

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER

*Published for The Old English Division
of the Modern Language Association of America
by The Department of English, University of Tennessee, Knoxville*

| | |
|--------------------|-----------|
| <i>VOLUME</i> | <i>40</i> |
| <i>NUMBER</i> | <i>2</i> |
| <i>Winter 2007</i> | |

ISSN 0030-1973

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER

Volume 40 Number 2

Winter 2007

EDITOR

R. M. Liuzza, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Year's Work in Old English Studies: Daniel Donoghue, Harvard University

Bibliography: Thomas Hall, University of Notre Dame

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Research in Progress: Heide Estes, Monmouth University

Conference Abstracts: Robert Butler, Alcorn State University

Bibliography: Melinda Menzer, Furman University

EDITORIAL BOARD

Patrick W. Conner, West Virginia University

Antonette diPaolo Healey, *Dictionary of Old English*

David F. Johnson, Florida State University

Catherine Karkov, University of Leeds

Ursula Lenker, University of Munich

Mary Swan, University of Leeds

ASSISTANT TO THE EDITOR: Teresa Hooper

The *Old English Newsletter* (ISSN 0030-1973) is published for the Old English Division of the Modern Language Association by the Department of English, University of Tennessee, 301 McClung Tower, Knoxville, TN, 37996-0430; email editor@oenewsletter.org. The generous support of the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists and the Department of English at The University of Tennessee is gratefully acknowledged.

Subscriptions: The rate for institutions is \$20 US per volume; the rate for individuals is \$15 per volume, but in order to reduce administrative costs the editors ask individuals to pay for two volumes at once at the discounted rate of \$25. Individual back issues can be ordered for \$5 each. All payments must be made in US dollars. A subscription form is online at http://www.oenewsletter.org/OEN/subscription_form.pdf.

Correspondence: General correspondence regarding *OEN*, including changes of address, should be sent to the Editor; correspondence regarding the *Year's Work*, *Bibliography*, *Research in Progress* or *Abstracts* should be sent to the respective Associate or Contributing Editors. Editorial addresses appear on the inside back cover.

Submissions: *OEN* 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 off-prints of articles, and notices of books or monographs, to the Editor.

Material in *OEN* may be reproduced for noncommercial educational or scientific purposes. All other requests for permission to reprint items from *OEN* should be addressed to the Editor.

Copyright © 2007 The University of Tennessee.

<http://www.oenewsletter.org/>

THE YEAR'S WORK IN OLD ENGLISH STUDIES

2005

CONTRIBUTORS

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Frances Altvater | <i>University of Hartford</i> |
| Dabney Bankert | <i>James Madison University</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> |
| Dianne Jonas | <i>Yale University</i> |
| Eileen A. Joy | <i>Southern Illinois U—Edwardsville</i> |
| Stefan Jurasinski | <i>State U of New York—Brockport</i> |
| Paul Kershaw | <i>University of Virginia</i> |
| Aaron Kleist | <i>Biola University</i> |
| Christina Lee | <i>University of Nottingham</i> |
| Joseph P. McGowan | <i>University of San Diego</i> |
| Robin Norris | <i>Carleton University</i> |
| Andrew Rabin | <i>University of Louisville</i> |
| Mary K. Ramsey | <i>Southeastern Louisiana 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> |
| Douglas Simms | <i>Southern Illinois U—Edwardsville</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

| | |
|---|------------|
| Foreword | 5 |
| 1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects | 6 |
| 2. Memorials, Tributes, History of the Discipline | 8 |
| a. History of the Discipline | 8 |
| b. Memorials and Tributes | 14 |
| 3. Language | 16 |
| a. Lexicon, Glosses | 16 |
| b. Syntax, Phonology, Other Aspects | 25 |
| 4. Literature | 44 |
| a. General and Miscellaneous | 44 |
| b. Individual Poems | 80 |
| c. <i>Beowulf</i> | 95 |
| d. Prose | 114 |
| 5. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works | 141 |
| 6. Manuscripts, Illuminations, Charters | 156 |
| 7. History and Culture | 168 |
| a. General Sources and Reference Works | 168 |
| b. Religion and the Church | 169 |
| c. Ecclesiastical Culture | 175 |
| d. Society and the Family | 181 |
| e. Gender and Identity | 182 |
| f. The Economy, Settlement and Landscape | 183 |
| g. Medicine and Science | 187 |
| h. Law, Politics and Warfare | 188 |
| i. Vikings | 192 |
| j. The Norman Conquest and Settlement | 192 |
| 8. Names | 202 |
| 9. Archaeology, Sculpture, Inscriptions, Numismatics | 205 |
| a. Excavations | 205 |
| b. The Anglo-Saxon Church | 208 |
| c. Regional Studies and Economic Studies | 209 |
| d. Artifacts and Iconography | 214 |
| e. Numismatics | 217 |
| f. Miscellaneous | 220 |
| Abbreviations | 222 |

Foreword

In the last issue's Foreword we welcomed five new reviewers and bid adieu to four. This time we welcome another five and say farewell to three. I won't trouble you with the math, but the upshot is a net gain in the number of reviewers. For the 2005 issue, the masthead boasts almost thirty names, the largest number of reviewers in the long and distinguished history of *YWOES*.

Once again we thank Catherine Karkov for her one-year gig in Archaeology, Numismatics, Sculpture for 2004; for 2005 we welcome Christina Lee of the University of Nottingham, who joins veterans Fran Altvater and Betty Coatsworth.

David F. Johnson, who started reviewing for the 1995 *YWOES*, has decided to step down after contributing to ten issues. We will miss his judicious reviews, not to mention his competence in Dutch. In his place Glenn Davis has shifted over from Syntax. And because Mary Blockley has also decided to step down after two years of reviewing (Mary, you go with our thanks), there has been a complete turnover within Team Syntax for 2005. In place of Glenn and Mary we welcome Dianne Jonas of Yale University; the last-minute loss of another reviewer has meant that an unusually large number of items have been deferred until next year, when we hope Section 3b will be fully staffed again.

More addition without subtraction: Douglas Simms of Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville has joined the review team for Literature: General and Miscellaneous. And Paul Kershaw of the University of Virginia contributes this year to the History and Culture section.

Adding numbers to the team of reviewers as we have done over the past few years has formed part of the larger calculus to bring the publication schedule up to date, on the theory of an inverse relation: more reviewers equals less burden on each individual, which equals an increased rate of production. But the larger number has also brought with it some logistical difficulties. As with previous two issues, this one contains duplicate reviews. For the editors and reviewers the inadvertent duplications are a relatively minor problem—extra labor is the worst of it—and we let them stand because readers may enjoy the double perspective. The duplicates are marked with a double dagger (‡). At the other extreme, as we add reviewers the division of items within each section becomes more complicated, and misunderstandings or lapses in communication more frequent; as a result, too many items slip through the cracks and are left to languish in the list of “Works Not Seen” that concludes each section. A more serious difficulty is that as the number of reviewers increases, so does the likelihood that the project will be slowed down by some who, for whatever reason, find it impossible to meet deadlines. We had hoped to publish this volume in the calendar year 2007, which would meet our ideal publication schedule. We came close, and we're determined not to let our approach to that goal become an asymptotic curve!

The contributors to *The Year's Work in Old English Studies* are named on the title page, and the authorship of individual sections is indicated by initials within or at the end of each section. Reviewers work from the *OEN* bibliography 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

1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects

Research Resources, Print and Electronic

A number of research resources of interest to Anglo-Saxonists appeared in 2005. Volumes 29 and 30 of *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter), edited by Heinrich Beck *et al.*, have gone into a second edition. Volume 29 covers much of the letter S, from *Skirnismál* to *Stiklestad*, with entries on Spong Hill, Stauch Meadow, and stichic and strophic verse forms. Volume 30, covering *Stil* to *Tissø*, includes essays on Suffolk, Surrey, Sussex, Sutton Hoo, Thanet, and Thetford.

Two useful bibliographic items appear every year with little fanfare but deserve notice as they underscore the productivity of scholars in our field. Robert Butler compiles and edits "Abstracts of Papers in Anglo-Saxon Studies" (*OEN* 38.3: 41–127). For 2004–2005, Butler prints some 165 abstracts of papers presented at various conferences and meetings. Heide Estes solicits and prints notices of current research, work completed, and forthcoming publications in "Research in Progress 2004" (*OEN* 38.4: 39–45).

In "Bibliographie sur la Tapisserie de Bayeux (1985–1999)," Shirley Ann Brown has performed a vital service to researchers interested in the body of work on the Bayeux Tapestry in this period (*La Tapisserie de Bayeux: l'art de broder l'Histoire*, ed. Pierre Bouet *et al.*, 411–17). Appearing in a larger collection of essays (see Section 7 below for a review of other relevant essays in this volume), Brown's bibliography is a supplement to the earlier one she published in 1988 (*The Bayeux Tapestry: History and Bibliography* [Woodbridge: Boydell Press])

In 2005, Edward Christie succeeded Martin Foys as compiler of "Circolwyrde 2005: New Electronic Resources for Anglo-Saxon Studies" (*OEN* 39.1: 45–49). Christie has maintained the high standards set by his predecessor, and this year's feature includes some thirty annotated entries across ten subheadings.

In "A *Thesaurus of Old English Online*" (*OEN* 38.3: 36–40), Christian Kay delivers a comprehensive report on the genesis, development, and future directions of the *Thesaurus of Old English* (TOE) project. The most recent iteration of the project is the launch of the electronic version of TOE. Given that the primary use of an electronic TOE would be in research, the team identified five search ranges for the online version: "Old English Word Search," "Modern English Word Search," "Browsing Searches," "Flags indicating Restricted Occurrence,"

and "Old English Phrases." The TOE is available free of charge online at <http://libra.englant.arts.gla.ac.uk/othesaurus/>.

Pedagogy

Gabriele Knappe has edited a collection of conference papers in *Englische Sprachwissenschaft und Mediävistik: Standpunkte—Perspektiven—Neue Wege / English Linguistics and Medieval Studies: Positions Perspectives—New Approaches; Proceedings of the Conference in Bamberg, May 21–22, 2004* (Bamberger Beiträge zur Englischen Sprachwissenschaft 48 [Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang]). This collection features twenty-five essays spread across eight subsections, all dealing in some fashion with the future prospects and directions of Medieval Studies in English. Many of the essays in this Proceedings volume are reviewed elsewhere in YWOES 2005. Three will be treated here.

In "Putting Old and Middle English Studies Back on the Map: Possible Approaches and Strategies" (*Englische Sprachwissenschaft und Mediävistik*, 53–64), Luuk Houwen muses on many of the difficulties faced by academics in the field of Medieval English Studies, such as dwindling enrollments, especially in advanced courses of study, evaporating resources for academic research and faculty appointments, and proposes several possible responses. Houwen suggests that we make more dynamic use of electronic media, increase our visibility on campus by collaborating with other departments on interdisciplinary projects, and on a grander scale, arrange faculty and students into larger organizational units, such as a research school of medieval studies, to promote teaching, training, and research. Without such measures, Houwen is fearful that "solutions" to these woes will be forced upon our programs by external entities.

