our understanding of the appropriation of that history by subsequent communities.

Catherine Cubitt’s essay, “Images of St. Peter: The Clergy and the Religious life in Anglo-Saxon England” (*The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England: Approaches to Current Scholarship and Teaching*, ed. P. Cavill [Woodbridge: Brewer], 41–54) addresses two parallel issues: first, she asks how the symbolism of the Anglo-Saxon cult of Saint Peter sheds light on the clergy’s role in the Benedictine Reform, and second, she considers how introducing such a question into the classroom helps students better understand the pre-Conquest Church. She points out that “the single most outstanding issue for all those involved in teaching early medieval religion is simply the ignorance in religious matters of students, most of whom will never have set foot in a church. This must be set against our scholarly tradition, which is learned in the extreme, and which for much of the subject has been formed by generations of scholarly monks and priests” (41). Studying the Petrine cult, she suggests, “open[s] up issues in ecclesiastical history that might otherwise

appear dry and rebarbative but which also have important bearing on modern historical debates" (53). As an example, Cubitt cites the emphasis on problems of clerical marriage in Anglo-Saxon Petrine texts, as well as their deep interest (common throughout early medieval theology) in penance and salvation. Though many who teach at less prestigious institutions—including the author of this review—will question whether the texts she recommends might not be too advanced for their undergraduates (and even some of their graduates), Cubitt nonetheless does offer a number of helpful suggestions for teaching a difficult topic to a modern student population.

Although resurrection is more commonly found in medieval hagiography than modern scholarship, this is precisely what Heather Edwards hopes to accomplish in her article, "The Saint of Middleham and Giggleswick" (*Yorkshire Archaeological Jnl* 76: 135–144). Alkelda, patron saint of two Yorkshire parishes had been thought fictional since 1893, when T. Carter Mitchell argued that her name was actually derived from *halig kelda*, a phrase meaning "holy spring" ("S. Alkelda of Middleham," *Yorkshire Archaeological Jnl* 12 [1893]: 83–86). However, according to Edwards, extensive linguistic evidence contradicts the possibility of *halig kelda* becoming Alkelda. She suggests instead that the name is a bastardized version of an identifiable saint, Alchhild. Edwards then reconstructs the admittedly spare details of Alchhild's life and concludes with a useful, if general, account of how women could come to be considered local saints, only to be forgotten or deliberately neglected by later generations. An appendix lists those Anglo-Saxon women who were considered saints—at least, temporarily—during the pre-Conquest period.

In "The Cult of St Mary at *Beodericesworth* and then in Bury St Edmunds Abbey to ca. 1150" (*JEH* 55: 627–53), Antonia Gransden argues that the earliest church at *Beodericesworth* (later renamed Bury St. Edmunds) was dedicated to the Virgin Mary. Although the written evidence for this is found only in late copies, their agreement on this point suggests that it is likely to be true. Probably in the reign of Athelstan, the supposed body of St. Edmund, king and martyr, was translated into this church. The cult of St. Edmund burgeoned, and before the end of the eleventh century, St. Edmund's shrine had become one of England's foremost pilgrim centers and attracted the wealth that helped pay for the great Romanesque church built to house it. A wide variety of sources, both written and visual, demonstrate that the cult of St. Mary retained much vitality, becoming the

pre-eminent secondary cult in Bury St Edmunds. For example, a reliable eleventh-century source, the psalter in Vatican City, BAV Reg. Latini MS 12, attests to a church built at St. Edmunds at the time of Cnut that was dedicated jointly to St. Mary and to St. Edmund.

Michael Hare ("Abbot Leofsig of Mettlach: an English monk in Flanders and Upper Lotharingia in the late tenth century," *ASE* 33: 109–146) assembles and evaluates all of the known evidence concerning the abbot, known to German scholars as "[o]ne of the greater personalities" of the intellectually lively late tenth-century diocese of Trier but "largely unknown to an English-speaking audience, a surprising omission for he was a man of considerable cultural accomplishments" (109). Our sources for the life of Leofsig are, in most instances, disappointingly late. The bulk of Hare's essay is indebted to the *Miracula S. Liutwini*, composed by "an anonymous monk of Mettlach" no later than 1095. But the earliest surviving manuscript of the *Miracula* dates from the beginning of the sixteenth century, and Hare acknowledges (here paraphrasing the arguments of Stefan Flesch) the possibility of substantial late-medieval interpolations as well as the sort of scribal errors that would ordinarily accumulate in the course of such a lengthy process of transmission (111). Another source is "Benoit Picart's history of the town and diocese of Toul, published in 1707," which Hare suggests draws in part from "Mettlach sources which have since been destroyed" as well as "possibly ... the same materials which the author of the *Miracula* had used at the end of the eleventh century, or at any rate something derived from the same source" (114). Out of these and other materials, Hare carefully sketches a biography of Leofsig, reconstructing the dates of his abbacy and his likeliest accomplishments.

Paul Hayward ("Gregory the Great as 'Apostle of the English' in Post-Conquest Canterbury," *JEH* 55: 19–57) wonders why Lanfranc, an "Italian prelate devoted to the Norman cause" (57) conventionally viewed as "the arch-critic of English saints' cults" (19) would "appear to have embraced a saint's cult that was dear to his English subjects" in his designation of Gregory the Great as the "apostle" of the English and promotion of his cult (20). An exhaustive consideration of the relevant evidence leads Hayward to see in this gesture a shrewd attempt to curb the ambitions of St. Augustine's Abbey:

Located just outside the walls of Canterbury, this monastery was attempting to win greater status and exemption from the jurisdiction

of its bishop on the grounds that such privileges were due to the resting place of the apostle of the English. Promoting Gregory's cult provided Lanfranc and Anselm with powerful means of contesting the abbey's claims, for it had been a long established tradition of the Anglo-Saxon church that Gregory, not Augustine, was the nation's apostle. (22)

Gregory's designation as such was facilitated by a broadening of apostolic status in the eighth century "to cover the leaders of large-scale missions that brought about the conversion of entire peoples" (24). Crucial to understanding the development of apostolic cults in early medieval Europe, Hayward argues, is an appreciation of the role they played in the organizational structure of the early Church: "All the important bishops had an apostolic founder or forged historical narratives to this effect where they were lacking," and "[c]laims to apostolic status figure strongly, if with less frequency and finality, among the arguments used to justify primacy within the monastic order" (24). The nascent apostolic cult of Augustine, which showed little strength before the eleventh century (27), threatened Lanfranc's authority when deployed as a rhetorical tool by the monks and abbot of St. Augustine's, for the "special relationship with the papacy" that would have resulted from official recognition of Augustine's status as *anglorum apostolus* "stood to detract from the quasi-papal aspect of [Lanfranc's] own authority," particularly "given ... Lanfranc's plan ... to establish a vicariate in which matters that would otherwise have been taken to Rome would be diverted to Canterbury" (37). There is no evidence in Lanfranc's receptiveness to the cult of St. Gregory "of a Norman prelate warming to the English and their religious traditions"; rather, Lanfranc's "cunning" move "appropriat[es]" one English saint's cult where other Norman colonists had merely ridiculed them, ultimately "turning [Gregory's cult] against potential rivals and centres of resistance" (55). However cunning this move may have been, it was doomed to fail: the campaign of St. Augustine's for the apostolic cult of its namesake was wholly successful by 1120. Hayward's essay is a marvelous portrait of the complexities of post-Conquest ecclesiastical politics.

In "Wyrð, Causality, and Providence: A Speculative Essay" (*Mankind Quarterly* 44: 329–38), Ian McNish argues that it was not Germanic paganism that brought the Dark Ages to Europe but rather a monotheistic "Oriental" religion that suppressed the roots of scientific thought. Whereas Germanic myths tell of the gods'

quest for knowledge, the Christian church suppressed classical teachings and long resisted the revival of science by persecuting those who questioned whether natural forces rather than Providence determined human history.

In "The Frankish Cult of Martyrs and the Case of the Two Saints Boniface" (*RB* 114: 326–48), James T. Palmer shows that not all contemporaries felt that Willibald's *vita* of Boniface, the Anglo-Saxon archbishop of Mainz, provided a fully acceptable model of a martyr, and an important question for those wanting to defend Boniface or promote him as a symbolic part of Carolingian authority would have been how best to illustrate his sanctity. Palmer argues that this was done by linking the memory of Boniface with the cult of Bonifatius of Tarsus. At Fulda, Hrabanus used the connection to comment on how Boniface had not sought martyrdom but rather had been a good servant to his master. In Vienne, Ado promoted the cult of Boniface by moving the festival of Bonifatius of Tarsus to June 5, the same day as the feast of Boniface of Mainz. As the cult of Boniface spread, the cult of Bonifatius of Tarsus developed along with it, although the latter saint was originally the older and better-established of the two.

Jonathan Pitt argues that there was a significant relationship of influence between "Malmesbury Abbey and Late Saxon Parochial Development in Wiltshire" (*Wiltshire Archaeological & Natural History Magazine* 96: 77–88), due to the abbey's control of extensive tracts of land and the churches located on that land. For example, the churches at Crudwell, Bremhill, and Purton seem to have been estate churches or estate minsters that were products of the late Anglo-Saxon monastic reform. That is, pastoral reforms such as those advocated by Ælfric of Cerne and Wulfstan assumed that churches would have designated parishes. Secular churches in settlements on monastic estates were thus particularly likely to be the recipients of changes arising from the reform of monasteries, changes that included the development of parishes.

Although Anglo-Saxon culture generally is not discussed in Derek Rivard's "Consecratio Cymiterii: The Ritual Blessings of Cemeteries in the Central Middle Ages" (*Comitatus* 35: 22–44), he does consider the role of the *Liber Pontificalis* of Archbishop Egbert of York in the history of cemetery consecrations. Rivard's purpose in his essay is to examine how cemetery blessings evoke burial grounds as sacred space. Drawing his methodology from the phenomenological ritual theory

of anthropologists such as Mircea Eliade, he concludes that, "by means of their prayers, songs, gestures and objects, such rituals established a sacred space wherein the medieval community could access the power of the divine, ground its existence within the context of the sacred stories which defined its history and identity, and provide a safe place of rest for departed members of the community" (44). The *Liber Pontificalis* provides the earliest version of the cemetery ritual, and Rivard provides a useful account of how that ritual was performed in the early middle ages. Rivard's claims tend towards the overly general, yet he does provide a useful summary of an under-studied aspect of medieval religious practice.

In *Bede, Wilfrid, and the Irish* (Jarrow Lecture 2003 [Jarrow: St. Paul's Church]), Clare Stancliffe investigates the complex attitudes of the English clergy towards the Irish after the Synod of Whitby. For Wilfrid and his followers, apparently what mattered above all else was adherence to the Roman dating of Easter and Roman tonsure, so that they had a friendly attitude towards those Irish who had embraced Roman practices and a hostile attitude towards Irish churches that refused to do so. Rome's view of what was considered heretical changed over the course of the seventh century, and consequently English judgments of Irish Christianity changed as well. Individuals could also change their opinions of the importance of various points of Roman orthodoxy. For example, after his Continental pilgrimage in the 650s, Wilfrid returned to England with the conviction that Irish Easter practice was a kind of Quartodecimanism. Theodore, in contrast, softened his stance on the seriousness of Irish Easter practice, as the difference between his Reordination Group rulings and his Reconciliation Group rulings shows. Stancliffe then goes on to ask why Bede gives the impression that the Synod of Whitby had definitively solved the Easter dispute in Northumbria when it had not, and also why he is so well disposed towards the Irish yet so hostile towards the Britons, although both calculated the date of Easter in the same way. She argues that in this part of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Bede wanted to provide an edifying, uplifting, and accurate account of what was actually a fractious dispute. He therefore adjusts a few minor facts, omits awkward details, focuses on what was exemplary about each of the clerics he describes, and makes a schematic contrast between the charitable Irish, who provided missionaries to the Anglo-Saxons, and the standoffish Britons, who refused Augustine's request to join his mission to the English. The result is a text in which almost all the details are true, but

the general impression of what happened is very different from the reality. An appendix demonstrating the authenticity of the relevant sections of Theodore's *Iudicia* completes the pamphlet.

Matthew Townend's collection *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference* (Turnhout: Brepols) offers the most complete assessment of Wulfstan's life, work, and influence yet published. Covering Wulfstan's entire career from his early bishopric in London to his later years at York, the comprehensiveness and quality of the essays will make this volume a touchstone for future Wulfstan studies. As Townend points out in his "Introduction," this volume fulfills a need that had been growing for some time: since the extent of the Archbishop's activities only came into focus in the middle years of the twentieth century, "the progress Wulfstan studies and the significance and standing of Wulfstan himself have in recent decades been increasing at an exponential rate" (1). Townend notes that the articles' diverse subjects make it difficult to draw any overarching conclusions out of the anthology, yet he does highlight three general "observations": first, "in spite of their sheer multifariousness, Wulfstan's many diverse activities cohere with one another in a manner that in fact makes them wholly inseparable" (5–6); second, that manuscript studies can offer "a way into broader historical and cultural concerns" to a greater extent than hitherto recognized (6); and third, that "in spite of a paucity of biographical information, Wulfstan's work and world may be recaptured" (7). Patrick Wormald's essay "Archbishop Wulfstan: Eleventh-Century State-Builder" (9–27), the collection's opening piece, offers a magisterial account of Wulfstan's career and intellectual development. Although he claims to say "little that has not been said before" (9), Wormald nonetheless advances powerful arguments for expanding the corpus of Wulfstan's homilies and, more controversially, revising our understanding of Wulfstan's career after 1014. Wormald argues that "Wulfstan was, must have been, a late developer" (15) and that recognizing this fact helps us understand his evolution as (in Whitelock's famous pairing) a homilist and statesman. As Wormald writes, "Wulfstan's conjunction of homily and law was not a bastard progeny of a union of moral and jural genres better kept apart. It was a wholly logical response to the position of Carolingian and sub-Carolingian bishops as God's servants and the king's too. The surprise is only that Wulfstan was the one European bishop of this time to adopt this approach" (21). According to Wormald, it was the coherence and resonance of this conjunction that lent Wulfstan's



works—particularly *I-II Cnut*—their value to the English polity, both before and after the Conquest. Julia Barrow opens her contribution, “Wulfstan and Worcester: Bishop and Clergy in the Early Eleventh Century” (141–59), with the observation that, while we know a great deal concerning Wulfstan’s theories on bishop-clergy relations, “when we try to look for definite information about his relations with individual clergy in any of his dioceses ... we are at a loss” (141). In an attempt to fill this void, Barrow then engages in a detailed examination of the records of Wulfstan’s episcopate at Worcester, yet the archive yields little evidence of the bishop’s involvement in the day-to-day life of the diocese. Although Barrow’s research reveals much concerning the life and influence of Worcestershire clergy, she notes that Wulfstan appears largely absent. From this, she concludes that, “Wulfstan’s period in office at Worcester was an unexciting one in terms of ecclesiastical administration. He appears to have made little impact upon his see, though he did give limited support to the growth of Benedictine monasticism” (159). In “Archbishop Wulfstan and the Administration of God’s Property” (161–205), Stephen Baxter likewise attempts to shed light on Wulfstan’s approach to ecclesiastical administration, although here the subject is his management of property rather than his relations with his clerical subordinates. Baxter’s detailed analysis of the *Liber Wigorniensis* and two documents relating to archiepiscopal estates in Yorkshire (British Library MS Harley 55 and a property survey appended to the York Gospels) reveals Wulfstan to have been an innovative manager deeply committed to preserving the tenurial rights of his diocese. In particular, Baxter argues that Wulfstan himself compiled the *Liber Wigorniensis* (which also happens to be England’s earliest extant cartulary) to be used as a working register of leases, perhaps the first of its kind. According to Baxter, Wulfstan’s emphasis on the uses of documentation in estate management reflect his treatment of writing elsewhere—especially in his legal writings—as a means of imposing order on society. Christopher Norton also focuses on property under Wulfstan’s supervision in “York Minster in the Time of Wulfstan” (207–34). Unfortunately, though, the dearth of archeological evidence for the Minster’s location or appearance means that Norton must rely heavily on speculation in his attempt to “define the limits of our ignorance and, secondly, to seek ways to pierce the encompassing darkness” (207). In doing so, Norton points out that our sources of information are not always as reliable as we hope (he notes, for instance, that the York Gospels likely were taken from the Minster at Wulfstan’s death, and thus provide

only limited evidence for the Church’s library), yet that archeological evidence may still shed light on questions of location and construction. Particularly provocative is his use of the Minster precinct’s topography to advance a hypothesis regarding the Minster’s position and orientation. Norton concludes with a question concerning Wulfstan’s own relationship to the Minster: if Wulfstan did bequeath the York Gospels elsewhere and his own body to Ely, was his attachment to the Minster and its clergy as close as it is often assumed? Joyce Hill’s “Archbishop Wulfstan: Reformer?” (309–24) examines Wulfstan’s work within the context of the Benedictine Reform. She argues that resituating Wulfstan within his reformist *milieu* enables us to better understand the archbishop’s understanding of his career as “homilist and statesman,” as well as appreciate the role of the secular church in the Reform movement. Hill points out that Wulfstan, like other reformers, came from a monastic background (although this point is often overlooked in Wulfstan scholarship), and he was deeply influenced by the work of the Carolingian Reform. In his writings, Wulfstan expresses a reformist nostalgia for the reign of King Edgar—however, as Hill notes, “in Wulfstan’s case, this may be as much a yearning for a period of political stability as for the golden age of monastic reform” (313)—and shares the reformist emphasis on the importance of increased liturgical ritual. Ultimately, she argues, we must see Wulfstan’s “deployment of resources, in substance, technique, and mental outlook, as being thoroughly understandable as an expression of the Benedictine Reform, a movement which, as Darlington pointed out as long ago as 1936, was always aimed at something more than a revival of strict monastic observances” (324). In “Vir optimus Wlstanus: The Post-Conquest Commemoration of Archbishop Wulfstan of York at Ely Cathedral” (501–24), the volume’s final essay, John Crook examines the history of Wulfstan’s bones and the site of their entombment. Wulfstan’s remains reached their present location—a tomb at the southeast corner of Ely Cathedral shared with six other Anglo-Saxon luminaries, most notably the *ealdorman* Byrhtnoth of *Maldon* fame—in 1771, having been translated from the spot where they had lain since the fourteenth century. Close analysis of the records of Ely’s eighteenth century renovation, along with earlier documents such as the *Liber Eliensis*, allows Crook to reconstruct the appearance of the earlier tomb, as well as advance some suggestions regarding the meaning of its iconography. Crook notes that Wulfstan’s monument was among the most prominent of those with whom he was buried, and that the tomb became the site of several miracles over the

centuries, including the “revelation” that the archbishop’s chasuble and pall had been preserved uncorrupted. “In this light,” Crook concludes, “it is possible that the monks of Ely hoped that Archbishop Wulfstan might have become regarded as a saint even if *vir optimus*—the term used by the compiler of the *Liber Eliensis*—was the highest epithet they were prepared to bestow” (524).

### c. Ecclesiastical Culture

The focus of John Blair’s review of Warwick Rodwell *et al.*, *Wells Cathedral: Excavations and Structural Studies, 1978-93*, 2 vols. (London, 2001) is the question of “Wells: Roman Mausoleum, or just Anglo-Saxon Minster?” (*Church Archaeology* 5–6: 134–37). After describing the phases of the sunken rectangular building that Rodwell asserts was a Roman mausoleum, Blair voices doubts that such a small flimsy building stood from before 500 A.D. to the 940s and during that time received important coffined burials aligned north-south in defiance of universal Christian practice. Instead, he points to a neighboring circular feature and other burials and proposes that a circular enclosure—prehistoric, Roman, or early medieval—was respected by one group of graves and contained another. The sunken area was probably an unused damp-proofing cavity below a suspended floor and was eventually filled with dumped earth and quantities of well-sorted charnel, which Blair interprets as the contents of the ever-accumulating coffins.

Donald A. Bullough’s “Alcuin and Lay Virtue” (in *Predicazione e società nel Medioevo: riflessione etica, valori e modelli di comportamento / Preaching and Society in the Middle Ages: Ethics, Values and Social Behaviour. Atti / Proceedings of the XII Medieval Sermon Studies Symposium Padova, 14-18 luglio 2000*, ed. Laura Gaffuri and Riccardo, Centro Studi Antoniani 35 [Padua: Centro Studi Antoniani, 2002], 71–91) surveys what turn out to be the relatively meager sources of evidence for Alcuin’s views on the virtues to be cultivated by the laity. Bullough begins by excluding from consideration the homiliaries that a number of scholars over the centuries have assumed were compiled by Alcuin. What remains are his letters to lay magnates and monarchs in Francia and England: one to “a Frankish dux and his wife,” possibly “Gerold, brother of the deceased queen Hildegard,” another pair to “count Roger of Limoges and to an Ardbert who is identifiable as an *optimus* in English Mercia” (77), and a letter “addressed jointly to king Æthelred of Northumbria (a man of problematic character and doubtful reputation)

and to his *patricius* and one of his *duces*, i.e. two of the leading laymen in his kingdom” (77–78). In all of these, Alcuin harps on a similar theme: good conduct, defined in formulaic lists of virtues not unlike those found in other manuals of piety, is not only a conduit to heaven but a way to prevent divine punishments in the form of natural disasters. Bullough observes in these letters “an essentially pragmatic approach to ‘virtue’”: Alcuin can even be seen minimizing the sexual infractions of his addressees, focusing instead on their “*public* lives ... their behavior and ‘works’ proper to their social and political function, their *dignitas*, their office-holding” (81). According to Bullough, Alcuin seems to have displayed little interest in the moral lives of less elevated members of the laity, a possible effect of his general contempt for lay *rustici*, whose behavior he assumed to be irredeemably base.

Bullough’s “Was there a Carolingian anti-war movement?” (*EME* 12 [2003]: 365–76) raises what the author admits is an “absurd question” as “a way of testing some of the assumptions that underlie much recent discussion of war, peace and the repression of violence in the period c. 600-1000” (365). Bullough begins by noting that the England described by Bede offers a poor basis of comparison for Carolingian Francia: while Archbishop Theodore was obliged to negotiate a monetary settlement between Ecgrith of Northumbria and Æthelred of Mercia, “both third or second-generation Christians,” Charlemagne and Louis the Pious “fought most of their major wars against non-Christians,” nor is any bishop “reported to have intervened to prevent the overthrow of the Lombard royal dynasty or the ultimately less-successful campaigns against Benevento” (365–66). The surviving clerical statements of repugnance for warfare typically object to its distastefulness rather than its inherent evils. Paul the Deacon and Alcuin, for example, both refused to join the king at sites of battle on the grounds that monastic life had rendered them unfit for participation in armed conflict. There is little evidence for the widespread circulation of the so-called “pacifist” pronouncements occurring in patristic Biblical commentary, nor would the intellectual environment of the early Middle Ages, within which the Vulgate’s *pax* was primarily understood as referring to personal tranquility, offer much ground for such views to take root. And though Bullough offers grounds for an alternative reading of Bede’s views, any moral vituperation against warfare seems curiously absent from the *Historia Ecclesiastica*: “[Bede’s] *bella* are neither *horrida* nor *saeva* and only once *acerba* ... and they can—but do not necessarily—produce desirable

results" (369). Though the expression with which Martin of Tours refused to fight following his baptism ('Christi ego miles sum, pugnare mihi non licet') might have survived to be reworked by Alcuin, the sentiment behind it endures in the work of the latter perhaps only in his insistence that the Viking assaults against Lindisfarne in 793 were "God-willed punishment[s] for the misconduct of Northumbrian kings and others" (374). Certainly Alcuin did not urge abstention from violence at other levels of society: "[I]n his last years he praised the man who had revenged his lord by killing a man, without any suggestion that penance might properly follow" (374). Any vestiges of clerical discomfort with warfare in Francia were certainly, according to Bullough, swept away by the Viking attacks of the late ninth century, during which "[c]hurch leaders, bishops and abbots, were soon involved willy-nilly: and in these circumstances, the established boundaries may quickly have broken down" (375). Bullough ultimately, however, finds the consensus view that "even before 830, clerics ... regularly lauded *bellum*" (375) to be an oversimplification, revealing in its place a diversity of views reflecting the status of warfare as a significant intellectual problem for the Carolingian church.

Bullough offers a comprehensive survey of the search for traces of the court library tantalizingly hinted at in Einhard's *Vita Karoli* ("Charlemagne's Court Library Revisited," *EME* 12 [2003]: 339–63), expressing doubts about arguments that depend heavily on "scribes and scripts," which he argues "take us only a frustratingly short way" (342). There are grounds for a few certainties. According to Bullough,

it is no longer possible to accept the Berlin Diez-manuscript list as one of codices gathered together at the pre-Aachen Frankish court, and therefore the core of its book collection then and later, and putatively familiar to the young Einhard. The work of reconstructing what was available in the palace *armaria*, in winter quarters at Ingelheim, Worms or Regensburg and only later in a permanent place, has to begin anew, and not least by exploiting the evidence of texts used by the first generation of court scholars in their own writings: never forgetting, however, that particular books may have been 'owned' for a few years only before being given away, borrowed and not returned, or simply lost—when fording rivers, perhaps, or packing up camp in a hurry in bad weather. (343–44)

This is the very work taken up by Bullough, who after an astoundingly learned overview of the evidence, suggests that "the library 'put on the market' at Charlemagne's death ... was a rather different collection of books and texts than the one which we have been imagining for more than a quarter of a century," one from which "[l]uxury 'illustrated' codices, like ivory book covers, were hardly to be found" (361). The shape and development of the library suggested by most prior scholarship, implying "a steady, even planned, building up of a 'court library' over four decades" is perhaps "seriously misleading" (362). The contents of the more informal library sketched by Bullough are likely to have been far less picturesque than earlier commentators have imagined: "handbooks, manuals ... assemblages of extracts of various lengths," many of them arriving "as unbound *libelli*—of, say, sixteen, twenty-four or thirty-two leaves" (362). Many if not most of its contents, in Bullough's view, are likely to have been lost.

"Empire and Emperordom from Late Antiquity to 799" (*EME* 12 [2003]: 377–87) is the English version of an essay published by Bullough in 1999, "Der Kaiseridee zwischen Antike und Mittelalter," and traces the descent of Roman notions of "royal dignity" (377) from late Antiquity into the court of Charlemagne. Alcuin plays a significant role in this reception, though Bullough contends that much of the credit given to Alcuin by historians such as Francois-Louis Ganshof for the styling of Charles as "imperator et augustus" is misplaced. Bullough finds suspect, if not doubtful, the suggestion of such historians that the notion of a "Christian empire," so crucial to Charles's political transformation, was an Alcuinian coinage: such references are in his view "merely incidental features of letters which are concerned for the most part with the defense or extension of the Christian faith, but also with other topics" (386). Nowhere in Alcuin's writings does Bullough find a suggestion that Charles "replace his *regalis dignitas* with *imperialis dignitas*" (387).

Bullough's posthumous *Alcuin: Achievement and Reputation* (Boston: Brill) is a major contribution to medieval studies whose object is not only the synthesis of several decades' work in Carolingian literature, but also the resurrection of what many academic historians would consider outmoded or unfashionable ways of looking at the past: those that hold documents such as letters to be "evidence of the experiences that formed [Alcuin's] opinions and intellect and for changes in his perception of himself" (120). Excessive adherence to the views of scholars such as R.G. Collingwood, who

contended (as paraphrased by Bullough) “that biography is not merely non-historical but anti-historical and comparable rather to the novel” threatens “ultimately to reduce history to the operation of impersonal forces, with no place for human dignity, sanctity (in the widest sense) or the elusive inner journey that nourishes both” (25). Bullough goes on to assert that “Alcuin’s collected correspondence is at least a partial exception to the often-expressed doubts ‘whether there were any private letters in the modern sense of the word’ in the Middle Ages, unless on an excessively-narrow and post-Romantic definition of ‘private’” (110), here quoting as a representative of the conventional view remarks in Giles Constable, *Letters and Letter-Collections*, *Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental*, fasc. 17 (Turnhout, 1976), 11. Bullough’s doubts about such views of medieval authorship lead him to conclusions that will interest scholars who are not Alcuin specialists. His discussion of supposedly “homoerotic” passages in Alcuin’s correspondence, for example, is a model of caution. Here Bullough is concerned with a striking outburst in Alcuin’s letter to the younger Bishop Arn of Salzburg, composed in 790: “I treasure the memory of loving friendship, longing that some day the desired time will come when I may put my longing arms around your neck; if only I could fly like Habakkuk, how quickly I would rush to embrace you and how eagerly I would kiss not only your eyes, ears and mouth but also each finger and toe not once but many times” (113). In explaining this passage, Bullough initially defers somewhat to the views of scholars such as C.S. Lewis and R.W. Southern, both of whom insisted that similar moments in the work of other medieval authors are no evidence of the conclusions likely to be drawn by “a knowing, post-Boswell (John) and post-Holroyd, generation” (113). Bullough goes on, however, to point out ways in which such reassurances may not ultimately apply to Alcuin. Such remarks are problematic less for their often virulent homophobia (Lewis, for example, balks at the notion that “pansies” would be found at the court of Hrothgar or among “all those hairy old toughs of centurions in Tacitus” [quoted in Bullough, 114]) than for their failure to deal with evidence “hint[ing] that Alcuin’s use of homoerotic language in the letters is not just an extravagantly-expressed plea for affective and supportive friendship,” including a remark “that to see the mutual love of [Alcuin and the younger cleric Sigwulf] was like ‘observing Rebecca linked (*copulatum*) with Isaac and Anna with Tobias” (115). Scholars subscribing to the notions of authorship to which Bullough objects will no doubt find many of the claims in this study troublesome. Nonetheless, *Alcuin* is a model of

careful scholarship and a worthy coda to a great academic career, marked throughout by Bullough’s often astounding sensitivity to the Latin of the Carolingian court and subtle knowledge of doctrinal history.

Paul Cavill makes the somewhat unusual move of combining scholarly and pedagogical essays in his edited collection, *The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England. Approaches to Current Scholarship and Teaching* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer). His stated aim is to present perspectives on the religious life of Anglo-Saxon England acknowledging “that variation and divergence were understood and often appreciated by the Anglo-Saxons themselves” (xiii). Accordingly, the essays within this volume present a “Christian tradition” that is “far less monolithic than sometimes appears” while remaining “undoubtedly a tradition that has a definable shape, and in turn shapes a definable world view” (xiii). Given that most undergraduates’ knowledge of the Bible and the early history of the Church leaves much to be desired, a collection offering new ways of incorporating Anglo-Saxon devotion into classroom instruction is certainly welcome, though some might argue that the foreignness of Anglo-Saxon Christianity to the sensibilities of our students could at times serve as a pedagogical asset, as it potentially discourages some students’ hazardous identification of their own religious behaviors with those of pre-modern Europeans. Some of the essays in this volume are quite pedagogical indeed. Jonathan M. Wooding’s “Some Issues in the Teaching of Insular Medieval Theology” (193–203) begins by presenting us with a vision of the academic future awaiting all of us that will seem, depending on your perspective, either utopian or nightmarish:

In what is rapidly becoming an environment of Student-Centred Learning (SCL), the onus may fall more and more upon students to make choices as to the skills they perceive as necessary to acquire. Increasing investment by universities in Information Technology (IT), alongside declining investment in printed sources, would seem to support the idea that students in the future will be expected to resource themselves through SCL, with subject-teachers exerting little direct control over which resources are accessed by students. (194)

Wooding considers the implications of such an environment for an MA program in insular theology at the University of Wales-Lampeter. He finds in a survey,



somewhat to his surprise, that “on the specific question of Bible translations and the basis for selection and recommendation ... students appear to be a *tabula rasa*: they will mostly accept a Bible text as recommended” (198). (This reviewer doubts that similar results would surface were this survey conducted at just about any university in the United States.) Students’ indifference to what were once burning issues of Biblical translation, apparently resolving itself into a view that one edition is basically as good as another (so long as what’s chosen is the shorter Western canon of the Bible), is seen by Wooding as “suggest[ing] the need for training in sources of Biblical apocrypha and patristic commentary” (199). Recent IT resources, according to Wooding, make such knowledge more accessible than it may have been before, possibly even “enabl[ing] students and others to engage in source-criticism of medieval texts” largely with the aid of web resources. Wooding goes on to note the theology students’ unsurprisingly poor knowledge of Latin, where IT again offers a solution: “IT offers some alternatives in language and text-acquisition for students who start, from a point late in their studies, with a requirement to use Latin texts but without knowledge of Latin” (201). He concludes that instructors in Theology should accept the fact that students will rely primarily on “cribs and search tools” to read the Bible and other early texts: “[B]y approaching languages through transferable IT skills, we may succeed in interesting students in just those areas of language that at the moment are seen as too ‘dry’ to be of interest—but which are crucial to interpretation” (202). I wonder if assertions such as these may confuse the resistance of students to the study of Latin with the more trenchant resistance of administrators, many of whom are wary of making long-term commitments to faculty with demanding specializations in the era of student evaluations and corporate styles of management. One shudders to think of the ideas articles like this one might suggest to administrators as they formulate library budgets. All too often, talk of cutting print resources in favor of expanding subscriptions to databases is yielding grim results, as libraries are compelled both to purchase fewer books and journals and to pay exorbitant subscription fees to educational database cartels whose products, often quite inferior, leave students and faculty more reliant on interlibrary loans than they were before.

A list of the resting places of Anglo-Saxon saints receives its first complete translation in Nicholas Grant’s essay, “John Leland’s List of ‘Places Where the Saints Rest in England’” (*AB* 122: 373–88). According to

Grant, Leland copied the list from an unknown source, possibly of thirteenth century origin. Grant annotates the list and provides a brief introductory essay elaborating on problems of date, organization, and the puzzling omission of such prominent figures as Cuthbert of Durham.

The boundary between historical narrative and propaganda receives valuable scrutiny in Paul Hayward’s “Some Reflections of the Historical Value of the So-Called *Acta Lanfranci*” (*Historical Research* 77.196: 141–160). Although the *Acta Lanfranci* is often taken as an accurate account of the tension between the archbishop of Canterbury and St. Augustine’s monastery in the late eleventh century, Hayward points out that its narrative is littered with inaccuracies and inconsistencies. These problems lead Hayward to a significant reevaluation of the text and its sources, from which he concludes that the *Acta* should be dated somewhat later than is usually assumed. The later date allows Hayward to argue that the *Acta* is “another of the many works of propaganda that were produced amid the abbey’s dispute with its diocesan, and that while this finding may vitiate the its use as a mine of straightforward information the *Acta* nonetheless retains great interest as an example of the uses to which history was put during a period of dramatic change” (145).

Some may regret that Bernd Jaspert’s “Bonifatius—Mönch, Missionar, Märtyrer” (*Studia Monastica* 46: 283–99) ultimately has so little to say about the activities of Boniface. Jaspert’s essay instead bemoans at length both the secularization of Europe (an attitude enshrined, to Jaspert’s chagrin, in the Constitution of the European Union) as well as the encroachment of Islam: “Heidentum und Aberglaube gibt es überall” (299). This grim situation causes Jaspert to ask what examples the life of Boniface might offer to the contemporary Church, which Jaspert suggests occupies a position not unlike that of its eighth-century antecedent (284). These suggestions may not be welcome to all readers, but Jaspert’s essay is, in fact, of potential value even to those who are uninterested in deploying the reputation of Boniface as a weapon in twenty-first century culture wars. The essay contains a substantial and intriguing (if highly polemical) discussion of the missionary’s reputation in nineteenth-century Germany, where Protestant professors of Theology such as Friedrich Hermann Hesse found little in the life of Boniface that was worth celebrating given his establishment of customs that Germans would give their lives to uproot during the Reformation (292). Recuperative gestures were made

by Winfried Zeller in 1954, who attempted to explain away Boniface's "guilt" for the subjection of Germans to Rome by contending "daß die enge Bindung des Bonifatius an den Hl. Stuhl in Rom aus seinem monastischen Gehorsamsverständnis zu begreifen ist" (293). In contrast to such claims, Jaspert finds that it is precisely because of Boniface's having introduced not only the customs and rituals of Christianity, but its organizational structure as well, that his missionary undertakings were enduringly successful (294). Jaspert contends that it is this element of Boniface's missionary activities that should overcome the traditional reservations of Protestants, for in his fidelity to the organizational structure of Rome, Boniface made possible the later manifestations of West European Christianity: "Bonifatius war als Mönch, Missionar und Märtyrer der noch ungeteilten Christenheit ein Wegweiser durch Jahrhunderte. Seine Verehrung, nicht nur in der katholischen Kirche, zeigt es. Er hat das christliche Europa oder Abendland nicht geschaffen, aber er hat dem Christentum auf diesem Kontinent Stützpunkte gebaut und Wege bereitet, die noch heute genutzt werden können" (298). Jaspert's essay offers something to those who are curious about the roles played by nationalism and religion (here hardly separable) in shaping the medievalist historiography of the nineteenth century, as well as that of the present era.

In "Suneman and Wulfric: Two Forgotten Saints of St Benedict's Abbey at Holme in Norfolk" (*AB* 122: 361–72), Tom Licence describes the unique account of Suneman and Wulfric that is found in the fourteenth-century *Chronicon Joannis Bromton*. The story of the hermit Suneman, who was massacred at Holme by the Danes around 870, seems to have been based on a now-lost work in verse or rhyming prose from sometime between the tenth and twelfth centuries. The author may not have been a monk of Holme, but his audience was certainly a Benedictine one. Licence supposes that the legend of Suneman may have grown around the ruined chapel where Wulfric later established his monastery, and perhaps the legend was even what brought Wulfric to Holme. Alternatively, Suneman's legend may have been invented after Wulfric's arrival, to push Holme's origins further back into hallowed antiquity. The chronicler's stories about Wulfric proving his loyalty to Cnut are unlikely to be true, for they not only parallel stories about St. Guthlac but are most intelligible if considered to have been composed after 1066, for Abbot Ælfwold fled into exile after the Conquest, and St. Benedict's must have struggled to maintain its rights under the new regime.

In "Good King Offa: Legends of a Pious King" (*Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society* 98 [2002]: 1–14), Stephen Matthews catalogues local narratives concerning the ruler named in his title. Matthews finds that, despite Offa's later questionable reputation in the works of such later Church chroniclers as William of Malmesbury, local legend more often lauds him for his exceptional piety.