In much the same vein, Hildegard L. C. Tristram poses the question "Warum die (Potsdamer) Studientage zum englischen Mittelalter (SEM)?—Zwecke und Nutzen," (*Englische Sprachwissenschaft und Mediävistik*, 65–78). Her resounding answer is that the Potsdam workshops are one such solution as Luuk Houwen is seeking. Tristram organized and facilitated five seminars at the University of Potsdam between 1999 and 2003. These workshops served as lively forums for the exchange of ideas, methodologies, and research among scholars working at institutions in German-speaking countries. In addition, the workshops created

opportunities for career advancement for younger faculty, occasions for senior faculty to be informed about new developments in their fields, and served to promote interdisciplinary liaisons among faculty at various institutions. Tristram notes that the networking that took place at these workshops has already had a demonstrably positive effect on the job market among institutions in German-speaking countries.

In a section on new media and teacher-training, Guillaume Schiltz discusses the advent of various electronic learning modalities and their application to introductory Old English classes (“Integration von E-Learning in der Präsenzlehre am Beispiel des Kurses ‘Einführung in die altenglische Sprache und Literatur.’” *Englische Sprachwissenschaft und Mediävistik*: 81–93). Schiltz reports on the preliminary results of having run a blended class (combining distance and face-to-face learning environments) of “Introductory Old English Language and Literature” at the University of Basel. The blended environment made use of a class website, “Yahoo!Groups,” “Yahoo!Messenger,” and an online discussion forum to facilitate interaction among the students. Schiltz uses practical experience gained from the class to demonstrate how the blended classroom environment promotes both independent and collaborative learning.

Tolkien Studies

In their essay “Tolkien, King Alfred, and Boethius: Platonist Views of Evil in *The Lord of the Rings*” (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 131–59), the historical theologians John William Houghton and Neal K. Keese review the central positions in the debate over J.R.R. Tolkien’s view of good and evil, particularly as it is expressed in the famous trilogy. Rose Zimbardo, Colin Gunton, and Scott Davison all associate Tolkien’s view with an essentially Augustinian theology of evil, while T.A. Shippey has argued that Tolkien essentially combines two fundamentally contradictory views of evil. Acknowledging the validity of Shippey’s insight into the tension inherent in Tolkien’s views of evil, Houghton and Keese argue for a more consistently Augustinian understanding of evil. In the body of their essay, Houghton and Keese chart the Augustinian tradition in *Lord of the Rings* from its origins in Plato’s *Gorgias* through Augustine and Boethius to King Alfred’s translation of the *Consolation of Philosophy*, focusing close attention on the novel’s key scenes, particularly the scene in which Frodo claims the Ring in the Sammath Naur. In the end, Houghton and Keese agree with Shippey that Tolkien’s view of evil is complex and nuanced, but they argue

that it is rooted firmly in Neo-Platonic tradition and as such is “consistently paradoxical rather than ambiguous or contradictory” (151).

Announcements and Reports on Projects

Elaine Treharne unveils an exciting new research enterprise in “Project Announcement: The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060–1220” (*OEN* 38.3: 33–34). The collaborative venture between the Universities of Leicester and Leeds is funded by a five-year research grant through the Arts and Humanities Research Council (ARHC) and led by two principal investigators, Elaine Treharne of the Department of English at Leicester and Mary Swan of the Institute for Medieval Studies at Leeds. According to Treharne, the project aims to “identify, analyse and evaluate all manuscripts, fragments and single leaf texts containing English written in England between 1060 and 1220 and to produce an analytical corpus of material in order to address fundamental questions about this crucial period in the evolution of English textual culture” (33). Information about the project and a preliminary list of manuscripts can be found through the project’s website: <http://www.le.ac.uk/ee/em1060to1220/>.

Progress reports appeared for three ongoing projects. After a relatively quiet 2004, C.P. Biggam, Director of the Anglo-Saxon Plant Name Survey, announces plans for a new book “which is likely to offer various delights including juniper, pears, and seaweed” in “Anglo-Saxon Plant Name Survey (ASPNS): Sixth Annual Report, January 2005” (*OEN* 38.3: 35). Biggam welcomes Dr. Margaret Scott of the University of Glasgow and Editor of Scottish Language Dictionaries to the ranks of ASPNS and publishes a list of works by ASPNS members for 2003 and 2004. The work of ASPNS and its members can be followed on its website, <http://www2.arts.gla.ac.uk/SESL/EngLang/ihs1/projects/plants.htm>.

Joan Holland reports on particularly productive year on both editorial and technological fronts in “Dictionary of Old English: 2005 Progress Report” (*OEN* 39.1: 21–24). Early in the 2005, the DOE Corpus project released the most recent scholarly editions of various versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. In anticipation of the publication of entries for *G* in 2006, DOE project staff also began the development of DOEonline, the Web-based *Dictionary*. During this year, drafting of DOE entries for *H*, *I/Y*, and *L* continued apace.

Peter Jackson offers a brief update on the *Fontes* project in “Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: A Register of Written Sources Used by Authors in Anglo-Saxon England. Twentieth Progress Report, April 2005” (*OEN*

38.3: 34–35). Jackson points out that the project website receives some 500 hits a month and continues to generate publications on a regular basis, such as recent articles by Augustine Casiday in *Journal of Theological Studies* and Robert Upchurch in *Traditio* (both reviewed in YWOES 2004). The most up-to-date version of the database is available free of charge from the project website: <http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk>.

Varia

In “The *Dictionary of Old English: The Next Generation(s)*,” Antonette diPaolo Healey discusses the future directions of the DOE project. Her essay is among fifteen honoring the memory of Richard Venezky, a leading authority on literacy, spelling, and educational technology, who died shortly after the festschrift was announced (*From Orthography to Pedagogy: Essays in Honor of Richard L. Venezky*, ed. Tom Trabasso, John Sabatini, Dominic W. Massaro, and Robert C. Calfee [Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum], 289–307). Healey describes the comprehensive survey of English manuscripts from the years 600 to 1150 CE which are at the heart of the project. Richard Venezky was associated with the project as its Director of Computing, and Healey acknowledges the groundbreaking work he conducted in that capacity. More recently, the project has moved away from closed proprietary systems to more open source technology, a migration that has liberated the project from “the tyranny of searches only on headwords” and rendered it capable of “multiple points of entry” for students and scholars alike (292). Healey’s essay closes with a look to the future and the challenges that face the project.

In *The Idea of Anglo-Saxon England in Middle English Romance* (Studies in Medieval Romance [Cambridge: D. S. Brewer]) Robert Allen Rouse demonstrates the extent

to and means by which the “idea” of Anglo-Saxon England was remembered and re-imagined in the literature of the post-Conquest period. Chapter Two examines the way in which the Middle English *Proverbs of Alfred* reconceives Anglo-Saxon England, particularly during the reign of King Alfred, as an idealized Christian society. Rouse argues that the *Proverbs* appropriates the re-imagined, idealized Anglo-Saxon past in order to make an ideological commentary on his own twelfth-century culture. Chapters Three and Four explore the process of English identity formation. Through an analysis of the Matter of England in the Middle English romances such as *Guy of Warwick* and *Beues of Hamtoun*, these chapters argue that the romances re-imagine the Anglo-Saxon past as a means of expressing the continuity of the English as a single people. Chapter Five emphasizes the importance of the Anglo-Saxon roots of English law in the construction of English identity. Chapter Six demonstrates the centrality of the Guy of Warwick legend to the urban mythology and geographical history of Winchester in the late Middle Ages. Rouse’s book builds on and in the end makes an important contribution of its own to the large body of work on the subject of later appropriations of the Anglo-Saxon past.

Works not seen

Healey, Antonette diPaolo. “The Face of Text: The Dictionary of Old English Project in the Twenty-First Century.” *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. Vol. I, pp. 433–80.

Jervis, Simon Swynfen. “Antiquarian Gleanings in the North of England.” *AntJ* 85 (2005): 293–358.

Young, Helen. “*Athelston* and English Law: Plantagenet Practice and Anglo-Saxon Precedent.” *Parergon* 22.1 (2005): 95–118.

RFJ

2. Memorials, Tributes, History of the Discipline

a. History of the Discipline

At 1073 pages, Jane Chance’s collection of seventy-two biographical essays on female medievalists born chiefly before 1935 (*Women Medievalists and the Academy* [Madison: U of Wisconsin P]), which weighs in at an impressive and (necessarily) sturdily-bound three pounds, belongs in every academic library. Each essay, meticulously researched and eloquently written, is itself a summary of its subject’s life and career; consequently,

this summary is decidedly selective. The collection functions “as a corrective history of the founding of the academy (that is, higher education in general) and the role of women medievalists in its development” by illuminating “the lives and careers of women who have helped build a field or a discipline or an area or a specific subject in medieval studies” (xix, xviii). Each essay “sketches the woman’s life,” “her intellectual contribution to medieval studies,” and the problems she faced and circumvented “working in a predominantly

masculine field” (xix). Portraits, bibliographies of each subject’s work, alphabetical and chronological tables of contents, and comprehensive index complete this impeccably edited volume. Each essay, Chance explains, “tells repeatedly the story of the academy’s resistance to female excellence and achievement and the complementary triumph of female perseverance and continuing achievement in its despite” (xxx). For example, in 1945, on leave from St. Hilda’s, Oxford, caring for an ailing mother and frustrated by St. Hilda’s marginal status in the University, Dorothy Whitelock considered resigning. Urging her to reconsider, Sir Frank Stenton writes: “what is keeping women back from the consideration which many of them deserve is not ‘sex prejudice’ (except among a few eccentrics). It is a doubt whether women can stay the course as well as men” (554–55). Were she to resign, he worries, it “would give a telling argument” to those who hold this view (555). Whitelock stayed. This anecdote is emblematic of the challenges faced by every woman featured in this rich historical compilation.

Of those included who have contributed materially to Anglo-Saxon studies—Elizabeth Elstob, Mary Bateson, Bertha Surtees Phillpotts, Eleanor Shipley Duckett, Nora Kershaw Chadwick, Doris Mary Stenton, Margaret Schlauch, Dorothy Whitelock, Rosemary Estelle Woolf, Rosemary Cramp, and Benedicta Ward—only two were married: Chadwick to Professor Hector Munro Chadwick, and Stenton to Sir Frank Stenton. Both forwarded their husbands’ careers while energetically pursuing their own. Stenton, for example, “created a monumental legacy of printed [legal] records in previously unimagined variety, with ‘masterly’ introductions and notes that serve well as legal texts” while giving “equal energy to her marriage” (441). “She did everything,” Patricia R. Orr explains, “from caring for the car to managing the finances. She bought his clothes, cut his hair, and scrupulously observed his wishes, never having a dog in the house or going to the hairdresser, for example” and she devoted herself equally to his professional life (450). Doris won “recognition and distinctions,” Orr suggests, but “in some sense she remained in Frank’s shadow during his life” (452). Still,

she carved out a position that is unique in scholarly endeavor. Frank’s career was as much a work of her art, in the support she gave him, as any of her writings. Their work was separate and independent; her role as wife and scholar was united and indivisible. We know her as the sustenance of her husband’s scholarly life and the one who did much to

introduce historians to the legal records and show what could be done with them (453).

The distinctions that mark Whitelock’s and Stenton’s narratives are evident in all seventy-two essays; common is the desire to become medievalists, “a daunting, unenviable choice, given the misogyny of the period” (xxxiii). Each woman responded to the various permutations of this misogyny in her own way. For example, early in her career and not knowing any better, as she puts it, Eleanor Duckett asked “an eminent scholar” to read her first manuscript, *Hellenistic Influence on the Aeneid*. “With courteous voice and complete British sincerity he replied: ‘Do you want me to judge it on its own merits or as the work of a woman?’” (215). Much later, Duckett, who served as Smith College’s Professor of Latin, founded Smith College Classical Studies, and understood “women had received little attention because of the concerns of traditional scholarship,” recommended that “[i]f women were to become scholars like her, they were enjoined to leave behind a feminine persona and adopt a masculine voice” (219, 221).