*The Durham 'Liber Vitae' and Its Context*, edited by David Rollason *et al.* (Woodbridge: Boydell), consists of essays about BL MS Cotton Domitian vii, a manuscript listing the names of persons associated with the Northumbrian church from the mid-ninth century to around 1100, when the names of all the monks of Durham began to be listed, as well as those of a good many laypeople. The book stopped being used in 1539, when Henry VIII dissolved the cathedral priory. The essays range in topic from the manuscript's history to analyses of the names and comparisons with confraternity books from England and the Continent. Four essays are of particular interest to Anglo-Saxonists. In "The Make-Up of the Durham *Liber Vitae*: The Codicology of the Manuscript" (17–42), Michael Gullick gives a detailed description of the manuscript, including its tenth-century core. Jan Gerchow investigates "The Origins of the Durham *Liber Vitae*" (45–61), and since the lists of abbots are headed by abbots of Wearmouth and Jarrow, this is guessed to be where the book originated. The occasion might have been the peace treaty after the 679 Battle on the River Trent. Borrowing a custom from the Franks, the meeting that sealed the peace would have involved the creation of a confraternity agreement between the participants. This in turn would have led to the compilation of a list of their names, which would have been deposited in the place of meeting (York) and may then have been sent to other monasteries in Northumbria and perhaps Mercia. This initial confraternity list may have been the core to which later additions were made. Gerchow further speculates that it was Athelstan who donated the book to St. Cuthbert's community. Elizabeth Briggs also investigates "Nothing But Names: The Original Core of the Durham *Liber Vitae*" (63–85) but ascribes to it a Lindisfarne origin. She dates the writing down of the original core to the period when the cult of St. Cuthbert was being promoted after his enshrining in 698, and she associates it with the register of the congregation of St. Cuthbert in which Bede wished his name to be placed. She then analyzes the known names, discusses the implications of their geographical distribution, and notes some significant absences. Janet Burton considers "Commemoration

and Memorialization in a Yorkshire Context” (221–31) in the post-Conquest period. As part of her introduction, she notes that in the fourth quarter of the eleventh century, the temporary monastic communities at Lastingham and Hackness entered into confraternity with Durham, with which they shared a common origin. It is significant that these arrangements were made at an early date, when the monastic order in Yorkshire was still in its infancy, and when the support of mutual prayer would have been particularly valuable.

Christopher Scargill’s essay “A Token of Repentance and Reconciliation: Oswiu and the Murder of King Oswine” (*Studies in Church History* 40: 39–46) asks why Bede should hold Oswiu so much more culpable for the assassination of his rival, Oswine, than he did other kings for similar crimes. Scargill suggests that Bede’s emphasis on Oswiu’s guilt reflects local biases and traces several possible sources. Scargill also offers a guess as to the location of *In Getlingum*, the site of Oswine’s murder as well as the monastery Oswiu raised in penance.

Anthony J. Turner’s survey of sundials from Late Antiquity to the eighth century (“A Use for the Sun in the Early Middle Ages, the Sun-Dial as Symbol and Instrument” [*Micrologus* 12: 27–42]) concludes with an examination of the routes by which sundials might have arrived in Britain. The dial at Bewcastle seems to be an example of the earliest form of medieval sundial found in Britain, a dial divided into twelve. The addition of crosses to distinguish the hours of the liturgical offices was perhaps a northern innovation. Since the dials worked less and less well as they moved northwards, and were perhaps increasingly less understood, the lines that did not relate to the church offices were gradually abandoned, and with the decline of monumental sculpture in the generation after the Norman Conquest, the dials themselves gradually disappeared. Moreover, although the moment of the equinox—whose occurrence was necessary to note for the correct dating of Easter—could have been seen on a dial with seasonal lines, the dials in northern England were not so marked. The lack of these markings, and indeed the lack of practical usefulness of sundials in England, resulted in the later Anglo-Saxon writers treating sundials as symbols or metaphors (as Byrhtferth does in his *Manual*), rather than as time-keeping instruments.

Adalbert de Vogüé’s “L’idéal monastique de saint Columban” (*Studia Monastica* 46: 253–49) attempts to abstract from diverse records of Columbanus’s life

and thought (including his correspondence, his *Regula Monachorum*, his *Regula coenobialis*, and Jonas of Bobbio’s *Vita*, but oddly excluding his penitential) the assumptions governing his work as abbot and missionary to the continent. The historicity of the *Vita* is vigorously defended: “Jonas n’invente rien quand il montre sans cesse chez son héros ces deux aspirations opposées, l’une à prêcher l’Évangile aux hommes, l’autre à se retirer de leur compagnie pour être seul avec Dieu” (265). Throughout the essay, de Vogüé points out the indebtedness of stock formulations in Columbanus’s writings to earlier work. The study perhaps offers the most to those who are unfamiliar with the work of Columbanus.

That Bede’s dates for Æthelberht’s reign are incompatible with observations in the *Historia Francorum* of Gregory of Tours concerning the marriage of Bertha (not mentioned by name) to “the son of a certain king in Kent” has been known for some time. As Nicholas Brooks argued, the fifty-six-year reign attributed by Bede to Æthelberht is implausible, the number more likely referring to the king’s “age at death” (“The Creation and Early Structure of the Kingdom of Kent,” *The Origins of Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms*, ed. S. Bassett [Leicester, 1989], 67). Given the disarray into which Gregory’s chronicle throws Bede’s account of Æthelberht’s reign, Barbara Yorke’s “Gregory of Tours and Sixth-Century Anglo-Saxon England” (*The World of Gregory of Tours*, eds. Kathleen Mitchell and Ian Wood [Leiden: Brill, 2002], 113–130) wonders whether the “major revision of Kentish chronology” necessitated by “two sentences” in Gregory’s account might “raise broader questions about the reliability of the information for the sixth and seventh centuries which Canterbury provided for Bede” (114). Uncertainty over the date of Æthelberht’s succession ultimately poses a number of problems for the standard narrative of the conversion of Kent. Bede’s statement that Æthelberht died twenty-one years after his baptism threatens to make his conversion by Augustine impossible: “As Bede believed Æthelberht died in 616 his baptism on this calculation would have occurred in 595. At this date Gregory had yet to dispatch Augustine from Rome, but 595 was the year in which the pope can be shown to have demonstrated an interest in the conversion of the English for the first time” (116). More of the credit for the conversion of Kent should, accordingly, perhaps belong to Liudhard; in any case, “[u]ncertainty must remain about exactly when Æthelberht could be described as a Christian and it could be that whatever initial commitment he made was not entirely satisfactory to the Church, which could explain Pope Gregory’s reticence

on the topic" (117). Yorke goes on to suggest that Æthelberht might have "maintained altars to both pagan and Christian gods" (118). Still, the news is not all bad for the veracity of Bede's account; Yorke finds archaeological support for his famous suggestion—disdained by some philologists—that the Germanic peoples who settled Kent were Scandinavians. Frankish interest in England (and its conversion) may stem from earlier relations with its inhabitants; the significance of "Saxon" colonies in Normandy and elsewhere has, Yorke suggests, been insufficiently appreciated by some historians, and indicates "that Germanic settlers in southern England need not have come directly from Saxony, but may first have spent time on the continent as raiders or in the employ of Frankish kings" (130). The Frankish interest in England may have been greater than the scant attention paid to English affairs by Gregory would suggest. Yorke urges us to entertain an image of England's conversion less reliant on the supposed crossings of stark boundaries between the Christian and pagan worlds of early Northwest Europe. Given the frequency of contact between merchants and missionaries across the Channel, and the possible ethnic ties between inhabitants of Francia and England, such divisions are unlikely to have assumed the form conventionally imagined, and conversion seems to have been significantly more gradual than sources such as Bede's *History* seem to allow.

#### d. Society and the Family

In "Looking Backwards to the Early Medieval Past: Wales and England, a Contrast in Approaches" (*Welsh History Rev.* 22: 197–221), Wendy Davies compares the lack of studies of the social history of early medieval Wales with the plentiful scholarship in this field for the same period in England. Whereas England's pre-Norman past has long been seen as important because it was considered formative for the English state and English values, early medieval Wales has been studied for its peoples (i.e., migration, settlement, and languages), its kings, its contributions to the Church, and its "tribal system." Davies concludes that the difference in approach results from the Anglicizing tendencies of Welsh culture in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. As Wales was ruled by the English parliament, it was obviously irrelevant to look for origins in early Welsh communities, since democratic institutions necessarily had English roots.

This year, Gale R. Owen-Crocker offered two major contributions to the study of Anglo-Saxon dress. First, in "Pomp, Piety, and Keeping the Woman in Her Place:

The Dress of Cnut and Ælfgifu-Emma" (*Medieval Clothing and Textiles* 1: 41–52)—published in the inaugural issue of a journal she will be editing with Robin Nether-ton—Owen-Crocker examines the outfits worn by the royal couple in the frontispiece to the *Liber Vitae* of the New Minster at Winchester (London, British Library, MS Stowe 944). Observing that the figures are characterized more by their clothing than by their generic portraits, she argues that Cnut's image adapts crucifixion iconography to fit Germanic notions of kingship. The depiction of Emma, on the other hand, downplays her status in order to portray her as merely an extension of Cnut's royal image.

Owen-Crocker's other significant publication this year was the second edition of her much-respected volume, *Dress in Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: Boydell). The first edition, published in 1986 by Manchester University Press, examined textual and archeological evidence to provide readers with the first book-length study of early English clothing. Both her primary argument—that styles of dress reflected Anglo-Saxon beliefs concerning gender and status—and her meticulous research proved useful, not only to scholars of Old English culture, but to reenactors and theatrical costume designers as well. Though the new edition retains the themes, major claims, and organization of the earlier volume, the intervening twenty years of scholarship have led Owen-Crocker to re-write large sections of the text. In her new introduction, Owen-Crocker highlights the influence of new archeological discoveries and what she calls "the theoretical developments which had dominated scholarly thinking in the last decades of the twentieth century" (5). The result is a book roughly twice as long as its predecessor, but the new length is well earned. In addition to individual chapters on women's and men's dress between the fifth and eleventh centuries, she also incorporates chapters on "Textiles and Textile Production" and "The Significance of Dress," as well as a particularly useful glossary of Old English garment names. As before, the volume is extensively illustrated, with new drawings and watercolors by Rosalyn Smith added to Christine Weatherall's artwork from the first edition. Even if readers are already familiar with the first edition, the revised text offers so much new material that it will surely replace its predecessor as the standard text on its subject. Certainly, the internet has yet to offer much competition, as Owen-Crocker's research assistant learned when he entered "medieval leather garments" into a search engine, only to be rewarded with "some dazzling pornography!" (9).



Susan Pearce examines how society changed in *South-Western Britain in the Early Middle Ages* (London: Leicester UP), that is, from the fourth to the tenth century. She sets out the working lives of most of the inhabitants of the peninsula during the early medieval centuries, showing that their lifestyle was based upon a seasonal cycle of arable farming and cattle grazing that had its roots in prehistory. Using the evidence of ancient hill-forts, temples, and burial grounds from the later fourth and fifth centuries, she suggests that although there were probably Christian communities in and near Dorchester and Ilchester and probably in Exeter and Bath, most people of the peninsula were only slightly touched by Christian beliefs and practices. During the sixth and seventh centuries, the foundation first of British monasteries and then of West Saxon minsters provided important elements in the spread of Christian practices, which also appear in the gradual developments at local graveyards. Pearce is less interested in political history for its own sake than in the nexus of issues regarding who controlled the land and to what end—questions that can be asked at the level of the individual, the church, and the polity. Questions of “who” lead to archaeologically-influenced analyses of culture and identity, and she moves easily from documentary sources (e.g., the mixed English and Cornish names of landholders who manumitted slaves, as noted in the tenth-century manuscript of the Bodmin Gospels) to archeological ones (e.g. the appearance of Danish-style bar-lugs in locally-made cooking pots, suggesting that Cornwall had its own trade contacts with the North Sea region that were separate from the *emporium* at Hamwic). Overall, Pearce stresses the cultural similarities between southwestern Britain and the wider antique world as it gradually changed into the world of the early Middle Ages.

Victoria Thompson’s fascinating *Death and Dying in Later Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: Boydell) does a remarkable job not only of filling in some of the many gaps in our knowledge of pre-Conquest burial rituals but also of demonstrating the value of death studies to discussions of literature, medicine, homilies, art history, law, and a number of other subfields of Old English. Her use of mistranslations in Werferth’s version of the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great cleverly unravels the considerable evidence within this text for early attitudes concerning the preparation of the dead for burial: Werferth’s renderings indicate

that the washing, clothing, and shrouding of the corpse were familiar practices in Mercia

around 900, at least in Episcopal circles, a deduction supported by contemporary continental *ordines in agenda mortuorum*. Embalming, however, is another matter; Werferth firmly categorizes it as something foreign, perhaps even specifically Byzantine. This implies that even the use of externally applied substances such as myrrh and balsam to disguise rather than delay the onset of decay was unfamiliar. The more interventionist approach described by Gregory was wholly opaque to him ... show[ing] us a cultural world in which the decay of the human body was seen as rapid and inevitable. (21)

The backdrop and exigency of Thompson’s study is the well-known indifference (or apparent indifference) of pre-Conquest ecclesiasts to burial customs. The apparent “silence” of canon law “on the minutiae of burial practice” is, as Thompson notes, “all the more striking given their detail on other issues of which their authors did disapprove” (35). She agrees with recent studies suggesting that the demarcation between Christian and pre-Christian burials is not nearly as obvious as earlier studies held, adding that “while the ‘how’ of burial may not have been considered relevant to salvation, the ‘where’ was coming to be crucial” (36). As the Church did come to assert greater control over burial, the placement of remains became another means of exerting authority and meting out punishments—and a potent one at that, given the tendency of some surviving testaments to assert vigorously the legal personality of the deceased and the seriousness of obligations to pray on their behalf. Developing the relatively recent insight that confession was probably tied to the death-bed as well as to the liturgical calendar, Thompson suggests that dying was for some “a community activity, with an involved audience participating in the salvation of the dying soul.... Individual circumstances permitting, this was the ideal death envisaged for themselves by most members of Anglo-Saxon religious communities” (62). Conclusions such as these have implications for our understanding of manuscripts such as Oxford, Bodleian Lib. Laud Misc. 482, one of a handful containing the principal vernacular penitentials of pre-Conquest England. Noting the difficulties faced by prior scholarship in their efforts to classify this compilation, Thompson contends that we need not see it as “primarily ... a book from which the *ordines* for the sick or the dying would be performed” or as “oriented towards the needs of a confessor ... the kind of book that a priest would use in the field,” for “the texts are

integrated in such a way that neither the penitential nor the ritual element dominates, and it is probable that all this material was intended to work in harmony" (70). While one might have wished for a consideration of this manuscript that dealt more with the particulars of the texts not explicitly concerned with death contained therein, the result is, nonetheless, a striking way of seeing the codex and its contents. The issues with which this study is concerned are too numerous to be dealt with effectively here: for a relatively lean book (236 pages, index included), its handling of a diverse array of subjects is remarkably effective. This is a rich study that scholars from many subfields will want to consult, one that is likely to inspire much further work.

#### e. Gender and Identity

As an introduction to their specially-edited journal issue on "Gender and Empire in the Early Medieval World," Clare Lees and Gillian Overing's essay "Signifying Gender and Empire" (*Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 34: 1–16) is less interested in posing a single, unified argument than it is in articulating the themes that will be explored in more depth by their contributors. According to Lees and Overing, the issue at the core of their anthology is, "how sociopolitical and cultural discourses of the imperial are formed and used ... and how such discourses might differ from those of later periods" (11). The formation of imperial discourse, they continue, is linked inextricably to culturally-conditioned beliefs about the gendered body. They write, "the map of empire is written across the body; the geography of empires can be found in physical, material, cultural, and psychic domains, and in the forms of representation that create them, and gender them" (12). Lees and Overing's methodology partakes liberally of contemporary critical theory, and they express hopes (perhaps quixotically) that their collection will remedy the ignorance of the medieval so common among modern theorists of post-coloniality. Although Anglo-Saxon England receives only brief discussion in Lees and Overing's introduction, Nicholas Howe addresses issues of empire and postcoloniality in pre-Conquest culture more directly in his contribution to the issue, "Rome: Capital of Anglo-Saxon England" (*Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 34: 147–72). Howe uses a *Chronicle* entry (816 in the C-text) that deals entirely with events taking place in Rome to open a discussion on the central position occupied by the former imperial capital in the Anglo-Saxon imagination. The examples he finds for Rome's influence are many: the opening entry of the A-text

of the *Chronicle*, which describes Caesar's invasion of Britain; Bede's reference to the British Isles as distantly northwest of Rome (rather than referring to Rome as distantly southwest of Britain); as well as Cynewulf's focus on Roman culture and history in *Elene* and the *Fates of the Apostles*. Based on these and other instances, Howe suggests that "we suspend our assumption that a capital must be the established political seat of a nation-state and instead take it in a more etymological sense as the head (*caput*) or chief city of a culture" (155). Drawing on Walter Benjamin's formulation of the city as the locus of cultural capital, "as a source of those ideas that define what is transformative and vital" (157), Howe argues that Anglo-Saxon culture derived its notions of cultural validity from its perceptions of Rome, and that links to Rome—physical, literary, political, or linguistic—served a legitimizing function in pre-Conquest society.

Howe addresses similar questions of culture, geography, and identity in "Looking for Home in Anglo-Saxon England," an essay in his edited volume, *Home and Homelessness in the Medieval World* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame UP), 143–63). Pointing out that "the Anglo-Saxons had a remarkably wide lexicon for designating home in its various senses" (147), Howe attempts to move beyond scholarly truisms regarding the importance of "the Hall"—which, he points out, is only a "surrogate home" (144)—in order to map out the psychological and cultural space occupied by ideas of home in pre-Conquest culture. Comparing descriptions of the "Heavenly Home" in poems such as *The Wanderer* with accounts of property and habitat in Old English legal documents, Howe comes to two conclusions: first, that meditations on home and homeliness pervaded Anglo-Saxon textual culture, and second, that "home" served more as a conceptual or theological category than a literal designation. He writes that, for both literary and legal authors, "home is, finally, the place that lies beyond direct human experience or apprehension. It can be entered only by those who knew how to live well on earth in a transitory house of wattle and daub" (160).

In "The Legitimacy of St. Edith" (*The Haskins Society Journal* 11 [2003]: 97–113), Barbara Yorke examines whether the parents of St. Edith, King Edgar and the former nun Wulfthryth, were legally married at the time of her birth. Though her conclusion is based largely (and admittedly) on speculation, Yorke argues in favor of Edith's legitimacy. She then contextualizes the arguments regarding the saint's birth within the

Anglo-Saxon dynastic struggles of the late tenth century. Perhaps most useful to readers is Yorke's consideration of how doubts concerning Edith's legitimacy reveal anxieties about the political role of women in late Anglo-Saxon England.

#### f. The Economy, Settlement, and Landscape

Keith Bailey's essay, "Aston Sandford: Some Reflections on its Early History" (*Records of Buckinghamshire* 44: 134–6) continues the work of Peter Gulland's earlier article, "Open Field Enclosure and Village Shrinkage at Aston Sandford" (*Records of Buckinghamshire* 43: 127–42). Focusing on evidence from Domesday Book, Bailey compares Aston Sandford to the similarly-named Aston Mullins to elucidate the nature of the settlement, its precise location, its population, and the demographics of that population.

To assess the relationship between *Urban Growth and the Medieval Church: Gloucester and Worcester* (Aldershot: Ashgate), Nigel Baker and Richard Holt study the major churches that were already established long before the phases of sustained urban growth began, as well as the lesser churches whose foundation accompanied urbanization and which were nearly all in place by 1100. For the Anglo-Saxon period, they find that Worcester and Gloucester were already established central places in the Hwiccian kingdom of the seventh century and became important in the new religious hierarchy that was being established. Both cities had proto-urban functions before their refoundation as *burhs* towards the end of the ninth century. The close resemblance of Gloucester's new street system to that of Winchester, the prototypical Wessex *burh*, suggests that the new royal city was meant to play a central political and military role in consolidating Alfred's authority over the area of western Mercia. Worcester, by contrast, was refortified some years later in a much less ambitious operation, and the recognition of Bishop Wærferth's joint lordship by Æthelred and Æthelflæd confirms this as mostly likely an episcopal enterprise. The later growth and transformation of each *burh* was achieved in part by extramural growth (e.g., suburbs and marketplaces) and in part by post-mural redevelopment. Moreover, there seems to have been a consistent policy, over at least a century, of granting house plots to the Church's greater retainers. In a parallel trend, the rapid development of these communities saw the appearance of lesser churches in numbers demonstrating the vigor of the pre-1000 phase of urbanization, and the driving force behind the foundations was not

lay piety but greater churches or the state and its officials. Finally, the same period between 900 and 1200 that saw the construction of most of the lesser churches also saw the end of the bishops' position as lords of the city.

Urbanization is also the subject of *Lordship and Medieval Urbanisation: Coventry, 1043–1355* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press), in which Richard Goddard investigates the urbanization and subsequent growth of Coventry between the founding of its Benedictine abbey and the monastery's final loss of jurisdictional power. He hypothesizes a two-stage urbanization process. First, lords laid the foundations for future commercial growth by building a market, offering attractive privileges, and laying out plots for new settlers. Next, the city grew as a result of the private actions of those traders and artisans who were attracted to the city as immigrants. One of Coventry's lords was St. Mary's Abbey, and it appears that the monastery did begin the process of urbanization. Recognizing the commercial potential of the site, it built a market and some burgage plots within its newly acquired fee, and it seems likely that it charged a 1s. quit rent for these plots and probably included other privileges as well in order to attract settlers to the commercial zone outside its gates. Goddard also enters into the debate over whether Coventry in 1086 was a rural village worth £11 or whether it had an urban constituent not mentioned in the Domesday Book. Anglo-Saxon finds in the area hint at the existence of an old minster and suggest that the market area was already occupied around the time of the abbey's dedication in 1043. As with the houses in Worcester that belonged to the cathedral priory there, the small urban area outside of St. Mary's appears to have been omitted from Domesday.

The archeological report by Craig Cessford *et al.* on "The Origins and Early Development of Chesterton" (*Proc. of the Cambridge Antiquarian Soc.* 93: 125–42) extends to finds dated as late as the seventeenth century, but with respect to the earlier Middle Ages, it appears that the settlement at Chesterton began when the royal *vill* of which its land was part was broken up to form the *burh* of Cambridge. The earliest settlement lay around St. Andrew's church and the manor house. In the Late Saxon period, the landscape of Chesterton contained large enclosed areas demarcated by ditches, with the foci of domestic occupation somewhere relatively close by. Most likely Chesterton consisted of small dispersed sites rather than a single core around the church. In the late eleventh or early twelfth centuries, the village seems

to have undergone planned development, with a number of property plots being laid out at the same time with an overall design in mind. This may have been an initiative of either Barnwell Priory or the abbey of St. Andrew. Specialist comments on the medieval environmental, faunal, pottery, and metalwork finds supplement the main report.

K. R. Dark casts a skeptical eye on the evidence for several "Large-scale population movements into and from Britain south of Hadrian's Wall in the fourth to sixth centuries AD" (*Reading Medieval Studies* 29: 31–49). He argues that the Votadini (later known as the Gododdin) could not have migrated to northwest Wales during this period, for the supposed "north British" barrows at Tandderwen in Wales post-date the fifth century, and the barrows they resemble are located in the Pictish zone rather than the Votadini homeland around Edinburgh. He also finds the epigraphic evidence too weak to support any of the hypothesized fifth-century Irish migrations to southwest Wales, and he discounts the presence of grass-marked pottery as evidence of Irish settlement in that period, as it has been redated to the seventh or eighth century. With respect to the so-called Irish areas of Dyfed and Bryncheinog, he suggests that they might have been culturally and linguistically Irish. He sees no reason why the linguistic boundary between Irish and Brittonic could not have been further east than is now believed.

The location of the property described in the early eighth century *Hellerlege* charter (S64) has been the subject of considerable scholarly debate. In particular, historians quibble over the identification of the *liontan/leontan* stream named as a boundary in the document. In "The Lost Lint Brook: A Solution to the *Hellerlege* Anglo-Saxon Charter and Other Explorations of King's Norton History" (*Transactions of the Birmingham and Warwickshire Archaeological Society* 107 [2003]: 111–29) George Demidowicz offers his own solution to the mystery along with some provocative speculation regarding several other questionable place-name identifications in the area. Demidowicz relies principally on the evidence of sixteenth and seventeenth century rental records to suggest that the *liontan* stream is actually a tributary of the Rea, now nameless but once known as Lett Brook. Conceding that his solution to the *liontan* stream question "cannot be absolutely certain" (121), Demidowicz does find that the identification with Lett Brook helps resolve several other place-name location conundrums in the King's Norton region, particularly those of Bishopshill, Masshouse Farm, and the Cotteridge Parcel.

Although the readership for Demidowicz's article may be limited to those interested in local Warwickshire History, he does provide an excellent case study of the ways Anglo-Saxon place-names and land-transactions can affect the later development of a community.

David Harrison presents the first comprehensive study of *The Bridges of Medieval England: Transport and Society 400–1800* (Oxford: Oxford UP) and rejects the widely held view that major improvements in transportation were a post-medieval phenomenon. Instead, it appears that the first bridges at most sites were constructed between 750 and 1250. Emphasizing that the Roman network of roads and bridges mostly fell out of use and was replaced with roads and bridges in other locations, Harrison shows the importance of bridges in Anglo-Saxon England. Beginning with a survey of the kinds of evidence for the existence of late-Anglo-Saxon bridges and causeways (texts, place-names, and the ubiquitous obligation to repair bridges), he describes specific bridges, the creation of the Anglo-Saxon road system, Anglo-Saxon techniques for constructing bridges and causeways, and—not least of all—the mechanisms by which Anglo-Saxon bridges were funded.

In his study of the relationship between the "Fuel Supply and the Medieval Salt Industry in Droitwich" (*Trans. of the Worcestershire Archaeological Soc.* 3rd ser. 19: 111–32), J.D. Hurst finds that from the pre-Conquest period up to 1215, the holding of the right to make salt from Droitwich's brine wells was to some degree correlated with personal access to woodland resources, as if the latter were an important prerequisite for the former. Paradoxically, the wooded character of parts of medieval north Worcestershire owed much to Droitwich and its industrial activity, with woodland management likely to have been practiced from an early date in order to supply the regular demands for fuel.

No précis can do justice to Tim Pestell's *Landscapes of Monastic Foundation: The Establishment of Religious Houses in East Anglia c. 650–1200* (Woodbridge: Boydell), an outstanding contribution to John Hines's and Catherine Cubitt's monograph series "Anglo-Saxon Studies." This rich interdisciplinary study explores the place of the monastery in the landscape of East Anglia and what it meant to contemporary populations. After analyzing monasticism in Middle Anglo-Saxon East Anglia, the consequences of the first Viking Age for East Anglian monasticism, monastic reform in the later Anglo-Saxon period, and the establishment of monas-



teries in the Norman landscape, Pestell shows that the Normans largely established new monasteries where there already were communities, a contradiction of the usual view of the nature of Norman monastic ideology and reform. In the earliest period of Norman settlement, this correspondence suggests an appropriation of the Anglo-Saxon past and was manifested in a variety of ways. For example, when Bishop Herbert de Losinga's see was transferred to Norwich, St. Michael's minster was reduced to a chapel. In other cases, Anglo-Saxon cathedrals were completely rebuilt, even to the extent of altering the alignment of the new buildings. This indicates a desire to expunge the physical structures and reshape the religious institutions of the Anglo-Saxon past. The limited excavations of East Anglia's monasteries make it impossible to assert that they received the same treatment as the cathedrals, but Pestell thinks it likely that, at least in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries, many Norman monasteries totally rebuilt all the buildings of a community, incorporating a standardized claustral groundplan arrangement. Although the spirituality of a site was important, the manner in which religious life was manifested was capable of presentation in very different ways. The Normans' changes implicitly criticized contemporary Anglo-Saxon priestly communities, regardless of whether their motive was to use regularization to support religious communities in a way more fitting to the Norman view of monasticism or to demonstrate patronage in the place of an older, Anglo-Saxon social order.

In their 2000 volume, *Atlas of Rural Settlement in England* (London: English Heritage), Brian Roberts and Stuart Wrathmell argued for the existence of a central region crossing England from northeast to southwest with distinct nucleation and dispersion settlement patterns. Mary Hesse, in "Domesday settlement in Suffolk" (*Landscape History* 25: 45–57), uses the evidence of William's census to offer a detailed critique of Roberts and Wrathmell's conclusions. Although she largely agrees with their claims, she does note a series of contradictions between her findings and the nineteenth century-based *Atlas*. She also finds correlations between freemen landholdings and settlement dispersal and between evidence of strong local lordship and the early organization of open fields and nucleated villages.

David Sivier's account of *Anglo-Saxon & Norman Bristol* (Stroud: Tempus) begins with Bristol's late foundation ca. 1000 at *Bricg Stowe* ("the place of assembly by the bridge") as a *burh* with a planned grid layout, a new town in an expanding urban landscape. Sivier reviews

the various theories regarding Bristol's origins: was it a Viking settlement, an ecclesiastical center, a port for the palace at Barton Regis, or simply in a strategic location? Further uncertainty clouds the question of which hundred the town lay in. No Anglo-Saxon church in Bristol has survived, and only St. Peter's is definitely an Anglo-Saxon foundation, so the discussion of what the churches in Bristol would have looked like then is based on contemporary parallels. However, three other Anglo-Saxon sites in Bristol have yielded to excavation, proving to be timber buildings all used for metalworking. As regards trade and industry, Sivier notes Bristol's traffic in human beings (against which Bishop Wulfstan preached) and the possible Anglo-Saxon origins of the town's leather industry, as well as the Anglo-Saxon mint, ironworking, pottery production, spinning, and quarrying. The discussion of agriculture and food covers the kind of livestock slaughtered in town, as well as what is known about Anglo-Saxon landholding in the surrounding area. The coverage of the pre-Conquest period ends with a review of the Anglo-Saxon rings, pins, strap-ends, hones, and other personal items found in Bristol, and a chapter on the impact of the Normans begins by surveying the dispossession of English landlords and clerics in Gloucestershire after the Conquest, the construction of the Norman fortress in Bristol, and Bristol's role as supplier to other Norman fortifications.

#### g. Law, Politics, and Warfare

Although the tide of essays concerning England in the year 1000 that accompanied our own transition to a new millennium has largely subsided, David Bates revisits the topic once more in his essay, "England Around the Year 1000" (*Hommes et Sociétés dans l'Europe d'aujourd'hui*, ed. Pierre Bonnassie and Pierre Toubert [Paris: Presses Universitaires du Mirail], 101–112). He argues that, "to commemorate the year 1000 is not in truth to commemorate a specific year or event. It is to confront a multidimensional range of issues" (101). For Bates, these issues coalesce around issues of governance and administration. According to Bates, "the most obvious characteristics of the tenth—and eleventh—century English polity are without a doubt firstly the strength of what I shall for convenience call the state and secondly the kingdom's continuing absorption into a Scandinavian, as well as a western European, world" (103). As comments like this suggest, Bates adopts the so-called "maximalist" view of late Anglo-Saxon administration voiced by James Campbell and Patrick Wormald, rather than the more "minimalist" approach advocated by Paul Hyams. The conclusion drawn from this "max-

imalist" argument is that England's upheavals around the year 1000, while serious, did not threaten the continuity of English government or national identity: "The Wessex kings in the tenth century, the Danish ones after 1016, and the Norman ones after 1066 all centralized power on themselves and made great play of perpetuating existing structures and law. It is a paradox that crisis and change reinforced continuity" (112).

Regarding "The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* for 614 and Brean Down, Somerset" (*N&Q* n.s. 51: 234–35), Andrew Breeze would emend the hitherto unidentified *Beandun*, site of the slaughter of over 2,000 Cornish-speaking Celts of southwestern Britain. If the *Chronicle* scribe meant to write *Breandun*, he could have been referring to Brean Down on the north Somerset coast. A natural stronghold, it was occupied in sub-Roman times, and its location twenty-eight miles from Bath might have provoked an English attack.

Regarding "The Battle of the *Uinued* and the River Went, Yorkshire" (*Northern History* 41: 377–83), Breeze amplifies on earlier, disregarded identifications of the river Uinued with the Went in Yorkshire. It was near this river that Oswiu killed Penda in 655, and if the battle took place in November, as has been suggested, it strengthens the case for a single long campaign by Penda, rather than two consecutive ones. The geography of the open land between East Hardwick and the Went also makes the victory of Oswiu's tiny army understandable: he presumably took advantage of winter flooding to trap Penda's much more numerous forces, so that the Northumbrians literally descended on their enemies, who had no effective means of retreat.

In "The Welsh identity of the kingdom of Strathclyde c. 900-c. 1200" (*Innes Rev.* 55: 111–80), Dauvit Broun argues that the kingdom of Strathclyde lived on as the bishopric of Glasgow. Under Bishop Jocelin (1175–1199), there was a new awareness of the bishopric's royal association and an emphasis on the Brythonic or Welsh aspect of the kingdom. Section 3 of this substantial article investigates whether Strathclyde was ruled by Gaels or Britons from ca. 915 to ca. 1030, and Broun firmly rejects the scholarly consensus that the Gaels were dominant. The latter opinion rests on the chronicle of John of Fordun, but Broun shows that this fabrication of the late fourteenth century cannot be accepted as a source here, for its account of tenth-century Strathclyde is largely fictional. The contemporary evidence, however, is consistent with a continuous succession of identifiably Brythonic kings into the eleventh cen-

tury. By 1113, a significant part of the old kingdom of Strathclyde had evidently fallen into the hands of the kings of the Scots, in what Broun sees as an ongoing struggle for dominance between the rulers of Northumbria, the kings of the Scots, and the *Gall-Gaidil* of Galloway. In this context, the raid on "Britons" in 1030 noted in the *Annals of Tigernach* could refer to a ravaging of Strathclyde rather than Wales, and Broun speculates that Mael Coluim, the last surviving member of Strathclyde's ruling family, was taken to York, later to emerge as the protégé of Siward, earl of Northumbria, in the campaign against Mac Bethad in 1054. Broun guesses that Mael Coluim would not have survived long after the death in Earl Siward in 1055, and a continuing English domination of Strathclyde after 1050 would explain the consecration of two bishops of Glasgow by Archbishop Cynesige of York (1055–1060). The final establishment of Scottish rule at the expense of Northumbria may therefore be dated to the 1060s. The fact that *Gospatric's Writ* (composed between 1067 and 1069) is addressed to those "dwelling in all the lands that were Cumbrian" is interpreted as a reference to the still living memory of the end of Brythonic lordship in the area.

Clare Downham's "England and the Irish-Sea Zone in the Eleventh-Century" (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 26: 55–73) was reviewed in *YWOES* 2003.

Ten years in the making, Ralph Evans's *festchrift* for Trevor Aston entitled *Lordship and Learning: Studies in Memory of Trevor Aston* (Woodbridge: Boydell) finally reached print this year. Featuring a series of essays concerning the history of English administration and governance, this volume offers much that will delight the Anglo-Saxon legal scholar, not least of which is a hitherto-unpublished essay by Aston himself. Particularly useful is T.M. Charles-Edwards's dense, wide-ranging study of the relationship between language-change and nationhood, "The Making of Nations in Britain and Ireland in the Early Middle Ages" (11–37). In this essay, Charles-Edwards offers a detailed discussion of how a growing consciousness of the distinction between English and continental Germanic languages in the post-migration period fed a burgeoning awareness of national identity among the Anglo-Saxons. Use of the term "nation" in an early medieval context tends to provoke controversy, yet Charles-Edwards argues vigorously for its applicability. He writes that, "it is better to accept that the one flexible concept, *nation*, must do for Bretons and Frenchmen, Hausa and Nigerians, Mercians and English, and that in the middle ages as in

the contemporary world it is a habitually contentious notion" (12). For Charles-Edwards, this sort of culturally-based, historically-specific approach to nationhood is linked to a notion of language-evolution as likewise conditioned by its social *milieu*: "we should think of English arising from a new 'settler' norm, one which placed a high value on distinguishing its linguistic performance from that of the more conservative dialects in their North Sea homelands" (21). The article pairs its discussion of English national origins with accounts of how Irish, Scots, and Pictish identities compare with Anglo-Saxon. It concludes with a provocative consideration of the link between linguistic development and colonialism in the evolution of early medieval national identity. Eric John's contribution to the anthology, "The Annals of St. Neots and the Defeat of the Vikings" (51–62) begins by taking issue with David Dumville's dating of the annals. Noting that "there is a striking resemblance between the concerns and interests of Asser and those of the compiler" (53), he argues that the annals must have been written during the tenth century, rather than closer to the twelfth-century date of the manuscript (60–61). The significance of such a claim, John posits, is to force us to reconsider the relationship between England and the continent during the late Anglo-Saxon period. John argues that the "European perspective" (62) of the compiler suggests that Anglo-Saxon culture was far more continental and less insular than it is often portrayed. Put differently, "at the very least the view of late Anglo-Saxon England as a lot of home-spun peasants waiting to be taken into Europe by William the Conqueror is a load of codswallop" (62). While the essays of John and Charles-Edwards focus on broad questions concerning England's identity in a European context, Rosamund Faith's article, "*Cola's tūn*: Rural social Structure in Late Anglo-Saxon Devon" (63–78) uses evidence from *Domesday Book* to examine notions of social and class identity in a smaller, more provincial setting. According to Faith, Collaton, a small community in Devon, offers a useful case study for this sort of research, since evidence for pre-Conquest boundaries and land-holdings survive in both the main "exchequer" *Domesday* as well as the more detailed *Liber Exoniensis*. Her article both reveals the diverse range of properties found in rural southern England and suggests some reasons why these properties were never consolidated. In particular, she points out that, "the forays which late Saxon landowners had made into the local land market had been made with an eye to acquiring farms with under-exploited potential which they could develop as large scale pastoral enterprises" (71). Faith argues that the dispersal of lands around Collaton made such "large

scale pastoral enterprises" impossible. Trevor Aston's article, "The Ancestry of English Feudalism" (79–95) is actually a hitherto unpublished lecture originally delivered in 1964. As such, it lacks citations or bibliography and, as the editors themselves concede, many of its ideas have since been superseded. However, much in the essay remains thought-provoking, and it is difficult to argue with the editor's decision to publish it despite its age. Aston here examines evidence from southern and western England to consider how feudal structures manifested themselves in England prior to 1066. He points out that early English feudal estates (especially ecclesiastical ones) "were characterized first and foremost by their elaborate proliferation of dependent tenures, involving at least a degree of personal dependence" (80), and that this proliferation "was in a sense socially and economically necessary as the counterpart to the lavish scale of lay piety and the marked expansion of ecclesiastical landholding from the mid-tenth century onward" (81). He notes, though, that many differences still existed between Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman practice, particularly in the realm of military responsibility: "the Old English responsibility I have been mentioning was still, as it were, very much on a public basis; it was conceived in hundredal terms and operated through single and multiple hundreds. Equally important, it was part of a special and, in the only certain cases, highly elevated franchise. Anglo-Norman responsibility was not formulated in hundredal terms; and it was in no meaningful sense a franchise, being built into the customary framework of baronial duties" (93). Peter Coss's contribution, "What's in a Construct? The 'Gentry' in Anglo-Saxon England" (95–107) is as much an anti-theory polemic as it is serious historical scholarship. It is likely that many readers will be put off by some of Coss's more hyperbolic rhetoric, such as his declaration that, "those who see clearly realize just how naked the emperor post-structuralism actually is, but it may be a very long time before his post-modernist courtiers are brought to acknowledge the fact" (95). Whatever one's opinion of post-modern theory might be, such comments add little to any discussion of its merits. Underlying the bellicosity is an argument concerning the applicability of critical vocabularies and social constructs to earlier historical periods. In brief, is it anachronistic to speak of an "Anglo-Saxon gentry"? Coss's response to this question is an analysis of the risks involved in appropriating such later terminology. He points out that discussion of an Anglo-Saxon gentry tends to distort the word's meaning, to misconstrue the relationship between aristocrats and the state, and to fall into errors similar to those of the Whig histori-

ans of the nineteenth century. In the end, for Coss, both post-structuralist theorizing and the use of later class terminology run too many methodological and historical risks. Although the other essays in the volume do not address Anglo-Saxon issues directly, the contributions by Paul Brand, P.D.A. Harvey, and others (including another essay by Aston himself) nonetheless add much to our understanding of governance and administration in the middle ages. Though not reviewed here, these articles will still offer much to the student of pre-Conquest culture.