A common obstacle was the inability to participate, even while holding impressive appointments at such colleges as Girton (Cambridge) and St. Hilda’s (Oxford), in university decision-making. These restrictions were so widespread as to make jarring Woolf’s assessment of University College, Hull in the 1950s that it “revealed no trace of prejudice against women as teachers or as lecturers” (828). It was chiefly women who effected change in less enlightened institutions. Phillpotts helped to obtain the Royal Charter which would allow Girton full status at Cambridge; Cramp enfranchised younger staff at Durham through the establishment of an Academic Electoral Assembly (896); and Whitelock proved that a woman could build “an excellent Department of Anglo-Saxon and Kindred Studies” at Cambridge (559). Whitelock’s career, in particular, illustrates the struggles women faced in this regard:

[Her] successes in academia—as a student, teacher, administrator, and scholar—are all the more impressive when one considers how few opportunities there were for women when she began her college career in 1921. In 1893 a Newnham student had been the first woman appointed to a University of Cambridge teaching post; in 1913 there were about 120 women in such posts, but they had no say in decision making, syllabus setting, and marking of exams—in other words, the running of their departments or colleges (560).

In 1946, when Whitelock lost the Rawlinson and Bosworth Professorship of Anglo-Saxon at Oxford to C. L. Wrenn by one vote, her friend, Doris Stenton, wrote: “a notably second rate person was put in because he enjoyed the inestimable privilege of masculinity. In a way I’m glad it’s Wrenn and not Alistair Campbell for no one could think Wrenn beat you by scholarship” (555). Thirteen years later, in 1957, Whitelock became the first and still the only woman to hold the Elrington and Bosworth Professorship of Anglo-Saxon at Cambridge.

At the turn of the eighteenth century, Elizabeth Elstob’s work, explains Sean F. D. Hughes, demonstrated “that women could be just as accomplished scholars as men, that gender was no essential impediment to intellectual achievement,” but that in her time “and for many, many years to follow, unless a woman was of independent means (which usually meant she had no interest in scholarship), there were no opportunities for her in the scholarly world without the support and forbearance of male patrons and supporters” (16). Indeed, in the same year her *Grammar* was published (1715), Elstob lost her brother and her financial support; in 1718 she vanished, reappearing in 1735 “in charge of a small private school under the name of Frances Smith ... never again to tackle any Saxon project” (15). In the late 1800s, Mary Bateson, financially independent as Elstob was not, “firmly believed, twenty-five years before Virginia Woolf addressed the faculty and students of Newnham College about the necessity of ‘a room of one’s own,’ that women could not pursue serious scholarship without the financial and professional support of an academic institution” (72).

Support—financial and academic—challenged every woman in one way or another; they responded with determination, drive, and creative energy. Phillpotts, who taught herself Old English and Old Icelandic and boasted as patrons and admirers Eiríkr Magnússon, Geir Tómasson Zöega, and Finnur Jónsson, rigged her bicycle with a sail to facilitate her commute between Girton and Cambridge. A young Chadwick spent her clothing allowance on books. When “a bank on the family land near Market Harborough collapsed and she and her sister found part of a Roman villa,” Cramp’s archaeological career was born (892). In mid-career Duckett reeducated herself as a historian, reformed her writing style, and learned “to imagine a remote and little-known age through the eyes of its authors and to convey what those authors saw and understood in their own time to modern readers” (215). Margaret Schlauch, who opposed US policy in Asia, evaded a subpoena by the House Un-American Activities Committee for her

political activity by leaving NYU in 1951 to spend over two decades behind the Iron Curtain at Warsaw University (524). Thus, “McCarthyism deprived the United States and the West of Schlauch’s learned contribution in any conversation about the relationship of Marxism to medieval literature” (526).

The body of work elaborated even in the limited selections discussed here is impressive. Whitelock’s *English Historical Documents* “transformed primary source studies in departments around the world” (557). Bateson set new editorial standards with her “enormously important *editio princeps*” of Ælfric’s *Letter to the Monks of Eynsham* (70). Phillpotts challenged entrenched assumptions about Icelandic sagas and Eddic poetry. Chadwick’s first publication, *Stories and Ballads of the Far Past, Translated from the Norse (Icelandic and Faroese)* (1921), “still stands up very well” despite the “two modest ellipses [in her translations] where the original text tells us exactly what the goddess Freyja offered to the four dwarf-smiths, on four consecutive nights, in exchange for the gold necklace she was later famous for owning” (368–69). Cramp’s work with Anglo-Saxon stone sculpture has changed “the way specialists think about Anglo-Saxon England,” her excavations at Monkwearmouth and Jarrow spawned Bede’s *World*, and her essays on *Beowulf* and archaeology have illuminated “the material world depicted in Anglo-Saxon poetry” (888, 890). “English works that reflect the foundations and basic traditions of monastic spirituality” have become accessible through Ward’s translations (949). Duckett taught us that “[w]omen may not have been ... abbots, bishops, emperors, or popes, but for an audience of educated women early women authors were significant, whatever their concerns” (219). Schlauch’s “marvelous linguistic expertise” and “daunting language skills” generated an impressive body of scholarship on the Icelandic sagas, on “Chaucer, folklore, manuscripts of ancient texts, and Old and Middle English works” (527). Woolf’s “conviction that a literary work is a cultural artifact, inextricably linked to other art and literary forms and to contemporary scientific, religious, and philosophical systems of belief” helped to modernize the discipline (829). Certainly there is a corresponding body of influential work by male medievalists, but to compare this collection, as Chance does, with “Norman Cantor’s nearly womanless book *Inventing the Middle Ages*” and Lee Paterson’s *Negotiating the Past*, is to appreciate just how corrective this history truly is (xxvii). To place women’s accomplishments in the context of difficult personal and professional histories is to fully understand the remark that reputedly concluded Rosemary Cramp’s address to first-year

students at Durham: “if you don’t work, then you fail and you just get thrown out!” (894). Facing prejudices and obstacles with which few of their male colleagues had to contend these women did not fail even when, at times, they were “thrown out.” In its entirety the collection reminds us that we follow in the footsteps of these early female medievalists whose passion, persistence, and determination “paved the way(s) to success and achievement” in the face of “barriers that ... prevented their advancement—whether a higher degree, travel funding, time, political forces, cultural and social stereotypes, or academic misogyny” (xxxv).

Eileen A. Joy’s five-part essay, “Thomas Smith, Humfrey Wanley, and the ‘Little-Known Country’ of the Cotton Library” (*Electronic British Library Jnl*, art. 1, n.p. [online]), explores the antagonistic, if productive, professional relationship between Thomas Smith (1638–1710) and Humfrey Wanley (1672–1726), who produced, respectively, the first two official printed catalogues of Thomas Cotton’s library (Smith’s *Catalogus librorum manusciporum bibliothecae Cottonianae* [1696] and Wanley’s *Antiquæ Literatuae Septentrionalis Liber alter*, the second volume of George Hickeys’s *Tesaurus linguarum septentrionalium* [1705]). In parts one and two Joy examines the men’s early relationship and Smith’s catalogue; in parts three and four, the 1703 government-ordered inspection of the library’s holdings and Wanley’s catalogue; and in part five, the significance of their work and its implications for manuscript bibliography. Smith, unofficial and proprietary keeper of the Cotton library under the patronage of Sir Robert Cotton’s grandson, Sir John, sported a “difficult personality,” and Wanley, a “brash and even self-aggrandizing” temperament (6). Such personalities and competing interests in the “Saxon charters” (BL, Cotton Augustus II), and in “the formes of the old letters found” in these charters created conflicts only resolved in 1703 when “Wanley was sent into the Cotton library as an Inspector for the government and Smith was finally locked out after Sir John’s death” (6). Smith’s was the only full, printed catalogue to predate the 1731 fire. His introductory essays on Sir Robert Cotton’s life and on the library’s history were drawn from “family memories which might otherwise have perished” (8). The catalogue was also an important witness for those who assessed and restored the damaged manuscripts after the fire. Drawing heavily on lists by Richard James, James Ussher of Armagh and William Dugdale, Smith completed his catalogue rapidly—in approximately four years—and it necessarily contains omissions (summarized by Joy). Wanley’s 1705 catalogue (begun in 1699), followed “the path laid out by

the series of Smith’s omissions” to become “one of the greatest achievements of English union bibliography,” a work that, in N. R. Ker’s words, “scholars will continue to use, or neglect at their peril” (27, 21). Like Smith’s, it was hurried and so plagued by problems that Wanley “may have also occasionally rushed things to the press in order to get some of the screaming monkeys off his back, and also felt cheated as a result” (22). Wanley’s desire for “an inspection so minute that it would have amounted, in fact, to a recataloguing” was thwarted in part by Smith’s obstructions—at one point he removed some loose charters to his private rooms to keep them away from the commissioners—and the objections of both the Cotton Trustees and Wanley’s fellow commissioners (16). Still, Joy asserts,

[the] relationship, often fractious, between Smith and Wanley is the productive convergence of the efforts of two bibliographers, both aiming for comprehensiveness within the framework of a specific place and genre, yet both also limited by the very human impossibility of achieving total control and mastery over the archive of manuscripts in question (26).

Even as they disputed each other’s territorial claims to the Cotton library, both men “instinctively understood the value of bibliographic collation” (27). Together the catalogues more fully realize Cotton’s collection. The lesson that concludes this account is that

[e]ven in our electronic age, where texts have been freed from their traditional material existence as books and there is no longer an absolute connection between where texts are housed and conserved and where they are read, nevertheless, the dream of encyclopedism still has us in its thrall, while at the same time, we are still caught, much as Smith and Wanley were, in the flux between an embarrassment of textual riches, entropic decay, and the contingencies of time and place. Smith’s and Wanley’s cataloguing labours demonstrate that the library, or archive of texts, has always been a dynamic environment of an often overly immense scale, at least when confronted by the individual bibliographer whose quest to catalogue and index the library has, finally, the tinge of the heroic (31).