Kent G. Hare's "Athelstan of England: Christian King and Hero" (*Heroic Age* 7: n.p. [<http://www.heroicage.org/issues/7/hare.html>]) considers the discrepancy between the medieval and modern reputation of this successor to Alfred the Great. The essay contains a useful and, for the most part, judicious overview of current scholarly opinion on the sources out of which knowledge of Athelstan's reputation has been reconstructed, though its summary is not without some noteworthy gaps. A case in point is the perhaps too-brief discussion of the fourteenth-century Middle English romance *Athelston*, referenced as evidence for the survival of "[e]nduring legends surrounding this king" that are, perhaps, traces of what was once his exalted reputation. Hare refers to Trounce's edition of the poem, but not at all to a very important study that would certainly have caused Hare to modify some of his observations, namely Elaine M. Treharne, "Romanticizing the Past in the Middle English *Athelston*," *RES* n.s. 50 (1999): 1–21. The author's insistence that the apotheosis of Alfred was "a product of post-Conquest, Anglo-Norman historiography" likewise threatens to become, as it is phrased here, an oversimplification of the evidence (though I suspect it was not intended as such by its author): no Anglo-Norman chronicler had a hand in composing some of our earliest evidence of Alfred-worship, the *Proverbs of Alfred*, and metrical studies of these collections of aphorisms have confirmed their retention (in severely garbled form) of pre-Conquest modes of verse composition. Still, this essay offers (with the exceptions noted here) a sound introduction to a subject that deserves more attention.

Narrative history occupies a much smaller place in the catalogue of scholarship on Anglo-Saxon England than it once did. Modern historians prefer the detailed analysis of the person, action, or event to the reconstruction of a grander historical plot-line. Nonetheless, it is precisely this latter task undertaken by Emma Mason in her book, *The House of Godwine: The History of a*

*Dynasty* (London: Hambledon). Mason's objective is both to reconstruct the trajectory of the dynasty's influence and to understand how Godwine's family managed to capture the imagination of later writers, so much so that by the twelfth century it would become the subject of histories, poems, skaldic verse, sagas, and epic narratives. Growing out of a documents-based course on the history of England in the eleventh century, *The House of Godwine* deliberately eschews explicit discussion of modern scholarship in order to retell the rise and fall of the earldom of Wessex based almost entirely on primary sources. This is not to say that Mason is unfamiliar with the work of recent historians—on the contrary, her extensive notes reveal her account to be impeccably researched—rather that she prefers to let the sources speak for themselves. This sort of approach often yields a reductive or an overly simplistic treatment of its subject, but Mason is careful to highlight points of controversy, discuss disagreements among her sources, and clarify where her narrative relies more on speculation than fact. If her narrative is largely familiar, it nonetheless benefits from the clarity and vigor of her style. The book opens with two chapters detailing the background to Godwine's rise to power: the rise of Wessex as a political power under Alfred, the beginnings of the Viking invasions, the uniting of England and the institution of the Danelaw, and the disastrous reign of Æthelred Unræd. Most of this account will be familiar to scholarly readers, and Mason adds little that is new to a history that has been retold many times before. Her subsequent three chapters deal with the life of Godwine himself, focusing especially on his conflict with Edward the Confessor between 1051 and 1053. Her generous assessment of Godwine's character may surprise some readers more familiar with the Earl's more negative, post-Conquest reputation, but her reading of the sources provides enough evidence to make a more sympathetic Godwine plausible, if not entirely convincing. She does succeed in debunking some of the more damning charges laid at Godwine's door, such as the accusation that he dispatched Harold to the nunnery at Berkeley to feign illness and, while there, impregnate as many of the nuns as possible in order to justify the seizure of their land. (This story first appears in the late twelfth century following a similar—and very real—scandal involving the nunnery at Amesbury.) Her final chapters deal with the Conquest and its aftermath. As is to be expected, most of this narrative involves Harold, but she succeeds in incorporating much interesting material involving Edith, Emma, and Harold's all-too-frequently overlooked siblings as well. Her final chapter deals with the "Survivors" of the House of Wessex,



in particular Edith and Emma's failed attempts to rally support for Saxon uprisings against William. Some academics will fault her for not taking a more rigorous, philological approach to her sources, as well as for not engaging more directly with modern scholarship. Yet this would be to mistake her objective. Mason has a talent for narrative which makes this book an engaging, informative read. While this volume may not necessarily add much new to our knowledge of the period, she synthesizes an impressive amount of information in a clear, compelling fashion.

Few historians are inclined to view ninth-century England and Francia as zones within which anything resembling modern "rights" is likely to have been well established. Janet Nelson ("England and the Continent in the Ninth Century: III, Rights and Rituals," *TRHS* 14: 1–24) finds evidence that such belief in the absence of "rights" in early medieval polities distorts much of the available evidence: "[I]f ideas of the natural rights of rational men took philosophical shape only in the fourteenth century, already in the ninth there were ideas of rights, individual as well as collective, pertaining to persons of relatively low status as well as to *potentes*, men of power, and relating particularly to property" (1). The familiar distinction between *bocland* and *folcland* offers a convenient starting point, as norms governing the disposition of the latter would seem to indicate a recognition of "interests and expectations of kin" that might justifiably be termed "rights," though such "Anglo-Saxon rights were less clear-cut, more conditioned by circumstance, with greater propensity to link law and religion, than people brought up on modern legal definitions tend to expect" (3). Nelson goes on to search for plausible synonyms or analogues for "rights" in Frankish Latin: *drictum*, "derived from late Roman Latin *directum*, 'straight' ... seem[s] more often to have the very broad sense of rightfulness than the more particular sense of right" (5). A more likely analogue, based on its usage in Continental sources, is *justitia*, which seems closely tied to notions of "individual or institutional right" (6). The analogy between Frankish "rights" and modern ones, Nelson concedes, should not be pushed too far: whatever liberties were conferred by such language are necessarily unlike those recognized in modern legal discourse: "Ninth-century rights were not eighteenth-century-style rights of man, universal and egalitarian, though gendered men-only. Medieval rights were specific to particular persons and particular ranks ... including some women. They were concrete, firmly linked with personal status, with property and inheritance, and with specific acts of recognition

by the powerful" (11). Often, these "rights" and the legal behavior they engendered (such as Æthelwulf's "decimation grants") were tied to religion and ritual in ways that modern rights are not: "Rituals ... helped constitute rights, and so complemented them" (22). This dependence of early medieval notions of "rights" on ritual underlies Nelson's criticisms of Philippe Buc's *The Dangers of Ritual* (2002), a study disparaging historians' interest in ritual. Defending this preoccupation from what she sees as Buc's logically troubled attacks, Nelson finds rituals to be crucial to an understanding of early medieval politics given their capacity to turn "political experiments into political habits, individual hopes into collective expectations" (24).

Anglo-Saxon laws of sanctuary receive significant mention in Trisha Olson's lengthy article, "Of the Worshipful Warrior: Sanctuary and Punishment in the Middle Ages" (*St. Thomas Law Review* 16: 473–549). Olson argues for a "rethinking of sanctuary's relationship to the sacred" and suggests that "the predominant justification for the granting of refuge rested not in the idea of *holy places*, but in the idea of *penitential action* between intercessor and disputants" (476–77). Her subsidiary claim is that the practice of sanctuary disappeared not so much because the state triumphed over the power of the church, but because "the rise of criminal jurisprudence within the learned circle of Roman and canon lawyers" made it unnecessary (478). Anglo-Saxonists may find this claim suspect, implying a bias all too frequently found in legal historiography: that early medieval law was somehow more primitive or barbaric than the professionalized and classically-influenced legal practices of a later age. Indeed, her most frequently cited sources for Anglo-Saxon law—Pollock and Maitland's 1911 *History of English Law*, Julius Goebel's 1937 *Felony and Misdemeanor*, F. L. Attenborough's 1922 *Laws of the Earliest English Kings*, and A.J. Robertson's 1925 *Laws of the Kings of England from Edmund to Henry I*—should give some sense of the argument's scholarly context. That said, the scope of her argument, which encompasses nearly one thousand years of European sanctuary practice, should make this a useful reference point for the legal historian. If her arguments are not entirely convincing, the impressive amount of information she compiles offers useful material nonetheless.

In "Iona in the kingdom of the Picts: a note" (*Innes Rev.* 55: 73–76), Thomas Owen Clancy draws attention to Walahfrid Strabo's poem on the martyrdom of the cleric Blathmac mac Flainn in a raid on Iona by the

Vikings in 825. Composed ca. 840, this work drew on recently received information from a source familiar with Iona, and in it the island is described as “off the shore of the Picts” (*insula Pictorum quaedam monstratur in oris*). Clancy suggests that this might indeed have been the case if the kings of Dál Riata were under the control of the kings of the Picts. The *regnum Pictorum* during this period seems to have been a geographically ramified entity, within which or under which could be incorporated the old kingdom of Dál Riata and part of all of the old kingdom of Dumbarton.

Sean Davies tackles the subject of *Welsh Military Institutions, 633-1283* (Cardiff: U of Wales P) in hopes of getting beyond the traditional view of poor, free Welsh warriors drawn from the entire community who defended their homeland with ferocity but little professional skill. A thematic approach yields chapters about the *teulu* (the household force), the *llu* (the expanded army), campaign strategies and tactics, equipment and tactical dispositions, fortifications, and conduct in warfare. Overall, Davies finds that Welsh military forces from the seventh to the thirteenth century bore comparison with those throughout western Europe. The evidence is scanty for the pre-Norman period, but some interesting points emerge. The combined Welsh-Mercian forces that fought at Hatfield Chase could have contained 2,500 fighters; in the fifth and sixth centuries in militarized north Wales old army officers would lead surviving elements of the Roman military as their warband, whereas in west and north Wales ancient territorial administration is likely to have provided each leader with his *teulu*; and the rise of overkings in the eleventh century led to a need for military resources beyond household groups, as in the 1055 sack of Herefordshire. The presence of Welsh in Edmund Ironside's forces for his battles with Cnut suggests that there might have been Welsh involvement in Anglo-Saxon battles, and the Anglo-Saxon use of the shield wall suggests that the Welsh used similar infantry tactics in battle. However, from the end of Roman Britain to 1066 there is virtually no evidence of Welsh techniques used in siege warfare; Davies also warns against generalizing from the one example of Cadwallon's ravaging of Northumbrian churches. The stereotype of the Welsh as reluctant to engage in pitched battle is countered by citing Vegetius on the importance of ravaging and keeping a force in the field without engaging the enemy. There are also extended discussions of British-Welsh battles ca. 450-1063, the military use of horses in the pre-Norman period, and fortification strategy ca. 450-1066.

J.R. Maddicott's “Edward the Confessor's Return to England in 1041” (*EHR* 119: 650–66) decides to take seriously the claim of the twelfth-century *Quadripartitus* that Edward agreed at a gathering of all the thanes of England to uphold the laws of Cnut, a remark of considerable historical significance that has, perhaps because of its sometimes untrustworthy source, received little scholarly attention, referred to briefly (“if allusively and dismissively” [651]) by Wormald in his *Making of English Law*, and not at all in the works of Stenton, Barlow, and Stafford (where a discussion would presumably be most expected). In spite of the lateness of the account, and the “convenience” of its argument given claims by Henry I to have restored Edward's laws, Maddicott finds that its probable accuracy is, nevertheless, established by evidence for the “venerat[ion]” of Cnut's laws before the Conquest—a possible corrective to the entrenched habit among historians of seeing such attitudes as characteristic of the post-Conquest era (652–54). There are likewise no obstacles to our assuming the participation of Godwin and Ælfwine: the role of the former in Edward's return is well known if sparsely documented, whereas Ælfwine's “immediate prominence early in Edward's reign” would seem to support the account of the *Quadripartitus* (657–59). It is the site of the putative meeting, however, which offers “the greatest difficulties but also the most intriguing possibilities” (659). The very strangeness of the name suggests the authenticity of the statement, for “[a]ny author wishing to invent or embroider an episode in order to elevate Cnut's laws and to project them forward into the nearer post-Conquest past would surely have chosen a more illustrious and better known setting: London or Winchester or Canterbury would have done” (659). Maddicott concludes that the place-name referred to as *Hursteshevet* in the *Quadripartitus* cannot be, as was first suggested by York Powell in 1893 (and repeated uncritically ever since), “(East) Horstead in Sussex, just north of Lewes on the road to London” (659). The suggestion is “a linguistic non-starter,” since the last element of the name is plainly not *stede* but *heafod*, which in addition to meaning ‘head’ can also mean “‘headland,’ ‘promontory’ or ‘spit’” (660). The likeliest candidate for the meeting-place described by *Quadripartitus* is thus, in Maddicott's view, “a flat headland of sand and shingle ... [k]nown today as ‘the Hurst’ or ‘Hurst Beach’” (660). That the meeting should have taken place here is to be expected given that “[i]n early medieval Europe, peacemaking and treaty negotiation often took place on islands, boats or boundaries. There, on neutral ground, the negotiators could meet freely and on equal terms, without the overtones of

submission implicit in the one visiting the other's territory" (662). Maddicott's essay is a superb example of historical and philological detective work reflecting the renewed seriousness with which scholarship is beginning to approach the compilations of pre-Conquest law prepared in the reign of Henry I.

By *Families of the King* (subtitled *Writing Identity in the "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle"* [Toronto: U of Toronto P]), Alice Sheppard refers not to biological families but to the *Angelcynn*, a term that she argues always refers to the "family" constituted by the members' fealty to their king, regardless of their descent. Sheppard's thesis is that the annalists of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* used the topos of lordship practice as a means of depicting various rulers as successes or failures. By focusing on Alfred's ability to use lordship relations to bind the Danes to him in peace, the "Alfred annalist" narrates the foundation of a kingdom and the creation of a people; Alfred's many military defeats are irrelevant to judging his qualities as a sovereign. The "Æthelred-Cnut annalist" contrasts Æthelred's inability to foster mutual loyalty with Cnut's reconstitution of the *Angelcynn* under his rule. Later, when the *Angelcynn* do not cohere around William's lordship, the "D William annalist" suggests that the English are united only in denying their lordship obligations, and he characterizes William as basing his authority on the control of land and castles, rather than on the bond he should share with his men. Similarly, the "E William annalist" criticizes William's use of a text—the Domesday Book—as a shameful substitute for the personal relationships of proper lordship. Sheppard is thus less concerned with an analysis of actual Anglo-Saxon lordship practice than with its use in Anglo-Saxon historiography, although she helpfully points out where the reality diverges from what is written about it in the annals. On the highest level, her reading of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* seems plausible enough, but the argumentation is often frustratingly underdeveloped. For example, Chapter Four shows that the Æthelred-Cnut annalist uses the paradigm of salvation history to frame Æthelred's loss of his kingdom, but Chapter Five shows that it is poor lordship practice, not sin, that causes that loss. Two incompatible interpretations are also proposed regarding the St. Brice's Day massacre of *ealle þa deniscan men þe on Angelcynne wæron* ("all the Danish men who were among the *Angelcynn*"): Sheppard understands this to mean that these were Danes who were members of the *Angelcynn*, but the contrastive use of *deniscan men* and *Angelcynn* makes it difficult to accept Sheppard's subsequent assertion that the annalist does not distinguish between the Danes

of the Danelaw and the Anglo-Saxons in general (103), an assertion that is required in order to interpret *Angelcynn* as she does. One must also take exception to the assumption that annal notices that do not comment on their events should be interpreted solely on the basis of the text, without the benefit of information from other sources (e.g., 110 and 127). On the contrary, medieval annals were written by and for people who had a reasonable familiarity with the events alluded to; this is what enables the notices to be so terse in the first place. But modern readers do not know what was "common knowledge" in the past, so restricting the interpretation of an unqualified notice to the words on the page is like trying to determine what a shark looks like solely on the basis of the fin visible from shore. Similarly, Sheppard invokes the annalists' strategic silences and policies of obfuscation, but in the specific context of medieval annals, these blanks are more often produced by gaps in the knowledge of the reader, rather than being strategies deliberately employed by the writer.

Ann Williams revisits the medieval accounts of "An Outing on the Dee: King Edgar at Chester, A.D. 973" (*Mediaeval Scandinavia* 14: 229–43) and focuses on a spurious charter in Edgar's name that is first found in a Canterbury Cathedral register of the fourteenth century. Williams suggests that this charter could go back to an early twelfth-century forgery and that its witness-list might have provided John of Worcester and William of Malmesbury with the names of some of the kings who rowed King Edward on the Dee.

In "Caedwalla *Rex Brettonum* and the Passing of the Old North" (*Northern History* 41: 5–24), Alex Woolf argues that nothing in the *Vita Columbae*, the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, or the Irish chronicles supports a location in Gwynedd for Caedwalla (Cadwallon), the seventh-century British ruler who killed King Edwin of Deira and who was in turn killed by King Oswald of Bernicia. The identification of Catguollaun in the *Historia Brittonum* as *rex regionis Guenedotae* is an authorial gloss on material otherwise drawn from Northumbrian sources two centuries after the events; the entries in the *Annales Cambriae*, which may be no earlier than the tenth century, do not identify Catguollaun's origins; the pedigree of the kings of Gwynedd preserved in the tenth-century collection in Harleian MSS 3859 appears to contain too many generations between the mid-sixth and the mid-seventh century; and the poem *Moliant Cadwallon* is demonstrably late and not an independent witness. Woolf instead proposes that Bede's *Caedwalla rex Brettonum*—presumably a northcountryman,

a neighbor to both Deira and Bernicia, appropriately placed to be overking of both, and with a *floruit* in the early to mid-seventh century—was Catgualan map Guitcun, a descendant of Coyl Hen.

#### h. Vikings

*Scandinavia and Europe 800–1350: Contact, Conflict, and Coexistence*, edited by Jonathan Adams and Katherine Holman (Turnhout: Brepols), presents papers from a conference of the same name held at the University of Hull in 1999. As its purpose was to bridge the academic divide separating studies of Scandinavian-European relations of the Viking Age and Scandinavian-European relations of the high Middle Ages, only a few papers touch on Anglo-Saxon England. In “Britons, Saxons, and Vikings in the South-West” (35–41), Derek Gore surveys Viking activity in southwestern Britain. He emphasizes the degree of independence which the Britons there retained in the face of the developing power of the West Saxons to the east, an independence that was undoubtedly aided by the Saxons’ having to deal with Viking incursions. Although Scandinavian leaders may have seen the southwestern peninsula as the Achilles’ heel of Wessex, there is little evidence to suggest Viking settlement there, in contrast to other areas subject to their depredations. In “Anglo-Danish Contact across the North Sea in the Eleventh Century: A Survey of the Danish Archaeological Evidence” (43–67), Anne Pedersen concludes that the variety of objects reflecting contact with England in eleventh-century Denmark suggests traffic and exchange during the period of joint reign, leading to the adoption and in some cases manufacture of similar objects on both sides of the North Sea. Enamel brooches and some kinds of pottery provide evidence of continued contact between England and Denmark after the demise of the North Sea empire in 1042. In “The Scandinavian Languages in the British Isles: The Runic Evidence” (121–136), Michael P. Barnes examines the evidence for both East and West Scandinavian involvement in England and Ireland. Demotic forms of Norse seem to have developed in Man and northwestern England, but as Scandinavian had become extinct in Man by 1200, it seems unlikely to have lasted beyond the second or third generation anywhere the Norse settlers were more thinly spread. In “Scandinavian Settlement in the British Isles and Normandy: What the Place-Names Reveal” (137–147), Gillian Fellows-Jensen surveys the place-names of the eleven zones of Scandinavian settlement in the British Isles and Normandy and warns that although the distribution pattern of place-names of Scandinavian origin

provides us with the best general indication of the areas where Norwegians and Danes chose to settle, many of the names can have been bestowed upon the settlements that now bear them long after the Viking Age, by people who no longer spoke, or even understood, a Scandinavian language.

Despite its title, Clare Downham’s essay, “Eric Bloodaxe—Axed? The Mystery of the Last Scandinavian King of York” (*Mediaeval Scandinavia* 14: 51–77) does not frame Eric’s death in the battle of Stainmore (954) as some sort of Anglo-Saxon whodunit. Rather, she argues that the Northumbrian King Eric killed at Stainmore was not Eric Bloodaxe at all, but a different Eric of Irish descent whom subsequent generations have confused with Eiríkr blóðøx, son of Haraldr hárfagri. Downham makes an excellent case for reevaluating the Irish evidence for Eric Bloodaxe’s life, and if her ultimate conclusion remains somewhat speculative, she nonetheless provides strong reasons for reopening what had been a settled question of identification.

In “Scandinavians and ‘Cultural Paganism’ in Late Anglo-Saxon England” (*The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Cavill, 55–68), Judith Jesch investigates the use of heathen motifs and vocabulary in certain literary and artistic contexts. Such “cultural paganism” characterizes the poetry composed and performed at the court of the pious Christian King Cnut, as well as certain pieces of religious sculpture from London and Winchester. On the basis of two late Anglo-Saxon law codes that reinforce their ban on heathendom with fines and punishments, Jesch also thinks that heathenism was still present in the Danelaw in the eleventh century. This may indicate that there were still non-Christians in the area, or it too may have been a kind of cultural paganism, in this case, traditional Scandinavian practices followed by people who were nominally or even essentially Christian, just as modern Christians still throw coins into fountains.

A kinder, gentler Viking (when compared to the standard view) emerges from the second of Janet Nelson’s presidential addresses to the Royal Historical Society (“England and the Continent in the Ninth Century: II, The Vikings and Others,” *TRHS* 13: 1–28). The essay is a searching exploration of both nineteenth-century and medieval historiography that is particularly concerned with the “oscillat[ion] between repulsion and association” characteristic of English views: while American and even Russian cultures have lately developed a place for claims of Viking ancestry, Nelson notes that “English



identity has been constructed against a Viking Other, as a narrative of shared victimhood and resistance” but “constructed, too, on an assimilationist paradigm, in which the Vikings ... become no longer ‘them’ but ‘us’” (4-5). Nelson notes that many of the sources of present-day claims about the Vikings are more ambiguous than typically assumed. The use of the Old English cognate *wicenga* in the A-text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* “may denote some authorial peculiarity”; more common are references to Scandinavian raiders “collectively as a *here*, an ‘army’. Sometimes they are called ‘Danishmen’, and very occasionally ‘heathen’” (5-6). “[A] more insistent Otherness,” Nelson contends, “has been back-projected” (6). These remarks precede some disapproving observations on Dorothy Whitelock’s translation of the *Chronicle*, which “added classificatory references to ‘Danes’ and ‘English’ where few or none were present in the original’s account ... so that Alfred’s battles became international ones, trials through which England was formed and united”, and the translation of Asser’s *Life of Alfred* by Simon Keynes and Michael Lapidge, in which “Asser’s *pagani* become, consistently, ‘the Vikings,’ despite clear evidence in the same text that the term (with or without any religious significance) had become a synonym for Danes, as when Asser refers to *pagani* in Alfred’s retinue or at one of his monastic foundations” (6). Nelson goes on to suggest reasons to doubt the assertion, nearly ubiquitous in most historicist scholarship on Anglo-Saxon England, that the Vikings are to be held responsible for the near-collapse of what had been England’s vigorous monastic institutions (7). Analogues for what is likelier to have been the situation in England are evident, according to Nelson, in the responses of Frankish (and present-day French) historians to the arrival of *Les Normands*. Here one finds a new emphasis on “continuities between the structures of Carolingian government and the ‘new’ principalities of the tenth century” in place of what had been the customary arguments for the Vikings’ role in eroding monarchical authority: “[T]here is scholarly agreement on the definitiveness in the long run of the Normans’ reconstruction as *Franci*” (8-9). Overall, the picture emerging from Continental historiography of the Middle Ages as well is one of assimilation: “The ninth-century Frankish evidence does not leave the impression of strong or exclusive adherence to Viking paganism, nor of resistance to Christianity,” particularly when abandonment of one’s customs allowed one the privilege of doing business with Frankish kings and lords; even those Vikings “who for decades showed no propensity to convert” could still expect to partner with Christian kings in a fair amount of “wheel[ing] and

deal[ing],” cases of which Nelson amply documents (13-14). Could such conditions have obtained in ninth- and tenth-century England? Nelson suggests that they did, particularly in centers of trade like London (24). Moreover, Alfred can only be said, in Nelson’s view, to have established “what looked like an ethnic identity for his men to inhabit”; the ethnic taxonomy established by his treaty with Guthrum, for example, was exceptionally fluid, based significantly less on notions of “race” than some nineteenth-century historians would have us believe (27). Nelson concludes that “the Vikings” as presently understood are primarily a cultural construct that emerged in the nineteenth century: “In the historic ninth century, there were indeed Northmen who threatened and damaged the people they encountered in England and on the Continent. But there were also Northmen that opted in” (28).

### i. The Norman Conquest and Settlement

Buckinghamshire landowners at the time of the Domesday survey are the subject of several articles. K. A. Bailey estimates “The Population of Buckinghamshire in 1086” (*Records of Buckinghamshire* 42: 1-14) to have been around 23,200, making it one of the more lightly populated counties. On the whole, Bailey finds the population to have been overwhelmingly rural. Villeins formed almost three-fifths of the total, bordars about one-quarter, and slaves one-sixth. The other groups (sokemen, vavasours, knights, cottars, and boors) were probably little different from the major classes. Bailey points out that slaves were an important but declining element in the local population in 1086, for although many estates had none or very few, they remained critical in sustaining desmesne farming in many places. The manumission of slaves was a form of upward mobility that only partly counterbalanced the depressed status of many Anglo-Saxon freemen after 1066. However, in “The Population of Buckinghamshire in 1086: Some Reflections on the Domesday Book Evidence” (*Records of Buckinghamshire* 43: 209-15), D. Thorpe argues that the population was likely to have been at least 30,000 and possibly even higher. The different conclusions result from Bailey’s assumption that the Domesday Book covers 95% of the population, whereas other scholars think that up to as much as one-third of the population was landless and so not included in the survey. Another questionable assumption is that the slaves listed were unmarried and childless, whereas Thorpe thinks it more likely that they had families and that their number should be multiplied by three to estimate the total number of slaves. Bailey

responds with "The Population of Buckinghamshire in 1086: A Reply" (*Records of Buckinghamshire* 43: 215–16), noting that much of his article was written in the mid-1990s, before the publication of several works on which Thorpe relies. He questions Thorpe's multipliers as well as his assumption that millers, woodsmen, shepherds, and others were probably not counted, for they could well have been counted if they owned any land at all. In the same volume of *Records of Buckinghamshire* (43: 61–76), Bailey discusses the scanty evidence for the history of "The Church in Anglo-Saxon Buckinghamshire c. 650-c. 1100." The relevant charters, architecture, archeological finds, and saints' lives indicate that Buckinghamshire came late to the conversion process, partly due to Penda's paganism and partly due to its remoteness from the centers of missionary activity. Once conversion began, the primary minsters seem to have been provided on the basis of one for each of the later triple Hundreds. The individual Hundreds may each have had a secondary minster church founded between the ninth and eleventh centuries. After ca. 1000, there was a trend away from district churches. Instead, groups of priests and monks who owned extensive tracts of country began to establish churches that they could control and from which they could profit. Finally, Bailey looks into "Who Was Who and Who Became Whom: Buckinghamshire Landowners 1066 and 1086" (*Records of Buckinghamshire* 44: 51–66). The Domesday Book shows how dramatically the nature of landownership in Buckinghamshire had changed during this period. Aside from various churchmen, the Saxon landowners were completely dispossessed, having been replaced by several kinds of absentee Norman and Flemish tenants-in-chief. Scarcely one acre in a hundred remained in English hands.

Richard Barber's "The Norman Conquest and the Media" (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 26: 1–20) was reviewed in *YWOES* 2003.

Andrew Bridgeford's "Whose Tapestry is it Anyway?" (*History Today* 54.4: 5–7) promotes his book *1066: The Hidden History of the Bayeux Tapestry* (New York: Walker, 2005). Building on earlier scholarship, he argues that the Tapestry is designed to have two layers of meaning: a surface pleasing to Normans and a coded message supporting Boulogne. As the Tapestry gives greater prominence to Count Eustace of Boulogne than to Duke William of Normandy, Bridgeford thinks it possible that the Tapestry was commissioned by Eustace from a Canterbury workshop as part of his reconciliation with the Normans in the 1070s. It was

perhaps a peace offering to Bishop Odo, connected with an attempt to gain the release of a kinsman who had been captured by Odo's men at Dover. In addition, the image of a so-called "Norman knight" seen despatching King Harold with a blow of his sword may be a coded picture of Eustace.

Meredith Clermont-Ferrand sees a different agenda behind the *Anglo-Saxon Propaganda in the Bayeux Tapestry* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen). As the Tapestry gives greater prominence to Bishop Odo than to Duke William, she argues that it was commissioned from St. Augustine's by the ambitious Odo and that it accompanied him around England as part of a secular propaganda campaign to explain the Conquest while glorifying his role in it. Unbeknownst to Odo, the Anglo-Saxon monk who designed the Tapestry and oversaw its construction decided to subvert the Norman story through pictorial clues and careful captioning. In Clermont-Ferrand's view, the Tapestry Master depicts Harold Godwinson as a tragic hero like Byrhtnoth in *The Battle of Maldon* and especially like Beowulf. In addition to marginal illustrations of a bear and a man stabbing a sea-serpent underwater, the Beowulfian parallels include Harold and Beow both being washed ashore in a strange land; Harold and Beowulf both being challenged upon landing; both being made to relinquish their arms before being led to the local ruler; both pledging to aid that ruler; and the end of Beowulf's rule being signalled by a fire-breathing dragon, Harold's by a fiery comet. The Tapestry Master also counters the Norman characterization of Harold as a blasphemous oath-breaker by showing him devoutly entering a church and by posing him like Christ harrowing Hell for the rescue of the two Norman soldiers.

Marjorie Chibnall provides a clear and concise political history of "England and Normandy, 1042–1137" (*The New Cambridge Medieval History; Volume IV: c. 1024–c. 1198. Part II*, ed. David Luscombe and Jonathan Riley-Smith [Cambridge: Cambridge UP], 191–216). Taking the coronation of Edward the Confessor as the start of the century of the Norman Conquest, she swiftly moves from the Danegeld to royal finances and administration and thence to the instability of England at Edward's death, William's rule in Normandy, the invasion itself, changes in England after the Conquest, the succession, Norman expansion under William Rufus, Henry's possession of England and Normandy and his consolidation of power, and the dispute between Matilda and Stephen over the succession. Stephen's failure

to establish any lasting order in Normandy during his one visit in 1137 marks the end of the Anglo-Norman realm. This is primarily a history of events, so analysis is limited to topics such as landholding and resources, the process of detaching financial and judicial institutions from an undifferentiated household-court, and the problems of ruling Normandy from England. The students and non-specialists who are the chief audience for a survey such as this will find only a few technical terms (e.g., non-comital lords, money fiefs) as stumbling blocks; specialists will note with approval Chibnall's even-handed balance between change and continuity, as well as her non-judgmental treatment of events that often raise partisan sympathies.

The two recent digital editions of *Domesday Book* published by Aleco and Phillimore receive a critical treatment in Robin Fleming and Andrew Lowerre's review article, "MacDomesday Book" (*Past and Present* 184: 209–32). Judging the editions on the basis of their indices, search capacities, maps and images, ease of use, and (of course) texts, Fleming and Lowerre find serious flaws with each. While many of the difficulties they highlight may be inevitable, given *Domesday's* notorious complexity and compendiousness, many more could have been avoided with a little care on the part of the editors. Ultimately, they conclude, "Aleco's *Digital Domesday Book* remains, essentially, little more than a machine readable text. Phillimore's *Domesday Explorer*, on the other hand, is extremely useful. In spite of graphics that seem twenty years out of date, its sometimes frustrating interface and its inability to handle statistics or be used in conjunction with other databases, it is, nonetheless, a tremendous boon to both scholars and their students" (232). Hardly a ringing endorsement, but one that will be useful to those considering which edition to purchase for their library or personal collection.

In two brief articles, Bruce Heydt explains for a general audience some aspects of the Norman Conquest. "To Hastings" (*British Heritage* 25.3: 26–31) reviews the obstacles that William had to overcome to get his army from Normandy to England: he had to obtain an enormous number of ships, pay the army while they waited for favorable weather, contend against contrary winds, cope with shipwrecks during the first leg of the crossing, and regroup off the English coast after becoming separated from the rest of his fleet during the all-night voyage. "Cavalry versus the Shield Wall" (*British Heritage* 25.3: 32–37) reviews the Battle of Stamford Bridge and the Battle of Hastings. Heydt draws attention to the

medieval military necessity for avoiding pitched battle in favor of starving out one's enemy by ambushing his foraging parties. Because Harold was likely to prevail in such a scenario, William chose to risk a battle, and because his cavalry-heavy army was more mobile than Harold's, Harold had to accede. In the event, the Normans were repeatedly unable to penetrate the English shield wall, and Heydt speculates that if Harold's men had been able to maintain strict discipline, they might have prevailed.

J.O. Prestwich's *The Place of War in English History 1066–1214* (Woodbridge: Boydell) presents his Ford lectures at Oxford from 1983. Although the focus is on the Anglo-Normans and Angevins, he treats the period of the Conquest here and there. For example, he hypothesizes that after the Battle of Hastings, Gytha withdrew to the southwest, where the house of Godwin had held very extensive estates, in hopes of holding out until Harold's sons could bring reinforcements from Ireland and her nephew, King Sveinn of Denmark, could launch an expedition against William. The Conqueror's winter campaign and siege of Exeter in 1068 would then be a successful pre-emptive strike that helps to explain the failure of the sea-borne expeditions of Harold's sons in 1068 and 1069 (27–33). Elsewhere (50–54) he amplifies Maitland's original case for the *Domesday Book* as a land tax book. The first levy of the land tax after the making of *Domesday* of which any detailed descriptions survive is the levy of 4s on the hide in 1096, which was imposed on the tenants-in-chief—precisely the plan of the *Domesday Book*. And far from being a product of feudal thinking, the *Domesday* survey of 1086 was part of the response of the Conqueror's administration to the military crisis of 1085–86. In discussing the relationship between war and the English economy (62–67), Prestwich emphasizes that the use of paid troops (noblemen as well as the rank and file) was the norm for William, and that it was taxation that sustained this practice. He further says that the *Domesday Book* is an inadequate guide to the English economy of 1086 and almost useless as an indicator of the coming forces of economic change, for not only does it give little evidence of the lords' habit of breaking their contracts to take advantage of rising land values, but the times it represents were to be superseded just two years later by the long prosperity of Rufus's reign.

In "1088—William II and the Rebels" (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 26: 139–57), Richard Sharpe proposes several new views of the rebellion in 1088 against William II. He first deals with the problematic date of March 12 given

in the *Libellus de iniusta uexatione Willelmi episcopi* for the king's ordering the disseisin of Bishop William of Durham. If March is emended to May, then this order falls into place and comes after the start of the rebellion on April 16, as would be expected. Next, the lists of witnesses to various diplomas appear to bear out the story that King William treated the rebels with clemency and received them back into his service. Moreover, the process began before hostilities had even really ended, as the witness-lists show that before the siege of Rochester was over, several of those who had broken their faith to the king had gone to join him, presumably to make their peace and renew their oath of fealty. William of Malmesbury's view of the king's treatment of the rebels thus seems to be accurate.

Naomi Sykes gives an overview of the "Zooarchaeology of the Norman Conquest" (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 27: 185–97), in which she follows the use of different animals and their products across social boundaries for the period between the fifth and the fourteenth centuries. She finds that 1066 did not result in the wholesale imposition of a pre-packaged Norman system on a post-conquest England, but many changes did result. Pork and heron were consumed more regularly than before, new species of animals (e.g., peacock and fallow deer) were brought to the country, and the increased exploitation of wild animals seems to reflect the increased social division of late-eleventh and twelfth-century England.