In “*Beowulf* in the House of Dickens” (*Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O’Brien O’Keeffe and Orchard [see

below], I:421–39), Nicholas Howe recounts the story of a forgotten nineteenth century contribution “to the study of Old English poetry,” Henry Morley’s “prose summary of *Beowulf* that appeared in the 1 May 1858 issue of *Household Words*” (421). Morley (1822–1894), physician turned teacher, writer, and editor, joined Charles Dickens’s *Household Words* in 1851. In 1858 he proposed and Dickens approved a series of articles “illustrating English literature by anecdotes and sketches of old writers and writings from the earliest time onwards” (427). The series consisted of three articles; the first, on Celtic bards, the third on, chiefly, the works of Cædmon and Alfred. The second, entitled “A Primitive Old Epic” and prepared from Benjamin Thorpe’s edition and translation of *Beowulf*, was “a bare-bones recital of Beowulf’s deeds [that] strips away both the historical digressions that set the hero’s life in its larger context and also the premonitions of disaster that fill the last third of the poem” (422). Despite omissions and conflation, it is still “a relatively faithful rendition of the mood or spirit of the poem” (430–31). Howe reads the summary in its “manuscript” context—that is, its placement in the 1 May issue of *Household Words* immediately following Dickens’s essay, “Please to Leave Your Umbrella,” in which an umbrella left at the door stands for its owner’s “individual tastes and opinions” (432). It is a “pointed and witty demand that readers should read for themselves” rather than delivering up one’s “private judgment with [one’s] walking-stick[s]” (432). To read “A Primitive Old Epic” after reading Dickens’s sketch, Howe argues, is to see it “not as an old chestnut, a piece of canonical literature to be read dutifully, if not reverentially,” but, as Morley puts it, “[a] lively picture of past customs, and a record of past manners of thought” (433). *Household Words*, “edited by the greatest and most popular novelist of its time,” boasted a large circulation and “advocated a strikingly progressive set of social and political causes” (422). By its inclusion *Beowulf* became available to “self-educated workers, attendees of extension schools, readers in pursuit of general knowledge,” and so “part of the national heritage of the readers of *Household Words*” (433). It reached “a greater number and unquestionably far more diverse range of readers than did any” scholarly versions, and “it found a popular readership for a poem that had previously been the preserve of scholars and antiquarians” (434, 435). Morley’s series, “part of a larger cultural vision that saw knowledge as essential to a progressive and reformist politics that would yield better material and political conditions for the disenfranchised” was a means “to level social class hierarchies that rested in part on who had read what and, more crucially, on who was not allowed to read what”

(434). Its publication in *Household Words* is a reminder “that the desire to read *Beowulf* need not be antithetical to the desire to improve the material conditions of those who live in the world in which we read” (435).

R. I. Page’s “The Transcription of Old English Texts in the Sixteenth Century,” (*Care and Conservation of Manuscripts* 7: 179–90), responds to “a request made at our Parker Library seminar that we should compile a complete edition, or perhaps set of editions, of sixteenth-century attempts at Old English” (179). Sixteenth century interest in Old English was “antiquarian and to a great extent political” rather than “linguistic/literary,” Page reminds us (179). “The Church of England wanted to prove that it was the natural successor, not of the papal-dominated institution of the later Middle Ages, but of the church that St. Augustine brought to English in 597” (180). To do this, church historians needed historical records of “the English-speaking peoples and the church they worshipped with,” as well as the “texts, grammars and dictionaries” that would make it possible to read the records (180). Of the examples housed in the Parker Library, Page focuses on those of historian Matthew Parker (1504–1575), whose 1568 remit from the Privy Council requiring him to collect and copy manuscripts lead to a collection of books and papers that form “an extensive and heterogeneous set of sixteenth-century versions of Old English which enable us to see the difficulties that that period had with the earlier language” (180). The copies are by various scribes and copyists, some educated, some not. Examining selected transcripts in MS CCC 100, 101, 188, 302, 359, and 449, Page speculates on the political and pragmatic reasons for their creation, discusses what these transcripts reveal, and suggests avenues for future research. For example, CCC 111 contains Robert Talbot’s transcripts of eleven Old English charters “for which no early texts are available” (186). Detailed additions in the vernacular “indicate the boundaries of the lands which the charter disposes of” and are “important for place-name scholars” and etymologists (186). Overall, the essay offers a model for working with Parker’s materials and with those of other contemporary collectors “whose libraries need looking at” (188). “Even accepting the limitations of the present study,” Page concludes:

there are further points of development: distinguishing between the hands of individual copyists if that is possible; studying the make-up of composite/confected manuscripts and trying to find how, when and why their various contents were brought together; examining watermarks with a view to closer dating of

different papers. Enough here for some years to come (188–89).

Clare A. Lees opens her “Analytical Survey 7: Actually Existing Anglo-Saxon Studies,” (*New Medieval Literatures* 7: 223–52), with the claim that “the very success of Anglo-Saxon Studies as a self-contained discipline is a symptom of its weakness as a discipline within the larger fields of Medieval Studies, English Studies, and in popular culture” where it is “an increasingly irrelevant field” (225). In three sections, Lees compares Anglo-Saxon Studies with “its closest disciplinary relatives in Middle English, Medieval Studies, and English Studies”; examines “strategies whereby Anglo-Saxon Studies maintains and promotes scholarship within the discipline itself”; and proposes to remap recent scholarship using “more general categories of knowledge such as world, body, and belief” to “connect [Anglo-Saxon Studies] to wider fields of knowledge” (225–26). In Part 1, Looking Forward, Looking Back, arguing for “a richer and more inclusive historiography,” Lees contrasts, for example, Frantzen’s *Before the Closet*, which “looks back to Gregory’s famous story of the angelic Angles and forward to John Bale’s sixteenth-century polemical rewriting of it” and Graham’s *Recovery of Old English*, which “advances our historical understanding of Anglo-Saxon scholarship, but not in the context of the related field of Middle English scholarship, with which it might be fruitfully contrasted and compared” (229). This contrast, she claims, illustrates how “interdisciplinary, comparative, and cross-cultural approaches ... continue to operate side by side with the more archaic and archaizing constraints of disciplines and fields” (231). Anglo-Saxon Studies, she argues, “is not self-contained, coherent, and self-regulating. Rather it is a force-field crossed by various relationships and affinities, with all the tensions, ambivalences, and anxieties that implies” (235). Thus, “[h]istoricist modes that emphasize mobility across synchronic and diachronic ways of exploring the past in theory *and* in practice provide the opportunity for better use of the complex networks of critical and cultural affiliations that cross the various fields of Medieval Studies such as Old and Middle English” (233–34). In part 2, Traditionality and Disciplinarity, Lees critiques “large-scale, multi-year, research project(s)” (SASLC, for example), for framing new scholarship “by normative expectations of what such scholarship should be,” as well as “critical anthologies, essay collections, companions, and encyclopaedias” that aid analysis rather than “determine it” by repackaging and reinforcing “already established research” (235, 236). She finds in *Companion to Anglo-*

Saxon Studies, for example, no “historicist approach to, or cultural analysis of, gender, the body, ethnicity, race, rank, ideology, the economy, aesthetics, or indeed any sustained encounter with modern critical theory, be it post-colonial, materialist, or post-structuralist” (239). “At stake,” she concludes, “is the field itself, a fear of change, and the inevitable loss contingent upon such change: the fear, in sum, that we might compromise the scholarly home we have worked so hard to build and maintain, and in which we believe so deeply” (241–42). In Part 3, World, Body, and Belief are proposed as “arguably more responsible, and certainly more flexible [categories] than those currently offered by the discipline ... [and which] look beyond the discipline from the perspective of the discipline itself” (242). Lees surveys recent scholarship, which connects to “wider fields of knowledge” and proposes ways to “enlarge [its] territorial reach” (226, 243). For example, while it “reposition[s] the old dichotomy and/or synthesis of the two worlds of Germanic and Christian culture within the broad sweep of colonial studies,” Anne Savage’s “The Old English *Exodus* and the Colonization of the Promised Land,” might be extended to explore “the encounter between the old world of *Germania* and the new world of Latin Christendom ... created in Anglo-Saxon England, in part by a poetics that collectively and deliberately looked back to the mythic past of an old world” (243–44). In conclusion, Lees argues, “our critical categories need to be flexible enough (theoretically *and* practically) to accommodate both the particular discourse of Anglo-Saxon Studies and the general discourses of Medieval Studies and English Studies, to which it is intimately related” (252).

Medieval English Language Scholarship: Autobiographies by Representative Scholars in Our Discipline (ed. Akio Oizumi and Tadao Kubouchi [Hildesheim: Olms]), collects autobiographies by Janet M. Bately, André Crépin, Ralph W.V. Elliott, Jacek Fisiak, Manfred Görlach, Roger Lass, Robert E. Lewis, Bruce Mitchell, Shigeru Ono, R. I. Page, Jane A. Roberts, Fred C. Robinson, and Manfred Scheler. While varying in length, focus, and style, together they demonstrate that historical events, accidents, and geography shape careers as readily as does mentoring. Elliott, for example, too young for hotel managerial training at 17, “was advised to go to university and come back in three year’s time” (35). He never returned. Scheler escaped life in a deadly Saxony uranium mine by going into education (197). Roberts, who had planned to “spend a couple of years growing up before reading medicine” upon completing her Arts degree at Trinity College Dublin, somehow “detoured into Old and Middle English” (163).

Historical events intrude in both chilling and amusing ways: Scheler's arrests, the "madness" of the turbulent 60s and 70s that informs Robinson's memoir, Fisiak's near detention as a suspected spy during the Cold War when U.S. Customs discovered in his luggage a database of slips on Chaucer's English (58). Notable academic memories are included. Robinson recalls Norman E. Eliason's class: "[a]nyone who came ... underprepared (no one ever came unprepared) was made to feel very uncomfortable" (182), and C. L. Wrenn, who "taught by terror and demanded so much work in preparation for his seminar meetings that I had time for little else" (185). Bately also remembers Wrenn: "Well, Miss Bately, how is our Greek? ... Oh dear. You had better go away and learn some" (8). Roberts recalls that her M.Litt. research topic "'the position of women in Anglo-Saxon England,' aroused much mirth" at Trinity College, Dublin (163). Yale in 1961, Lass reflects, was "tough, competitive, and completely lacking any element of 'pastoral care'" (78). Lessons punctuate the narratives: "one of the least pleasant academic activities is editing a multi-author volume most of whose contributors are friends" (Lass 86); Lewis's cartoon motto: "By doing just a little every day, I can gradually let the task completely overwhelm me" (108); and Page's horrifying account of his campaign for manuscript security at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (153–54). A body of unfinished work is revealed: Bately's study of lexicographer and grammarian Guy Miège; Görlach's edition of the fifteenth-century legends in Bodley MS 779; Lewis's edition of the Middle English poem *Stimulus Consciencie Minor*, for example.

This slim, handsomely produced volume is cursed by typographical errors (at least one per chapter), but charmed by many delightful anecdotes. Upon arriving in England in 1936, for example, Elliott's vocabulary consisted of "corned beef," "darling," and "'bugger,' probably the most useful English word I ever acquired" (34). After more than twenty years on the *MED*, Lewis "never met a word I did not like or enjoy working on" (109). Page describes the room housing the Copenhagen Library's Arnarnaganean Collection as "two windows, one at each end, one enlightening the desk of Professor Helgason, the other that of his secretary. In between was a region of deep gloom" (148). Robinson modestly and poignantly assesses his career: "When I measure myself against the generation before mine ... I feel inadequate and overrewarded for my efforts" (192). In their foreword, the editors assert that, "[s]cholarship develops into a discipline with the collective attainments and enthusiasm of scholars. Individual scholars in the process give their individual colourings to the

discipline, as when stained glass colours the day-light" (ix). The window this volume opens does indeed "convey a vivid picture of ... past lives and present selves" (x).

b. Memorials and Tributes

Paul Withers's and Stewart Lyon's tribute to Elizabeth J. E. Pirie (*British Numismatic Jnl* 75: 212–15), includes a select bibliography of her books and papers, chiefly on Northumbrian numismatics. On the twentieth anniversary of the death of Derek H. Turner (1931–1985), former Deputy Keeper in the British Museum Department of Manuscripts, a memorial marks his "contribution to the world of liturgical studies" (Johnson and Ward, *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 119: 373–75). The same volume contains Anthony Ward's memorial for Janet Backhouse (1938–2004), (*Ephemerides Liturgicae* 119: 258–62). Memorials were also published for René Derolez (M. C. Bodden, "In Memoriam: René Derolez [1921–2005]," *OEN* 38.3: 4–7), and for Raymond P. Tripp, Jr. (Peter J. Fields, "In Memoriam: Raymond P. Tripp, Jr." *In Geardagum* 25: 1–5; and Alexandra H. Olsen, "In Memoriam: Raymond P. Tripp, Jr. [1932–2005]" *OEN* 38.3: 7–8).