Frank W. Thackeray and John E. Findling's chapter on "The Norman Conquest, 1066" (*Events that Changed Great Britain from 1066 to 1714* [Westport, CT: Greenwood], 1–18) presents a brief history of England from 2500 B.C. to 1066 for a general audience. (Specialists will know that the Viking invasions were often Danish rather than "Dutch" [3] and that William the Conqueror's half-brother was named Odo and not the Simpsonsque "Do" [6].) Frederick Suppe's interpretative essay also summarizes the events leading up to the Battle of Hasting and then considers the implications of the Conquest for English-French relations, the English legal system, the Magna Carta, Parliament, the United Kingdom, and the history of the English language.

SAJ, AR, EAR

[SAJ] reviewed Anderson, Bullough, Cavill, K. Hare, M. Hare, Hayward "Gregory," Jaspert, Madicott, Nelson, Thompson, de Vogüé, Wooding, Yorke "Gregory"; AR reviewed Aston, Bailey "Aston," Barrow, Bates, Bax-

ter, Burghart, Charles-Edwards, Coss, Crick, Crook, Cubitt, Demidowicz, Downham, Edwards, Evans, Faith, Fleming and Lowerre, Grant, Hargan, Hayward "Reflections," Hesse, J. Hill, Howe, John, Lees and Overing, Mason, Matthews, Norton, Olson, Owen-Crocker, Rivard, Scargill, Townend, Wormald, Yorke "Legitimacy"; EAR reviewed Adams and Holman, Bailey "Population," "Reply," "Who," "Church," Baker and Holt, Barnes, Blair, Breeze, Bridgeford, Briggs, Broun, Burton, Cessford, Chibnall, Clancy, Clermont-Ferrand, Dark, S. Davies, W. Davies, Fellows-Jensen, Fox, Gerchow, Goddard, Gore, Gransden, Gullick, Harrison, Heydt, Hurst, Jesch, Licence, McNish, Palmer, Pearce, Pedersen, Pestell, Pitt, Prestwich, Rollason, Sharpe, Sheppard, Sivier, Stancliffe, Sykes, Thackeray and Findling, Thorpe, Turner, Williams, Woolf.]

*Works not seen*

- Данилов, Д. В. [Danilov, D. V.] "Gens Anglorum Беды Достопочтенного: в поисках английской идентичности" ["Gens Anglorum Bedy Dostopochtennogo: v poiskakh anglijskoj identichnosti" = The *gens Anglorum* of the Venerable Bede: Searching for an English Identity"]. *Образы прошлого и коллективная идентичность в Европе до начала нового времени* [Obrazy proshlogo i kolektivnaya identiochnost' v Evrope do nachala novogo vremeni = *Images of the Past and Collective Identities in Europe before the Modern Age*]. Ed. Л. П. Репина [L. P. Repina]. Moscow: Krug, 2003. pp. 95–101.
- Lehtola, Lori. "King Æthelstan: Rightwys Kynge Borne of All England." Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Houston, 2004. *DAI* 65A (2004), 648.
- McKinley, A. S. "Church-Patron Relationships amongst the Anglo-Saxons and Franks, c. 650-860." Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Birmingham, 2002. *Index to Theses* 53 (2004), 7247.
- Norris, Janice Racine. "Anglo-Saxon Religious Women Who Went to the Continent: Group Study." Ph.D. Diss., State Univ. of New York at Binghamton, 2003. *DAI* 65A (2004), 1916.
- Probert, D. W. "Church and Landscape: A Study in Social Transition in South-Western Britain, A.D. c. 400 to c. 1200." Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Birmingham, 2002. *Index to Theses* 53 (2004), 7656.
- Takahashi, Mariko. "The Immaculate Conception: Devotion and Doctrine in High and Late Medieval Europe." Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Southern California, 2003. *DAI* 65A (2004), 1925.
- Töpf, A. L. "Mitochondrial DNA Diversity and Origin of Human Communities from 4th–11th Century



Britain." Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Durham, 2003. *Index to Theses* 53 (2004), 5977.

Walunas, Elizabeth Walen. "Me tangere: Perceptions and Portrayals of Healing Relics in Medieval Northwest Europe." M.A. Thesis, Univ. of Houston, 2004. *MAI* 42 (2004), 1530.

*Deferred until next year*

Brooks, Nicholas. *Church, State and Access to Resources in Early Anglo-Saxon England*. Brixworth Lectures, 2nd ser. 2. Brixworth: Friends of All Saints' Church, 2003.

Hill, Paul. *The Age of Athelstan: Britain's Forgotten History*. Stroud: Tempus, 2004.

## 8. Names

Three books in the year's bibliography chart the ongoing work of the English Place-Name Society. In *The Place-Names of Leicestershire, Part Three: East Goscote Hundred* (Nottingham: EPNS), B. Cox follows the format of his two previous volumes as he focuses on the part of Goscote Wapentake that was separated from West Goscote Hundred by the river *Soar* by the year 1571 and perhaps as early as 1346. The place-names show the expected influence of both Old English and Old Norse but very little Norman influence. The information is organized alphabetically by parish, and the elements (other than personal names) in place-names, field-names, and stream-names are summarized near the end of the volume in a seventy-five-page section. In *The Place-Names of Shropshire; Part IV: Shrewsbury Town and Suburbs and the Liberties of Shrewsbury* (Nottingham: EPNS), M. Gelling, in collaboration with W. Champion and the late H.D.G. Foxall, speculates that the first element of *Shrewsbury* comes from OE \**scrob(b)* 'scrubland'. The volume is divided into two sections: "Shrewsbury Town and Suburbs" and "The Liberties of Shrewsbury." The first section is broken down into the three ancient Wards of *Castle*, *Stone*, and *Welsh* and the suburbs of *Castle Foregate*, *Coleham*, *Coton*, *Frankwell*, and *Kingsland* and the suburb of *Abbey Foregate*, which is discussed under the parish of *Holy Cross and St. Giles*. The names in each division are discussed alphabetically under street-names, field-names, and shuts and passages. The names in the second section are arranged alphabetically by township or parish with both place-names and field-names in each of these units discussed. Four maps provided by A. Cole are included in a pocket at the back of the book. *The Cambridge Dictionary of English Place-Names: Based on the Collections of the English Place-Names Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge

Padberg, Lutz von. *Bonifatius: Missionar und Reformier*. Beck'sche Reihe 2319. Munich: Beck, 2003.

Parsons, David. *Lost Chuntries and Chapels of Medieval Northamptonshire*. Brixworth Lectures, 2nd ser. 3. Brixworth: Friends of All Saints' Church, 2003.

Sermon, Richard, and Bruce Watson. "A History of Mitton Chapel and Its Environs." *Glevensis* 37 (2004): 29–37.

Stasch, Gregor K. *Bonifatius: vom angelsächsischen Missionar zum Apostel der Deutschen. Zum 1250. Todestag des heiligen Bonifatius. Katalog zur Ausstellung, 3. April bis 4. Juli 2004, Vonderau Museum in Zusammenarbeit mit dem Stadtarchiv und dem Dommuseum Fulda*. Vonderau Museum Fulda, Katalog 10. Petersberg: Imhof, 2004.

UP), ed. V. Watts, will obviously serve as the standard reference work for some time because of its scope and source materials.

*The Durham 'Liber Vitae' and Its Context* (ed. D. Rollason *et al.*), contains six essays relevant to this section. In "Nothing But Names: The Original Core of the Durham *Liber Vitae*," 63–85, E. Briggs suggests that the original core of names in the Durham *Liber Vitae* was written at Lindisfarne in the 830s from earlier lists from the 680s and 690s. These original core differs from other compilations of names by not listing the names of bishops (which may imply lost pages), by listing anchorites early in the contents (signifying their high status), and by making no references to the distinction between the living and the dead. More importantly, the names in the original core of the *Liber Vitae* are arranged by classes, and they show the nationality of the people associated with St. Cuthbert's community. Most names are Northumbrian, with more people from Bernicia than from Deira, but other sources of names in descending order of frequency are Mercia, the Continent, Wessex, Kent, Ireland, Essex, Pictland, Sussex, East Anglia, and Lindsey. In "The Scandinavian Personal Names in the Later Part of the Durham *Liber Vitae*" (87–96), J. Insley examines eighty-two names on fol. 46v of the Durham *Liber Vitae* and divides them into Old English, Scandinavian, and Continental. The Old English names are primarily compounded names like *Aldwif* from Northumbrian OE *ald-wif* and *Wulfgeove* from OE *wulf-gifu*. The Scandinavian names show varying degrees of Anglicization like *Asegrim* from ON *ásgrímr* and *Turstan* from ON *þorsteinn*. The Continental Germanic names are probably from northern Gaul and may reflect Romance influence like *Ascelin* from OFr *a(s)celin* (cf. OHG *ezzelin*).

Inasley says the Scandinavian names are typical of the Viking and early medieval North Germanic anthroponymy and compares them with the Scandinavian names found in the earliest part of the *Liber Vitae* of Thorney. In "Anglo-Norman Names Recorded in the Durham *Liber Vitae*" (97–107) J. Moore notes that the list of names in the Durham *Liber Vitae* do not necessarily record the names of visitors to the Durham Cathedral Priory as much as the names of benefactors and that the lists contain commemorative entries made by other persons who visited Durham at later dates. Because the entries are often not chronological, since names were later added to empty spots in earlier columns, the dating is tentative; however, Moore identifies the Anglo-Norman section of the Durham *Liber Vitae* as covering roughly 1050 to 1250. He says that this section shows the immigration of a military aristocracy and their administrative officials from France and Flanders with a gradual adoption of Norman naming-practices by the native population at all levels; however, the majority of names recorded there are of the ruling classes (landed gentry, government officials, and ecclesiastical equivalents) rather than the common people. In "Scots in the Durham *Liber Vitae*" (109–116) G. Barrow examines and identifies the names of several Scottish clergy, the names of small aristocratic Scottish families, the names of Scottish merchants, and even the names of royalty such as Edward IV "Rex Anglie et Francie illustrissimus," his wife Elizabeth Woodville, and their eldest son Edward, all found in the Durham *Liber Vitae*. In "The Names of the Durham Monks" (117–25) A. Piper discusses the names of the Benedictine monks who served the Durham Cathedral Priory from its founding in 1083 to its dissolution in 1539, as recorded in the Durham *Liber Vitae*. In general, the names were recorded chronologically with the exception of the period from 1315 to 1365. Around 1215, surnames began to appear as well as forenames, and by the 1250s, surnames were regularly included. In the fifteenth century, the names of monks like *Geoffrey Forest* were entered with the names of other people who appear to have been his family members. Piper has several suggestions as to why the names of monks were entered so slowly, particularly toward the later years, but admits that they can only be speculation. In "The Late Medieval Non-Monastic Entries in the Durham *Liber Vitae*" (127–37), L. Rollason says there was a lack of method for entering names of persons other than monks to the Durham *Liber Vitae* during the period from 1300–1539, with the frequency varying from period to period. Although most names that were entered were for people alive at that period, some entries commemorate people who had died. The

names recorded were primarily of local people who were not necessarily the benefactors of the monastery. Rollason focuses on fols. 72v–73r and suggests that the names entered on those two pages were the names of the people in attendance at the rededication of the high altar on November 8, 1380, but that was atypical of the general contents of the book.

A. Breeze has several articles in this year's bibliography dealing with individual place-names. In "Welsh *pybyr* 'Staunch' and Poorton, Dorset" (*Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries* 359: 302–04), he derives the first element of *Poorton*, Dorset, adjoining the Mangerton River, from a Primitive Cornish *pober*, cognate with Welsh *pybyr* 'strong, stout, staunch, valiant'. However, since the Mangerton River "is little more than a stream," Breeze thinks a better translation of the root in this context would be 'flourishing, thriving'. In "Bradon in Somerset and Braydon in Wiltshire" (*Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries* 359: 313–14), he suggests that the first element in *Bradon* is Celtic, related to Welsh *brad* 'treachery', so the Somerset Bradons (*South Bradon, North Bradon, Goose Bradon*) probably refer to places susceptible to floods, therefore treacherous. Breeze thinks that the treacherous part of *Braydon* in Wiltshire, however, is that it was associated with thieves or other criminals. In "*Portus Adurni* and Porchester, Hampshire" (*Studia Celtica* 38: 180–83), he emends the sixteenth century *Notitia Dignitatum* reference to *Portus Adurni* to be read as *Portus Adiuni* where *Adiuni* is a British female name meaning 'she who is much desired or sought after', which is used as a hydronym referring to Wallington River if *Portus Adiuni* refers, as Breeze suspects, to Porchester, Hampshire. In "Manchester's Ancient Name" (*Ant J* 84: 353–57), he argues that *Mamucium*, the Roman name for *Manchester*, as well as *Mansfield* in Nottinghamshire and *Mamhead* in Dover, have as their first element *mam* as a hydronym meaning 'mother' which reflects the fact that Celtic rivers are often named after goddesses or other females and that fact that many Roman forts are named after rivers. Breeze identifies the river in question as the source for the first element in *Manchester* as the Medlock. In "*The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* for 614 and Brean Down, Somerset" (*Ne&Q* 51: 234–35), he suggests that the scribe who wrote in the Parker Chronicle *on Bean dune* identifying the site of a West Saxon victory over the Welsh (actually Cornish-speaking, not Welsh-speaking) in 614 mangled the name which should have been \**brean dune* where the *-an* in *Brean* is either a diminutive or a plural and *bre* is related to Welsh or Cornish *bre* 'hill'. Breeze then identifies the site of the battle as *Brean Down* in

Somerset, which is a ridge jutting out into Bristol Channel and is a natural stronghold guarding an important river-crossing. In “The River Garw of Glamorgan and Gara Bridge, Devon” (*JEPNS* 36: 23–24), he argues that the river *Gara* and *Gara Bridge* in Devon as well as the *Afon Garw* ‘rough river’ of Glamorgan have as their etymon the Brittonic form resulting in Cornish *garow* ‘rough’ and Welsh *garw* ‘rough, turbulent’ and *gāra* ‘triangular strip of land’ or OE *gear* ‘yair, fishdam’. In “Rivers Glenderamackin and Glenderaterra, Cumbria” (*Northern History* 41: 385–89), he argues convincingly that *Glenderamackin* means “glen of the water called ‘pig’” and that *Glenderaterra* means “glen of the water called ‘bulls’” reflecting “pagan British veneration of rivers, swine, and bulls.” In “The Ancient Britons and Cronton, Lancashire” (*Northern History* 41: 181–82), he suggests that the village of *Cronton* which used to be in Lancashire but now is in Merseyside is a Celtic-English hybrid meaning “pig-sty farm” combining a Celtic element equivalent to Middle Welsh *crowyn* “shed for animals, sty, coop, kennel” and OE *tūn*. Breeze interprets the name as showing British survival north of the Mersey after the English occupation in the seventh century, continuous habitation, and a humble kind of settlement there. In “Breton *melchi*, ‘Prince-Hound,’ and Melkaham” (*Wiltshire Archaeological & Natural History Magazine* 96: 227–28), he rejects OE *meoluc* ‘milk’ as an etymon in *Melksham* in western Wiltshire and proposes that the first element in the name comes from a Middle Breton personal name *Melchi* from British \**maglocu* ‘prince-hound’, so the Domesday *Melchesham* would mean “the settlement or enclosure of Melchi.” Breeze suggests that Melksham may have been a recent settlement in 1086 and the name does not provide evidence of Celtic survival in England but of re-introduction. In “The Name of Cound near Wroxeter” (*Shropshire History and Archaeology* 76: 76–77), he derives the name of the village *Cound* on *Cound Brook* which flows through the village on its way to the Severn, as well as the river-names *Kennet* in Cambridgeshire and Suffolk and in Wiltshire and Berkshire and *Kent* in Cumbria, from British \**cunetio* where *cun-* means ‘dog, hound’. Thus *Cound* means “Hound (-River or -Stream).”

In “Melksham (Wiltshire)” (*N&Q* 51: 231–33), C. Hough reaches a different conclusion than Andrew Breeze; she suggests that *Melksham* in Wiltshire derives from either an Old English personal name or a byname like *Melc* or a river-name with OE *meoloc* ‘milk’ referring to the milky color of the water rather than OE *meoloc* literally as the first element and either OE *hām* ‘homestead, village’ or OE *hamm* ‘river-meadow, land

hemmed in by water or higher ground’. In “The Place-Name Marlow (Buckinghamshire)” (*N&Q* 51: 2–3), G. Kristensson derives *Marlow* in *Great Marlow* and *Little Marlow* in southern Buckinghamshire close to the Thames, which serves as the boundary between Berkshire and Buckinghamshire there from OE (*ge*)*mære* ‘boundary’ and OE *hlāw* ‘mound’, so the name supposedly means ‘boundary mound’. However, in “Marlow (Buckinghamshire)” (*N&Q* 51: 345–47), C. Hough presents strong arguments rejecting Kristensson’s derivation in favor of the more traditional derivation from OE *mere* ‘lake’ and OE *lāf* ‘remains, what is left’ as put forth by Mawer and Stenton in *The Place-Names of Buckinghamshire*. Hough cites her own essay “OE *lāf* in Place-Names” as well as *Smith’s English Place-Name Elements* to contradict Kristensson’s statement that OE *lāf* “is not found in any other place-names.” In “Tracing Emon: *Insula Sancti Columbae de Emonia*” (*Innes Rev.* 55: 1–9), G. Márkus explains that *Emonia*, the other name for the island monastery of *Inchcolm* from *Inis Choluim* “Colum’s island” and frequently called *Insula Sancti Columbae* “island of St. Columba” comes from *emon*, the Old Gaelic word for ‘twin’. Márkus suggests that the name may refer to the fact that *Inchcolm* consists of two peaks joined by a narrow isthmus that was probably submerged at high tide during medieval times, turning the two peaks into separate islands or twins, with the monastery on it being called *Emonia Insula*. C. Hough, in “Pinch Park and Pinch Croft” (*N&Q* 51: 228–31), rejects the traditional explanation of *Pinch* in *Pinch Croft*, a field-name in Nottinghamshire, and in *Pinch Park*, a field-name in Northumberland, as a derogatory name referring to poor land. She, instead, proposes a derivation from OE \**pinc(a)*, ME \**pinch* ‘finch, chaffinch’ in both *Pinch Croft* and *Pinch Park*, although she says in the second case that *Pinch* might be metaphorical, referring to the small size of the field rather than a literal reference to the bird.

Two essays in the year’s bibliography identify the places mentioned in medieval writings. P. Cavill, S. Harding, and J. Jesch, in “Revisiting *Dingesmere*” (*JEPNS* 36 [2003–04]: 25–38), suggest that the *Dingesmere*, mentioned in *The Battle of Brunanburh*, refers to the ‘wetland by the thing’ or ON *þings-marr* ‘marshland by the thing’. In “The Place-Name *Wrdelau*” (*Durham Archaeological Jnl* 16: 33–34), V. Watts identifies the *wrdeiau* cited by Symeon of Durham as the place where the vehicle carrying the shrine of St. Cuthbert stopped and could not be moved, leading to the foundation of Durham Abbey as *Warknowle*, a field-name on the Pitlington Hallgarth estate. Watts suggests

that the probably origin is from OE *weard* (Northumbrian *ward*) 'watchman' and OE *cnoll* 'knoll, summit', and the meaning is 'look-out hill' since the site "rises to over 275 feet beside a road running north from Sherburn to Pittington."

Several articles this year focus on individual place-name elements. In "The Use of ON *nata* in Place-Names" (*JEPNS* 36 [2003-04]: 51-53), A. Cole follows up on her article from last year on the use of OE *netel* in place-names by identifying four place-names with ON *nata* 'stinging nettle' in and around the Lake District where Norwegian influence was strong. She identifies two *Natebys* as well as *Nattrass* and *Natland*, all of which occur where there has been a build-up of phosphate in the soil from bones, manure, and household waste from a settlement or the presence of animals. In "Another \*(ge)strēones halh" (*JEPNS* 36: 61-62), C. Hough acknowledges D. Whaley for pointing out that a fifth \*(ge)strēones halh should be added to the corpus: *Strenshal*, a bend in the river Esk in Cumberland, and acknowledges Mrs. D. Postlethwaite, a local resident, who reports that *Strenshal* "has always been used as a good fishing place," thus supporting Hough's earlier interpretation of the compound as a "good fishing place." In "Chilton and Other Place-Names from Old English *cild*" (*JEPNS* 36: 63-82), C. Hough proposes that OE *cild* meant "young living creature" which developed specialized meanings "young human" which is represented in the literary corpus and "young animal" when it appears in place-names. The latter meaning is attested in the *OED* as early as 1590 and in the *MED* as early as the late fourteenth century; Hough concludes that the same meaning occurred in Old English to explain the large number of *Chiltons* throughout England as well as other place-names with *child* and other place-name elements. Her suggestion is that *Chilton* would derive from OE \**cilda-tūn* and mean "breeding farm." D. Parsons, in "A Note on Herrings in Place-Names" (*JEPNS* 36: 83-85), suggests that *Herringby* is East Flegg Hundred might be a hybrid formation from \**hæringa-bý* with the first element from OE *hæring*, following J. Campbell's suggestion that the former island of Flegg on the Norfolk coast was likely to have been a pre-Conquest center of the herring industry. However, Parsons says that *Herringfleet* in northeast Suffolk is the result of folk etymology and does not derive from OE *hæring*. In "A Further Note on Domesday Herrings" (*JEPNS* 36: 85-86), P. Cullen adds that the field-name *Herynglond* mentioned in a thirteenth-century survey of lands in Eastry Hundred (Kent) provides further evidence for OE *hæring* in Old English

place-names. J. Baker in "The Distribution of *tūn* Place-Names in Hertfordshire, Essex and Neighboring Areas" (*JEPNS* 36: 5-22), studies the occurrence of such names in Hertfordshire, Essex, Middlesex, most of Buckinghamshire, and the southern parts of Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire. Baker concludes that the *-tūn* place-names where the first element is a personal name or suggests ownership were not formed at a different date from other *-tūn* names and that *-tūn* names were not part of a large-scale replacement of earlier types of Old English place-names. In "What Is a *hersumdich*? A Note upon the Hersum Ditch, Birmingham and Coventry" (*Birmingham and Warwickshire Archaeological Soc. Trans.* 107: 150), M. Gelling derives the term *hersumdich*, referring to "linear earthworks bounding the property of manorial lords" in Warwickshire, from OE (ge)hirsunness 'obedience' combined in Middle English with *dich*, with the loss of the *-ness* morpheme because of the length of the compound.

In "Buckinghamshire Field-Names 2: The Dead" (*Records of Buckinghamshire* 44: 137-39), K. Bailey argues that the field-names in Buckinghamshire containing the element OE *dēad* like *Dedmanville*, OE *hlæw* 'hill, burial mound' like *Anlow*, and the later element *burying* which usually derived by folk etymology from OE *burh* 'fortified place' or OE *beorg* 'hill' like *Burying Field* often suggest burials associated with them, some of which have yet to be identified. His lists of field-names with these elements are organized alphabetically, but the dates often are added to record the first extant print-references to the field-name. Those place-names with *burying* are all very late references. In "Uses of Scottish Place-Names as Evidence in Historical Dictionaries" (*New Perspectives on English Historical Linguistics III*, edited by C. Kay et al., [see section 3], 213-24), M. Scott examines Germanic place-name elements in southern Scotland, focusing on elements that are recorded in place-names predating extant literature or are unattested in literature, such as the Ayrshire name *Privick*, which survives in the place-name *Privick Mill* recorded from the late twelfth century and containing the rarely attested OE *peru* 'pear tree' and OE *wīc* '(dependent) farm', or the *Hedderwick* place-names in East Lothian and Angus, which contain an unattested OE \**hæddre* 'heather'. She also shows how place-name evidence is being used in the Third Edition of the *OED* for various lexical items.

Two essays in this year's bibliography focus on Scandinavian settlement in England. In "Place-Names and the History of Scandinavian Settlement in England"



(*Land, Sea and Home*, ed. J. Hines *et al.* [see section 9], 379–431), L. Abrams and D. Parsons begin with a review of seventy-five years' worth of hypotheses concerning the significance of the patterns and frequency of Old Norse elements in place-names in England. They focus on place-names in *-bý* to show their value as a tool for historians of Scandinavian settlements in England and conclude that *bý*-names were generally coined by speakers of Old Norse, that there were large communities of Old Norse speakers in the Danelaw who were significant land-holders in parts of England, although many of their land-holdings were relatively marginal or low in status, and that the majority of the *bý*-names were coined before the eleventh century. In "Scandinavian Settlement in the British Isles and Normandy: What the Place-Names Reveal" (*Scandinavia and Europe 800-1300*, ed. J. Adams and K. Holman [see section 7], 137–59), G. Fellows-Jensen builds on B. Crawford's four zones of Scandinavian influence in Scotland to identify eleven zones of Scandinavian settlement in the British Isles and Normandy. In zone 1 (Shetland, Orkney and northern Caithness), which was settled by Norwegians from the west coast of Norway, place-names with Old Norse elements are common such as *Birsay* from ON *\*byrgis-ey* 'island with a fortified building'. In zone 2 (Sutherland, Easter Ross, the Hebrides, and the northern and western seaboard of Scotland), which was also settled by Norwegians, things are complicated by the fact that Old Norse names were often borrowed into Gaelic with the resurgence of that language there. The West Scandinavian names in zones 3 and 5 (Galloway and Dumfriesshire and northwest England respectively) are more easily recognized. In zones 9 and 10 (the eastern seaboard of Ireland and the northern and southern seaboard of Wales respectively), a few place-names contain the Scandinavian generic *-fjörðr* 'fiord or inlet' such as *Wexford* in Ireland and *Milford Haven* in Wales. Zone 6 (northeast England) was settled by Danish Vikings from the west coast of Jutland, but the place-names from this invasion survive primarily in Yorkshire and southern County Durham, most notably place-names with *-bý* 'settlement' as in *Dalby* from ON *dalr* 'valley' and *-bý*. Zone 7 (the East Midlands) shows the same use of Old Norse elements from Danish Vikings as does zone 8 (East Anglia). In zone 11 (Normandy), the most common place-name reflecting Scandinavian influence is the compound of a Scandinavian personal name like ON *Ketill* with the Romance generic *-ville* producing *Quetiéville*. At the end of the essay, Fellows-Jensen no longer maintains the position that place-names in *-bý* were coined at two different periods (the *-býs* with personal names as specifics

being younger than those with appellatives as specifics) but suggests that most of the place-names *-bý* in the Central Lowlands of Scotland, on the Isle of Man, and in Wales were analogical formations at later dates based on names originally coined in the Danelaw.

Two essays this year deal broadly with pre-English influence on place-names in England. In "The (Non?)-Survival of Romano-British Toponymy" (*NM* 105: 25–32), C. Hough suggests that the higher proportion of topographical place-names coined by the Anglo-Saxon settlers in the fifth and sixth centuries may be the result of translation or partial translation of Celtic place-names which were "overwhelmingly topographical in character." For example, *Rochester* may have as its first element OE *hrōf* 'roof' and be a direct translation of the Romano-British *Durobrivis* where OE *hrōf* is used as metonymy for a building and British *duro* means 'fort, walled town'. In "Toponymic Traces of the Earlier Inhabitants of North-Eastern Leicestershire" (*JEPNS* 36: 55–60), B. Cox identifies *Soar* as a pre-English river name from a Primitive Welsh *\*sār* 'flow (of water)' flowing from Leicestershire northwards to the Trent. He also identifies *Ratis* with British *rātis* 'an earthen rampart, a fortification', which may have been transferred from the Iron Age hill-fort of Burrough Hill to Leicester itself. He suggests that *Arbour* at the northern edge of the Wolds could be a late reflex of OE *eorð-burh*. The Romano-British settlement of *Vernemton* was on the Roman Fosse Way where it crosses the county line; the name meant 'great sacred grove', deriving from a British *\*nemeton* 'sacred grove' with *\*uer* 'great'. Temple enclosures in the surrounding area may have given rise to place-names like *Honou* from OE *hærg* 'a sacred grove, a heathen temple' and *Alfletford* from OE *alh* 'a heathen temple' and *flēot* 'a stream' and *ford*. Place-names like *Walton on the Wolds* from an OE *\*wāla-tūn* 'farmstead, village of the British' and *Cumberland* whose first element comes from OE *Cumbre* 'the Cymry, the British' indicate Romano-British survival in the area as well.

In "Coincidences of Names, Anglo-Scottish Connections and Anglo-Saxon Society in the Late Eleventh-Century West Country" (*Scottish Historical Rev.* 83: 150–70), S. Marritt uses "the West Country" to refer only to Wiltshire, Somerset, and Dorset as he examines the occurrences or "coincidences" of the names *David*, *Alexander* and *Harding* in this area. He notes that the names *David* and *Alexander* which came to be associated with the Scottish royal family were first recorded as the names of two of the sons of King Malcolm of Scotland, but that the two nephews of Henry I's chief

minister and "alter ego," Bishop Roger of Salisbury, had the same names; the first became the archdeacon of Buckingham, and the second became the bishop of Lincoln. Marritt shows the connection between these two families and argues that these illustrate the Anglo-Scottish links in the West Country and Norman-English integration as well. He further suggests that the *Donecan* in Domesday Book is probably King Donnchad (Duncan) of Scotland. In "Sur le nom du bateau de Guillaume" (*Annales de Normandie* 53, 1–18), R. Lepelley decides that the *Mora*, the boat that William the Conqueror sailed in to begin the Norman Conquest, is borrowed from Arabic *amir* meaning 'chief' or 'head', represented in the Latin text as *mora*, and used in the military sense metaphorically as 'lance-head' or lead-point of the attack.

M.A. Martín Díaz's "A Three-fold Development of Old English *y* in Middle Kentish Place-Names" (*Estudios ingleses de la Universidad Complutense* 19: 139–55) is really a dialect study using Middle Kentish place-names as a corpus to study the development of OE *y*

in the twelfth and fourteenth centuries. She uses place-names on fourteen accompanying maps to show that the southeast quadrant of Kent shows a predominance of *i* from OE *y* rather than the expected *e* which prevails in the rest of Kent and that in the fourteenth century, *u* as a reflex of OE *y* occurs in place-names more frequently when the OE *y* is followed by *-l* or *-r*, as in OE *hyll* and *hyrst*.

JDC

#### *Works not seen*

Scott, M.R. "The Germanic Toponymic of Southern Scotland: Place-Name Elements and Their Contribution to the Lexicon and Onomasticon." Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Glasgow, 2004. *Index to Theses* 53 (2004), 12182.

Wilkinson, John Garth. "LANUM and LUGUDOUNUM: Full Lune, and Light on an Unkempt Wraith." *Nomina* 27 (2004): 71–89.

Yeates, Steven. "The Cotswolds, the Codeswellan and the Goddess Cvda." *Glevensis* 37 (2004): 2–8.

## 9. Archaeology, Numismatics, Sculpture

### a. Regional Studies and the Economy

In "Swine, Salt and Seafood: A Case Study of Anglo-Saxon and Early Medieval Settlement in North-East Kent," *Archaeologia Cantiana* 124: 117–35, Tim Allen shows how the excavation of a site can illuminate the study of the trade and economic links of a whole area. He considers the results of an excavation in 1999 in Chestfield, a mile east of Whitstable. Humble pottery and poor dwellings seem to indicate poverty and backwardness in the settlement itself, but the excavation also exposed the remains of ditched enclosures of the late Anglo-Saxon and medieval periods. Animal bones suggest that these were almost certainly swine pens. Part of a drove way that led into the complex and separated them from the dwellings was also identified. This, he suggests, was possibly part of an Anglo-Saxon and Early Medieval road system that probably originated as drove ways leading from small agricultural settlements such as Chestfield to the swine pastures of the Blean (a wooded upland). Documentary evidence suggests that one of these roads, the Radfall, also served as a major salt way as well as for the transport of seafood. The Anglo-Saxon practice of salting pig meat following the seasonal autumn slaughter, supported by the study of these roads, the landscape, documentary evidence for

salt working on the Blean and the archaeology of the site, points to an important economic link between the swine herds of the coastal levels and the North Kent salt industry, and also suggests that the drove ways were probably also used to transport seafood and wet fish to inland markets. He also notes that the settlement underlying the study had probably been part of a royal estate in the earlier Anglo-Saxon period, which might be of some interest in the ongoing debate on the factors necessary for economic development.

"Place, Memory and Identity among Estuarine Fishing Communities: Interpreting the Archaeology of Early Medieval Fish Weirs," *World Archaeology* 35 (2003): 449–68, by Aidan O'Sullivan, follows up recent discoveries of fish weirs of pre-Conquest date reported in previous reviews. Such weirs ("artificial barriers of stone or wood built in rivers or estuaries to deflect fish into an opening where they could be trapped by nets or baskets") are therefore important in understanding the control and exploitation of estuarine resources and also in landscape studies. The author also sees them as "storehouses of cultural values and traditions," by noting significant regional traditions in the size, location and building materials of weirs, which in each area show a striking continuity of form over many generations. He

looks at examples in Wales and Ireland, as well as England, and a case study of the Blackwater Estuary in Essex from the seventh to the ninth centuries is included (452–4). Fish would always have been important because of the meatless diet requirements of substantial portions of the Christian year. An apparent change from a small scale, subsistence activity to a more significant trade seems to have developed by the tenth to eleventh centuries, however, in the period of growth of urban populations, improved methods of preservation (not detailed) and development of Atlantic Sea fisheries. Documentary sources provide some evidence of ownership and incomes for the higher levels of society, but none on the lives of the people who worked them. It is therefore speculation that the Blackwater weirs were worked by *geburas* (who provided food render and services) working for monastic estates; and an even deeper level of speculation imagines the impact of such seasonal work on workers in a tidal estuary, not only on their distinctive local knowledge, but also on their sense of isolation, of living in the margins, or on their sense of time.

It is interesting to read Aidan O’Sullivan’s article in conjunction with another paper, “Dark Age Economics’ Revisited: The English Fish Bone Evidence AD 600–1600,” *Antiquity* 78: 618–36, in which James H. Barrett, Alison M. Locker, and Callum M. Roberts return to Hodges’s suggestion in *Dark Age Economics* that the transition from the exchange of high-value prestige goods to the low-value staples (and therefore from gift exchange to market trade) could be dated to the tenth to the eleventh centuries. They ask when an unambiguously low-value, high-bulk product—marine fish—was first harvested and traded on a large scale in medieval England and conclude, on fish bone evidence, that this indeed took place within a few decades of 1000. They do this by showing that fresh water varieties dominated fishbone assemblages from the seventh to the tenth centuries, and marine species such as herring thereafter. Sampling methods are clearly explained and visually illustrated in a range of plots and graphs, which also show that development of this trade in England was broadly in line with the trade elsewhere in Europe. Interesting support is provided from Ælfric’s *Colloquy* (ca. 987–1002) in which the fisherman complains he can’t catch as many fish as he can sell; and the laws of Æthelred, which set tolls for boats containing fish ca. 991–1002. The authors discuss a variety of possible causes—such as the adoption of driftnets (not suitable for cod); and environmental change (the development is contemporary with the height of the Medieval Warm Period and the intensification of agriculture); the

growth of urban populations; and the possibility that the development of fish traps (i.e. weirs) imply more elite control of fresh water fisheries, perhaps leading to a need to develop new sources. Changes in Christian practice regarding fasting are also considered but the evidence as to how much these affected the general population seems hard to find. In the end, however, the authors conclude that the rise in urban populations is probably the more important factor, since fishbone assemblages that show the change to marine species appear earlier in them than in rural sites. They suggest this concentration of population led to a demand that could not be supplied by freshwater sources in periods of fasting. They therefore propose this evidence as an important indicator of the distinction between “Dark Age Economics” and later medieval trade.

Anne Baker looks at the development of a small rural area from prehistoric times to the fourteenth century in “A Study of North-Eastern King’s Norton: Ancient Settlement in a Woodland Manor,” *Birmingham and Warwickshire Archaeological Soc. Trans.* 107 (2003): 131–49. At the time of the Domesday survey this was part of a large royal estate held by Earl Edwin of Mercia. Tables of finds for the prehistoric and Roman periods are provided. The evidence for the sub-Roman, to Domesday Book period is provided on pp. 136–42. There appears to be some evidence of continuity of Roman roads and field boundaries, but direct archaeological evidence for the pre-Conquest period seems hard to find. There is some place name evidence implying woodland clearings and farmsteads. Anne Baker concludes that the evidence shows that the area had supported only a thinly spread population in dispersed settlements from the Bronze Age onwards, even after settlements began to cluster in nucleated settlements between the ninth and twelfth centuries elsewhere.

John Naylor’s *An Archaeology of Trade in Middle Saxon England*, BAR British Series 376 (Oxford: Archaeopress) starts with a survey of the work on the economic history of the Middle Saxon period from the 1920s to the present, by historians, numismatists, archaeologists and others, showing how each generation has been influenced by the theoretical models available in its day. This is the jumping-off point for the author’s own thesis. He believes that previous discussion has been skewed in favor of urban sites and international trade because of the amount of evidence available from such sites. Increasing evidence, particularly coin evidence, from so-called “productive sites,” he notes, could argue in favor of a monetary economy earlier than has been

thought, from the late seventh or early eighth century. If this is true the special status of the relatively few emporia cannot be sustained: on the other hand, he is anxious that the special role put forward by some for the church in the development of the “productive sites” in the rural economy should not become hardened in its turn into the only explanatory model. In particular, he is aware of the distortions that may arise through metal detector finds, and the patchiness of documentary sources. He pursues his theme through two extended case studies on areas from eastern England, Yorkshire and Kent, using the categories of evidence he believes have the most to offer in a discussion of the extent of trading connections: coinage, pottery, utilitarian stone objects (which have a geological provenance), and metalwork. From this study, he is able to suggest that coins provide the most important evidence, with sites that show consistent long-term patterns of coin loss similar to the calculated regional mean, most likely to be trading places. The existence of such sites suggests that the absence of one of the so-called emporia from a region was not detrimental to access to long distance trade, but that where there was an emporium, like Ipswich in Suffolk, there were fewer other trading places in the region. Naylor also considers that the case for elite control of such emporia is a strong one and should be accepted. Although full of detailed and important information, this book is somewhat difficult to follow, with several “conclusions” in one chapter, some with repeated material. Naylor’s overall conclusions are more simply set out in a paper in a collection that looks at aspects of trade and the sea over a breathtaking historical sweep: “Access to International Trade in Middle Saxon England: A Case of Urban Over-Emphasis?” in *Close Encounters: Sea- and River-borne Trade, Ports and Hinterlands, Ship Construction and Navigation in Antiquity, the Middle Ages and in Modern Times*, edited by M. Pasquinucci and T. Weski, BAR International Series S1283 (Oxford: Archaeopress), 139–48. Here Naylor again discusses the possibility that direct access to networks of international trade in Middle Saxon England may have been more widespread than has been thought. He uses the same sites discussed in the book to summarize his findings, including, for instance, that the sites with the largest number of coin finds are almost all located within 15 km of the coast, the distance being calculated as the limit for return travel to a market in a day. He argues that although there has been over-emphasis on urban sites in many models of the early medieval economy, his results show that there was real regional variation, and that the nature of the “productive site” is still a matter for debate.