It was a banner year for festschrifts and memorial collections. Over its two volume terrain, *Latin Learning and English Lore: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature for Michael Lapidge* (ed. Katherine O'Brien O'Keefe and Andy Orchard [Toronto: U of Toronto P]) honors "the inspirational and wide-ranging work of Michael Lapidge" and its "ground-breaking impact" on "long neglected works of Anglo-Latin literature" (I.ix). The theme of Volume I is Anglo-Saxon response to "the massive injection of foreign learning into Anglo-Saxon literary culture" (3). Most of the twenty essays on *Beowulf*, Archbishop Theodore, Aldhelm, Bede, Boniface, Alcuin, and Alfred revisit "topics that have already been illuminated by ... Lapidge" (8). Volume II "attends to the Old English and Anglo-Latin writings of Anglo-Saxon England from roughly 900 to the end of the eleventh century," grouping the essays by "cultural and scientific interests, learning and writing in Anglo-Latin and Old English, homilies, hagiography, Cynwulf's exegetical practice, and the writings of Ælfric" (3). The biography of Lapidge's work that prefaces Volume I (ix–xi), fittingly concludes "in the field of Anglo-Saxon studies now and in the future, as King Alfred nearly said, 'her mon sceal ealneg gesion his swæð' [his traces will always be seen]" (xi). A list of Lapidge's publications through 2004 and doctoral dissertations directed is also included (II.395–408).

Verbal Encounters: Anglo-Saxon and Old Norse Studies for Roberta Frank (ed. Antonina Harbus and Russell Poole [Toronto: U of Toronto P]), opens with a brief professional biography (1–4) and a bibliography of Frank's work from 1970–2003 (5–12). Fourteen essays are divided into four sections (Part I—On Words; Part II—On Anglo-Latin and Old English Prose; Part III—On Old English Poetry; and Part IV—On Old Norse Literature); “verbal exchanges” which reflect Frank's “own abiding interest in cultural and linguistic exchange in Old Norse, Old English and medieval Latin literature” is the common theme (1).

Robert M. Stein and Sandra Pierson Prior's collection, *Reading Medieval Culture: Essays in Honor of Robert W. Hanning* (Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P), honors the “scope” and “legacy” of Hanning's scholarship on his sixty-fifth birthday and retirement from Columbia University. Divided into three sections—The Place of History and the Time of Romance, Chaucer's Arts and Chaucer's Readers, and Italian Contexts—the essays are united in their “search to account for the complex ways in which these sources are situated in their own time, mediated historically to us through other texts and other readers, and, finally, are read within the context of our own social questions and disciplinary structures” (3). A bibliography of Hanning's work concludes the volume.

Text and Language in Medieval English Prose: A Festschrift for Tadao Kubouchi (ed. Akio Oizumi, Jacek Fisiak, and John Scahill, Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature 12 [Frankfurt am Main: Lang]), collects twenty essays on a range of authors, texts, and topics, including Wulfstan, Ælfric, Bede, and the Old English Boethius; homilies and sermons; the *Menologium* and *Ancrene Wisse*; and Old and Middle English language. Bruce Mitchell's tribute, “For Tadao Kubouchi” (1), and Shoko Muraosa's “Tadao Kubouchi and His Work,” which includes a bibliography of his publications (3–17), rounds out the collection.

Anne J. Duggan, Joan Greatrex, and Brenda Bolton have edited *Omnia disce: Medieval Studies in Memory*

of Leonard Boyle, O.P. (Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West [Aldershot: Ashgate]), twenty essays divided into four parts: Rome and the Papacy; Palaeography and Manuscript Studies; Clerical Education, Pastoral Care, and the Friars; and The Inspiration of Leonard Boyle, O.P. The first three parts “reflect three of Fr Boyle's particular interests,” and the two chapters that make up Part IV offer “personal appreciations by friends and colleagues” as well as Boyle's final address, introduced by Fr. Paul Murray, O.P. (xi). James M. Powell remembers the man in “Memoir of a Friend” (279–81), Margaret Wade Labarge, his career at the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies in “Canadian Reflections” (281–83), and Christine Maria Grafinger, his innovative work as Vatican Prefect from 1984–1999 in “Projects for the Vatican Library” (283–89).

Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Cyril Roy Hart (ed. Simon Keynes and Alfred P. Smith [Dublin: Four Courts]) honors the work of Cyril Roy Hart, author of an “impressive series of well received works on Child Care and Screening in medical practice,” a regular contributor to medical journals, and “amateur” historian who won “the respect of leading textual scholars of the post-war generation” with his ground-breaking, if controversial work on the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and early English charters (11). The seventeen essays take as their subjects the Archbishop of Canterbury (from Augustine to Parker), Wulfstan, charters and law, medicine, and the Bayeux Tapestry. A chronological bibliography of Hart's work (299–306), including his medical publications, concludes the volume.

Finally, in honor of Young-Bae Park, “renowned expert on English historical linguistics,” Jacek Fisiak and Hye-Kyung Kang have edited a two-volume collection of papers by North American, European, and Korean scholars on “medieval English language and literature or historical English linguistics” (*Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature in Honour of Young-Bae Park*, 2 vols. [Seoul: Thaeaksa]) (vi).

3. Language

a. Lexicon, Glosses

Jan Čermák surveys diachronically “obscured” compounds—or *verdunkelte Komposita* or “reduced compounds” among the other terms for the phenomenon (among those covered in Hans Sauer’s *Nominalkomposita im Frühmittelenglischen* [Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1992])—in his “Notes on Obscured Compounds in Old English,” in *Patterns: A Festschrift for Libuše Dušková*, ed. Jan Čermák, Aleš Kléger, Markéta Malá, and Pavlína Šaldová (Prague: Charles University), 35–45. Such largely nominal and adjectival compounds are traced from the general OE lexicon (*lāreow* < *lār-þeow*), as well as the onomastic (*Hrōþulf* < *Hrōþ-wulf*), and toponymic lexica (*Warwick* < *Wæringwic*). The preliminary observation that “the motivation of the obscuration processes in OE compounds is likely to have been complex but the primary conditioning of the lexicalisation was phonological” (36) is further specified by division of the “types of obscuration” into four large groupings: shortening of vowel of monophthongization of diphthong from “weakening of the second element of the compound due to the loss of secondary stress”; “loss of an unaccented vowel after a short syllable before a consonant group”; “simplification in the bimorphemic consonant cluster” or *Kompositionsfuge*, which is subdivided into eight specific types (such as loss of *-h-* or *-w-* or “dropping of a middle consonant in the bimorphemic cluster”); and “shortening of a vowel before a double consonant cluster” (36–37). A table of examples of these types of “obscuration” in OE compounds follows (37–39)—*fulluht* < *fullwiht* an example of Čermák’s first type of “obscuration”—before the discussion turns to diachronic implications: “Though obscuration in compounds is a process that has been taking place in the history of English continually, the transition from Late Old to Early Middle English—a period when profound phonetic, morphological and sociolinguistic changes were transforming the structure of the English word and when there existed no regularized spelling to exert conservative influence on its form—appears to have been a particularly favourable time for obscuration processes in compound words” (39). Some other delimiting observations obtain from the examination of these types of compounds; e.g., “Where there existed a variation between the obscured and full forms, the former appear to have been scarcer” (39). While the most frequent type of such compound reshaping has as its basis the “bimorphemic consonant cluster

simplification,” it is difficult to argue for semantic factors to “obscuration” as “the only evidence we seem to have of semantic conditioning rests on an irregular phonetic/phonological behaviour of the items in question” (40). Three factors are seen at work in the decline in productivity in compounding processes in the IOE to eME period: “compounding as a highly productive word-formation strategy in OE was closely linked with the poetic language whose tradition came to be largely abandoned soon after the Norman Conquest”; “the ME period witnessed a gradual decrease in coining compounds as loan-formations inspired by Latin models and manifested in OE prose”; and “a number of compounds came to be replaced by simplexes borrowed primarily from French” (40–41). Drawing on Prague-school typology, specifically the work of Vladimír Skalička, Čermák brings larger matters into view: “In this diachronic tug-of-war between the drifts in language towards greater complexity and simplification, respectively, formations such as obscured compounds may then paradoxically testify to the productive status of compounding at the given moment in the life of a language.... Moreover, in the transition between OE and ME, such obscuration processes no doubt had a specific sociolinguistic facet: this was a period when many lexical items, both compounds and simplexes, fell into oblivion or became lexicalized and structurally isolated simply because they never gained access to the written page” (41).

A few OE forms put in a “cognatic” appearance—OE *būgan*, *bī(e)gan* (78), *br(o)ēgan* (85), *pūca* (90) in Brian Cooper’s interestingly wide-ranging ‘bogey, boogeyman’ study “Lexical Reflections Inspired by Slavonic **bogŭ*: English *bogey* from a Slavonic Root?,” *Trans. of the Philological Soc.* 103: 73–97. The answer to the titular question is “no,” but the early suggestion made by R. G. Latham, in his *Dictionary of the English Language* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1866–70), that an ancestral form to the whole *bogey-bugbear-Böggelmann* complex passed one way or the other between Celtic and Germanic in what is now central Europe Cooper takes to heart, leaning toward an origin in Gmc. (94), and pursues through its wealth of forms and folkloric expressions. Section 5 of the philological study, “What About Puck?,” notes the OE glossary entry *larbula* [*larvula*]: *pūca* and comes out, as the reader anticipates, to *A Midsummer Night’s Dream’s* Puck (90–92), then is drawn back to British (Welsh) *bwg*, *bwci*. Densely packed with details, meandering at times, but always

interesting and offering the unexpected at some points, Cooper's study is philological in the main, but also folkloric, literary, ethnographic. So much is covered, often discursively, but there is always a unifying strand (or form): from Scots *bogill* (Dunbar's *The twa mariit wemen and the wedo* to Scott's *Black Dwarf*), to *bug-aboo*, *booger* (the frightful spirit and the "dried nasal mucus"), to *Fastnacht* traditions. One is pleased too to see recourse made to developments in English abroad, with citation of the eminently useful *Dictionary of American Regional English* (Harvard: Belknap Press, 1985-). The sheer number of forms cited can dazzle the eye (or dull, depending upon interest or taste), sometimes seemingly burying the most interesting points: one of the most densely argued elder Gmc. passages, Section 4, is given the somewhat cryptic title "A Link Between *Böggelmann* and *Butzemann*?" (86-90).