Roger Ellaby’s “Erbridge and the Merstham Dens in Horley,” *Surrey Archaeological Collections* 91: 71–92, uses documentary sources and maps to speculate on what he believes are the precise locations and boundaries of the Wealden dens of Merstham, later to become the tithing of Erbridge in Horley. Dens are woodland swine pastures. Ellaby’s conclusions are based on a new translation of an appendix to Merstham charter bounds of 947 (which differs from those of Ekwall, Rumble, and Blair), and an interpretation suggesting that enclosure of much of the Low Weald had long been complete when the charter was written. This interpretation rests on a translation of the word *forræpe* to mean ‘land fronting on a statutory boundary’. The translation, part of which in his interpretation reads “land fronting on the northern boundary of Thunderfield,” together with place name and later documentary evidence, is used to identify three blocks of land with the dens of the charter. The enclosure into discrete administered dens, he argues, was the work largely of Chertsey Abbey in the eighth or ninth century, in order to better control the resources of a communal pasture previously belonging to a “federation” of settlements on the Downs and greensand to the north. Part of the area remained unenclosed until the nineteenth century and was known as “Thunderfield.” The author explores the relationship of this area with the dens, with locations suggested for a royal vill of Alfred (*Punresfelda*) mentioned in his will, and a possible pagan shrine dedicated to Thunor, which he speculates in an appendix may have been at a Romano-British site in the area which included a Bronze Age barrow, destroyed in the nineteenth century.

Michael J. Jones, David Stocker, and Alan Vince, with the assistance of John Herridge, in *The City by the Pool: Assessing the Archaeology of the City of Lincoln* (ed. David Stocker, Lincoln Archaeological Studies 10 [Oxford: Oxbow]) make good on the claim of the sub-title; the volume provides an assessment of the current state of the archaeology of Lincoln, together with an attempt to “insert archaeological research priorities into the planning process” for future work (6). In addition to a CD-ROM, the survey has excellent illustrations and fold-away maps of each period covered—from the prehistoric era to the industrial age (1750–1950). Each chapter ends with a section detailing the research agenda as presently seen. That for the Early Medieval period (chapter 8, “Lincoln in the Early Medieval Era, between the 5th and the 9th Centuries,” 141–58) suggests more questions than answers about this period, though there is an interesting discussion on the interpretation of burial evidence, and whether evidence can



be found for a continuous Christian community in the city between the Roman period and the arrival of St. Paulinus in 628. However, on existing evidence, the authors are able to posit a Middle Saxon market and ecclesiastical site in the area which later became Monks Abbey; and the period is illustrated by drawings and a photograph of some of the major metalwork finds, as well as by maps and plans. Chapter 9, “The New Town: Lincoln in the High Medieval Era (c. 900 to c. 1350),” (159–302) is more substantial not only because it covers a long period but also because it has been the most intensively studied. The section is divided thematically, so that information on the period to the eleventh century appears in discussion of the defenses, urban and suburban development, ecclesiastical and vernacular buildings, streets and markets, water supply and rubbish disposal, and in a number of sections under the broader heading of Commerce, Crafts and Industry. The discussion of the development of Lincoln, from a sparsely populated area “outside any hypothetical monasteries” in the early ninth century to a true urban center with a population engaged in many different aspects of manufacturing and trade by the early tenth century, is in fact a very important one in light of much other current discussion about the development of urbanization. One caveat: I did not find the CD-ROM added much to my understanding of the overall picture (many of the text boxes appeared to repeat those in the book) but perhaps this tool would have been more rewarding with more intensive use.

A regional (and period) study with a much broader sweep is provided in the volume edited by John Hines, Alan Lane, and Mark Redknap, *Land, Sea and Home: Proceedings of a Conference on Viking-Period Settlement, at Cardiff, July 2001*, Soc. for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 20 (Leeds: Maney). It begins with an introduction by John Hines which with some wit explores the various, and variable meanings of “home” in its widest and narrowest meanings, and through several of the relevant languages; and the equally wide range included in terms such as “settlement archaeology.” It is not, he says, “a field of study that is defined by its boundaries,” thus allowing an exploration of the development of cities, rural settlements, landscape, crafts, and artifacts covered in the included papers. The book is divided into three sections: “Scandinavia and Northern Europe”; “The Atlantic Provinces”; and the last, “England,” which includes all the papers noted here. Rural and urban settlements are both well represented. “Sedgeford: Excavations of a Rural Settlement in Norfolk” (313–23) by Sophie Cabot, Gareth Davies,

and Rik Hoggett reports on an unfunded, volunteer-staffed project which began in 1996 with the aim of studying “the full extent of human settlement and land use within the parish of Sedgeford, North West Norfolk.” The study centered on a field known as Boneyard Field, in which middle to late Anglo-Saxon settlement evidence and a contemporary Christian burial ground had been found. An earlier unpublished excavation had been unable to connect the cemetery and the earliest phases of the settlement stratigraphically but both were dated to the Middle Saxon period by the presence of eighth- to mid ninth-century Ipswich ware pottery, while the later phase of settlement had ninth- to eleventh-century Thetford ware. The recent excavation has identified the Middle Saxon cemetery without grave goods, consistent with eighth- to ninth-century Christian practice; and two phases of settlement immediately post-dating the cemetery, indicative of residential and light-industrial occupation. Finds included Ipswich and Thetford ware, bone comb fragments, dress pins, an Anglian silver penny of Eadwald (769–98), two styli and fragments of decorated vessel glass. The Late Saxon settlement evidence suggests that the focus of the settlement had moved. The Middle Saxon evidence was consistent with the so-called “high status” sites such as Brandon in Suffolk and Flixborough in Humberside, although more of this type of site is now known, and objects such as styli are no longer assumed to be evidence of monastic literacy. The authors therefore question the meaning of such terms as “high status” or “productive” applied to such sites; in particular because at Sedgeford the finds assemblage is associated with a comparatively “ordinary” structural sequence, in a location which is not historically documented. Although one has to agree that the former assumption that such sites were monastic has to be questioned, it must be said that the problem of placing them within a hierarchy of sites would not have arisen had not many of the previously identified sites with the same features not fallen through the gaps in our historical knowledge. However, the authors then go on to consider the site in the Viking period, and the question of how this might be recognized archaeologically, especially since East Anglia suffered two major periods of Viking conquest and from the ninth century was under strong Scandinavian influence: it was within the Danelaw for forty years. At Sedgeford, however, this history appears not to be reflected in the finds assemblage, nor does there appear to have been any break in occupation. There are no certain Scandinavian place or field names in Sedgeford, though there are in East Anglia as a whole. There are a few metalwork objects from the area in

Scandinavian styles—a Borre Style brooch (of a type produced locally) and an Urnes style mount—but none found within the settlement context. Evidence for Scandinavian building and burial types seems to be lacking in East Anglia, in contrast to other areas of known Scandinavian immigration. The authors can only suggest, along with Pestell, that Viking involvement was only with the upper echelons of society and that mass immigration did not occur.

“Simy Folds: Twenty Years On,” in the same volume (325–34), represents the last thoughts on this site by the excavator and author, Dennis Coggins, who died shortly before publication. The site had three farmsteads, producing few finds, as is usual with upland sites, and is therefore difficult to date. However, more comparable sites had been discovered since the original excavation. Some iron working evidence (slag) had been discovered: this could have gone on from the pre-Roman period until much later in the medieval period. Work on charcoal-burning and iron working sites in the area as a whole is ongoing. He concludes it is still difficult to say who the early medieval inhabitants were or where they came from though radio-carbon dates on two of the hearths confirm their presence, but not whether they were British, English or Scandinavian; pagan or Christian. Some features of the farmsteads such as internal stone benches are also found in Norse settlements in Scotland, the Faroes, and elsewhere: on the other hand, the arrangement of the buildings so as to form two sides of a square is a Pennine rather than a Scandinavian feature. Other evidence is similarly inconclusive, although spindle whorls of a stone brought from the area around Penrith in Cumbria could suggest Norse incomers, and there is local Scandinavian place name evidence, evidence of dialect words of Norse origin, and pre-Conquest sculpture showing Scandinavian influence on sites not too far away.

Alan King, “Post-Roman Upland Architecture in the Craven Dales and the Dating Evidence,” (*Land, Sea and Home*, ed. Hines, 335–44) usefully draws together all the construction and dating evidence for domestic buildings from the post-Roman period in the defined Pennine area. It is not clear that he is showing that these buildings are Viking, as opposed to (in some cases) Viking Age. He notes finds of hoards and chance or metal detected finds likely to be associated with Scandinavian settlers. He also notes with some regret that most work in recent decades on Viking period vernacular sites, from the Craven area west towards Morecambe Bay, is being undertaken by metal detectorists. He ends

with a plea that this area, which includes part of west Yorkshire should be more carefully studied, to follow up the work of the field walkers and metal detectorists as part of north west England, since it is in fact so close to the west coast. However, this plea raises the issue of to what extent this area was integral to Northumbria before the late ninth century, and of how Scandinavian incomers then influenced it: issues that are not raised here, but see the paper by Nicholas Higham, discussed below.

Stephen Rippon, in “A Push into the Margins? The Development of a Coastal Landscape in North-West Somerset during the Late 1st Millennium A.D.” (*Land, Sea and Home*, ed. Hines, 359–77) looks at landscapes outside those dominated by issues of Scandinavian settlement in eastern and northern Britain, or the reorganization that led to the development of nucleated villages and open fields in central England at the same period. What, he asks, was going on elsewhere? He looks at the development of marginal lands, mentioning the development of upland sites in the Craven area and at Simy Folds in passing, before turning to his main theme of the colonization of coastal marshlands, particularly the Somerset Levels, all of which he regards as evidence of a new pressure on agrarian resources and a need to exploit the landscape more effectively. He uses archaeology and documentary sources, but also retrogressive analysis of the landscape to suggest patterns of evolution, which then have to be verified through fieldwork. He suggests that a diverse settlement pattern, involving a mixture of enclosed and open fields emerged in the area of Puxton, in the tenth and eleventh centuries (the same period in which the open field plus nucleated village pattern emerged elsewhere on large estates in Somerset), in the context of a large estate which had begun to fragment, allowing landlords and tenants to adopt different strategies of estate management. He acknowledges, however, the degree to which his paper, based on this methodology, is speculative.

The rural evidence so far seems inconclusive, and a study by Mark Gardiner, “Timber Buildings without Earth-Fast Footings in Viking-Age Britain” (*Land, Sea and Home*, ed. Hines, 345–58), although very important as a study of building history, does not necessarily add to our knowledge of the contribution of Scandinavian settlers in spite of its title, since it is concerned with the development of building types in response to changing social demands and performance requirements of buildings. The author challenges the assumptions of earlier archaeologists who saw a simple pattern of development,

with building posts set directly into the ground before the thirteenth century, and thereafter built on sill walls so that the posts could be kept drier and last longer. But, he says, neither element of this simple picture can be maintained any longer. He identifies three groups of buildings that do not fit. The first covers the period from around 800 onwards, in which buildings in stone or with stone or gravel footings are associated with high status sites (He discusses Whithorn, Hartlepool, Dunbar, Whitby, Flixborough and Minster in Sheppey). Here the aim seems to have been to give an impression of longevity and permanence for social or spiritual reasons, but the usefulness of footings for this purpose was clearly known. The second concerns mainly urban buildings from the tenth century onwards, in which the use of timber sills and stone footings, sometimes below ground level, shows builders striving towards a more permanent form of construction in which structural posts were protected from the damp. The Scandinavian connection is that these developments took place within urban sites such as York, Lincoln, and London. The third group consists of buildings with a partial solution to the problem in which the main structural posts were earthfast but placed within the building to protect them from the weather and reduce exposure to damp in the soil. This last group continues well into the post-Conquest period. The author notes the changes in non-prestigious buildings coincides with the period in which villages as well as towns became established on permanent sites, and there were more closely defined boundaries. The development of these building types reflects a more permanent and structured environment, which was developing from the tenth century.

Richard A. Hall discusses York as the main focus of Scandinavian interests in the Anglo-Saxon period, in “*Jórvík: A Viking-Age City*,” (*Land, Sea and Home*, ed. Hines, 283–95). He begins by looking at the flimsiness of the evidence for the widely held assumption that the pre-Viking occupation of York increased markedly in the eighth or ninth century. He suggests that the evidence which survives “a rigorous pruning of the dubious or ill-authenticated” is relatively slight, implying that pre-Viking York was a dispersed network of occupied areas, with a relatively small permanent population, along the river-fronts, around the cathedral, and perhaps in the Bishophill area. The change on this analysis therefore dates to the takeover by the Viking “great army” in 866. He details the discoveries made in tenth- to eleventh-century York so far, but notes that in spite of the weight of the evidence, “it is as yet impossible to comprehend how York developed to become, by 1066,

the second largest city in England.” His synopsis of the evidence for artifacts and their production allows the possibility that some work was carried out on a commercial scale, but his acknowledgment that there are difficulties in extrapolating “from excavated debris which represents an unknown fraction of the amount originally generated” strikes a note of caution and leads to a conclusion which incorporates a plan for future research designed to address the gaps in, or questions raised by, current knowledge.

Nicholas Higham, “Viking-Age Settlement in the North-Western Countryside: Lifting the Veil?” (*Land, Sea and Home*, ed. Hines, 297–311), takes issue with “the notion of a mass migration of Vikings into the north-west of England,” and particularly with the idea that this was mainly Norse in character. This theory, largely based on place name and field name evidence, has, as he shows, become the accepted commonplace in much mainstream historical writing, though he begins by pointing to the varying interpretations of this “Norse space” of the north-west as interpreted by different writers. He looks again at the various types of evidence, and concludes with a much more nuanced interpretation, of an area in which a Scandinavian language, probably Norse, became the *lingua franca* of a much more mixed population. He argues for the arrival of incomers, but does not see those of Scandinavian origin among them as homogeneous groups, but rather as a mixture of Norse and Danish; and suggests that the makeup of the population would have included other incomers—Irish, for example—as well as a pre-Viking population, which would have remained *in situ*. He suggests ways in which political and cultural changes in Northumbria and Mercia (including the collapse of Northumbria as viable whole in the 860s) must have impacted on different local communities in different ways, especially if it is acknowledged that a level of cultural diversity must have existed even before the era of Viking settlements. This is a thought-provoking analysis of the current state of knowledge, and it is clear from the citations that others too are looking at the limitations and real implications of the various categories of evidence.

Two papers in the collection specifically address artifacts and production issues, and are discussed here as part of the regional picture. Esther Cameron and Quita Mould in “Saxon Shoes, Viking Sheaths? Cultural Identity in Anglo-Scandinavian York” (*Land, Sea and Home*, ed. Hines, 457–66), believe that the huge quantity of Anglo-Scandinavian leatherwork from York—over

20,000 fragments from the Coppergate site—is enough to show evidence of change in craft technique and style in common artifact types. The first of their chosen examples is sheaths for knives and seaxes of which they have a range from 930 to the mid-eleventh century, with the majority from the mid-tenth century. Here they note that one type of sheath dominates, one that appears to have spread through Viking influence since similar sheaths are found from London, Lincoln, and Dublin. This type seems to have superseded one known in England from the seventh century, but represented in York by only a few examples. The second case study, shoes, shows elements of Anglo-Saxon tradition present in a large proportion but also the inclusion of some fashionable, Scandinavian-influenced features that disappeared in the eleventh century as that influence declined. The discussion of different techniques and shoe-cutting styles is well illustrated, and the point about native adaptability to new fashions is well-made. Philippa A. Henry, in “Changing Weaving Styles and Fabric Types: The Scandinavian Influence” (*Land, Sea and Home*, ed. Hines, 443–56), makes the point that textile studies are increasingly being used to assess cultural affinities and settlement patterns. She notes changes in weaving styles and fabric types associated with Scandinavian sites in Scotland and to some extent in Ireland, but suggests that evidence in England is not so clear cut. She concentrates on the distribution of some specialist fabrics. Two wool twill types that originated in western Norway have been found in Britain only on the islands of Eigg, Orkney, and Lewis. Such twills have not been found in York, but she notes that the fleece type represented in York wools is different from that from other English sites. She does not speculate on what this means: does it mean that the Viking settlers introduced a new breed of sheep into Yorkshire? Other specialist fabrics include a nålebinding technique, with a single example at York; a piled weave, found in Ireland, Scotland, the Isle of Man, and in England at York—though in York in a different technique—and silk headdresses found in Viking Age Dublin, York, and Lincoln. However, the type of headdress is also peculiar to these sites, which suggests they are a Hiberno-Norse/Anglo-Scandinavian fashion. In general she shows the strongest connections are between the islands of the North Atlantic and western Norway, while with a few exceptions Ireland and England seems to have followed their already established traditions.

Finally, one paper in the collection investigates the possibility of influence from the laws of Denmark on England in the late pre-Conquest period, especially

through the period of Cnut, but Antonette Hoff in “Law and Landscape” (*Land, Sea and Home*, ed. Hines, 433–42) concludes that no connection can be demonstrated. The relationship to landscape seems slight.

EC

Sam Turner has two goals in “Christianity and the Conversion Period Landscape of South-West Britain,” in *Belief in the Past: Proceedings of the 2002 Manchester Conference on Archaeology and Religion*, ed. Timothy Insoll; BAR International Series 1212 (Oxford: Archaeopress), 125–36. The first is to investigate whether the foundation and development of Christian sites affected the wider early medieval landscape, and the second is to compare the initial impact of Christianization on the landscape of two different parts of southwest Britain with different cultural and political traditions: Cornwall and western Wessex (the modern Wiltshire, Dorset, Somerset, and Devon) between 500 and 1000, with special emphasis on the sixth to eighth centuries. Turner investigates the impact of the church on the landscape in three ways: in terms of topographical location, the location of church sites in relation to contemporary settlements, and the location of church sites in relation to certain kinds of elite burials. In terms of topographical locations, analysis shows that the vast majority of early churches in western Wessex were sited in valley bottoms, so there was clearly no concern for physical domination of the surrounding landscape. In Cornwall, over half the sites are in low-lying positions—on valley sides or in valley bottoms—but in general, locations in Cornwall are more varied than those in Wessex. As far as the relationship between churches and contemporary settlements goes, in Wessex some areas of late Roman settlement continued as settlements, but overall there was a refocusing of the settled landscape in the early medieval period. There is some evidence for relocation on the lower slopes of valleys in close proximity to churches. Also, sites that had been open were now enclosed by ditches or fences. Turner attributes these changes to legal, economic, and ideological shifts linked to the conversion. In Cornwall, rounds (small enclosed settlements) ceased to be occupied during the sixth century and were probably replaced by unenclosed farmsteads, with little overlap in location. Early churches such as that at St. Neot appear to have been the focus for these new settlements. The final area of investigation, the relation of church sites to elite burials, reveals that in Wessex certain elite burials of the sixth to eighth centuries are tied to the new Christian landscape. In the sixth and seventh centuries burials were



increasingly distant from settlement sites, and were often located on hilltops, or close to routes of communication and associated boundaries—though in some cases what type of boundary (kingdoms? religious centers? elite centers?) is debatable. Turner suggests that the burials may be on the margins of areas of settlement whose centers were marked by churches and royal villas. In Cornwall burials were marked by inscribed stones. Some are located around churches, but over half are isolated and may also have marked boundaries. Turner concludes that the landscape in both regions, and in all three areas of investigation, was increasingly shaped by Christian ideology.

In “Hillforts and Churches: A Coincidence of Locations?” (*Records of Buckinghamshire* 44: 105–09), Alexander (Sandy) Kidd examines the location of four or five Buckinghamshire churches built within late prehistoric hillforts. A sixth known example lies just over the county border in Whittlebury, Northamptonshire. Three of these sites have Anglo-Saxon royal connections: Aylesbury was a royal manor with a minster church, Taplow is the site of the famous seventh-century barrow burial as well as a now destroyed eighth- or ninth-century stone church with western porticus, and Whittlebury may have originated as an Anglo-Saxon *burh*. A fourth church, All Saints, Brill, may possibly have been associated with one of Edward the Confessor’s hunting lodges. Of the sites studied, only Taplow provides evidence for continuity of use, the chronology of the other sites remains uncertain. Kidd concludes that the likeliest explanation for the location of the churches is that they were founded next to early medieval settlements, usually as private chapels, but because of the chronological uncertainties, all such conclusions remain to some degree speculative.

Alan Ward examines Bede’s statements about the beginnings of the Anglo-Saxon church in Canterbury against the archaeology of the area in his “Church Archaeology 410 to 597: The Problems of Continuity,” *Archaeologia Cantiana* 124: 375–95. His purpose is to show what the two types of evidence reveal about the continuity of the Christian religion and religious structures in Kent from the end of Roman Britain to the sixth century. Ward sees little evidence for the continuity of religion in the south-east, and no concrete evidence for Christian burial in the area—noting that the presence or absence of grave-goods in a burial cannot be taken as a sign of religious affiliation. He also notes a complete lack of physical evidence for writing or writing equipment in post-Roman Kent. He believes

that Bede’s statement that St. Martin’s was founded by Roman Christians may have had more to do with the politics of the eighth century than with reality, and suggests either that the Roman part of St. Martin’s could have been a shrine to a water deity rather than a Christian church, or that there is perhaps some validity to the argument for the St. Pancras chapel being Bede’s church of St. Martin. As he points out, the cathedral is on a different alignment to the Roman street system than the Roman buildings. Ward also sees the argument for the Roman villa site of Eccles as evidence for Christian continuity as a red herring, arguing that there is evidence for pagan burial at the site prior to the seventh-century Christian cemetery there, and that the place-name Eccles may derive not from *Ecclesia* but from OE *aec laes* (meadow of the oak) or from the personal name *Ecca*. He also dismisses arguments for continuity at Lullingstone. Ultimately this is a very conservative interpretation of the material, especially when it comes to the burial evidence. The article includes an appendix on the dating of St. Martin’s church.

*Aspects of Anglo-Scandinavian York* (Archaeology of York: Anglo-Scandinavian York 8.4. [York: Council for British Archaeology]), edited by Richard Hall, includes papers by David Rollason, Mark Blackburn, David N. Parsons, Gillian Fellows-Jensen, Allen Hall and Henry Kenward, T. P. O’Conner, Dominic Tweddle, Alison Mainman and Nicola Rogers, and Richard Hall himself. The articles by Blackburn and Parsons will be reviewed below under Numismatics and Inscriptions, respectively. The collection opens with Richard Hall’s historiographical introduction (293–304), which reviews the archaeological interest in and scholarship on York and its Viking antiquities, and provides a summary of the topics covered in the papers that follow. In “Anglo-Scandinavian York: The Evidence of Historical Sources” (305–324), David Rollason examines what the historical (written) sources tell us about Anglo-Scandinavian York without, as far as possible, reference to non-written sources. He also looks at the problems posed by the sources which, though limited in number, are varied in nature. Although Rollason limits himself here to a survey of the textual sources, he acknowledges that archaeology and art history have potentially major contributions to make to our knowledge of the city, especially in regard to the process of Christianization and the development of parish churches.

Gillian Fellows-Jensen surveys a problematic field of evidence in her “The Anglo-Scandinavian Street-Names of York” (357–371). The evidence is problematic

because very few street-names are recorded prior to the twelfth century. It is likely, however, that "a substantial body of Scandinavian names had been coined in the tenth and eleventh centuries so that a close-meshed network of streets with Scandinavian names had been established before the Norman conquest" (371). Scandinavian occupational terms are preserved in many York street names, suggesting that streets were being laid down at a period in which Scandinavian craftsmen were still at work in the city and a Scandinavian language was still in use.

Allen Hall and Henry Kenward cover a lot of material in their "Setting People in their Environment: Plant and Animal Remains from Anglo-Scandinavian York" (372–426). Waterlogging and the lack of free oxygen in the deposits beneath York have famously combined to preserve a wealth of organic material. The authors cover the history of analysis of these deposits before moving on to examine just what sort of material constitutes them—chiefly wood, but also feces and bone. There is an impressive variety of plant and animal remains. The number of plants is due to their exploitation by the inhabitants of the city, and the number of insects to the range of appropriate habitats created for them by those same inhabitants. The analysis of both plant and animal remains makes it possible in some instances to establish the construction of and conditions within a building, and most of the buildings appear to have been relatively dry and sheltered. There is some evidence for gardens and fruit trees, but there is no evidence for large-scale cultivation. Food remains indicate that diet was rich and varied, and fecal evidence shows infestation by common parasites such as whipworm and roundworm. Lice, fleas, and disease-bearing flies would also have been widespread. Pigs, sheep, cattle, goats, and chickens were present in the city, but there is surprisingly little evidence for horses. Plant evidence and animal fibers are consistent with textile and leather working, and there are indications of trade over both short and long distances. This study does much to elucidate the relationship between the city and its rural landscape, including timber and woodland management, and the use of heath, bog, wetlands, and arable pasture. Hall and Kenward's analysis of the evidence leads them to suggest that the preservation of organic matter at York had little to do with the regular flooding of the city's two rivers, as has been suggested previously, and that there is nothing to indicate a thriving city prior to the arrival of the Vikings. They conclude that "York in Alcuin's time may only have been a tight-knit ecclesiastical community and its lay associates—it

is hard to believe that a more densely urban settlement could have existed without leaving clearer traces in the archaeological record" (424). Some questions about the city's development remain unanswered, and the paper closes with an extensive agenda for future research.

In "Animal Bones from Anglo-Scandinavian York" (427–445), T.P. O'Conner provides an overview of the current state of knowledge, with most of the evidence coming from the Coppergate site. Like so much else, the animal bone evidence reflects York's development into a major trading center—similar to other such Scandinavian centers. Cattle bones predominate, and indicate that the carcasses were used extensively to extract all their food value. In addition to a source of food, cattle were also used for their dung, for agriculture, and for crafts such as leatherworking. O'Conner notes that there is little evidence for hunting, but it is unclear whether the absence of hunting activity was due to a lack of time, a lack of necessity, or to legal restrictions. There is also evidence for a change in the freshwater fish supply between the ninth and eleventh centuries, but again the reasons are hard to pin down. The change could have been due to pollution of the Ouse-Foss river system, or to a reduction in the gradient of the rivers, or to a simple change in fishing patterns.

Dominic Tweddle opens his "Art in Pre-Conquest York" (446–458) with a discussion of the Coppergate helmet and its importance as an object, for the evidence that its inscription provides for the production of manuscripts in the city, and for its relationship to other objects and fragments of artwork from Anglian York. Other important works include the Ormside bowl (arguably a York product), and a blue glass mount from Coppergate, both of which provide evidence of Carolingian influence. Such influence, in the form of naturalistic plant and animal motifs, is also apparent in the fragmentary cross-shafts from the excavations at York Minster and other sculptures. Tweddle speculates whether the increasing Carolingian influence that develops from the late eighth into the ninth century might be indicative of "a relationship reflected or even mediated by Alcuin" (448). After the Viking Conquest Continental influence, as well as the influence of styles developed elsewhere in England (the Winchester Style, for example), remain strong, but the conquest also brought new sources of inspiration. Typical of this period is the transformation of native Scandinavian styles (Borre, Jellinge, Mammen, Ringerike) into original and distinct English variations. Tweddle notes that "most of the objects from Coppergate having affinities

with Viking art are from archaeological contexts later than the commonly suggested dates for the currency of the styles” (456), a phenomenon that provides evidence for the continued use of styles long after they had lost their popularity in the Scandinavian homelands. He concludes by noting that the patterns of artistic influence and development at Coppergate are exactly what we might expect from the historical sources.

In “Craft and Economy in Anglo-Scandinavian York” (459–487), Alison Mainman and Nicola Rogers survey a range of crafts including metalworking, woodworking, leatherworking, bone and antler working, amber working, glass working, jet working, and textile working. This is very much a synthesis of evidence from individual specialist studies, but one of the most surprising things to come to light in this survey is the concentration of evidence for craftworking in the Coppergate/Castlegate/Ousegate area. This can be partially explained by a combination of the archaeological focus on the area and its good preservation conditions. The authors note that while there is evidence for the practice of many crafts across Coppergate, there is no evidence for the zoning of individual crafts, and indeed some buildings seem to have housed more than one type of craft. They also place the York evidence in the context of that from other sites within England and Scandinavia. The article includes a gazetteer of sites in York with evidence for Anglo-Scandinavian craftworking, and very informative maps.

Even though there is very little documentary evidence for the development of York in the period 400–1100, there is plentiful archaeological evidence, and the latter is surveyed by Richard Hall in “The Topography of Anglo-Scandinavian York” (488–497) as part of his attempt to document the changing nature of the city. Hall believes that the plan of the city in the late eleventh century was roughly that of the city in the later Middle Ages, a period from which documentary sources do survive. He begins with two defended enclosures built by the Romans on opposite banks of the Ouse that survived into the seventh century, although the buildings within them may have been reduced to rubble. Little evidence survives for the post-Roman period, but the picture changes in the seventh to mid ninth century, when much evidence centered around the cathedral. This period saw extensive growth and topographic development of the city. It has been speculated that this is the period in which many of the medieval streets were laid out, but Hall notes that this remains problematic due to the ambiguous nature of so much of the evidence. The

art historical evidence is fraught with similar problems. For example, are objects decorated in the Anglian style necessarily of Anglian date? Moreover, the date of an object’s production says nothing about the date of its deposition. Hall stresses that a more critical reading of this sort of evidence is necessary. Concrete evidence of Anglo-Saxon occupation has, however, been recovered in the form of Anglian hall structures erected at 46–54 Fishergate, outside the zone of Roman occupation. The structures have been dated ca. 700–850. Objects from the same site provide evidence for a number of crafts from textile to metalworking. There is evidence for Continental imports, and coinage indicates an incipient market economy. Hall suggests that the area was a manufacturing and commercial depot, and suggests further that the economic developments of the ninth and tenth centuries are not as revolutionary as has been suggested. The old Roman defenses were also used to define and protect the growing city of Jorvik. Hall concludes that “at present there is sufficient evidence to assure us that the Anglo-Scandinavian period was fundamental to York’s development. With very few exceptions, however, chronological and other detail is lacking, and so the overall picture of urban growth remains somewhat unfocused. The challenge now is to match the obvious need to provide core data on a number of topics (the waterfront, for example) and to determine more precisely the overall trajectory of urban growth—with the opportunities provided by redevelopment proposals and with other research initiatives” (497).

The volume closes with an afterword by Richard Hall (498–502) that sums up the evidence and arguments presented in the individual papers.

Also dealing with the Anglo-Scandinavian period is Anne Pedersen’s “Anglo-Danish Contact across the North Sea in the Eleventh Century: A Survey of the Danish Archaeological Evidence,” in *Scandinavia and Europe 800–1350: Contact, Conflict, and Coexistence*, ed. Jonathan Adams and Katherine Holman (Turnhout: Brepols), 43–67. Pedersen’s goal is to present a survey of old and new finds from Denmark that reflect contact with England, especially objects dated to the late Viking Age and the early Middle Ages. Interestingly, despite the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle’s record of the payment of Danegeld, there are relatively few known Danish hoards that contain Anglo-Saxon coins from the ninth and tenth centuries. The explanation could be that the silver was melted down, or the wealth spent or reinvested abroad. The picture begins to change in the late tenth century. In marked contrast to Norway,

there are also very few finds of other types of Insular objects from ninth and tenth century Denmark. This is probably in part because most ninth-century graves in Denmark are sparsely furnished, and while this begins to change in the tenth century, the numbers of foreign objects still remain relatively small. The most significant of the objects that have been uncovered are a fragmentary tenth-century cauldron from a male burial at Nørre Langelse from northern England, an eighth-century silver hanging bowl found at Lejre, Sjælland, a tenth-century Anglo-Saxon sword found at Støvringgård, Jutland, and two similar swords from Hedeby. This picture may change, especially with the increased use of metal detectors. Archaeological evidence from the eleventh century differs in both quantity and type from the earlier period. The swords and riding equipment are well known, and recent finds of copper alloy fittings strengthen the picture they provide of cultural influence passing both ways across the North Sea, perhaps associated with the reign of Cnut. In addition there are twenty circular cloisonné enamel brooches from Denmark and Skåne. All are in eleventh- and twelfth-century styles, but none has been found in a datable context. Three inscribed objects suggest English people living in Denmark and/or English influence on Danish name-giving: a Maplewood pen case from Lund inscribed LEOFWINE MY...ER..., and two bone combs inscribed with the names Eadrinc and Hægwin. Pedersen also notes significant English influence on early phases of minting in Denmark, and through the reigns of Svein Forkbeard and Cnut. Pedersen sees three phases of Anglo-Danish contact. The first phase was the period of early Viking raids and attacks in which wealth was probably reinvested and there was limited direct return or reuse of objects. The second phase was that of Viking settlement in England in which there is evidence of Scandinavian influence on, and artifacts in, the area of settlement, but the interaction was generally not reflected back into Denmark. The third phase was that of the renewed campaigns and contact of the reigns of Svein and Cnut. This period provides extensive evidence of contact and exchange of objects, as well as of traveling craftsmen and artisans. These contacts were kept alive beyond the mid eleventh-century breakdown of the North Sea Empire.

Susan K. Harrington's Ph.D. thesis "Aspects of Gender and Craft Production in Early Anglo-Saxon England with Reference to the Kingdom of Kent" (University College London, 2003; *Index to Theses* 53: 14820) is in two volumes, the first of which is devoted to text, and the second to figures and appendices. Harrington's

purpose is to explore craft production through "engendered methodologies," and she focuses primarily on the evidence of textiles and textile-working tools from female burials from the period 475-750. The first four chapters of her thesis introduce the material by laying out the theoretical issues to be addressed, the literary and historical background, and issues of methodology. Here, she is careful to define her terms and lay out the issues that complicate the historical picture and its interpretation. Chapters 5 through 8 present her analysis of the material and archaeological evidence; and the final chapter provides synthesis and conclusions. Harrington's working hypothesis was that "in the period of dynamic social change of the early kingdom of East Kent, the status and identity of women textile producers underwent stress and renegotiation, with a fragmentation of their mode of production and the loss of control of the use of their end products" (86). Her analysis of the burial record leads her to conclude that there is no evidence for either stress on or renegotiation of status or identity until the later eighth century, and that the reasons for the changes, when they occur, are difficult to pin down. Do they represent changing modes of textile production, or might they be "a function of ongoing challenges to the meanings and concepts associated with the feminine powers embedded in cloth creation" (357).

CK

*Debating Late Antiquity in Britain AD 300-700*, ed. Rob Collins and James Gerrard, BAR British Series 365 (Oxford: Archaeopress), is a selected proceedings of a conference at the University of York in June 2003; the aim was "to critically consider and debate the validity of the Late Antique label, as applied to Britain, and ... to explore how this period could be accessed archaeologically by drawing together individual approaches" (1). The papers are short, often maintaining their conference "orality"; they are supplemented with lengthy bibliographic material at the end. With the exception of a few consigned to the "Death and Burial" subsection, the essays will be addressed individually here. In "The Case for the Dark Ages" (5-12) Neil Faulkner takes the aggressive position that there is considerable difficulty in labeling the period between ca. 250/300 and ca. 600/800 as "Late Antiquity" in Britain. Part of what he finds most objectionable is the "impressionistic" term "Roman" and the vagueness with which the term is used to blanket very different political and social situations. Faulkner uses the Roman form of towns—with their tax collection, political identification, and cultural connotation—and the complete change in British



settlement structure (based on work of Wolfgang Liebeschuetz, 2003) as his primary counter case against the scholarly assumption of a Late Antique characterization of Britain. Faulkner calls attention to the scholarly valuation of an imperialist model of Roman/colony interaction. In the second part of his paper, Faulkner develops an archaeological categorization for both the “Roman” culture and the culture of “Early Dark Age Britain” of the fifth and sixth centuries, drawing attention to significantly different architectural norms and techniques. What Faulkner contends is a decisive break from Roman military totalitarianism to British peasant settlement culture, occurring sometime in the period between 375/425 and 450/75. The culture that develops is a politically unstable group of war-bands and a connotative legitimation strategy that draws on Roman culture and the patronage of the Church (450/75–550/575), later emerging as kingdoms with more stable institutional structures. Faulkner’s essay should be read against that of Martin Henig; the two form an oppositional dialogue on “Late Antique Britain.”

Martin Henig, “Remaining Roman in Britain AD 300–700: The Evidence of Portable Art,” (13–23), observes that Roman continuity is a complicated issue when considering art and jewelry. Since Henig clearly takes the approach that colonial material culture influences Roman Imperial culture, it is no wonder that he sees local British culture as similarly permeable. Henig’s analysis focuses on elite modes of dress in consular diptychs, mosaics, and literary descriptions; grave goods and the differences between Christian and pagan burials are also key. Connections can be made between Roman/Byzantine and Anglo-Saxon stone cuts and metalwork designs, notably from Ickham, Kent, and Dorset (also disk brooches). Chip-carving and buckle engraving techniques as well show evidence of Germanic traditions trying to “look Roman.” Henig sees portable art and its Roman trends as part of a deliberate and conscious culture of (political) connotation and (ecclesiastical) integration.