Another proposal to the origin and meaning of *viking*, f., and *vikingr*, m. (OE *wicing*) is on offer in Eldar Heide's "Viking—'rower shifting'?" *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 120: 41-54. Heide's argument in favor of an original sense to 'Viking' having to do with shifts of rowers and the *vika sjóvar*, 'a sea's shift' or "the distance covered between two shifts of rowers" (45) carries further a similar proposal made some years earlier by Bertil Daggfelt ("Vikingen roddaren," *Tidsskrift för Svensk Antikvarisk Forskning* 78 [1983]: 92-94). Objections to existing proposals—from the usual *vik* 'bay' to the *Vik* (Norwegian Skagerrak coast) geographical association as home of original Vikings and others—are lodged early on (41-4) before the "rower-shifting explanation" (44ff.). The philological arguments and counterarguments are largely retailed from other sources, as this is more a semantic argument. Daggfelt had concerned himself only with masc. *vikingr* and Heide picks up with fem. *viking* and the matter of which verb the abstract noun was derived from (i.e., normally one expects from weak verbs). He proposes that the *vika* in *vika sjóvar*, and so the 'Viking' forms in his argument, derives from *vika* and that "[t]he essence of the verb ... seems to be 'move or step aside, turn to the side' (48). The proposal then shifts to the shifting itself of sets of rowers, for which Heide provides abundant detail, even personal experience (from rowing traditional Norwegian *fembørdingar*; 50). An advantage to this Nordic-produced study is the citation of contemporary dialectal detail in support—reference to going fishing as a matter of 'going rowing' (e.g., the Norwegian question "Skal du ro?" can really ask whether one is going fishing): in short, that the means of making the journey becomes the cover term for the activity and the one pursuing the activity—the semantic argument. Interestingly, as it has

been brought up before in "Viking"-word etymological studies, is the separation of the terms from a chronological lower limit (namely, the Viking Age proper, A.D. 793 and later) when it is argued that the terms do not refer to the activity of sea-borne raiders. This extends back the age of "Viking ships" to the Migration period, to before the age of sail to that of rowing, and so: "If the term *viking* (**wiking[ō]*) originates from the 4th century, then ships like the Nydam Ship [dated to AD 310-20 by dendrochronology] would be the 'Viking ships' in the original sense of the word" (52).

Carole Hough's "Old English **dunnoc* 'Hedge-Sparrow': A Ghost Word?" *N&Q* n.s. 52: 11-13, follows from her citation of the surname Dunnock in an earlier *N&Q* piece ("The Surname Purrock," 248 [2003]: 375-7); this while presumably deriving from OE, as Ruddock < OE *rudduc* < *rudu* 'redness', may be a ghost word as Hough has found no occurrence of **dunnoc* in the "anthroponymic record," only in the toponymic (12). Though "[a]s a derivative of the colour adjective OE *dunn* referring to the sparrow's dun-brown plumage, it is paralleled by OE *ruddoc*" (12). The only possible toponymic use Hough finds near the time of the Conquest is an attestation of Dunkeswell in Devon from AD 1086 (*Doduceswilla*); the other attestations are all significantly later. As "[i]t is of course difficult to prove a negative, so there is still a theoretical possibility that ME *donoke* may have had an OE etymon which does not appear within the literary or onomastic corpora. But there is no evidence that it did" (13). While the toponymic evidence is often mined to seek support for a hypothetical OE form, here it is used to dump one; one wonders whether *rudduc* would meet the same fate had we not had the glossary preservation of this term for 'robin'.

Hough brings toponymic evidence to bear on Philip Rusche's "Play-Shields and Play-Ships in Old English," *N&Q* 249 (2003): 225-8, with her "Play-Shields, Play-Ships and Play-Places in Old English," *N&Q* 52: 153-55. Here examined are OE toponymic *plegstow* formations, numbering about a score (Playstow, Plaistow, Plaistowgreen, Pleystow Farm, etc.; 153), and though "the majority are not recorded until the thirteenth century," the toponyms referring to 'play place', whose "possible interpretation" may be 'place where sports were held' (153), are pressed into the service of interpreting the OE compounds in the title as having to do with 'play' after all. Rusche's argument is not being invalidated so much as mildly vitiated: "In conclusion, the place-name evidence offers support for Rusche's contention that the element *pleg-* in the Old English compounds *plegscyld* and *plegscip* has a physical rather than

spiritual connotation, indicating that such objects were not intended for use in combat. It remains uncertain, however, whether the distinction is between serious combat and sporting contests, or between actual combat and dramatic representations" (154–55). Actually, the thrust of Rusche's argument, fairly convincingly made, was that the two glossarial *pleg*- compounds were not to be taken as 'play' items, but as part of 'contests' normally found in training likely martial. Hough rather means to restore the sense of 'play', though it does hinge on whether one does indeed see the "possible interpretation" of toponymic 'play place' as 'place where sports were held'. Moreover, missing here is consideration of the lemmata: a contextual concern when dealing with glossarial rather than toponymic forms.

Michiko Ogura's "Some Variable Features of Negative Elements in Old English Psalter Glosses," in *Naked Wordes in English*, ed. Krygier and Sikorska, 9–26, is one of her two psalter gloss studies published in 2005 that carry on the main theme—and repeat much material from—her earlier study "The Variety and Conformity of Old English Psalter Glosses," *ES* 84 (2003): 1–8 (reviewed in this section of *YWOES* 2003). Ogura has been studying negation and negative forms in OE for some two decades in quite some detail, and detail here is the chief strength of this first in a pair of closely related papers (both in fact seem to derive from a paper given in 2004 in Poznań; cf. 9 n. 1). The "variety and conformity" theme is struck up a number of times in this series of brief case studies of OE negative forms with their tables and tabulations. This, the longer of the two studies, does begin with a preamble of sorts setting out the glossed psalters, most of the information from older sources (glaringly omitted is any reference to the first volume of Phillip Pulsiano's *Old English Glossed Psalters* [Toronto: Uof Toronto P, 2001], which would have aided in providing a comparative corpus to work with for the first fifty psalms). Ogura begins with the observation that as "It has often been said that glosses are inappropriate for the investigation into syntactic structures," and as some OE psalter glosses may be more in the line of "element-for-element rendering[s]," therefore "[t]o find similarities and differences and to define them clearly is indispensable" (11). It is not clear that this is ever consistently done as the psalter glosses are put to all sorts of uses and made to bear a number of burdens; imprecise too are such formulations as "the Roman-Gallican difference" (22) as to the Latin psalter texts glossed, found *passim* in Ogura's psalter-gloss studies. Unclear as well are such references as to the Salisbury Psalter (K; Salisbury, Cathedral Library 150, ca. 975, provenance perhaps Shaftesbury

as exhibiting "some carelessly unique renderings" (10) or that the Junius Psalter (B; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 27, a Roman psalter s. x', of Winchester provenance) "sometimes demands uniqueness, especially in syntactic structures" (22); though such English formulations are unclear, more cryptic, in terms of psalter-gloss interrelations and stemmatics, is the use of "unique(ness)." The first specific examples addressed involve "distribution of the forms *ne* or *na*" with contrast between psalter-gloss usage and that found in some other glossed/translated texts: namely the OE Gospels, the *Regula Benedicti* gloss, and *Liber Scintillarum*—texts that are apposite for citation, but left unexplained is why precisely these texts. Her citation of Peter Kitson's two-part "Topography, Dialect, and the Relation of Old English Psalter-Glosses," *ES* 83 (2002): 474–503 and 84 (2003): 9–32, as "support[ing] the results of my lexical comparison between the *A*-type and the *D*-type glosses, while my investigation in both full words and function words has, not being contradict to his results, added more detailed information than a mere vocabulary comparison" (11), does not quite square with the assessment in Kitson's in-depth study of the stemmatics of OE glossed psalters and their use to OE dialectology (he had questioned the "probative value" of what he saw as the "number-crunching" approach of work such as that of Ogura; see this section in *YWOES* 2003 for comments on the matter). Essentially the brief study of OE *ne* + Verb falls into line with Ogura's earlier work on forms such as *nelle* and so serves rather more a self-confirmatory purpose than casting much new light on OE psalter gloss use. Other brief case studies involve contracted negative forms (*ne is* versus *nis*; 15–18) and negative prefixes (*un-* in glossing Latin lemmata with negative or privative *i(n/m)-*). Orphaned along the way is section 6.1, which records that "[f]ive examples of *gratis* show a variety of glosses, but the major contrast is found between *bi un-* and *butan*" (20), which does maintain in radically smaller compass the "variety and conformity" theme but does not seem to have much other connection to the surrounding studies of negative forms in psalter glosses (only *butan* makes a tentative link). If the lack of a clear organizing principle constitutes a larger-scale problem here, some sloppiness in presentation is troubling: reference to "Ogura 1986" has no complement in the bibliography (15), citation of Ps 104,15 *Nolite tangere christos meos* is given as 104,5 (15), Ps 72,22 *nihilum* is given as *inhilum* (16); other infelicities abound.

In Ogura's "Variable Features of Negative Elements in Old English Psalter Glosses," in *Aspects of English Negation*, ed. Iyeiri, 27–38, the close similarity between

the titles of her 2005 studies is echoed in the content; here the focus is more narrowly on contracted negative forms and, a bit loosely, their significance in defining, still rather loosely, A- and D-type glossing traditions. Following on the results of two previous studies of hers—“On the Use of *Na* and *Ne* in *The Regius Psalter*,” *Neophilologus* 83 (1999): 133–43, and “The Variety and Conformity of Old English Psalter Glosses” (above)—Ogura notes from the start that “These results tell us the fact that negative contraction may occur in both West Saxon and non-West Saxon texts and that West Saxon glosses show variety in the way of rendering the same Latin context. The lexical comparison should be made both between full words and between function words so as to reveal the variety and conformity to the possible archetype gloss and to find the syntactic devices of each glossator in the interpretation of the contexts foreign to Old English” (27). In so brief a study little of this is gotten to besides the contracted versus non-contracted negative forms tables (and one will need to consult Kitson 2003, cited above, on the matter of any archetypes); the study does end with a useful appendix retailing the frequencies of “Contracted and Uncontracted Forms of *Be*-verbs” from *nis* to *nan bið* (35–6). No dramatic observations are made prior to the useful table: the Eadwine Psalter (E; Cambridge, Trinity College R.17.1, ca. 1155–60 at Christ Church, Canterbury) is a “gloss of the transitional period, that often chooses uncontracted forms” (28), though “We cannot conclude, however, that *E* is always exceptional in the choice of words or word forms” (29). Much material is repeated from the preceding article, reviewed above, including the glosses to Latin *gratis*. The densely packed summary is unclear, but striking toward significant ground, that “It is clear from the table [Table 1. Contraction and non-contraction with *be*-verbs] that the Mercian *A* [the Vespasian Psalter] has too many contracted forms to be ignored; it is in fact nearly half of the sum total. The early West Saxon *D* [Regius Psalter] shows a preference for contracted forms and a later gloss *F* [Stowe Psalter] shares the feature. Another late West Saxon *I* [Lambeth Psalter] shows a particular fondness for contracted forms. On the other hand, the *D*-type *G* [Vitelius Psalter], *J* [Arundel Psalter], a later *K* [Salisbury Psalter] and the mid-twelfth *E* [Eadwine] prefer non-contraction. The frequent use of *na(n)* in place of *ne* is expected to prevent contraction; but *G*, *H* [Tiberius Psalter] and *J*, which often choose *na(n)*-forms, also use contraction with *ne*, *D* uses *na* quite often but also shows a marked preference for contraction, and *E* uses *ne* in uncontracted [*sic*] forms” (30). Other observations are repeated verbatim from the preceding study,

with no new (and much needed) explanation offered. Some of the data on contracted and uncontracted negative forms assembled here is intriguing; precisely what use this one criterion can be put to in psalter-gloss interrelation study is never made clear. Looming large here with this pair of studies is the need for some current state-of-the-art assessment of where glossed psalter interrelations and glossing traditions stand.