In “Coast and Countryside in ‘Late Antique’ Southwest England, c. AD 400–600” (25–32), Sam Turner looks at the geographically distinctive patterns of settlement in Devon and Cornwall, defined by large earthen hedgebanks as field enclosures. Despite the poor survival of material culture, Turner considers the significant importation of Mediterranean pottery at fortified sites such as Cadbury Congresbury (Somerset), Dinas Powys (south Wales), and Tintagel (Cornwall) and at beachmarket sites, such as Bantham (Devon), which

revealed a massive collection of shards and artifacts. Archaeologically, these areas suggest a trading relationship between Britain and the eastern Mediterranean, particularly in locally produced tin; Turner holds (with A. Harris, 2003) that the trade relationship is further maintained because of its political ramifications and that these sites are a whole network of politically controlled/associated trade. In the second section of the paper, Turner looks at the countryside, where little Romanized work from the period of the 1st to the 4th centuries can be found and where Turner finds repetition of patterns established much earlier (Lizard pottery, Iron Age roundhouses). Turner suggests that having felt less and later Roman influence, the continuity is also longer and less sudden in social/political break; the survival of Christian sites begun in the late Roman period evince greater continuity even after the late sixth-, early seventh-century disuse of sites such as Tintagel. Like Henig, Turner holds the usefulness of the term “Late Antique” for this area of southwest Britain in the fifth and sixth centuries because of the incorporation of Roman culture and forms in the developing medieval culture.

Ralph Fyfe and Stephen Rippon also approach the landscape settlement transitions in “A Landscape in Transition? Palaeoenvironmental Evidence for the End of the ‘Romano-British’ Period in Southwest England” (33–42). Their approach is to consider the regional variations in settlement density as a reflection of cultural variations (highly Romanized eastern Somerset and Dorset, little Romanized southwest region) and political differences (Durotriges, Dumnonii). They look at paleoenvironmental techniques for studying the area; a blanket mire sequence analysis on Exmoor shows open pastoral landscape in the Roman period, declining in the fifth and sixth centuries with a general population shift to the periphery, a trend of low intensity grazing that persists to the 13th and 14th centuries. The Greater Exmoor Project’s analysis of eleven sites in three clusters, attempting to understand lowland usage, reveals not typical pollen sites but highly local vegetation, little evidence of arable cultivation of cereals, low levels of trees (notably oak and hazel), with no significant fluctuation in use, thus suggesting higher continuity than in upland areas. They end by noting a pronounced change in agricultural practice in the institution of a rotational system in Devon around the eighth century.

Taken from research in his doctoral thesis, John Davy’s look at “The Environs of South Cadbury in the late Antique and Early Medieval Periods,” (43–54), suggests

that in Somerset, beginning in the third century, there was a substantial planned reorganization of agrarian practices and that Cadbury Castle hillfort was the focus of substantial building in the post-Roman/Anglo-Saxon periods, with a high status occupation in the fifth and sixth centuries that lent continuity to the area before a period (seventh to tenth centuries) of increased enclosure and nucleation. Davey establishes his methodology and study boundaries clearly for the reader, a process that highlights his case for the definition of the environs of the settlement during different phase shifts. Gradiometer surveys and excavation reports point to this reorganization, perhaps testifying to the strength and stability of Roman-British Somerset. Davey also considers sixth-to-seventh century burial sites at Hicnoll Slait, one of which has a flint placed in the mouth (pagan) and three of which are unadorned and aligned west-east (Christian?). Davey sees Durotrigian maintenance of Roman cultural identity as a means of continuing authority and prosperity after the fifth-century collapse of central Roman-British governance.

James Gerrard in "How late is late? Pottery and the Fifth Century in southwest Britain" (65–75) examines the highly Romanized *civitas* of the Durotriges (modern Somerset and Dorset) from its material culture, noting the strong remains of the fourth century in light of the scarcity of the fifth century. Gerrard first traces our theoretical expectations for a market in Roman Black Burnished ware; he suggests not a free market, cheap products over expensive ones but a more complex model which links Black Burnished ware to other industries as a container, not as a primary product. Durotrigan production of Black Burnished ware, once commonly used by the Roman frontier forces, is gradually replaced by Huntcliff or Calcite Gritted wares; its patterns suggest that by the second half of the fourth century, production moves to a south-west core, linked to salt extraction. Gerrard provides comprehensive chart analysis of the date and distribution of the Type 18 form, which he concludes is a late Roman Black Burnished ware still in wide distribution in the late fourth century. His conclusion from these shards is that the Roman-based distribution networks using this kind of ware did not suddenly collapse in the early fifth century.

This volume closes with Robert Collins's "Before 'the End': Hadrian's Wall in the 4th Century and After." Collins seeks to address two problems: the treatment of the Wall as a whole object rather than as separate connected sites, and the inadequate discussion of collapse in the wake of Roman troop withdrawal. He focuses on

the site of Birdoswald (modern Cumbria), summarizing pollen studies close to the site (Midgeholme Moss, Fellend Moss, and Walton Moss), which suggest the clearing of the landscape of trees (although 30% is still arboreal pollen) under the Romans and maintained through the seventh century. His analysis also includes an examination of where provisioning may have come from; given the clearing of the land, more farmsteads in the area might have been expected than were found and that provisions likely came from beyond the 10 km. range. Collins then looks at road system and gate function associated with the Wall, since at Birdoswald at least one portal was blocked in the early third century, a move likely made to more effectively control traffic through this fort. From this case study, Collins offers the interpretation that in the late Roman period, Hadrian's Wall was less permeable, more a mechanism of control than originally constructed.

In "Making the Most of a Bad Situation? Glastonbury Abbey, Meare, and the Medieval Exploitation of Wetland Resources in the Somerset Levels," *MA* 48: 91–130, Stephen Rippon looks closely at the medieval institution of Glastonbury Abbey, particularly at the Meare wetlands in Somerset held by the abbey. His analysis of the landscape of the Meare, done with a combination of documentary evidence from the charters of the Abbey and its dispute over these lands and with a geological-archaeological investigation of the site, is masterful. One of the earliest grants to the Abbey in the seventh century, Meare was an island in the wetlands west of Glastonbury and the site was significant for its resources, including fishing and peat cutting. The manor site also was well appointed, containing a windmill, dovecot, orchards, vineyard, and fishery, in addition to the sizeable manor house (13th and 14th centuries) and church; Rippon adds a critical review of the tenant estates, water resources like Meare Pool as a fish house, and the land reclamation projects. In addition to carefully cultivating all of the wetlands resources, especially in the cutting of canals through the area, the Abbey holdings in the Meade may have been cultivated for their historic spiritual value as well, especially given its status free from episcopal jurisdiction. Glastonbury Abbey made full use of its rights to the Meae (fishing, timber, wildfowling, turbarry, piggeries, cattle grazing) and protected those rights aggressively. Rippon's article is a joy to read—a thorough, well-researched, multi-disciplinary analysis of the area and the ways in which a monastery participated in and manipulated its environment to its advantage.

### b. Excavations

A glimpse into a south Oxfordshire village in its formative period is the claim made by Dana Challinor, David Petts, Daniel Poore, and David Score, with contributions by Leigh Allen *et al.*, in “Excavations at Manor Farm, Drayton, Oxfordshire,” *Oxoniensia* 68 (2004 for 2003): 279–311. Some features dating back to the late Bronze Age and the Roman period were found, but there were two phases of ditches belonging to the early- to middle-Saxon periods, while most building evidence belonged to the late-Saxon, early-medieval period—mainly a series of boundary ditches forming enclosures containing post holes. The site is only ca. 300m. from the present church and high street, which is the principal evidence for seeing it as a village in process of formation. Among the finds reports (which include worked bone, flint, spindle whorls and querns and environmental evidence) is a discussion by Gabor Thomas of a zoomorphic strap end of a type found concentrated in East Anglia. Most interesting is the pottery report, which reveals an assemblage of St. Neots and Thetford ware atypical of Oxfordshire, suggesting that much must have come from the east, via London or along the Thames, rather than across country. The crop plants uncovered were typical of the Anglo-Saxon and Early Medieval period, and suggest that the main purpose of the settlement was agricultural.

James Wright, with contributions by R. Gale *et al.*, “Excavation of Early Saxon Settlement and Mesolithic Activity at Goch Way, Near Charlton, Andover” (*Proc. of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Soc.* 59: 116–38) found three sunken featured buildings from the early Saxon period at this site, with pottery of fifth- to seventh-century date, spindle whorls (perhaps indicating textile production in these buildings), bone pins, glass beads and fragments of a copper-alloy bowl. There appear to have been no post-built halls associated with these buildings. The excavator suggests that the sunken-features building were themselves occupied rather than ancillary structures. It is not clear whether the absence of halls reflects status, location, or chronology. However, with other evidence in the area, the author suggests that Saxon settlement probably spread over a considerable area, and is consistent with the pattern in other river valleys in the area, for example the Itchen valley.

The excavation by Keevill Heritage Consultancy at Dorchester on Thames in 2001 (Graham Keevill, with contributions by Jeremy Ashbee *et al.*, “Archaeological

Investigations in 2001 at the Abbey Church of St. Peter and St. Paul, Dorchester-on-Thames, Oxfordshire.” *Oxoniensia* 68 [2004 for 2003]: 313–62) produced the first significant evidence for the site of the Anglo-Saxon cathedral church of St. Birinus, founded 635/6. The church itself was not found, but there were a succession of sunken-featured buildings (some of which pre-dated Birinus’s mission and suggest a previous secular use of the site) and two timber-framed buildings. Later buildings were dated seventh to eighth century, ninth to tenth century and late tenth century. The dating relies entirely on pottery evidence. The artifact evidence, which included among other pottery four sherds of a high quality import found in a stratified Middle Saxon context, possibly of Byzantine origin, suggests domestic occupation. There was some evidence for the manufacture of glass, perhaps for windows.

The most important features on the site reported on by Jo Pine, and Steve Ford, with contributions by Sheila Hamilton-Dyer *et al.*, in “Excavation of Neolithic, Late Bronze Age, Early Iron Age and Early Saxon Features at St. Helen’s Avenue, Benson, Oxfordshire,” *Oxoniensia* 68 (2004 for 2003): 131–78, belong to the Neolithic period. Nevertheless, Early Anglo-Saxon activity includes three sunken-featured buildings and parts of two enclosures, one radio-carbon dated to 545–659 A.D. (141–4). The Anglo-Saxon pottery (356 sherds), which included eleven fragments of loom weights, one counter and one spindle whorl, revealed a standard range of sixth- to eighth-century domestic wares (154–8), which adds to the growing body of Anglo-Saxon material evidence from the Middle Thames Valley, comparable to groups from Abingdon, Dorchester and Sutton Courtenay. The animal bone evidence also has some importance (164–70), not only in showing some evidence of craft-work with bone, horn, and antler, but also “distinct differences in the use of stock and wild resources at Saxon sites in central southern England which examination of further assemblages may clarify.” It appears that Benson was the site of a royal settlement, possibly of an early king. However, so far only modest domestic buildings and finds (including some metalwork) have been found—so the excavation has revealed an area “at best” peripheral to any royal complex, evidence for which remains to be found.

A site at Snetterton in Norfolk has produced a similar spread from the Neolithic onwards: “Neolithic, Bronze Age, Iron Age, Early Saxon and Medieval Activity in the Norfolk Breckland: Excavations at Grange Farm, Snetterton, 2002,” by David Robertson, with contributions

by Sarah Bates *et al.* in *Norfolk Archaeology* 44: 482–521. The early Anglo-Saxon evidence consists of seven sunken-featured buildings, and there is also some evidence for iron-smithing, with metalworking debris, and a tuyere. Metalwork finds also included part of an early Anglo-Saxon brooch, a pyramid mount, and two knife blades. The pottery was mainly domestic wares of the fifth to the seventh centuries: one fragment of possibly late-Saxon pottery was found. Another early Norfolk site is recorded in “An Early Anglo-Saxon Settlement at Bishee Barnabee Way, Bowthorpe: Excavations 2001,” *Norfolk Archaeology* 44: 525–35, by Gary Trimble with a contribution by Richenda Goffin. This revealed three sunken-features buildings, and post-built structures with several phases of occupation. Nineteen fragments of pottery were dated to the fifth to the seventh centuries.

Gill Hey *et al.* in *Yarnton: Saxon and Medieval Settlement and Landscape, Results of Excavations 1990-96*, Thames Valley Landscapes Monograph 20 (Oxford: Oxford Univ. School of Archaeology) take in three sites: Yarnton itself, Cresswell Field, and Worton. The study considers in detail not only the sites themselves with their structures and finds, but the wider picture of the sites within their regional landscape. This is the first of three studies, but the fact that those covering the Neolithic and Bronze Age, and the Iron Age and Roman settlement, are to be published later necessitates a summary of the late Roman evidence here, since the development of the landscape between that period and the early Saxon settlement was one of the key research questions the excavation had been designed to answer. The evidence for continuity in this area is not as strong as had been expected—a useful if to some a disappointing conclusion. The book unusually begins with its lengthy overview, but since full use is made within it of all the available evidence, including field surveys, documentary and place name studies, and the excavation and specialist reports (which follow in exemplary detail), this is not a bad plan, given that the overall aim of the project of which it is a part is intended to be a study of a whole area over time, rather than a discrete site report.

*Catholme: An Anglo-Saxon Settlement on the Trent Gravels in Staffordshire*, Nottingham Studies in Archaeology 3 (Nottingham: Dept. of Archaeology, U of Nottingham, 2002) by Stuart and Gavin Kinsley, is the report of an excavation carried out by Losco-Bradley in the 1970s. Some of the reports are as written up in the 1970s, but several have been re-written and updated for

the publication, in the light of more recent discoveries. The report includes a chapter on pre-historic and Romano-British evidence for the area (with a note that the prehistoric evidence is to be published elsewhere); and there is also a brief but well-illustrated account of finds from an Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Wychnor, only 500 m. south-west of the excavated area, which had been found in 1899 with further discoveries in the 1920s. One of the most important of the new reports is the buildings catalogue (42–85) and the analysis of these buildings and the evidence for their reconstruction by P. Dixon (85–99). Altogether some sixty-five buildings were identified. Eighteen of these (including rebuildings) were Grubenhäuser, with sufficient evidence to suggest that the floors were below ground, which it seems would help to maintain a constant and probably damp atmosphere. The presence of loom weights, along with post holes suggesting internal structures which may have been associated with manufacturing activities, mainly in the larger Grubenhäuser, suggests they were used for weaving, and it is surmised that the damp conditions would have been ideal for the storage of vegetable fiber or wool. The remainder of the buildings were of wall-post construction. The study of the surviving remains (post holes), and the implications for reconstruction are a major contribution to the study of Anglo-Saxon domestic buildings. The large scale of the site makes the discussion of the development of the early Saxon settlement, which unusually was occupied for ca. 300 years, very important. Helena Hamerow's contribution (123–9) considers aspects of “continuity” and cultural relationships with the Romano-British at one end and possible Scandinavian influence at the other, though she cautions it is too soon to say whether this site is in any way either exceptional or typical of the West Midlands in the same early period. The book as a whole is well illustrated, but one caveat: two large site maps in a pocket at the back, though very informative, are difficult to remove and replace.

After these two exemplary reports, *Wharram: The North Manor Area and North-West Enclosure*, York Univ. Archaeological Publ. 11; *Wharram: A Study of Settlement on the Yorkshire Wolds IX* (York: York Univ.), by P. A. Rahtz, and L. Watts, with contributions by Trevor Ashwin *et al.* is somewhat disappointing, since to understand it seems to require knowledge of earlier excavations on other parts of the same site. This is perhaps inevitable for this important site and huge project, but the overview sections could have been longer and more helpful in supplying some of the necessary background information in a readable and informative way.



Most evidence uncovered for this area in fact belongs to the prehistoric and Roman periods but two sunken-featured buildings were found in an abandoned hollow way and reveal some post-Roman activity. The finds also include some small fragments of decoratively carved stone of Anglo-Saxon date. The main Anglo-Saxon settlement and burial sites have not been found, but the carved stones are suggestive of its proximity.

*Oxford before the University: The Late Saxon and Norman Archaeology of the Thames Crossing, the Defences and the Town*, Oxford Archaeology, Thames Valley Landscapes Monograph 17 (Oxford: Oxford Univ. School of Archaeology, 2003) edited by Anne Dodd, looks at a number of aspects of a town which developed beside a major river crossing, including a number of previously unpublished archaeological sites. St. Frideswide's Minster is known to have been established there by the end of the seventh century; it became a *burh* or center of defense against the Vikings by 911-12, and a prosperous urban center by the eleventh century. The synthesis and discussion of the evidence from the Neolithic to the Norman Conquest are given in chapter 2. Later chapters look at the archaeology of the Thames Crossing, and the defenses (where one finding is that evidence for Mercian fortifications before the *burh* is inconclusive). Chapter 5 presents the unpublished site reports, chapter 6 covers the finds reports from all of them, and chapter 7 the report on environmental remains. The major development of street frontages are clearly shown to date from the late-tenth to the early-eleventh century, with cellar pits of a widely distributed type of building current in the Viking Age, in towns such as York, Chester, Thetford, London and Wallingford: these "perhaps represented the first sign of building types that were specifically intended for commercial and urban needs." Evidence for buildings in outlying parts of the town (suburbs?) also imply a rapid expansion at this period.

Nick Stoodley and Mark Stedman's "Excavations at Shavards Farm, Meonstoke: The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery," *Proc. of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Soc.* 56 (2001): 129-69, is a report of a 1998-99 excavation prompted by metal detector finds in the area, which showed that the cemetery discovered in the 1970s and 1980s was larger than believed. It usefully includes a full report of all burials discovered by the earlier excavation. The authors relate the finds to evidence from Bede (*Historia ecclesiastica*) of a *Iutarum natio*, a Jutish province within southern Hampshire and of a *Meanuarorum prouinciam*, a province of the

dwellers by the Meon. The area seems to have survived into a later period as an administrative unit under West Saxon control. The cemetery was in use during the sixth and seventh centuries. But the majority of the burials date from the seventh century and these are different in character from those of the sixth. Characteristics include a lack of cremation burial, a reduction in the placing of grave goods and a concern with external marking of the grave. However, seventh-century princely burials have both artifacts and external marking, at Sutton Hoo and Taplow, for example. The authors regard grave 3 at Meonstoke as typical of a lower social tier, but nevertheless one of some social standing in the area, which employed similar though less elaborate symbolism to mark status, including some grave furniture and a post marker rather than an earthwork. Elsewhere in the cemetery was one "deviant" burial of a woman buried face down. This type is also seventh-century and associated with the emergence of kingship and a more hierarchical society. There was also a high proportion of male and weapon burials. They tentatively conclude that the cemetery belonged to a military garrison reflecting the military takeover of the area by Wessex in the seventh century.

"The Excavation of a Saxon Settlement at Riverdene, Basingstoke, Hampshire, 1995," *Proc. of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Soc.* 58 (2003): 63-105, by Melanie Hall-Torrance and Steven D. G. Weaver with contributions by Theresa Durden *et al.*, is a record of a seventh- to eighth-century Anglo-Saxon settlement with seven possible post-built structures and eleven possible sunken-featured buildings. A large sherd assemblage should mean that this site represents a considerable addition to the previously rather meager evidence for rural settlements in its region. The authors admit it is not clear, however, whether this was a large but short-lived settlement or a smaller one lasting for a longer period but involving internal shifting of buildings. Few features seem to be securely dated, and no evidence of the function of any of the buildings was found. They conclude however that the site was primarily of Middle Saxon date. Some radio-carbon dates point to the first half of the seventh century. Poor results from the analysis of environmental samples and a limited range of faunal evidence mean that there was little evidence of the economy of the site.

"A Middle Saxon Cemetery at Cook Street, Southampton (SOU 823)," *Proc. of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Soc.* 56 (2001): 170-91, by M. F. Garner with contributions by D. H. Brown *et al.* is a report

of an excavation in the south-west part of *Hamwic*, a small part of a greater whole. It uncovered a north-south ditch which appears to mark the western limit of Middle Saxon activity in the area, although it is not clear whether it is the boundary of the settlement as a whole or only of the cemetery. Little evidence of Late Saxon or Saxo-Norman activity was found. The Middle Saxon cemetery may have been one of several small, early cemeteries found across *Hamwic*. Woodstains in two graves were probably the remains of wooden coffins or plank-lined chambers. Three of the graves were within penannular ditches. Only five graves and one burial in a ditch were found altogether but evidence of later disturbance suggests it may have contained more originally. Specialist reports on pottery, animal bone and other finds are included.

M. F. Garner with contributions by D. H. Goodburn and L. Gray, in "Excavation at St Mary's Road, Southampton (SOU 379 and SOU 1112)," *Proc. of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Soc.* 58 (2003): 106–29, reports an excavation in the north-west part of *Hamwic*, revealing what seems to have been a main street, delineated by stakes, along the eastern edge of the excavated area, which had become a hollow way through heavy use, and so later metalled with a local gravel. A small number of Anglo-Saxon pits were found. There were few finds, but these included parts of a coopered cask used as a well-lining, and there was also evidence for iron-working (including hearth bottoms, hammer-scale and fragments of burnt clay); copper-alloy working; bone- and antler-working; and textile production (loom weights and bone pin beaters).

Jeremy Taylor, "Middle Saxon Remains at Covent Garden," *London Archaeologist* 10.8: 199–203, found stakeholes, pits and postholes, and a gravel surface possibly representing an external courtyard area for this important period in the development of London. The finds included a bone comb, three ceramic loom weights, and a copper alloy sword and pommel cap. Pottery evidence dates the site to ca. 730–850. The most important find was the impression of a finely-woven textile (commented on by P. Walton Rogers), caught in the clay of the loom weight when it was being manufactured. This was a fine tabby, and contained evidence of the stitched edge of the garment or other textile.

A most important site report of the same area is that analyzed by Gordon Malcolm and David Bowsher with Robert Cowie, *Middle Saxon London: Excavations at the Royal Opera House 1989–99*, MoLAS Monograph

15 (London: Museum of London Archaeology Service, 2003). The site is located at the heart of the Middle Saxon trading settlement of London, centered on the Strand and Covent Garden, as has been known since the 1980s. This substantial volume is a major contribution to the study of *wics*, defined as centers engaged in both regional and long-distance trade. The introduction includes an account of the area's geology and topography and a brief note on land use prior to the developments of the Middle Saxon period. A section analyzes changing features to show the rise of the *wic* in the seventh century, its period of maximum prosperity in the eighth, its decline in the first half of the ninth century and its apparent abandonment in the late ninth century, probably an effect of the Viking attacks during that period. These features include a sequence of buildings and what is described as the first identifiable road in the area. The next section takes the story through to the later medieval and post-medieval development of the area. The chronological narrative is followed (in chapter 5) by a thematic one with a useful introduction on dating methodology—based mostly on ceramic phasing with radio-carbon and archaeomagnetic data, stratified coin evidence and comparative dating of artifacts by analogy with objects from other sites, where possible. The themes covered include the evidence for overall layout and plan; buildings; daily life; craft and industry; agricultural economy and exploitation of natural resources; trade and status; development and demography. It is not possible to do justice to all these here, but the section on daily life includes observations on cooking and diet, sanitation, and dress. "Craft and Industry" has an interesting analysis of the evidence for textile manufacture. Though no actual textiles have survived, the authors are able to suggest that the proportion of spindle whorls to loom weights implies that London weavers were not involved in the initial stages of yarn production to the same extent as those from Coppergate in York: their "raw material" seems to have been yarn rather than fleece, and there is also little evidence for the plant remains which would imply the preparation of vegetable fibers on site. There are equally interesting sections on antler- and bone-working; metalworking and woodworking, all discussed in relation to raw materials, finished products, tools, and physical evidence such as hearths. The physical relationship between crafts, such as antler-, bone-, and horn-working, tanning and leather-working, and the butchery that provided the raw materials for all, is also demonstrated (p. 196 and fig. 147). The section on trade includes an important summary of the present state of knowledge, noting that it is easier to recognize imports than goods

produced for export beyond the immediate hinterland. However, the possibility that the whole area, extrapolating from that part under discussion here, could have had 1500-2000 workshops in the late eighth century, must be a pointer to its trading importance. The thematic sections are succeeded by the specialist reports on the various categories of material, including catalogues of finds, on which they are based, and the whole is well-illustrated by tables, maps, photographs and drawings, and reconstruction drawings.

A most important find, rare for its period, is the discovery of a late ninth-century Viking woman's grave in Yorkshire, recorded by Greg Speed and Penelope Walton Rogers with contributions from Paul Budd *et al.*, "A Burial of a Viking Woman at Adwick-le-Street, South Yorkshire," *MA* 48: 51-90. The woman was identified by isotope analysis of her teeth as coming from western Norway or north-eastern Scotland. The grave may be part of a more widely dispersed group of burials, not however found. The site is also important as being beside a Roman road, which may have provided an estate boundary from the Roman period onwards. The artifacts found with the woman are of great importance, coming from a period in which unfurnished Christian burial prior to the Viking settlement had become the norm. The woman had two oval brooches, unusually a non-matching pair, worn on either side of the breast and used to fasten the shoulder straps of her gown. These provided evidence of manufacturing techniques, and through their ornament and style also evidence of date. Textiles and cords were found in association with iron pins on the back of the brooches. The grave was also furnished with a copper alloy bowl and an iron knife, and an iron latchlifter or key. The grave belongs to the period of Viking settlement and consolidation in the late ninth century, and it also significant that the woman is Norse. Identifiable Viking burials are rare, and of Scandinavian women even rarer, so the importance of this find can hardly be over-estimated: the careful analysis of the finds provided here does it justice.

Elizabeth Howe and David Lakin in *Roman and Medieval Cripplegate, City of London: Archaeological Investigations 1992-8*, MoLAS Monograph 21 (London: Museum of London) look at another area of London with a very different history. It is a two period study, the first part of which is a detailed look at the Roman period. The second part looks at the whole of the medieval period and at some post-medieval evidence. The area however was abandoned in the early fifth century.

The focus of Anglo-Saxon settlement was in a different area centered on the Strand and Covent Garden—the area covered in the volume just discussed. In the Cripplegate area, there seems to have been no activity between the fifth century and the late eleventh, when activity resumes, apart from that indicated by a few animal bones and ten sherds of tenth- to eleventh-century pottery

The majority of features uncovered in the excavation recorded by Steve Ford, with contributions by Sheila Hamilton-Dyer, *et al.*, "Excavations of Late Saxon/Early Medieval Deposits at Mitcham Vicarage, 21 Church Road, Mitcham," *Surrey Archaeological Collections* 91: 93-104, date from the eleventh to the fourteenth century, in spite of its proximity to an early Anglo-Saxon cemetery. There is no early Anglo-Saxon pottery, and only one sherd that may be Middle Saxon. There are, however, some fifty sherds that may be Late Saxon or Saxo-Norman, though Late Saxon activity is represented by a single pit. The author suggests that the Late Saxon/Early Medieval settlement would have been nearby, closer to the church.

Lee Elliott, "Excavations at the Minster Chambers, Southwell, Nottinghamshire," *Trans. of the Thoroton Soc. of Nottinghamshire* 107 (2003): 41-64, found a ninth- to eleventh-century ditch in excavations of 1995-96 in advance of the construction of a visitors' center for the Minster. This ditch seems to have persisted as a boundary through many later phases of the site, and he further suggests it may reflect a continuity of features going back as far as the seventh century. Apart from the ditch, the pottery report includes some Saxo-Norman wares (54-5).

Jo Pine and Steve Preston, with contributions by Sheila Hamilton-Dyer *et al.*, "Early Medieval Settlement on Land Adjoining Froman's, Cow Drove Hill, King's Somborne, Hampshire," *Proc. of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Soc.* 59: 139-62, offer an account of a twelfth- to thirteenth-century medieval occupation site, with a small amount of residual Late Saxon pottery.

Alison Telfer in "Medieval Drainage near Smithfield Market: Excavations at Hosier Lane, EC1," *London Archaeologist* 10.5 (2003): 115-20, records an east-west early medieval drainage ditch thought to have run into the river Fleet. Environmental and artifactual evidence suggest it was a means of disposing of domestic refuse. Pottery from the earliest fills dates to the second half of

the eleventh century at the earliest, and in fact the area seems to have been largely undeveloped between the Roman and later medieval periods.

Mick Diack with contributions by Enid Allison *et al.*, "Excavations at Barton Hill Drive, Minster-in-Sheppey," *Archaeologia Cantiana* 124: 265–90, notes that a small quantity of Roman and Anglo-Saxon material was recovered from this site but no features, in contrast to the considerable activity for the periods ca. 850–600 B.C. and later medieval activity of ca. 1050–1225 A.D. Only four fragments of pottery were identified, with a date range between them of ca. 450–850.

EC

"A Bronze Age and Saxon Occupation Site at Frog Hill Farm, Fingringhoe," *Essex Archaeology and History* 3<sup>rd</sup> ser. 33 (2002): 54–62, by Howard Brooks with contributions by Nigel Brown, *et al.* is a report on excavations undertaken in 1975 and 1976. The only Anglo-Saxon remains uncovered were sixteen shards of pottery from ten to fifteen vessels, all of the same sixth- or seventh-century fabric type, and a single cylindrical light-blue glass bead with a trail of white glass, of the same date. There were no Anglo-Saxon deposits or features, but the finds suggest some sort of Anglo-Saxon occupation. Both the finds and the archives are now in the Colchester Museum.

"Evidence for Iron Age, Roman and Early Medieval Occupation on the Greensand Ridge at Haynes Park, Bedfordshire," *Bedfordshire Archaeology* 25: 55–135, by Mike Luke and Drew Shotliff, with contributions by Jackie Crick, *et al.*, is the report of 1993–1994 excavations conducted adjacent to St. Mary's Church within the grounds of Haynes Park House in advance of the construction of a new access road. The Late Saxon and Saxo-Norman evidence appears to relate to the dispersed settlement of Haynes Church End. The settlement was located adjacent to the earlier Roman settlement, and much residual Roman material, especially pottery, was found in the Saxo-Norman and Early Medieval levels. The Saxo-Norman structures consisted of three post-built rectangular buildings, and a hurdle revetment and timber tank built in an attempt to prevent two natural spring hollows from silting up. (The spring may have existed in some form during the Roman period.) There was also evidence of a field or enclosure boundary ditch. Finds were limited to domestic debris: pottery, animal bones, charred plant remains, daub, two fragmentary rotary querns, and fragments of leather shoes. The pottery was all utilitarian in the St. Neots type tradition,

and none of the other finds was in any way unusual. Early Medieval activity was limited to the digging of two ditches (one a recut Saxo-Norman ditch), a gully, and a pit, and the construction of a rectangular timber building with associated pit group. The authors believe that it is possible that the Saxo-Norman buildings also continued to function into the Early Medieval period. They also note that while the Saxo-Norman and Early Medieval levels were distinct stratigraphically, they could only be dated very broadly. By the end of the twelfth century the settlement site had been incorporated into the township's field system. This report contains a wealth of information, but the manner in which the material is divided and subdivided may make it difficult for the non-archaeologist to follow.

Andy Chapman (with contributions by Trevor Anderson *et al.*) reports on the excavation of a 400 x 15 m. corridor done in advance of a proposed Anglian Water pipeline in "Excavation of an Iron Age Settlement and a Middle Saxon Cemetery at Great Houghton, Northampton, 1996," *Northamptonshire Archaeology* 29 (2000–01): 1–41. The majority of the features uncovered related to the Iron Age settlement which was begun in ca. 400 B.C. and abandoned in the early first century A.D. Also uncovered were twenty-three Anglo-Saxon inhumation burials without grave goods, which formed the southern part of a cemetery of unknown extent. The burials were unusual in that there was extensive evidence of healed traumatic injuries (mostly skull, mandible, and upper limb fractures) and a high incidence of anatomical variants which when taken together suggest a small inbred community. One elderly female had suffered a blow to the head that had caused asymmetrical facial damage and possible tooth loss. This is the first published archaeological example of this type of compression fracture of the condylar head, and it provides possible evidence of wife-beating in the Saxon period. Equally interesting is the fact that an unusual variant in the wrist bone of a female burial from the Iron Age settlement was also found in one of the males from the Saxon cemetery. It is possible that this indicates a small stable community, though if true it would indicate some continuity of settlement in the area for over a thousand years. The Saxon burials were aligned west-east; this fact, a single radiocarbon date in the second half of the seventh century obtained from one of the bones, and the lack of grave goods all indicate a Christian cemetery. Twenty-one of the burials were in simple graves, and one was in a coffin placed within a probable upstanding timber mausoleum. The latter burial was that of a tall male aged 28–33, whose bone structure



showed evidence of a life of labor. It was set apart from the rest of the group, but near to the burial of a small child who may have been a close relative. Otherwise, there is some indication of segregation by sex and age, with males to the north and south-east. Further burials may have existed but been lost to plowing.

*The Origins of a Leicester Suburb: Roman, Anglo-Saxon, Medieval and Post-Medieval Occupation on Bonner's Lane*, BAR British Series 372 (Oxford: Archaeopress), by Neil Finn with contributions by Ian L. Baxter *et al.* is a study that takes the reader right up to the post-1960 period. There was limited Anglo-Saxon activity on the site, with the only structure uncovered being a sunken-featured building (SFB) of rectangular or square plan with rounded corners, and of fifth- or sixth-century date. Unusually, the SFB was supported by massive and closely spaced posts, leading the excavators to conclude that it may have been “a hybrid form incorporating aspects of both SFB and ‘hall-house’ construction” (18–19). It had been built over an earlier late Roman building. Indeed, a Roman road was laid out through the site in the early second century, which may have provided the focus for the Anglo-Saxon settlement. The finds, now housed in the Leicester City Museum, included pottery, a bone comb, a beating pin, and a spindle-whorl—all but the pottery being indicative of textile production. Excavations in 1977 recovered the remains of another SFB 30 m. from the Bonner's Lane site, so settlement and activity may have been more extensive. The volume includes a brief report by Paul Blinkhorn on the thirty-seven sherds of handmade Early/Middle Anglo-Saxon pottery.

CK

Nigel Baker has edited the comprehensive *Shrewsbury Abbey: Studies in the Archaeology and History of an Urban Abbey* (Shropshire Archaeological and Historical Soc. Monograph Series 2 in association with Birmingham Univ. Field Archaeology Unit, 2002) concerned with this eleventh-century Benedictine foundation. It is a critical integration of excavation reports from the major excavations of 1985–1988 at the Queen Anne House and Abbey Mill sites. Central to the volume is the question of the Abbey's relationship to the town—how are these institutions influencing the form of the other, what is the impact on the environs and economy?—making this volume of interest to those examining urban development. The Shrewsbury foundation is itself unusual as Earl Roger of Montgomery established it in a developed area, on the grounds of a wealthy estate with a watermill, church, and burial grounds close to busy

roads and the Severn, not on agricultural open space. The archaeological record here is supported by the first part of the text which briefly rehearses the history of the Abbey, tracing its foundations through the Domesday Survey, Henry I's confirmation of the Abbey possessions in 1121, the acquisition of St. Winefred's bones in 1138 in a bid to become a cult site (popular in the 14th and 15th century), to its decline and subsequent dissolution and modern histories. David Pannett also addresses the geographical site, noting the location at the confluence of the Rea Brook and River Severn, details that bolster the economic focus of this analysis. Chapter 2 reconstructs the church and inner precinct of the Abbey by drawing together the bibliographic material of the 19th century and digesting and updating the material in D.H.S. Cranage's *An Architectural Account of the Churches of Shropshire* (1912), which presents a fuller account of the construction of the Norman aisled nave with its later accretions (14th century tower and west end). Most interesting in this account is the evidence for the east end and transepts, surveyed in 1986; the surviving Norman wall remnants contain 14th century tracery and radar analysis of the site suggests that the transepts may have extended for four bays on the north and south sides (structural evidence of the chapels remains inconclusive). A 1995 resistivity survey of the site confirms the likelihood of an 11th-century apsidal east end (as at St. Peter's Abbey at Gloucester, Worcester Cathedral, and the Benedictine Priory at Leominster), later removed for the lady chapel, likely in the 13th century. This chapter also examines in summary the cloisters, the west and east ranges, the “Abbey Mansion” and the guest hall. It provides a full and comprehensive summary of the basic features of the site; the reproduction of drawings, plans, and engravings from early 19th century sources is a useful gathering of material from disparate and less accessible material. Chapter 3 is an analysis of the western court and the Old Infirmary, the name given to the surviving sandstone building of about 130' whose function is unclear in pre-Dissolution documents. Baker illustrates and investigates the elevations and the replacement of stones. The most recent material is in Part 2: The Excavations 1985–1988; beginning with a methodological introduction, Hugh Hannaford discusses the Queen Anne House site in the Abbey Foregate area, an area of extensive flooding and rebuilding, and Victoria Bryant adds an analysis of ceramic finds. The most notable find from the area is a silver bowl, thought to be a saucer, from the 14th century with an unusual leopard's head hallmark, perhaps the earliest hall-marked silver other than a spoon. The majority of pottery is late 12th

century to the 1540 Dissolution, largely local but of varied form; two shards from small cooking pots of late Anglo-Saxon ware (radiocarbon 9th century) of the Stafford Type were found, leading to a conclusion that both town and abbey bought their ware from the local markets, with greater variety in the monastery because of its size. Chapter 6 is a catalogue of excavated artifacts (highlighting the silver bowl); domestic iron work (with blades falling into the earliest phases and within the precinct walls and tools to the mid-phase 3 (15th century) and concentrated outside the precinct walls) but with interesting analysis of several (later) wooden vessel fragments and a large holding of leather items (680 items, detailed drawings of shoes). Chapter 7 is an analysis of excavated building materials (floor tiles, roof tiles, structural timber, masonry and building rubble). Chapter 8 discusses faunal remains and Chapter 9 has an unusually detailed archeobotanical report of the plant remains. In Chapter 10, the authors discuss the Abbey Mill site, with excavation evidence from the medieval site through the 19th century remains. In Part 3: Synthesis, Discussion, and Conclusions, Baker suggests the importance of considering the site as fundamental to understanding the Abbey—not an ideal monastic site because of its proximity of town and secular construction, positioned on the riverways, creating a close/often encroaching relationship between the spaces. Certainly this affected abbey building and precinct wall placement; it seems to have affected landfill as well. Baker also examines the issues of monastic economy, especially trenchant in the case of Shrewsbury's milling rights. Baker draws the conclusion that while Shrewsbury Abbey may have maintained distance from the town in its suburban holdings, as a major institution in the area, it impacted town development in consumption of goods and services, especially in the 14th century when it was less able to maintain its self-sufficiency from its own resources and labor. Baker calls Shrewsbury “unmistakably an urban institution” (226) and offers comprehensive material to support that conclusion.

Martin Carver, in “An Iona of the East: The Early-Medieval Monastery at Portmahomack, Tarbat Ness,” *MA* 48: 1–30, examines in-depth the monastery well within Pictland as an early establishment, possibly in the sixth century by St. Columba, its development in the eighth century as a major center, to its dissolution in the eleventh century as a result of Scottish/Pictish/Scandinavian conflict. The site is of recent excavation interest as it moved to the possession of the Tarbat Historic Trust; initially, the site was not held to be

a monastery and indeed, that question of what an early monastery looked like is one still in discussion. The article contains several color plate illustrations of the site and items found. Carver offers details of the excavation methodology in one section. St. Colman's church and burial ground revealed a succession of churches, with the east crypt wall a remnant of the eighth-century church there; the eighth-century church also offers evidence of an ambry, a feature of eighth- and ninth-century Scottish churches. There is also some interesting evidence of the Phase 1 (beginning ca. 560) burials here as they are largely middle-aged or elderly men, in contrast to the more diverse burial demographics of the later periods. Excavations here also revealed a number of reused early-medieval stone sculptures, including incised stones used as grave markers, architectural frieze pieces, and remains of at least three monumental cross slabs (one with Pictish symbols, one with Scandinavian snake heads, and one with a complicated composition of clerics with books, bears, confronting lions, and a deer carcass). The cross slabs all date to ca. 800, and Carver feels them to be closely related to the Book of Kells, suggesting a sophisticated stylistic understanding as well as a complex theological one, adding support to the monastic function of the site. Carver's discussion of the site then moves to the Glebe Field and its workshops, including metal-working that used enamel, and leather working that extended to vellum preparation. Carver's radiocarbon analysis supports the sixth-century beginning as a monastery and its use until sometime between the eighth and eleventh centuries. The archaeological evidence presented here combines with our literary accounts of St. Columba to argue for an active engagement with the Christian teachings and practices in Pictland. The archaeological evidence also presents a case for the destruction of the monastery, possibly by Vikings though the date cannot be precisely pinpointed. Carver closes the article with suggestions for future research, particularly as more information emerges on other sites in the Moray Firth area and on the social function of these cross-slabs in Pictish Christian society.

Graham Keevil's *The Tower of London Moat: Archaeological Excavations 1995–9*, Historic Royal Palaces Monograph 1 (Oxford: Oxford Archaeology with Historic Royal Palaces) is lavishly illustrated, often in color, with full appendices of finds in the back. It is also heavily technical, with detailed discussion of the excavations (and focusing primarily on the excavations of 1995–9). The bulk of the book matches the bulk of the finds, from the 13th to the 19th centuries. At the beginning of

Keevill's text is a discussion of the context of the Tower, which addresses first the geographic siting on the River Thames. After the Roman invasion of 43, changes to the area of Londinium happened very rapidly, with the establishment of forts and roads, the growth of regularly ordered insulae, and port facilities. In addition to quarry pits, a timber-framed house was built in this period in what is now the Innermost Ward; remains of a hypocaust in the south-west corner and foundations under the White Tower also date to the Roman period. The masonry defenses of the third century helped to define the land sides of the area. Keevill notes that remarkably little is known about the Tower area in the Anglo-Saxon period, with little activity between the 410 "collapse" of Roman rule and the seventh-century reestablishment of London as a trading center. In the ninth century under Alfred, the Tower was split into administrative and fiscal offices within the defensible fortress. The two churches of St. Mary Magdalene by Aldgate and St. Peter ad Vincula, and that of the older church St. Botolph's, provide the greatest construction evidence in the Anglo-Saxon period. Keevill also includes discussion of the 10th-century ward of Portsoken and a communal defense group associated with the city wall, later dissolved after the Conquest castle is built on the site. There is a color photograph of the Anglo-Saxon arch at the south-west corner of All Hallows by the Tower church. Keevill then discusses the Norman Conquest transformation of the site, its subsequent expansion and history.

FA

### c. Death and Burial

An inhumation burial discovered adjacent to the River Avon at Lake, near Salisbury, is the subject of Jacqueline I. McKinley's "A Wiltshire 'Bog Body'? Discussion of a Fifth/Sixth Century AD Burial in the Woodford Valley," *Wiltshire Archaeological & Natural History Magazine* 96 (2003): 7–18. The burial was that of a 20–25 year old female with no associated artifacts, and with the body aligned south-north. The absence of post-Roman finds in the area suggests that the site had gone out of use, so the location was unusual even though the form of the burial was not. Despite the lack of finds, McKinley concludes that the area has a high potential for the discovery of further archaeologically significant deposits given the general ritual significance of rivers and the fact that the Avon valley was a boundary between the Saxons and the existing population in the fifth and sixth centuries.

"An Anglo-Saxon Quadruple Weapon Burial at Tidworth: A Battle-Site Burial on Salisbury Plain?" *Proc. of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Soc.* 57 (2002): 38–52, by Heinrich Härke and Roy Entwistle with a contribution by Jacqueline McKinley, is the report of the 1992 excavation of a mid sixth-century burial of four men accompanied by weapons on a spur of land east of Tidworth near the Hampshire/Wiltshire border. The grave is at the end of a Roman lynchet, as well as at the end of a natural spur so that it gives the impression of being a barrow burial. The burial rite, the style of deposition, and the grave goods all conform to standard early Anglo-Saxon burial practice in Wessex, although this seems to be the only quadruple burial of adult males, and the only quadruple weapon burial known from fifth- through seventh-century England. The men were buried with four spears, three shields, a knife, a decorated belt buckle, and an antler comb. The only unusual object was the antler comb, although the presence of only one knife and one belt buckle is surprising. All four bodies were laid out on a south-north alignment, before the shields (and possibly spears) were added. The grave is isolated, and not part of a community cemetery, and there is no known settlement in the vicinity to which the burial might relate. There is no clear evidence for the cause of death of the four men, but Härke and Entwistle suggest that the burial is connected with the expansion of Wessex that began with the battle of Old Sarum in 552.

The subject of "An Early Anglo-Saxon Cross-Roads Burial from Broad Town, North Wiltshire," *Wiltshire Archaeological & Natural History Magazine* 97: 89–94, by Bob Clarke, is a single unaccompanied sixth- or seventh-century burial excavated in 2000. The body was that of a 34–45 year old male aligned northeast-southwest, with the head to the southwest. Wear and damage to the bone suggest that the deceased had spent a significant amount of time riding. The site of the burial is visually prominent, with views over a wide area, and near the boundary between Kingsbridge and Selkley Hundreds. There was no evidence of trauma, but the remains were incomplete so that execution cannot be ruled out. Burial in unconsecrated ground at a cross roads and near a border, suggests some sort of punishment in death, but, as the author notes, the burial could also be of pre-conversion date. The form of burial mirrors that at other sites within Wessex and beyond, but the date opens the possibility of cross-roads burial, and the burial of criminals near boundaries at an earlier period than has hitherto been supposed.

Natasha Dodwell, Sam Lucy, and Jess Tipper report on excavations conducted in 2000 and 2002 at two separate sites in "Anglo-Saxons on the Cambridge Backs: The Criminology Site Settlement and King's Garden Hostel Cemetery," *Proc. of the Cambridge Antiquarian Soc.* 93: 95–124. The excavations revealed a probable seventh-century cemetery consisting of twenty-one burials in twenty graves, and a possibly related sixth- to seventh-century settlement. Both add significantly to the growing evidence for Anglo-Saxon occupation of the west Cambridge area. The graves excavated at the King's Garden Hostel cemetery site to the north of West Road varied in orientation. Orientation did not appear to relate to age or sex, but all of the graves containing grave goods (five in total) were oriented east-west. The skeletons were mostly those of juveniles and young adults, suggesting that the very young and very old may have been buried elsewhere, perhaps in a different part of the cemetery. Graves 2 and 16 were particularly interesting as they contained Roman objects—a Roman copper alloy bracelet, and a reused coin of the emperor Valens respectively—that the excavators believe had been curated for amuletic purposes. The coin was set within a rectangular copper alloy plate, and is presumed to have been a pendent. It is an extremely unusual, and possibly unique object. The amuletic use of Roman objects has been linked to women and children in inhumation cemeteries, and both the skeletons in this case were female. The authors suggest that the amuletic use of such objects may have developed in the Cambridge region, possibly from the practice of curating Roman material. The authors also note that there are at least four separate burial clusters on the west side of Cambridge, including an early seventh-century cemetery at St. John's Playing Fields. The King's Garden Hostel cemetery discussed in this paper is therefore likely to be a new foundation—a common occurrence in this part of the country that may be a sign of significant social changes. The settlement site to the south of west road consisted of five structures with associated features. Finds included animal bone, sixty-five sherds of Anglo-Saxon handmade pottery from a number of different fabric groups, and ten to fifteen clay loomweights. One of the structures (no. 3) had been constructed over the site of an earlier building (no. 1), providing evidence for more than one phase of occupation, which is unusual. Along with the cemetery it provides mounting evidence for Anglo-Saxon settlement along the Cam.

In "Death Warmed Up: The Agency of Bodies and Bones in Early Anglo-Saxon Cremation Rites," *Jnl of*

*Material Culture* 9: 263–91, Howard Williams argues that "recent archaeological theories of death and burial have tended to overlook the social and mnemonic agency of the dead body" (263). Archaeology, he believes, has focused too much on mourners, the treatment of the dead body, and the representation of the dead body through material culture, rather than on the materiality of the body itself. Williams draws on anthropological, ethnographic, and forensic research, along with Alfred Gell's theory of the agency of inanimate objects, to suggest that fifth- and sixth-century cremation rites in eastern England operated as "technologies of remembrance," that is, that cremated remains had the power to influence a selective remembering or forgetting of the body's personhood. Gell's theory holds that the corpse is both an object and a person. The materiality of the corpse, along with that of any associated artifacts and structures, are thus extensions of personhood and actively affect their remembrance by the living. The dead retain agency through, for example, instructions to mourners given before death, provisions made for memorial services or structures, and interaction with the living via dreams, ghostly appearances, or spirit possession. Williams sees early Anglo-Saxon cremation rites as "complex sequences of performances concerned with transforming and then reconstituting the dead into a new material form" (269). He emphasizes that cremation and death were very visual spectacles. Animals and artifacts were often cremated along with the dead, allowing for a temporary image of the dead by the mourners that would have been akin to that created by an inhumation burial. Moreover, fire and corpse interacted during cremation, creating sounds and smells and visual images that had the power to affect mourners. The absence of pyre material in early Anglo-Saxon cremation burials, Williams suggests, may be an indication that a great deal of care was taken in the collection and cleaning of the remains. The collection and disposal of the bones and ashes may have formed part of the creation of a "second body" for the deceased, with the cremation pot perhaps acting as a metaphorical second skin. This is a well-documented and thought-provoking article, though it is somewhat odd that Patrick Geary's work on death, memory, and the afterlife of the body does not appear in the bibliography.

CK

In "Votive Deposition, Religion and the Anglo-Saxon Furnished Burial Ritual"; *World Archaeology* 36: 87–102. Sally Crawford argues that "a rigid distinction between 'votive' and 'burial' deposition could be misleading, and that this distinction may be preventing us from seeing



that the mortuary ritual should be recognized as an expression of a communal belief system, as well as carrying other important social messages”(87). The idea that one form (votive) is always communal and one form (burial) is always personal is a matter of increasing controversy within the field. From the fifth to the seventh century in Anglo-Saxon England, burials largely included grave goods not intended to be retrieved; in the seventh century, there were changes marking a significant decline in grave good inclusion in the majority of inhumation burials, though not necessarily related to an active Christian prohibition. Crawford complicates the Anglo-Saxon practices, noting scholarly assumptions of religious significance that statistical findings may not support. Personal ornaments may also have had votive significance, as has been shown with Roman jewelry and Iron Age “regenerative” connotations with deposition; as Crawford notes, especially in the case of Anglo-Saxon grave goods, these are not items of special manufacture but items taken from the “life-cycle” and given a new connotation by their placement in the grave. Crawford has a large section on Final Phase burials, particularly of the female graves’ cruciform jewel artifacts, undoubtedly manufactured as Christian pieces but possibly used as status items in Anglo-Saxon pagan graves. One of the most interesting areas of enquiry is the section on cult offerings, which questions votive connections between Roman Britain, Scandinavia, and the incoming Christian practices. This is a nuanced discussion of the problems of burial interpretation and presents clearly some of the most current scholarship on the problem.

In “Negotiating Gender, Family and Status in Anglo-Saxon Burial Practices, c. 600-950,” *Gender in the Early Medieval World: East and West, 300-900*, ed. Leslie Brubaker and Julia M. H. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), 301-23, Dawn Hadley stands with a group of new scholars suggesting the social mediation and expression of burial in Anglo-Saxon culture; Hadley’s focus is specifically focused on gender, which she suggests was “erratically determined and variously expressed” but of critical importance at certain moments of social stress. The connections between grave inclusion of weapons and male burial on the one hand and jewelry and female burial on the other have often been noted as signifying age and gender within the burial ceremony. A major question arises with how we should treat “gender-neutral” burials, those without grave goods from the fifth to seventh centuries. Hadley notes recent studies that suggest the importance of pairing age and gender together in these burial

identifications; in the seventh century, with the decline in grave good inclusion, the inclusions mark social status and, particularly for women’s jewelry, a sumptuary fashion for cross pendants, which may be an expression of social status rather than of religious preference. Hadley follows the changes of the period from the eighth to the tenth centuries, noting different patterns of siting, coffin designs, and the diverse range of Christian liturgies; she suggests that location and grave marking may have been more important than the actual goods for the social distinction of the deceased. Even with Christian influence, burial remained an area for a combined social display of wealth, family status, and psychological anxieties about death. Hadley’s most interesting section is the attention she draws to northern and eastern England ca. 900 where there is a brief but strong return to an association with men and weapons in adult inhumations. A compelling way to read these grave finds is the possibility that these burials are culturally Scandinavian, perhaps as directly representative of the demographic but more likely as political expressions of allegiances. Hadley suggests a “punctuated equilibrium” of change in burial practices over these centuries: not gradual, these are deliberate social ceremonies which actively respond to the need to mark the character of the deceased (in connection to the living) and that gender is but one category, like age or family status or political alliance, which could be used.

Julian Richards and other scholars have contributed to “Excavations at the Viking Barrow Cemetery at the Heath Wood, Ingleby, Derbyshire,” *AntJ* 84: 23-116. Consisting of fifty-nine barrows in four clusters, one third of them were excavated at earlier points; the current study examines three barrows excavated between 1998 and 2000. The author begins with a site analysis, drawing attention to the naming conventions of Ingleby (confusingly suggesting “farm of Angles”) and the Scandinavian dominance in the area. The second section is a thorough summary of previous excavation work, especially of the 1855 Bateman dig and the 1941-49 excavations of Clarke and Fraser; the 1955 excavations and mound finds are discussed individually, background that is extremely important for comparison to the current material. Within the fifty-nine barrows, a number are empty, perhaps intended as cenotaphs for those Christian Vikings who were buried at Repton (Posnansky, 1995); it is these empty grave barrows that sparked the current study. Discussion of the 1998-2000 excavations begins with a thorough technical/methodological statement. Each mound is then discussed in detail, including geological stratification. In Mound 21,

unusual for having no clear edge and a homogenous makeup suggesting plowing, no evidence of a cremation hearth was found. Mound 50 revealed a cremation hearth, non-ferrous metal objects like a sword hilt grip decorated with Maltese and St. Andrew's crosses, and some iron objects such as a small craft/domestic knife, a number of nails, and iron clamps likely from a shield rim. The cremation in Mound 56 also yielded a copper-alloy ringed pin of the type used by Norse settlers of the ninth century. Bone analysis suggests female remains and two cremations (adult and juvenile) in Mound 50, while those in Mound 56 could not be typed because of insufficient evidence. Mound 50 was likely also the pyre site for the body and pyre goods, given the large amount of animal bone found here (horse, dog, pig, sheep or goat, other). The author closes the analysis of the site with a clear conclusions section, noting the extensive labor required to create these barrows, the ground conditions which lays question to the emptiness of the barrows and which suggests token cremations in a large number of barrows, the presence of nails and clamps as evidence of coffins, and the difficulty of sexing the graves based on remains and grave goods. Richards also suggests practices from the evidence: the prominence of the barrows, the raked condition in Mound 50, the deliberate maintaining of the form of the pin in Mound 56. The end of the paper compares the Heath Wood site with other Scandinavian burials, particularly north Jutland, to help understand the practice of the late ninth to tenth century in Britain where Viking burials between 800 and 1000 are relatively rare. In a section well argued and too detailed to do justice here, Richards connects the distinctiveness of these burials to the Viking forces in Mercia in the ninth century and its interest in Repton, only four km northwest of this site. The question of whether this is connected to the winter camp or to the holdings after the peace of 878 is one that Richards leaves open, as the evidence cannot really support definitively one reading or another, although the absence of vertical stratigraphy and the clear and very deliberate retention of pagan practices both argue against a settled Viking colony. Richards feels the site is likely closed after 917, leaving only a very brief window of use. With further excavation of the Viking camp at Repton, especially for its religious practices, more information may help to clarify the Heath Wood site. If, however, this was the primary war cemetery for the Viking Great Army, the Heath Wood site suggests that a large number (forty) of fatalities were considered worthy of barrow honors with deliberate pagan identification, and that the survivors dropped that pagan identification soon afterwards.

The next few entries come from *Debating Late Antiquity in Britain AD 300-700*, edited by Rob Collins and James Gerrard, BAR British Series 365 [Oxford: Archaeopress], most articles of which are reviewed above. "Roman Estates to English Parishes? The Legacy of Desmond Bonney Reconsidered" (55-64) is Simon Draper's examination of Bonney's seminal work on Wiltshire, which asserted the correspondence between Anglo-Saxon burial sites and parish boundaries pointed to a lack of Roman influence in the Late Antique period. While the work has been critiqued (Goodier 1984 and Welch 1985), Draper updates the recent archaeological work in Wiltshire to suggest that Bonney's assumption of early Anglo-Saxon dates may have been incorrect and that assumptions of pagan practice as opposed to Christian practice are in fact more complex and more inter-related than Bonney allowed for. Draper carefully elucidates flaws in Bonney's methodology, particularly around the identification of sites (as in the inhumations near the Crofton Pumping Station in Great Bedwyn parish which have no associated grave goods and are close enough to a Neolithic enclosure to raise question of an Anglo-Saxon date); in addition to a very useful chart of Wiltshire sites and their characteristics, in the main text Draper similarly problematizes sites at Newtown Plantation in Heytesbury and the secondary interment at Sherrington in the Wyvle valley, drawing attention to the strong correspondence between Anglo-Saxon burials and roads/tracks/rivers and the similarly strong correspondence between these geographic features and parish boundaries. Draper then proposes an alternative (working) model for parish boundary formation in which routes are established before ca. 450 and that the roads' proximity to prehistoric barrows makes them first focal points for high-status burials (ca. 450-700) and later boundaries for estates (ca. 600-1100). Draper's is a social model which asserts the use of roads for inclusion (status burials) and exclusion (estates, criminal burials); it is also one which allows for some continuity (Roman and Late Antique establishment of roads) but which accounts for a more active cultural exchange. The essay closes with a critique of boundary definition and pre-Roman/Roman roads, which serves also to highlight the fluidity of Draper's interpretation against the fixity of Bonney's analysis.

In "Burial in Western Britain AD 400-800: Late Antique or Early Medieval?" (*Debating Late Antiquity*, ed. Collins and Gerrard, 77-87) David Petts examines primary burial practices in an attempt to contextualize them in date or practice. In an especially useful article for non-specialists, he defines two groups of practice.

In Group 1, graves are placed in north-south rows of individual burials, with the body aligned west-east in an extended position; they contain few grave goods but are often in stone lined graves or stone coffins. In Group 2, graves are often clusters of bodies in north-south crouched position (and often post-mortem ritually decapitated); while there are few coffins, there is a wide range of grave goods (pottery, coins, shoes, jewelry). Petts offers some careful site analysis; the discussion of the Roman site Camulodunum (Colchester) with its earlier first to third century cemetery with its Group 2 burials and its dramatic reorganization between 320 and 340 to include 650 new burials in timber or lead coffins in west-east alignment with few grave goods is typical of Petts's social analysis of burial practice. He sets British practice against Continental practice, noting the regional variations in Gaul and gender tendencies in Germanic custom. Petts suggests continuity from late Roman practice, later changed by incoming Germanic influences, socio-political customs he sees in the wider (former-Roman Empire) Europe.

Howard Williams, in "Artefacts in Early Medieval Graves: A New Perspective," (*Debating Late Antiquity*, ed. Collins and Gerrard, 89–101), focuses on toiletry grave goods from early Anglo-Saxon cremation graves, primarily from the areas of East Yorkshire, East Midlands, and East Anglia. Williams, like many scholars of recent years (cf. *Burial in Early Medieval England and Wales*, edited by Lucy and Reynolds, 2002), takes a social interpretation of burying the deceased, using the grave goods not simply as a definition of chronology or of artifact type but as objects meant to be read by the mourning community in the construction of social identity for both the living and the dead. Williams notes that while certain grave goods overlap in both cremation and inhumation burials, toiletry items actually distribute along significant patterns (tweezers—mainly male, brooches—mainly female, combs—age categories). Williams suggests that while the display and ceremony in preparation of the deceased for cremation were important occasions for creating social memory, the inclusion of these objects may have played a part in defining a body for the cremated deceased. Williams considers these grave goods "objects enmeshed in technologies of the self that connected social conventions of bodily appearance and adornment with intimate social practices, possibly involving the participation of others" (97). As such, this article is less immediately concerned with the definition of the period "Late Antiquity" in Britain; it is fundamentally concerned with thinking about the problem of burial from a position of social

structuring and advancing the understanding of what Anglo-Saxon practice might have looked like during the rough date designation covered in this book.

"Living amongst the dead: From Roman cemetery to post-Roman monastic settlement at Poundbury" (*Debating Late Antiquity*, ed. Collins and Gerrard, 103–11) draws heavily on Christopher Sparey-Green's work in other sources (frustratingly glossed over in the conference paper format) to consider the successive cemeteries on the site, from the early settlement phases (1 and 2) and the larger Cemetery 3 with its special burials, mausolea, and orderly burials, its lack of use in the Saxon and medieval periods while the nearby area of Charminster remained a settlement area in the Middle Saxon period. Cemetery 3, in use through the early fourth century, served a large urban population; Sparey-Green describes three types of special burials in the post-Roman settlement. Focal burials at the center of the space show unusual marking and clustering, perhaps connected with baptismal status. Special burials can be seen in the number of gypsum packed coffins (possibly more than sixty-six). The mausolea at Poundbury form the third group, here the largest group of funerary structures and decorated with paintings (a Chi-Rho, a baptism scene, or Adam and Eve) which point to Christian occupation. Sparey-Green suggests that the mausoleum may also have functioned as a small church as well and through shard deposits places the date of construction to the late fourth century with continued use into the fifth. He further raises the possibility from grave goods here that Poundbury was a community of female Christians. He closes with discussion of the primarily agricultural use of the site in the post Roman/Anglo-Saxon periods.

FA

#### d. Artifacts and Iconography

An incidental find of a pottery type not common in Essex, but when found there always with a mainly coastal or riverine distribution, is the subject of a brief note by Helen Walker, "An Ipswich-Type Ware Vessel from Althorne Creek," *Essex Archaeology and History* 3rd ser. 32 (2001): 243–44. The ware is most usually dated from the seventh to the mid-ninth century, but it appears that there is a possibility that it continued to be made into the early tenth century.

Chris Caple and Phil Clogg, in "Saxon Shakudo," *Durham Archaeological Jnl* 16 (2001): 27–32, look at a copper-alloy cruciform brooch discovered in a 1991

excavation of Andrews Hill, overlooking Easington in Co. Durham. This was unusual in form, and in that it was covered in a black coating with a satin-like sheen instead the normal green copper corrosion products. This coating was unlike anything previously recorded from northeast England, but a brooch of similar form had been found at Norton, less than fifteen miles away. The black coating at St. Andrews Hill covered the whole surface and appeared to have been worn thin through wear, suggesting it was a highly prized and well-used object. Analysis (by X-ray fluorescence and Scanning Electron Microscope) showed it to be mineral layer, rich in tin, gold and phosphorous. This evidence supports the idea of a coating or surface treatment. The authors point to two possibilities: a deliberate form of black patination known as "shakudo" from examples in Japan (where however it was known only from the fourteenth century), which recent research has shown was a technique widely known in antiquity and in Roman times called "black bronze"; and the tin metal alloy used for mirrors, which is known to turn black in acidic burial conditions. The Andrews Hill brooch, they suggest, contains elements which could belong to either or both of these techniques, but as they rightly say more evidence of other examples is needed to show whether this was a result of deliberate patination, or the accidental result of an unusual alloy applied to the surface.

An excavation of 1983-84 near Holme-on-Spalding Moor produced a whetstone of Norwegian ragstone recently identified as a Viking Age or later import, as reported by Peter Halkon, Michelle McLean, Martin Millett, and David Williams in "Evidence for Early Medieval Activity at Bursea, East Yorkshire," *Yorkshire Archaeological Jnl* 76: 93-94. Whetstones of this material are first found in British sites from the Viking period onwards, initially in areas of Scandinavian settlement, but later found more widely, and also as late as the thirteenth century. Scandinavian place name evidence in the area suggests heavy Scandinavian influence.

David Hinton in "A Mid Saxon Disc-Brooch from Upavon," *Wiltshire Archaeological & Natural History Magazine* 96 (2003): 218-19, discusses a lead-alloy disc brooch which had been acquired by the Society's museum. It has a crudely rendered bird with a cross below its beak and a ladder-like border. This is dated to between 700-900 by its similarity to one from Saxon Southampton (*Hamwic*) and the find of a bone mould from which similar brooches were cast, from a London site contemporary with *Hamwic*. The design is therefore not peculiar to *Hamwic* or even to Wessex. The

author expresses uncertainty about the mechanism by which the type found its way into the countryside—the possibilities being that it was made only in "the new towns" such as *Hamwic* and spread through exchange; or that it was supplied by itinerant smiths. He concludes that, however it was spread, the type shows that the new centers were "affecting the nature of middle Saxon society by introducing an element of urbanization and commerce."

An account of a small-long brooch and an equal-armed brooch, both from the river terrace of the Itchen valley, is given in "Two Anglo-Saxon Metalwork Pieces from Shawford, Compton and Shawford Parish, Winchester," *Proc. of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Soc.* 58 (2003): 59-62, by Mark Stedman with contributions from Ken Ross and Saskia Tindall. The small-long brooch dates certainly to the fifth to sixth centuries. The equal-armed brooch was possibly manufactured in England but is ultimately based on Merovingian prototypes. It was a popular type of fastener in Middle Saxon *Hamwic*. This could be seventh to eighth century, but a wider date range of sixth to the eleventh century is possible. The same team looks at two metalwork pieces with strong continental homeland affiliations in "Two Germanic Migration Period Metalwork Pieces from St. Cross, Winchester, Hampshire," *Proc. of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Soc.* 59: 111-15. Both were again found on the Itchen river terrace. One is a miniature bow brooch, a simple late fifth- to early sixth-century type with a radiate head, associated with the Frankish Rhineland during the early stages of the Germanic migration. Usually in England such brooches are seen as a Kentish phenomenon but there are a few other examples in the Hampshire region. The second is a supporting arm brooch of the early to mid fifth century, which has a distribution centered on eastern England. It is not clear whether this would have been made in England by recent immigrants or brought from the Saxon homelands. It is also similar to examples from Holland, reflecting the wider pattern of migration.

*The Anglo-Saxon Shield* (Stroud: Tempus, 2002) by I. P. Stephenson looks at all aspects of the shield, using the evidence of surviving examples and fragments, representations on sculpture, metalwork and manuscripts, and literary references. Detailed evidence for materials and construction are given, including the development of individual elements (such as the shield boss), in relation to their function (which in the case of the shield boss appears to have been the protection of the hand



holding the grip immediately behind it). Decoration is considered both in its aesthetic role and as part of various probable and possible symbolic roles of the shield. There is a long section on the uses of the shield, in warfare, as an individual defense, and in burial rites. The book therefore touches on many themes of interest to both historians and archaeologists at the present time. The discussion on the use of the weapons was particularly interesting. The “design of spearhead and shield, the introduction of the seax, the disappearance of the axe [in the burial rite], [and] the possible emergence of both archery and cavalry” are all looked at as possible “precipitators of a tactical revolution” in early Anglo-Saxon warfare. The problems of coming to conclusions in some of the areas are handled fairly; and the author only makes the claim that “the Anglo-Saxons were perfectly equipped to participate in close-order combat.... [T]he technological changes which occurred need not have sparked a tactical revolution; they appear rather to have been designed as improvements to the existing situation.” The summary of conclusions at the end (from which the above quotations are taken) is an admirably concise representation of what has gone before, but the fascination of the book lies in the detailed evidence deployed and illustrated (mainly by drawings) in the main body of the work.

EC

“The Old Church of St. Mary, Brignall, near Barnard Castle,” *Durham Archaeological Jnl* 17 (2003): 25–41, by D. Coggins and K.J. Fairless with contributions by R.J. Cramp and P.F. Ryder, grew out of archaeological supervision of consolidation work done on the site of this ruined thirteenth-century church by English Heritage. The authors give a brief history of the building and scholarly interest in it, but it is the name of the site, and the fragments of sculpture built into the ruined church that will be of most interest to Anglo-Saxonists. The second element of the place-name derives from OE *halh*, meaning ‘small secluded valley’, or ‘land in the bend of a river’. The authors suggest that since neither meaning is applicable to the present village of Brignall, the name originally referred to the church site and was only later transferred to the village. Fragments of three decorated stones and a possible cross-base survive in the walls of the church. The most significant of these is the fragment of an Anglo-Saxon cross-shaft carved with interlace ornament, which Rosemary Cramp believes points to a burial ground, possibly as early as the ninth century at the site. Two tombstones in the present graveyard may be re-used Roman altars, suggesting that there may have been Roman as well as Anglo-Saxon antecedents

for the present church. Evidence was found for an earlier structure (though it was impossible to tell whether this might have been Anglo-Saxon or Roman), and for curving earthen banks outside the present churchyard and on a different alignment. The fragmentary remains of monuments of different dates at St. Mary’s provide fruitful material for future research.

Thor Ewing’s “Understanding the Heysham Hogback: A Tenth Century Sculpted Stone Monument and Its Context,” *Trans. of the Historic Soc. of Lancashire and Cheshire* 152 (2003): 1–20, is an iconographic study of this somewhat problematic monument. The Heysham hogback is one of James Lang’s Type VII (Illustrative) hogbacks, but the meaning of its figural and animal carvings remains elusive. Ewing reviews previous interpretations of the sculpture, noting quite rightly that it is dangerous to read abstract concepts such as “chaos” or “heaven” or “happiness” into such “obscure and clumsily carved” images. Ewing’s reading of the stone’s iconography unfortunately falls victim to the same dangers. He suggests that Face A may represent the story of Sigmundr and his nine brothers, or his three sons, or one of his sons and two kings; however he cannot really explain why there are only five men and six wolves (or dogs) in the panel, suggesting only that they may be alternative traditions of the stories that may have been preserved in perishable media such as textiles or wood. Face B may represent Sigurd’s struggle with the serpent Fafnir—if Fafnir is present at all. The poor quality of the illustrations that accompany the article do not help Ewing’s case.

In *Sculpture on the Mercian Fringe: The Anglo-Saxon Crosses at Sandbach, Cheshire*, Brixworth Lectures, 2nd ser. 1 (Brixworth: Friends of All Saints’ Church, 2003), Jane Hawkes examines the north and south crosses at Sandbach within their larger Mercian, and even larger Early Medieval contexts. To begin with, Hawkes notes that while we know relatively little about Anglo-Saxon Sandbach due to a dearth of both written and archaeological sources, the sculptural evidence alone suggests that it was an important ecclesiastical center—the town still houses the remains of seven Anglo-Saxon stone monuments, all dating from the ninth or tenth century. Hawkes is interested primarily in issues of style and iconography, noting that the figural style seen on the Sandbach crosses is very distinctive. The manner in which the decoration is laid out however, along with certain recurring motifs indicates the influence of metalwork from across the Insular world. The lozenge shaped-frames, for example, appear earlier on

the eighth-century Tassilo Chalice, while small skeuomorph nails and the contiguity of figures and moldings reveal a more general influence of metalworking techniques and models. She points out that the crosses were originally painted, and are likely to have included some metalwork attachments, so that in their original form the parallels with metalwork prototypes would have been even closer. Iconographically, many of the figural scenes on the Sandbach crosses are unique in a Mercian context, but Hawkes shows that they do have parallels outside the Anglo-Saxon world, especially in ninth century Carolingian art, and she suggests that the "appropriation" of the images could have been deliberate. Specifically, she believes that the artists (or patrons) may have been making reference to Carolingian royal contexts via the art of the Carolingian courts as a way of proclaiming their own status and identity.

Fred Orton takes a very different methodological approach to sculpture in his "Northumbrian Identity in the Eighth Century: The Ruthwell and Bewcastle Monuments: Style, Classification, Class, and the Form of Ideology," *Jnl of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 34: 95–145. Orton too is interested in style, but in the uses to which artists and art historians put it, rather than in searching for stylistic similarities between the monuments. He begins by pointing out the lack of agreement among scholars as to what exactly constitutes stylistic similarity or difference. Style, for Orton, has less to do with origins and comparanda than with ideologies of economics, class, gender, social differences and conflicts. To this end, he finds Meyer Schapiro's 1953 definition of style a useful starting point. Style, for Schapiro, was "the constant form—and sometimes the constant elements, qualities, and expression—in the art of an individual or group" (95). Much of this essay is a synthesis of Orton's earlier work (which he acknowledges), and his criticisms of the classifications of and "fixed relationships" between the monuments (especially Ruthwell and Bewcastle) that have been established in the work of scholars such as Collingwood, or projects such as the Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture will be familiar to many. Were the monuments originally crosses? What might the ambiguity of some early descriptions of the monuments suggest? How might our eyes have been influenced by what we read about the monuments rather than what we see in front of us? What were the different intentions or functions of Ruthwell and Bewcastle? What is new in this paper is Orton's location of Ruthwell and Bewcastle within a Northumbrian imperial ideology that appropriates both Rome and Northumbria's own Roman past. That

appropriation, however, takes different forms, has different meanings and functions on each of the two monuments, and has roots in different institutions and practices. Gender, time, death, the church, and secular society are all reflected and constructed differently at Ruthwell and Bewcastle, yet each can be seen as part of a larger effort to appropriate the past within the present, and to represent the latter as continuous with the Roman Empire past, and the eternal future promised by the ecclesiastical republic of St. Peter.

In "Memorial Stones or Grave-Stones?" in *The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England: Approaches to Current Scholarship and Teaching*, ed. Paul Cavill, Christianity and Culture: Issues in Teaching and Research (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer), 91–101, Elizabeth Okasha asks which of this large corpus of objects were actually grave-stones, and if the stones were not grave-stones, what were they? Okasha suggests that some were personal commemorative objects, and that some acted as *libri vitae*. Obviously we can assume that if a stone is *in situ*, either alone above a burial or within an Anglo-Saxon cemetery, it functioned as a grave-stone. Okasha suggests that the famous Hartlepool name-stones were grave-stones, but does not address the issue that some of these might have been in the graves rather than marking them, nor the fact that we cannot be sure that all were discovered in a primary context. On the other hand, she suggests that some of the Lindisfarne stones may not have been grave-stones as they were found in secondary contexts—like the Osgyð stone which was found in the north transept of the church at Lindisfarne. She wonders if such stones could have served as part of a *liber vitae* possibly placed around the inside walls of the church. Only one quarter of the stones described as memorial stones were actual grave-stones. Some were commemorative but not above graves. Her example is the Falstone stone, now in the Museum of Antiquities, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, with its identical runic and Roman inscriptions, but as she herself admits, there is nothing to preclude the stone having originally been placed above a grave. The inscription also suggests that the commissioner of the stone may have hoped that his own soul would come to be included in the prayers that the stone requests. Okasha raises some interesting possibilities in this paper, but they remain no more than that. Moreover, she fails to deal with the possibility that some of the stones might have served multiple functions simultaneously.

Jean Mary Cook's *Early Anglo-Saxon Buckets: A Corpus of Copper Alloy- and Iron-Bound, Stave-Built*

*Vessels*, ed. Birte Brugmann with contributions by Vera I. Evison *et al.*, Oxford University School of Archaeology Monograph 60 (Oxford: Oxford U School of Archaeology, 2003) was published posthumously from Cook's files by a group of her friends and colleagues. This is the first comprehensive corpus of over 200 buckets found in furnished burials from the period 400-700. It contains 339 entries derived from 152 sites, as well as maps, diagrams, and very clear definitions of terminology (a quibble: the drawings and photos do not accompany the entries, but are gathered together at the end of the volume, forcing the reader to flip continually back and forth). An updated version of the companion database, also planned by Cook, including her notes and drawings, is available online through the Oxford Institute of Archaeology (<http://www.arch.ox.ac.uk/archives.asbuckets/>). The emphasis in the monograph is on the archaeological context of the buckets, while the online database focuses on typological details of bucket production, and is searchable by various criteria. Both provide basic information on each bucket with find site, accession numbers, and bibliography. In addition, the printed corpus provides information on unpublished sources, conservation and conservators, excavation reports, and the age, sex, and gender of the person buried with the bucket (where known), along with a list of datable grave goods. Although very little information on the contents of the buckets is available, there is evidence to suggest that some buckets were covered with cloth. As the editors note, despite the best efforts of all involved, the corpus is unlikely to be complete due to the possibility of misidentification of bucket fittings.