Though it did not appear in the year’s bibliography, the felicitation volume *Indo-European Perspectives: Studies in Honour of Anna Mopurgo Davies*, ed. J. H. W. Penney (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004) contains two studies on OE words of interest: **Old English mæþelian, mæþlan, mælan*,” 417–35, by Don Ringe; and *Patrick V. Stiles’s “Consumer Issues: *Beowulf* 3115a and Germanic Bison,” 461–73. What is presented in Ringe’s argument is a step-by-step analysis, with testing of proposals accepted and rejected, of the thesis that the titular “three verbs are etymologically a single lexical item which has somehow been split, either in the poetic tradition or in the transmission of the texts” (417). This is an in-depth version treating just one OE etymological complex (these verbs of speaking and derivatives) with the historical linguist’s method; Ringe has just published the first volume to the Oxford’s A Linguistic History of English series, *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006), replete with reconstructed forms and paradigms (see, just for example, those for **h₂es-* ‘be’ and other core verbs at 35–40) and is best known for work with Greek dialects, Tocharian, and linguistic cladistics. The latter volume, *From PIE to Proto-Germanic*, will serve as the basis for at least the historical linguistic component to any future treatments of the history of the language. The current approach to *mæþelian* and company sets rigorous standards for approaching the etymology of OE and OE pre-forms; the value of Ringe’s precise historical work is such that some unfamiliarity with all of the current OE scholarship can be forgiven, though there are some generalizations about OE meter and chronology of texts and dialects that give one momentary pause. Ringe begins, and comes round to support amply in its complexity, the thesis that the OE verbs of speaking *mæþelian* (weak II) and *mæþlan* and *mælan* (both of weak I) constitute a single etymological item but that each of them was “linguistically ‘real’” (417, 421), that is, in the case of *mæþelian*, attested only in the 3rd sg. pret. and mainly in the poetry, one is not dealing purely with an invented or stopgap form (*metri causa*). As to poetic *mæþelode* Ringe begins with the metrical constraints evident in its distribution: it occurs “44 times, always at the end of the first half-line, in poems of every period.

In 42 instances it is preceded by a polysyllabic name (e.g. *Bēowulf mæpelode*, or *Elene mæpelode*). The remaining two examples are preceded by monosyllabic nouns" (418; namely, *mon mæpelade* from *Riddles* 38.5 and *weard mæpelode* from *Beowulf* 286a); furthermore, the semming formula appear only at the end of an A- or D-type hemistich. Thus, "we must address the possibility that *mæpelode* is an artificial creation of the poetic tradition, of the sort familiar in Homeric Greek ... [which] will prove to be only partly confirmed, and will develop in some unexpected directions" (419–20). The only cavil to be made at this point is some generalizing about the dating of the OE poetic corpus—that *Andreas*, *Genesis*, and *Christ* date to no later than the ninth century (presumably on linguistic grounds—an argument made for *Beowulf* later in Ringe's study: cf. the statement that *Beowulf*'s "almost certainly an eighth-century poem," being "confirmed by an unpublished analysis of the poem's syntax by Susan Pintzuk and Anthony Kroch" [423 and n. 7])—and the description of *Genesis B* as not "later than the ninth century" (418) and also as a "later" OE poem (419); in so far as anything is secure in dating OE poetry, this could have been stated more clearly. As to the etymology of the three verbs, Ringe states that the weak I forms *mæþlan* ~ *mælan* were indeed inherited from PGmc., while the same cannot be said of *mæþelian*, "a form whose origin not only can but must be explained within the history of OE" (420). Ringe proceeds to offer potential falsifying evidence to his thesis, which for the most part will be knocked down; that both *mæþelian* and *mælan* can be found in IWS OE prose is explained away in part as "the semi-standardized late WS chancery dialect became increasingly divorced from the spoken dialects of OE (so that the sudden proliferation of dialects in our early Middle English documents is simply an artifact of the chancery tradition's demise). It is reasonable to suggest that a word which had originally been confined to poetry could have been imported into such an artificial dialect even in prose, and that is just as true of a word that might have been created artificially in the poetic tradition as of a linguistically real word that had earlier been judged appropriate only for verse" (421). Here it is a little jarring to read of a "semi-standardized late WS chancery dialect" in the days before the chancery proper; perhaps not even such a designation has really been advanced for late West-Saxon or even, more narrowly, in the "Winchester Vocabulary" *affaire*. As to the ME, one does wonder to what extent the factor of written records (such as survived the Reformation) as a sample of actual speech in the transition OE to ME is taken into consideration; it is odd that the *Linguistic*

Atlas of Late Mediaeval English should not have been used. Nonetheless, the survivals into ME (e.g., *mēlen*) confirm "the linguistic reality of the OE class I weak verb or verbs, precisely as we would expect from the pattern of cognates in other Germanic languages" (421). The weaker survival of *mæþelian* in ME *mathelen* is probed, as most attestations derive from the *Ancrene Riwe*, in the form *meaðelin* and with the "pejorative meaning 'talk (too much), prate, gossip'" (422), though the OE lexica had advanced something similar—that is, a pejorative sense other than 'make a speech'—this for late OE too (CHM 'harangue'; compare the subst. *maðelere*, 'speaker, haranguer'). Some clearer use could have been made of Alistair's Campbell's *Old English Grammar* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959; revised ed. 1962): "Yet the fact that *mæþelian* has no genuine cognates in any other Germanic language argues strongly that it was created within the history of OE. In principle it could have been formed from the noun *mæþl* at any time, since the second class of weak verbs was the one completely productive throughout the history of OE" cites Campbell by page number, where use of section number, here §528, would have been clearer for comparison with the historical grammar (an odd usage as Streitberg and other such numbered-section Neogrammarian handbooks are used); and the reference is a slightly off fit, as Campbell was discussing the fate of early Latin loans in OE, those passing into weak I and II forms (*dihtan* < *dictare*, *predician* < *praedicare*), or those involving re-formation on a native element (*salletan* ~ *psallere*). Section 5 in Ringe's argument, "The Use of *mæpelode* in Verse," will be of interest to anyone concerned with OE metrical types; here Ringe sees a constraint on the 3rd pret. form in verse as it developed in the history of OE: the form "ought to have been **mæþlidæ* or **mæþlidæ*. The first alternative given form exhibits the regular effect of i-umlaut, but it is clear that in class I weak verbs **æ* was extensively restored on the basis of the nouns and adjectives from which the verbs were derived, in this case **mæþl*.... At this stage the form could not occur at the end of type A or D half-lines, since it ended in two fully unstressed syllables" (425). And: "Suppose that a traditional oral poet had learnt to use type A formulae ending in **mæþlidæ*, but began to pronounce the form **mæþlidæ* because that had become the normal spoken form in his dialect, thus rendering the formulae unmetrical. What would his reaction probably have been? ... Eventually, though, the tradition collectively either adjusts or abandons such 'deformed' formulae" (426). The metrical consideration draws to a close and includes the sage advice that "The indeterminate analysis of such half-lines is

one of many indications that Sievers's 'five types' theory is no more than a descriptive catalogue, not a 'theory' in the usual sense (as Sievers himself emphasized)" (428 n. 14). The last section before the concluding summary looks to "the history of *mæplan* and *mælan*" (428–33) and "how they [the weak I verbs] can be explained as divergent outcomes of a unitary prototype" (428). As ON cognates have led to suggestions that *mælan* is a Scandinavian loan, "if we ask, 'Is ME *mēlen* descended from OE *mælan* or ON *mæla*?', the correct answer is 'either or both'" (430). The suggestion that OE inherited from PGmc. a verb **mahlijjan* is dispensed with (431–2), after which we get a summary sort of argument: "By the PWG period the verb had not undergone any changes relevant to the present discussion, but the noun had: its nom.-acc. sg. was now the endingless **maþl*. Of course the other forms of the noun's paradigm still exhibited vowels after the stem-final cluster, but the nom.-acc. sg. could have been salient enough for the results of any sound change which affected it to have spread to the rest of the paradigm by analogy, while the results of any sound change which failed to affect it should have tended to be eliminated from the rest of the paradigm by analogy. At this stage, then, we have a reasonable chance of explaining the split between *mæþl*- and *mælan*- by processes of conditioned sound change and analogy in the noun paradigm. What we need to have happened is this: **þl* must have become **hl* intervocally but have survived when word-final" (432), but this is not quite what happened—one expects consonant cluster simplification (as with **maþl*)—and so "The loss of **þ* in various forms of this etymological family, often through an intermediate stage **h*, was an independent development in ON, OE, and the continental West Germanic languages" (432–3). A number of significant arguments have been passed over in surveying Ringe's contribution; in the end, he reasserts the opening notions that *mæpelode* owes its existence to the poetic uses of traditional oral poets—perhaps prompted by what Ringe had called along the way "the failure of oral metrics to 'catch up' with the phonological development of the language" (427 n. 13)—is linguistically real nonetheless, and its origin is to be sought within the history of OE.

The seemingly problematic form *weaxan* at *Beowulf* 3114–3115 *Nu sceal gled fretan / weaxan wonna leg wigena strengel* is diagnosed and treated in Patrick Stiles's "Consumer Issues: *Beowulf* 3115a and Germanic Bison," in *Indo-European Perspectives*, ed. Penney, 461–73. Klaeber had taken the *weaxan wonna leg* as parenthetical, an intransitive amid transitives, and "the dark flame to grow" has been assaulted by critics with either

emendation or semantic re-interpretation. Stiles takes the latter approach after establishing, ever so briefly, the 'impossibility' of the MS reading: "It has often been remarked that, if *weaxan* 'to grow' is accepted, then 3115a must be taken as parenthetical—'the dark flame (will) grow'—which is clumsy, as it comes between *fretan* and its direct object. It also interrupts the flow of the thought unduly. What is more, a parenthesis in the first half-line is very rare in the older poetry and may have been considered bad style" (461). As this is the only point where Stiles will openly argue against accepting the MS reading—neither palaeographically nor grammatically, and perhaps not syntactically, problematic—it might be worth emphasizing that the reading of *weaxan* literally as 'to grow' may need looking at again; and how probative is it that parenthesis in the first half-line is 'rare' (in the face of such parentheses as fit into half-lines?) As Stiles will cite later in his study Paul Maas's influential *Textual Criticism* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1958), it is worth noting how many critics have leapt for a *lectio difficilior* in the face of neither textual corruption nor semantic opacity. Nonetheless, Stiles suspends from this initial rejection a fascinating tour of *wesan*, its cognates, proto- and pre-forms, and potential other senses in this passage—all the way back to the European bison of the title. The hunt for a different *weaxan* begins with Ferdinand Holthausen's plumping for a transitive verb with the sense 'to consume, devour'. He would later amend this suggestion to read *weasan* for MS *weaxan* as a spelling of *weosan*, which he would enter into his *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* as *wesan* 3 (462–3), with some cognate support in Gothic *wisan* and OHG *fir-wesan*. Stiles offers that, "Evidently, a more conservative generation has been reluctant to accept *we(o)san* because of the lack of attestations of the verb elsewhere in Old English" (463). The ancestry of a *we(o)san* 'devour, consume'—provided that one accepts this first leap—is amply filled out by Stiles in fascinating detail, beginning with PIE. An excursus upon *wisan* in the Gothic Bible follows (464–7), the semantic trail of the verb and derivatives leading from 'consume' to 'food, sustenance, feast', WGmc. cognates follow; intriguingly, Acts 12:23 *consumptus* was glossed by OHG *firwesinir* and *verzaner*, "the same two verb-stems as occur in *Beowulf* 3114–15" (468). Adduced in support of an underlying OE **wesān* meaning 'devour, feast' are nominal forms *wesa* 'glutton' (from the "Kentish Glosses") and *oferwesnes* 'overindulgence' (CHM; glossed by Stiles 'excess (in feasting)', 468). And so we end, somewhat suddenly, with **wesand*, whence OHG *wisant* and OE *wesend* 'bison', the "naming-motive being 'big-eater'" (468).