CK

Extensive distribution maps, appendix tables with grave distributions by type, and beautiful color photos augment a very technical text in Birte Brugmann's *Glass Beads from Early Anglo-Saxon Graves: A Study of the Provenance and Chronology of Glass Beads from Early Anglo-Saxon Graves, Based on Visual Examination* (Oxford: Oxbow). Brugmann describes a bead from an Anglo-Saxon grave as "an object with a central perforation: they are often found in large numbers in the area of the neck or chest" (1) but quickly leads her reader to understand how limited a definition that is. She has chosen to focus on glass beads, showing the importance first of bead trade in the pre-modern world and then detailing the variety of techniques and materials. Brugmann draws on the preliminary classifications done by Margaret Guido (1999) but attempts to standardize the terminology for bead analysis. The

almost 40,000 Anglo-Saxon beads (56% amber, 43% glass, 1% natural material or metal) from 106 sites (few fully excavated sites, a problem Brugmann addresses in her methodology discussion) are seen against a small sample of Continental and Scandinavian beads from inhumation graves of the 5th-8th centuries. Her technical discussion of the process of making beads (opacifiers, coloring, etc.) is clear enough for non-specialists. Bead making was influenced by four main issues: the availability of materials, working conditions, skills, and demand; Brugmann notes that the technical demands of bead making were less than other glass manufacture but would undoubtedly have been connected. In her typological analysis, she suggests that fifth-century beads show a closer connection to Germanic beads (common monochrome beads of short globular beads) than Romano-British ones but notes that this is inconclusive given the incomplete excavation of these sites. Notably, she disagrees with Guido, asserting that the sample gives little evidence for the Roman fashion in stones versus beads and finds evidence for the reuse of Roman long cylinder beads in Anglo-Saxon work (29). Finally, she notes the unusual "doughnut" type from the 7th-8th century—a very short but large type that in the late phase has an annular twist—which have no finds outside the British Isles. In the next chapter, Brugmann develops a comprehensive chronological production for these types and subtypes. Clearly, historiographic shifts towards economic influences on artistic production can be seen to have prompted the present study: Brugmann states that she is interested in whether bead fashions follow strictly regional Anglo-Saxon patterns for female dress or whether bead fashions are cross-regional links, whether the distribution patterns show evidence of an Anglo-Saxon production, and perhaps most important for recent trends in scholarship, whether there are bead links between Anglo-Saxon and North Sea graves that help us understand cultural or economic relations between these groups. These are all larger questions than the current study can investigate but this is an important step—taking technically-codified groups of beads (thirty-nine types, sixteen subtypes) and applying critical social questions. It is somewhat disappointing, therefore, that Brugmann does not finish with a larger socio-economic analysis; the bulk of this material is technical and rooted in the individual pieces. The value of this work is clear in its definition of the objects and the way in which it enables better scholarly analysis and discussion.

Elizabeth Coatsworth's "Stitches in Time: Establishing a History of Anglo-Saxon Embroidery," *Medieval*

*Clothing and Textiles* 1: 1–27 opens with a self-aware assessment of the limits of such a study: a small sample size (from what was undoubtedly a more prodigious production) creates complications of dating, the highly portable nature of the material creates difficulties of cultural attribution, and the inadequate descriptions in previous scholarship creates its own set of problems. Nevertheless, she undertakes to summarize the material from before 1100 in order to understand whether there can be national or period schools of embroidery. Coatsworth deals not just with Anglo-Saxon embroideries but, reflecting the cultural interactions and portability of these works, with western European embroideries as a whole, beginning with early burial tunic pieces from Migration-period Scandinavia, gold embroidered cuffs of seventh century Francia (held generally to be Byzantine), and the so-called chemise of St. Bathildis, an Anglo-Saxon slave who became the wife of King Clovis II and founded the monastery at Chelles. It is in the assessment of this last piece that Coatsworth's strengths as a scholar of textiles are clear: in her description she notes the way in which the original work has been discussed, particularly as a way of understanding the media connection to metalwork and the Byzantine influence on Merovingian production, rather than offering an assessment of the embroidery stitching itself. The Anglo-Saxon works highlighted by Coatsworth reflect increased detail here on specific stitches like the plait stitch (seen at Sutton Hoo, in comparison to Danish woolens) and the soumak weave (discussed in detail and in combination with the plait stitch with connection to a tablet-woven band from St. Cuthbert's coffin in Durham). The ninth century is one of the most important periods for Anglo-Saxon works, including the gold brocaded tablet band on the bursa of St. Willibrord now in Utrecht and the Maaseik group of embroideries; Coatsworth suggests stitch information from previously published information for British imported works to Norway. The tenth-century material highlights in detail the finds from St. Cuthbert's tomb, a stole and a maniple and other smaller pieces. Coatsworth continually updates the small corpus of material, including a linen garment from a ninth century, possibly royal, site excavated in 1990 at Llan-gors Crannóg in Powrys, Wales. Coatsworth's critical history provides a summary of scholarship on these objects with an eye toward a new and more complete understanding of production in the field. Anglo-Saxon embroideries were esteemed outside England and the connection between the techniques seen in these embroideries and production from other regions has not yet been adequately investigated. Nor have we fully begun to understand

the sociological expression of sewing and embroidery for these cultures; we need to begin to ask questions of "function" beyond the mere strengthening of seams.

Mary Dockray-Miller's "Maternal Sexuality on the Ruthwell Cross" in *Sex and Sexuality in Anglo-Saxon England* (ed. Pasternack and Weston, 121–46; see section 2), part of a collection of essays for Daniel Gillmore Calder, begins with the idea that "maternal sexuality" is both under-acknowledged as a medieval category of sexuality and one complicated by desire and pregnancy. While desire is necessary for conception, the woman's sexual identity is subsumed by her role as mother, fulfilling the needs of the child; the work here refers back to the work of theorist Sarah Ruddick, a position Dockray-Miller summarizes clearly for those not familiar with the material. Indeed, the grounding of her own highly-theoretical reading in the work of other scholars on this work (Karkov, Orton, Farr, and others) is well done throughout. Dockray-Miller suggests that the presentation of the Virgin Mary in the Annunciation and the Flight into Egypt panels on the Ruthwell Cross show a conscious and deliberate focus on the maternal body of the Virgin, rather than downplaying her presence to emphasize the Christ child. The author concurs with other recent scholars, particularly Éamonn Ó Carragáin, in drawing a parallel between the body of the Virgin that bears the child and the Rood (here as visual form and poem) that bears the crucified body. The form of Dockray-Miller's argument can perhaps best be seen in her discussion of the conflictingly-read panel of Mary-Martha/Visitation, which she interprets not as an abstraction of the active/contemplative life but as a physical embodiment of that conflict in Mary's pregnant body; the emphasis on corporeality, specifically pregnant/maternal embodiment, is critical. In the visual analysis of the Annunciation scene, Dockray-Miller draws attention to the unusual standing figure of Mary and the ways in which elements like the halo equate her with the angel, rather than making her subservient. Similarly, the hunched protective posture of Mary in the Flight into Egypt is seen as an expression of this specifically maternal sexuality, in which her nurture of the child is a primary characteristic. Finally, her feminist reading of this iconography closes with speculation of audience reception: Anglo-Saxon widows, either lay or nuns, would have related very personally with the figure of Mary as both maternal and holy.

James Graham-Campbell's article "On the Witham Bowl," *AntJ* 84: 358–71, is an investigation on the now-lost Anglo-Saxon (probably 8th century) silver hanging



bowl found in the River Witham (Lincolnshire), which gathers its information from the previously published material and remaining evidence. Much is based on a set of color drawings, possibly actual size, of the bowl, its gold filigree, its millefiori panels, the human heads which form the legs of the bowl, and its beasts at the four cardinal points around the rim. Graham-Campbell traces the history of the search for the bowl by T.D. Kendrick in the early 1940s and his correspondence on the bowl with the collector Phillip Nelson. The author compares the elaborate Witham Bowl to the other known examples of Anglo-Saxon silver bowls, the late seventh- or early eighth-century version with gilt mounts from St. Ninian's Isle and the Lejre bowl. He then updates our knowledge of the Witham Bowl based on the 1995 excavation of a bowl in Bornholm, Denmark; that bowl has a similar quadripartite division with circular mounts and the unusual quadrupeds. After examining close common elements on the Bornholm bowl for stylistic similarities, Graham-Campbell notes that the bowl likely was used for water, creating a motif of the "dog" head paddling above the water or, more persuasively, of a long-necked water monster (connected to readings from the *Liber Monstrorum*). Finally, the article concludes with the possible presence of the bowl in the collection of John Hawkins, later dispersed at the death of his heirs. Graham-Campbell helps to understand the prominence of the bowl in the Society of Antiquaries holdings through the loan of the piece from Hawkins to a show organized by A.W. Franks in 1850. The bowl remains lost, but Graham-Campbell has admirably reconstructed the piece for us.

FA

#### e. Inscriptions

Elizabeth Okasha's "A Third Supplement to *Hand-List of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions*," ASE 33: 225–81, brings the *Hand-List*, originally published in 1971, up to date as far as 2004. It contains twenty-eight entries, all except two personally seen by the author. The format of the entries follows that of the original *Hand-List* and the two previous supplements. One change is that the list no longer includes inscriptions on coin brooches—although eleven new ones are listed in Index III—because these are more properly the concern of numismatics. She notes that new pieces of coin jewelry will be published by Marion Archibald and Gareth Williams.

Gifford Charles-Edwards also focuses on inscriptions in "A Reconsideration of the Origins of Early

Insular Monumental Lettering of the Mixed Alphabet Type: The Case of the 'Lapis Echodi' Inscription on Iona," *Proc. of the Soc. of Antiquaries of Scotland* 134: 173–81. Charles-Edwards begins with a discussion of Welsh inscriptions from the period 400–600 which show near calligraphic features and little scribal awareness in their execution. There are "mixed alphabet" inscriptions among them. The term "mixed alphabet" is from V.E. Nash-Williams's *Early Christian Monuments of Wales*, and refers to monuments in his Group 1. Such inscriptions combine features of informal curvilinear hands with simplified and angular minuscule letters. She suggests that we look for the source of the mixed-alphabet script in early Insular minuscule hands. The "Lapis Echodi" stone is a small chi-rho cross-slab that Charles-Edwards examines in relation to the non-calligraphic mixed-alphabet group of inscriptions. She points out that in both early Welsh and Scottish inscriptions a movement from two-line capitals to four-line letter forms with ascenders and descenders takes place. The movement suggests a scaling-down in the repertoire, and an abandonment of grand Roman monumental capitals in favor of the more practical letter forms of bookhands. An examination of the earliest surviving Insular manuscripts (the Cathach of St. Columba and Dublin, Trinity College Library MS Ussher I), and the Springmount Bog Tablets reveals that the scribes of all three were fluent in a minuscule rather than a majuscule hand. She sees a close relationship between the strokes used in the Echodi inscription and those used in the Cathach. By Group II (600–800) monastic house styles are clearly apparent in inscriptions. Charles-Edwards's study has implications far beyond identifying the influences apparent in the Echodi inscription. By establishing the influence of an early pre-canonical scribal hand on epigraphy, it might be possible to refine some of the broad dating bands that currently exist for this material.

In "The Inscriptions of Viking-Age York" (*Aspects of Anglo-Scandinavian York*, ed. Hall, 350–356) David Parsons asks whether the virtual absence of runic inscriptions from the city is significant. (Inscriptions in Roman script from the Viking-Age city are also very limited.) While it is probably safe to conclude that runic writing was less used in Viking York than in Bergen or some other Scandinavian towns in the medieval period, Parsons notes that such comparisons are anachronistic as most of the finds from Bergen, for example, are from the twelfth through fifteenth centuries. In fact, with the exception of such unusual places as Uppland, Sweden, or the Isle of Man, there are very few finds of

runic inscriptions from most of the Viking world. The marked decline in inscriptions from the Anglian to the Viking period in York, Parsons believes, is indicative of a wider decline in inscriptions across the area that followed the Viking conquest of the ninth century. He suggests that the Scandinavians were quick to embrace the language and religion of the Anglo-Saxons, but that isolated inscriptions, such as that on the Skelton-in-Cleveland sundial, may indicate that Norse speakers could use their own language and alphabet when they wished to do so. (See "Regional Studies and the Economy" above for more articles from this collection.)

CK

#### f. Numismatics

Also from *Aspects of Anglo-Scandinavian York*, Mark Blackburn's "The Coinage of Scandinavian York" (325–349) is not a survey but rather focuses on specific aspects of the coinage and what it reveals about the history and economy of the region. Blackburn begins by discussing the imitative coinage of the northern Danelaw, the earliest examples of which copied coins from Wessex and Mercia. In the mid 890s a new and distinctive type of coinage was introduced, a pattern that he notes is typical of newly formed states. This new type (ca. 895–905) is associated with the reigns of the kings Sigeforth and Cnut, and with Alwaldus, who is given no title, but who is probably to be identified with the West Saxon prince Æthelwold who fought against Edward the Elder. This is a complex, sophisticated, and highly literate coinage that is characterized by liturgical phrases and highly unusual iconography, and that shows an awareness of both Anglo-Saxon and Frankish coins. Its message is a combination of independence, power, and Christianity, and Blackburn demonstrates that royal rather than clerical control is evident in both its design and message. In 905 the St. Peter issues were introduced, and endured for another fifteen years—though they came to show a marked decline in weight and literacy. He disagrees with Rollason (313–14) that the St. Peter's issues were ecclesiastical coinages. The coinage is associated with Ragnold I, and combines a Scandinavian and Christian message, similar to contemporary sculpture and metalwork from the region. Blackburn rightly points out, for example, that the Thor's hammer can also be read as a Tau cross. The final period of this study (927–954) sees the reestablishment of a coinage with an obvious political message, again with a syncretic iconography. "The plan must have been to oust English pennies from circulation and replace them with an overtly Anglo-Scandinavian coinage on the same

weight standard as the Sword of St. Peter coins of the 920s" (336). Blackburn suggests that the declining standard of literacy evident in the coinage, coupled with the lack of surviving documents from Anglo-Scandinavian York, could indicate that the Scandinavian administration may have relied on an oral means of governing and legislation. The coinage itself reveals that, unlike other Anglo-Saxon mints, York often had a single moneyer in charge up until Edgar's 973 reform of the coinage. The names indicate that a large number of moneyers were of Frankish origin, and had most likely been recruited by the Scandinavians. All in all, the numismatic evidence provides a portrait of York as an economically thriving city. (See "Regional Studies and the Economy" above for more articles from this collection.)

D.M. Metcalf explores "Monetary Circulation in England, ca. 675–ca. 710: The Distribution Patterns of Series A, B and C—and F" *British Numismatic Jnl* 74: 1–19. A, B, and C, the three series of primary *sceattas*, originated in the southeast, and were also used in East Anglia, Mercia, Wessex, Lindsey, and Northumbria, and it is this distribution on which Metcalf focuses. He suggests that diffusion was from south-east to north-west, with the south coast and north-east area of England being somewhat left out. Based on circulation patterns, Metcalf suggest reassigning type BII to west Norfolk, and that series F is English, rather than Frankish, and probably originated in the Middle Thames region. Series D and E are not discussed in this paper because they have a different distribution pattern.

Marion M. Archibald and Michel Dhenin report on "A Scaet of Offa of Mercia," *British Numismatic Jnl* 74: 20–27. The coin, dated 757 to ca. 760–65, was found at an unknown location in France and is now in the Bibliothèque Nationale (BNF 1988–54). This is the earliest coin in Offa's name known to date, and is a previously unrecorded issue that preceded his broad penny coinage. It was struck at a Mercian mint, most probably London. The obverse of the coin shows a large wading bird moving to the right with raised wings. The only parts of the inscription that are clearly legible are O and F, with a serif suggesting another F, and traces of what has been interpreted as A, but which the authors prefer to interpret as X. They reconstruct the inscription as +OFFA REX, with pellets between each letter. The authors identify the bird as a Black-tailed Godwit, which they suggest was a Mercian emblem serving to identify either king or people. The Black-tailed Godwit was one of the most prominent Mercian birds, and because of its aggressive behavior would have made

an appropriate symbol for a king. On the reverse is a Celtic cross with four smaller birds. The design actually includes two crosses, the Celtic cross and a cross formed by the four birds. Both zoomorphic ornament and multiple crosses are typical of English *sceattas* of the period, but the design has no exact parallels in Anglo-Saxon art.

CK

In “A New Moneyer for the Post-Brunanburh Viking Rulers of York,” *British Numismatic Jnl* 74: 178–80, Stewart Lyon and Simon Holmes report on a 2002 find from Middleton on the Wolds, East Yorkshire which lists a new moneyer for coins made for Regnald Guthfrithsson, one of three Norse Viking rulers in the period between 941 and Edmund’s 944 retaking of York. The coin under investigation is of the Triquetra/Standard type, distinctively minted on a hand cut die in the York area, presumably where the coins were used. The authors link the Durant name to several other moneyer dies in Southumbrian issue, possibly (though not likely) by the same man working over a period of thirty years in the areas of York and Five Boroughs (with some straying into West Mercia).

In “The Bamburgh Hoard of Ninth-Century Northumbrian Coins,” *Archaeologia Aeliana* 5th ser. 33: 65–75, Elizabeth Pirie examines a group of 312 Anglo-Saxon *stycas* of copper alloy from the period between 830 and 855, discovered 1999–2002 and now in the collection of the Museum of Antiquities in Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Treated as a hoard for its coherence in make-up, the find is of moderate size; Pirie places it in the context of other finds from the area (Bamburgh Castle which also had a number of *stycas*). These *stycas* fall into two production phases and include work for both archbishops and kings together; Phase II shows clear evidence of connections between moneyers. At the end of the eighth century, Northumbrian practice retained the small size of earlier *sceattas* rather than switching to the larger silver penny of Southumbria. Initially made in silver (ca. 790–796) and reissued on occasion rather than regularly, the year 830 saw a break in production from silver to copper alloy. New moneyers took up production in the phase between 837 and ca. 855, and minting was more regular with a larger output; Pirie notes a number of unauthorized coins in circulation, which may have led to a collapse around 843, though the coins were accepted until the Viking incursions of 867. Pirie’s analysis shows highly regional die production, from York to Deira and a small but substantial group from multiple centers in Bernicia; they

are unlikely to have been minted at Bamburgh. Coin dies are linked as moneyers shared obverse dies for the king’s name while retaining their own individual named reverse dies, which suggests that moneyers were mobile from one center to another. Pirie’s analysis of the hoard has implications for understanding the Northumbrian economy and practices: the wide circulation of both regular and irregular issues, the actual practices of moneying, and in the use of certain dies (Wernuth), an indication of connection to earlier Roman-Anglian and Saxon motifs. In addition to plates showing the coins, Pirie includes a supplemental list of the hoard inventories held by the Museum of Antiquities.

FA

### g. Miscellaneous

Sarah Harrison, in “The Icknield Way: Some Queries,” *ArchJ* 160 (2003): 1–22, examines the tenuous evidence for the existence of such a route surviving from the prehistoric period to the present—a route, she maintains, which would never have been heard of “but for the creative minds of a few medieval chroniclers,” and which has yet been a secure feature of British archaeology for many generations. She maintains that at the most it could have been no more than medium-range Saxon trackway, perhaps linking significant settlements along the western end of the chalk escarpment (only part of its putative length).

EC

A. Letch’s “St. Mary and All Saints Church, Rivenhall: An Analysis of the Historic Fabric,” *Essex Archaeology and History* 3rd ser. 32 (2001): 133–45, provides the results of a 1999 survey undertaken following the removal of cement render from the north and south chancel walls of the church. The church consists of a nave, chancel, tower, and porch, and was constructed over the remains of a large Roman building that was part of a villa complex. Roman tile quarried from the Roman buildings was used to level the courses of the fabric, and as the height of the church increased larger quantities of material from the Roman villa were used in the fabric. In his 1985 survey of the church, Warwick Rodwell argued that the present structure was built in the tenth or eleventh century abutting the western wall of an earlier timber-built chapel, and the present paper generally supports his conclusions. The form of the church, its details and its fabric, are all typical of other Anglo-Saxon and Norman churches in the area. The survey documents four main builds within the Saxo-Norman period. Subsequently, the apse of the

Anglo-Saxon church was demolished and the chancel extended to the east in the medieval period, and the whole structure underwent further restorations and rebuildings in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries.

Robert Cowie surveys "The Evidence for Royal Sites in Middle Anglo-Saxon London," *MA* 48: 201–09. While no such site has been positively identified to date in central London, four possible locations for royal settlement have been proposed: (1) an area within the Roman town of *Londinium* (now the City), (2) the trading port of Lundenwic (now the area of the Strand), (3) the area around Fleet Street, (4) the Westminster and Whitehall river bank. Each proposed site is both problematic and promising. A recent reassessment of the archaeological and documentary evidence suggests that there is no royal site in the area of the City, although Cowie believes that it should not be ruled out altogether. He points out that the western hill of the City was an episcopal seat and was near to the port of Lundenwic, an area in which the limited number of Middle Saxon objects known to date have been discovered. Excavation has revealed that the Strand area, not surprisingly, was a hub of activity. While nothing suggestive of a royal site has been found, control of trade and income from it would have been "easily managed" from a royal center. As only a relatively small area of this site has been excavated, further discoveries may well come to light. Topographically, the area around Fleet Street would be the most likely place for a royal site. A number of suggestive finds, including a prestigious silver sword-hilt have been discovered here, but the archaeological evidence remains ambiguous. The Westminster and Whitehall river bank area, on the other hand, has provided few finds except for the Treasury site excavated between 1961 and 1963, where a late eighth- to mid ninth-century settlement was found. The site was originally interpreted as a thane's residence, though it could perhaps have been a palace. Cowie believes that of the four areas this is the strongest candidate for a Middle Anglo-Saxon royal site in central London.

CK

P.S. Barnwell, in "The Laity, the Clergy and the Divine Presence: The Use of Space in Smaller Churches of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *Jnl of the British Archaeological Assoc.* 157: 41–60, examines the plans of many different types of early churches in order to fill some of the gaps in our knowledge of ritual space in medieval parishes. These include the three-celled

churches, such as at Kilpeck, Herefordshire, and Elkestone, Gloucestershire; these buildings have a western nave, a square central compartment, and an eastern end, though the articulation of the eastern end does vary. Barnswell examines this as an architectural designation of status, especially given the decoration of arches as at Kilpeck. There is an extended discussion of altar placement in which Barnswell addresses the ways in which the central compartment as an area for the main altar might have both afforded sight lines from the nave through a rood screen and used the apse beyond for symbolic light. The author then takes up altar placement in single-cell or two-cell churches, often highlighting the spatial priority of the altar to the detriment of congregational space (as at Raunds Furnells, Northamptonshire). Barnswell sees a significant connection between these church arrangements (western congregant space, central altar placement, and eastern clergy space) and basilica design, perhaps a deliberate connection to Roman rite and Roman architectural practice. Barnswell notes that this spatial disposition does not change in the English design despite changes in the design in Francia in the eighth century which allowed for eastern placement of relics and more western placement of clergy; this spatial differentiation changes considerably after the thirteenth century, concurrent with increased emphasis on the elevation of the Host. This article feels somewhat generalized; one would have liked more specifics about both the buildings and the liturgy and the author's setting in context is overly vague about details, especially in the critical transitions from Roman Britain to Christian Anglo-Saxon Britain—see, among other recent works, Simon Draper, "Roman Estates to English Parishes? The Legacy of Desmond Bonney Reconsidered" in *Debating Late Antiquity in Britain AD 300-700*, ed. Rob Collins and James Gerrard (in section a above).

Claude Blair, in "Loving Cups and Grace Cups," *Antf* 84: 393–99, examines the practice at the close of City Company dinners to pass a cup of wine among the diners with those waiting to receive the cup guarding the drinker from being stabbed as is claimed to have happened to King Edward the Martyr at Corfe Castle by Elfrida. Blair's study looks at the Romantic origins of the practice, noting the erroneous and sentimental attribution to King Alfred's time (877-891). The practice of pledging, drawing from a repeated mythology of English-Danish distrust, is viewed in detail from its eighteenth century origins, including its visual origins in eleventh-century illuminations misinterpreted by these antiquarians. Finally, Blair connects the



loving-cup practice with the grace cup, which he connects to the Eucharist.

The editor, Neil Christie, presents the collection of essays *Landscapes of Change: Rural Evolutions in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Aldershot: Ashgate) as a companion to his earlier edited volume, *Towns in Transition: Urban Evolution in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (1996). While the two volumes address vastly different geographies, both address similar themes of redefinition in the period between 300 and 800, a characterization that is both multi-systemic and perceptual. In my opinion, it is indeed important to use these works together as the geographies of towns must be understood as not bounded by the countryside but integrated with their rural surroundings and that resource economy; the collected authors here are interested in nuancing the urban exploitation of the landscape. Christie's thoroughly-sourced introduction lays out the various methodological difficulties of documentation, landscape archaeology, and population modeling (with an interesting section on villa "(d)evolution"—an apt term for describing not the wholesale abandonment of large villas with their social display but the shift to smaller sites with different perception). Christie also raises questions about the effects of Christianization on villas (both the Italian center and the territorial peripheries). Does it reflect the religious conversion of the owners or reoccupation by new owners? And with whose authority? What was the relationship between the Church and the surrounding communities (in terms of service and architecture)? In this and in the case of *agri deserti* in cases of war, Christie reminds us of the frequent disparity between the historical accounts and the archaeological evidence; he adds that the perception of insecurity attendant on the new military realities is one we should approach as highly dependent on the individual factors of the settlement. The responses of communities to these shifting military/political identities as displacing the inhabitants, consciously affecting or denying social identifications, is an area for fruitful inquiry in these essays. Overall, the book is adequate but not lavish in its use of illustrations; its essays all have thorough bibliographies of use to the scholarly reader. A strength is in its address of the questions of transition over the whole of the former Roman Empire. Most of the essays provide a varied look at these patterns of use, reuse, and decline (Alexandra Chavarría Arnau, "Interpreting the Transformation of Late Roman Villas: The Case of Hispania"; Paul Arthur, "From Vicus to Village: Italian Landscapes, AD 40-1000"; Anna Leone and David

Mattingly, "Vandal, Byzantine, and Arab Rural Landscapes in North Africa"; G.D.R. Sanders, "Problems in Interpreting Rural and Urban Settlement in Southern Greece, AD 36-700"; William Bowden and Richard Hodges, "Balkan Ghosts? Nationalism and the Question of Rural Continuity in Albania"; Andrew Poulter, "Cataclysm on the Lower Danube: The Destruction of a Complex Roman Landscape"; Patrick Périn, "The Origin of the Village in Early Medieval Gaul"). The three essays that address Romano-Britain directly will be reviewed here.

Sarah Scott's "Elites, Exhibitionism and the Society of the Late Roman Villa" (39-66) suggests that we see the late Roman villa as a "dramatic flourish of wealth, power, and stability," and notes the semantic difficulties in defining their varied presence in the medieval economy. Scott provides critical background to the social situation of these villas as she traces the fourth-century rise in rural versus urban investments and the attendant literature which shaped the perception of this landowning. These were desirable residences, used as deliberate displays of personal wealth and cultural and spiritual learning. There is a large section in this essay on the villas of Sicily in addition to the architectural/decorative analysis of British sites (Woodchester in Gloucestershire, Box in Wiltshire, and Lullingstone in Kent). The Lullingstone site's apsidal plan and mosaics particularly show these trends of late Roman social valuation linking Classical forms and Christian connotations. Scott also addresses the stamp of the villa on the surrounding landscape, drawing on field studies to draw a picture of the Late Roman villa in Britain as an agricultural center of land tenure which actually reflect a whole range of declining scenarios from conscious retention of the Roman model, coexistence between Roman and Saxon models, and gradual transition to agricultural or even monastic communities.

In "The Late Antique Landscape of Britain, AD 300-700" (279-99), Ken Dark counters the traditional view of seeing Late-Roman-Britain as a sharp discontinuity between Roman and Saxon cultures/institutions/structures. Instead, he argues for a model of punctuated change—a gradual transition in socio-economic practice, a more sudden one caused by political and religious change (simultaneously occurring). He defines a re-formation of Roman practices as Roman-Christian practices, reflecting continuing pockets of paganism, developing Christianity, and even monastic architectural appropriation of pagan sites. Like Scott, he notes the difficulty of defining late-Roman villas (palatial

villas versus smaller villas) in the British tenure system given current archaeological research; critically, villas are centers of agricultural production, the monetary economy, and luxury consumption. Contrasting Neil Faulkner's assessment (2001), Dark suggests that the fourth century in Britain may have seen the continued growth of palatial estates at the expense of smaller holdings, with an attendant connection to pagan practice. Dark holds to a pattern of dramatic but not uniform collapse in Britain in the fifth century, noting areas of squatter occupation and reuse of Roman buildings with disregard for formerly significant features, drawing on Cool's (2000) analysis of coin use and fashions in common in the period, and marking Christian appropriation of sites (as in the monastery at Llandough, south Wales). Dark also examines the villa connection in the rise of hillforts and the development of British kingship in the later centuries. He closes with a look at incoming Anglo-Saxon settlement.

Helena Hamerow's essay, "The Archaeology of Early Anglo-Saxon Settlements: Past, Present and Future," (301–16), closes the *Landscapes of Change* collection with an historiographic analysis of settlement studies, seeing a change from the narrow focus of thirty years ago (West Stow, Mucking, New Wintles Farm, Chalton, Yeavinger) to a slowly wider focus. New understanding of settlement features like timber buildings, post holes, and the new use of foundation trenches, the shared use of templates between communities, and shared cultural building types (the "longhouse" absence) creates a new picture of the spatial and social norms. Hamerow offers a look at fruitful areas for continued study in the field, most engagingly in the mention of the Barton Court Farm (Oxfordshire) site where Saxon graves are within derelict Roman villa buildings but also in areas of archeo-botany/archaeo-zoology and economics.

John M. Steane's *The Archaeology of Power: England and Northern Europe AD 800-1600* (Stroud: Tempus, 2001) begins with a personal account that reveals his own understanding of the physical expressions of authority and his dedication to teaching. Steane's commitment to students is evident in his writing style—clear and direct—and his organization of material—an initial summary chapter entitled "The Ideology of Power 800-1600" that outlines the intersecting institutions of the period. The book is well illustrated, with several plates in color. Steane has a very broad view of power; since every level of society has some need to articulate its authority in some way, there are actually multiple expressions of power operating simultaneously

in medieval (and indeed, modern Foucaultian) society. In practice, this makes a book that presents a very broad overview; it becomes a book for students entering the material, not for specialists in any of his chapter topics. That said, it is a good book for students: a style not overly dry, informative overview of material, and many general examples that might spark deeper investigative projects, although disappointing somewhat in the rigor of its footnotes and bibliography. The first chapter broadly summarizes a number of historical sites over the broad range of the Middle Ages. It is here that his general thesis of a physical expression of power takes shape; in his very first chapter, he sets the reader up to see a Roman establishment of the palace form (in both Continental and English buildings) and then races through a site catalogue including such disparate designs as Aachen, Mayenne (ca. 900), Paderborn (ca. 900), and the Ottonian palaces of the fortified type (as at Werla) and of the Romanized type (as at Magdeburg), before moving on to England (Anglo-Saxon and then Anglo-Norman), the Magyar palaces, and closing with the episcopal form of palaces with some examination of the manor house at Witney (Oxfordshire), the town palace in London of the Bishop of Winchester, and the archbishop's palace in Canterbury. The second chapter, "The palace: purpose and location," encourages the reader to see various architectural structures—gates, halls, kitchens, staircases—as part of the experience of power. The section on English halls may be taken as typical of Steane's work: he summarizes English hall development "over five hundred years" under five main bullet points (entrance, doors off the entrance, the open hearth, the dais, and canopies/high tables), points that give an overview with a few examples but that do not focus on differences in design from building to building or specifics in usage at any particular location. The third chapter moves from secular to sacred in its look at the Church, with subheadings on the crowns, staffs, and rings of office, tombs (in which he makes a summary case for family or dynastic tombs being the focus of interest in the later medieval church), and seats and seating plans. Steane's case that the Church fights secularization with increasing the mysteries of the service (pulpitum, the elevation of the Host) is a political position that blurs the developmental subtleties of that sacramental history. In the fourth chapter, "The Crowning Glory," Steane focuses first on the English coronation ceremony, focusing primarily on fourteenth-century accounts, and then moves on to the French and German coronation ceremonies. He devotes significant attention to the Bohemian practice under Charles IV (crowned in 1346) and

his reorganization of Prague. The sixth chapter, "The Archaeology of Law," addresses the judicial system as an adjunct to the royal power, and focuses exclusively on England. There is a brief section on Anglo-Saxon prison sites, executions, and burials (which touches on but does not really lay out for the reader the current scholarly understanding of the complexity of Anglo-Saxon burials as social demarcations), then larger sections on the king's courts, Norman institutions of the shire and hundreds courts, and justice courts under Edward I. Steane addresses physical manifestations of power, particularly the stone benches, seals, and later medieval dress, that characterized the legal profession. The seventh chapter on town walls and town halls is followed by perhaps the most interesting chapter, "The archaeology of bureaucracy," a look at the trappings of civic engagement from the archaeological residue of wax tablets, rolls, royal archives, tallies, muniment rooms and chests, and library storage practices and tools. The weakest chapter is the last, "The archaeology of the high life," in which Steane's summary of the situation glosses over the nuances of social change from Roman to Anglo-Saxon to Anglo-Norman to Angevin to later medieval English court politics. The section on tableware in this chapter is much more detailed than the subheadings on dress and transport. He is similarly less convincing about the expression of these forms as exclusionary of other groups, a case he makes more convincingly in other chapters. To reiterate, the scholar well-versed in power mechanics as a methodology and the scholar interested in the Anglo-Saxon period in particular will find this book unsatisfying; those looking for a good summary for students for the whole of the Middle Ages on the topic of authority will find it most useful.

FA

*Works not seen*

- Edgeworth, Matt, with illustrations by Cecily Marshall. "Recent Archaeological Investigations in Bedford Town Centre: Evidence for an Early Northern Boundary?" *Bedfordshire Archaeology* 25 (2004): 190–200, ill.
- Hardy, Alan, and Peter Lorimer. *The Roots of an English Town: Exploring the Archaeology of Higham Ferrers*. Osney Mead: Oxford Archaeological Unit, 2004. 51 pp. ill.
- Lakin, David. "The Prittlewell Royal Anglo-Saxon Burial." *Minerva* 15.3 (May/June 2004): 31–32, ill.
- Leahy, K. "The Cleatham Anglo-Saxon Cemetery and Its Regional Context." Ph.D. Thesis, U of Nottingham, 2003. *Index to Theses* 53 (2004): 7633.
- Olsen, Ted. "Christian Saxon King Unearthed." *Christian History & Biography* 82 (Spring 2004): 9, ill. [Prittlewell tomb]
- Pine, Jo. "Excavation of a Medieval Settlement, Late Saxon Features and a Bronze Age Cremation Cemetery at Loughton, Milton Keynes." *Records of Buckinghamshire* 43 (2003): 77–126, ill.
- Semple, S. J. "Anglo-Saxon Attitudes to the Past: A Landscape Perspective." D.Phil. Thesis, U of Oxford, 2003. *Index to Theses* 53 (2004): 299.
- Thomas, Gabor. "Lewinna, Latrines and Loom-weights." *Sussex Past & Present* 102 (April 2004): 6–8, ill. [excavations of Anglo-Saxon village at Bishopstone, East Sussex]

## Abbreviations

---

AB	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i>
ANQ	<i>[formerly] American Notes and Queries</i>
AntJ	<i>Antiquaries Journal</i>
ArchJ	<i>Archaeological Journal</i>
ASE	<i>Anglo-Saxon England</i>
ASSAH	<i>Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History</i>
BAR	<i>British Archaeological Reports</i>
BN	<i>Beiträge zur Namenforschung</i>
CCM	<i>Cahiers de civilisation médiévale</i>
CSASE	<i>Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England</i>
DAEM	<i>Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters</i>
DAI	<i>Dissertation Abstracts International</i>
EHR	<i>English Historical Review</i>
ELN	<i>English Language Notes</i>
EME	<i>Early Medieval Europe</i>
ES	<i>English Studies</i>
JEGP	<i>Journal of English and Germanic Philology</i>
JEH	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
JEPNS	<i>Journal of the English Place-Name Society</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
MA	<i>Medieval Archaeology</i>
MAI	<i>Medieval Abstracts International</i>
MÆ	<i>Medium Ævum</i>
MLR	<i>Modern Language Review</i>
MP	<i>Modern Philology</i>
MRTS	<i>Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies</i>
MS	<i>Mediaeval Studies</i>
N&Q	<i>Notes and Queries</i>
NM	<i>Neuphilologische Mitteilungen</i>
NOWELE	<i>North-Western European Language Evolution</i>
OEN	<i>Old English Newsletter</i>
PBA	<i>Proceedings of the British Academy</i>
PQ	<i>Philological Quarterly</i>
RB	<i>Revue Bénédictine</i>
RES	<i>Review of English Studies</i>
SELIM	<i>Revista de la Sociedad Española de Lengua y Literatura Inglesa Medieval</i>
SN	<i>Studia Neophilologica</i>
SP	<i>Studies in Philology</i>



# 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 (fax 732-263-5242 or email 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):**

This information may also be submitted online at <http://www.oennewsletter.org/OEN/RIP.php>.



## *How to Contact the Old English Newsletter*

All correspondence regarding the editing of *OEN*, including submissions, and all business correspondence, including publication information, subscriptions, back orders, or change of address, should be sent to:

R. M. Liuzza  
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

For information on the *Old English Newsletter Subsidia* series, please contact:

*Old English Newsletter Subsidia*  
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

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 annual *Bibliography*, including citations and offprints, should be sent to:

Thomas N. Hall  
Department of English  
356 O'Shaughnessy Hall  
University of Notre Dame  
Notre Dame, IN 46556  
e-mail: thall8@nd.edu

To submit abstracts of papers given at conferences for the annual *Abstracts* feature, write to:

Dana Oswald  
Department of English  
University of Wisconsin, Parkside  
900 Wood Road, P.O. Box 2000  
Kenosha WI 53141-2000  
email: oswald@uwp.edu

Information about research in progress, including current research, work completed, and forthcoming publications, should be sent to:

Heide Estes  
Department of English  
Monmouth University  
West Long Branch, NJ 07764  
fax: 732-263-5242  
email: hestes@monmouth.edu

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER  
MIEVEAL INSTITUTE  
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY  
1903 W. MICHIGAN AVE.  
KALAMAZOO, MI 49008-5432

NON-PROFIT  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
PERMIT 478  
KALAMAZOO, MI