‡ Ring composition with allusion to medieval allegorizing of *alea* frames Martha Bayless's interesting contribution to the Lapidge Festschrift, "Alea, Tæfl, and Related Games: Vocabulary and Context," *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O'Brien O'Keefe and Orchard (see section 2), vol. II, 9–27. Bayless traces the history of late classical to early medieval references to the board-game *tabula* (*alea* .i. *tabula* could be used generically for board games, as could the OE gloss *tæfl*; 10–11) and board-game terminology; she begins with citation of Israel the Grammarian's *alea euangelii* (edited by Lapidge), cites Isidore's discussion of *alea* in Book XVIII of the *Etymologiae*, and concludes with Israel's allegorizing of "pieces in the *alea euangelii* to canon tables": "Thus the Anglo-Saxons echoed Isidore in terming a game *alea* and in allegorizing it; but in both instances they adapted their inheritance from the classical world to their own practices and purposes" (23). Bayless's survey restricts itself mainly to the British Isles, but ranges widely within that scope to include Norse and Celtic evidence (the latter, especially Irish and Welsh, seems particularly abundant; 17, 20). To any wide-ranging survey one can lodge queries—does the allegorizing of *alea* include its figurative use as 'chance, risk' (as sense B in the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, s.v. *alea*)?—or append minor notes: in the references to continued playing by the Lapps/Saami of a version of *hnefatafl*, such as that made by Carl Linné in 1732, it might be noted that their (the Saami) term *tablut* is obviously a Scandinavian loan (and, one presumes, the term like "[t]he game followed the course of the Vikings"; 14). One might quibble that the translation of Isidore's *de figuris aleae* begins with "Some who play *alea* seem themselves" for his *quidam autem aleatores sibi videntur*, as the reference to 'gamers, gamblers' seems worth retaining—Isidore will soon turn to them a few passages later with his *De interdictione aleae: Ab hac arte fraus et mendacium atque periurium numquam abest...* (*Etymologiae* XVIII.lxviii).

Cristina Raffaghello considers the lexicon associated with OE *gerefa* in her "Ancora sul lessico di *Gerefa*," *Lettura di 'Beowulf'*, ed. Dolcetti Corazza and Gendre, 331–45, this time in terms of two vocabulary sub-groups pertaining to the *gerefa*'s duties on an estate (or 'landed property': *proprietà terriera*) during the year, with particular reference to a legal tract on such in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 383. The first sub-class concerns gardening and carpentry implements ("Lista A," 332–6, with a further subsection on textile-working terms: *flexlinan*, *presse*, *timplean* [335–6]), the second ("Lista B," 336–44) comprising kitchen utensils. And lists they by and large are, with discussion of attestations and,

where available, of lemmata the OE terms can be found glossing. Of note, and serving to link the two lists, is consideration of two *-iren* compounds, *cimbiren* and *brandiren*, both of uncertain or variable meaning: Raffaghello comes out fairly closely with the former to the glosses Clark Hall-Meritt and BTS offered, if tentatively, 'edge-iron? (joining-iron, clamp?)' (she adds 'hook'/gancio' to the 'clamp, vise' and her more general 'strumento di ferro che serve per unire o per congiungere' [334]). The latter *-iren* occasions the most detailed commentary in the study (342–4); CHM gave 'firedog, trivet, grate', to which Raffaghello adds 'griddle' either one suspended from a hook and chain or resting upon a support in a hearth (344). Read *althochdeutschen* for *Altdeutschen* at 342 n. 33 for the Steinmeyer-Sievers collection.

JPMCg

‡ In "Alea, Tæfl, and Related Games: Vocabulary and Context" in *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O'Keefe and Orchard (see section 2), 9–27, Martha Bayless explains why a board game mentioned by the tenth-century scholar Israel the Grammarian is called *alea* 'dice' even though it involves no dice. "Old English subsumed all board games under a single term, *tæfl*; the Latin equivalent, again used for all board games, was *alea*" (10). The first stage in the evolution of this situation, which Bayless describes as a "gallimaufry of inexact vocabulary" (10), was the development of the backgammon-like Roman board game *duodecim scripta* in the early centuries A.D. into a simpler version which became known as *alea*, since, at this point, dice were still used to play it. Next, the phrase *aleae tabula* "the board game of the die" was applied to the game in the third-century pseudo-Cyprian *De aleatoribus*, and this usage led to "multiple ways to refer to the game in subsequent centuries: sometimes it was called *alea*, sometimes *alea* i.e. *tabula*, and sometimes simply *tabula*," one source of the Old English *tæfl* (11). A separate Roman game, *ludus latrunculorum* or *latrunculi* "little soldiers," was a battle game played with pieces on a latticed board, usually 8-by-8 cells, which involved capturing opponents' pieces by surrounding them, sometimes but not always involving dice. Medieval versions of this popular game became known in Scandinavia as *hnefatafl* 'the board game of the fist' or simply *tafl*. Under this name it became the pre-eminent game in Anglo-Saxon England. So at least two distinct games (and probably many more) were commonly known as *tæfl*, and the general term that came to be considered the equivalent in Latin was *alea* whether the version played involved dice or not. The actual game referred to by Israel, *alea*

euangelorum, was either a complex version of *hnefatafl* or was simply an invention of the author to serve his didactic purposes, though perhaps influenced by yet another board game of rising popularity—chess.

Michiko Ogura in “Words of Emotion in Old and Middle English Translations of Boethius’s *De Consolatione Philosophiae*” *Text and Language in Medieval English Prose*, 183–206 finds that “words of sorrow, joy, wonder, fear and anger show both lexical continuity and replacement ... while words of cruelty, pride and comfort are mostly replaced by loan words” (196).

In “The Relation of English *slowworm*, Swedish and Older Danish *ormslå*, Norwegian dialectal *sleva*, and German *Blindshleiche* to **slahan* ‘Strike,’ with a Note on Tautological Compounds” *NOWELE* 46–47: 119–132, after a characteristically meticulous review of the relevant literature, Anatoly Liberman concludes that the first part of English *slowworm* goes back to Germanic **slánhā*, versus its Verner’s Law variant **slanghó*: which became Old High German *slango* ‘snake’ (Modern German *Schlange*). So *slowworm* is a kind of tautological compound, ‘snake snake’, seen also in English *pathway*, *sledgehammer*, and *haphazard*, and in Old English *mægencreft*, *holtwudu*, and many others.

In “The Etymology of ‘brain’ and cognates” *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 3 (2004): 45–59, Anatoly Liberman displays his usual sharp wit, sound judgment, and painstaking thoroughness in reviewing earlier scholarly attempts at tracing the history of English *brain* (Old English *brægen*) as well as German *Brägen/Bregen* and Dutch *brein*. He points out (following Polome 1986) that the more-or-less standard etymology of Pokorny and others connecting the word with Proto-Indo-European **mregh-mo-* ‘top of the head’ (compare Greek *brekhmós* same meaning) has the disadvantage that “no other examples testify to the change **mr-* or **mbr-* to **br-* in Early Germanic” (49). His own proposal is that *brain* and its immediate Germanic relatives represent an early borrowing from Celtic **bragna* a “low” word for ‘refuse’, itself from PIE **bhragno-* ‘something broken’—the semantic connection being that brains are only seen when heads are broken. A similar semantic development can also be seen in the history German *Hirn* ‘brain’ from Germanic **herznja* which is from the same root as Latin *ex-cer-mere* ‘to separate’ (akin to *excrementum*). Old English *ex(e)* ‘brain’, of unknown origin and found only in specialized medical texts, may have once been the more common term which was driven toward the more learned register by the adoption of the once-low *brægen* as the general term, just as the new form competed with **harn-* elsewhere in Germanic. While no less speculative than many other

attempts, this is certainly an entertaining and not entirely implausible proposal. It would be bolstered if there were other examples of terms for body parts borrowed into Germanic from Celtic.

Aliki Pantos’s “*In medle oððe an þinge*: the Old English vocabulary of assembly” in *Assembly places and practices in Medieval Europe*, ed. Sarah Semple (see section 7), 181–201, illuminates the histories and uses of various terms for ‘assembly’ in Old English literature, legal texts, and place names. Beyond the most common term (*ge-*)*mot*, Pantos investigates other widely used words such as *þing*, *mæpel*, *spel*, and *sp(r)æce*. The history of *þing* is complicated by the identical Old Norse form, and place names using it are in fact most common where Scandinavian influence was strongest. The Old English forms are found mainly in poetry, except for the legal phrase *in medle oððe an þinge* in texts from the late seventh century. The term *mæpel* and its verbal forms refer particularly to speech of wise men and heroes and other formalized speech such as may occur at an assembly. Likewise, *spell* refers to wise speech, especially informative ‘tidings’, *godspell* being the prototypical example here. Pantos notes that “identification of ‘assemble’ elements in place names is, in many cases, more problematic than often assumed” (197).

After reviewing the relevant literature, Ewa Ciszek in “The development of –s(c)hip(e) in Early Middle English” in *Naked Words in English*, ed. Marcin Krygier and Liliana Sikorska, *Medieval English Mirror* 2 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang), 27–46 completes a careful and thorough-going analysis of the semantic development of the Old English suffix *-scip* into Middle English, including discussion of every attested form. Its use with (apparently) new formations from on native roots (for example *ladyship*) and on newly borrowed roots (for example *cowardshipe* ‘cowardice’ from an Old French root) shows that this morpheme remained productive through the Early Middle English period but not beyond. Surprisingly, the number of semantic categories it encompasses in Old English—condition, quality, act, group, status, thing, territory, and time—barely diminishes in eME before the formation loses productivity. (Only the ‘time’ meaning, attested solely in OE *hæþenscip* ‘time when heathendom prevails’, seems to be lost.) Also, while the meaning ‘condition, state of being’ predominated in OE, coinage with the meaning ‘quality’ became more common in the eME period.

Robert Lewis, in “Verbs with *i-* prefix in the *Middle English Dictionary*” *Texts and Language in Medieval English Prose*, Oizumi, Fisiak, Scahill (see section 2), 5–28, charts the history of the editorial policies on

where to place the various verb forms with the *i-* prefix (from Old English *ge-*) in the seventy-year history of the creation of the *MED*. This is a good source of information for anyone interested in investigating the spread in Middle English of *i-* to non-native forms (for example *i-cachen, icausen...*) or in the history of lexicography.

In the copiously documented article "On the syntactic and semantic development of *after* in Medieval English" in *Naked Words in English*, 47–66, Rafał Molencki demonstrates the much wider range of meaning and uses *after* had in Old English than today, including as it did locative as well as temporal meanings, and uses as adverb and prefix as well as its current use as a preposition. Also discussed is the development of *after* as a subordination conjunction from reanalysis of the phrase *after that* from preposition plus demonstrative pronoun to conjunction plus subordinating particle (which was later dropped).

Ruta Nagucka, in "Cognitive approaches for the understanding of Old English loanwords" *Text and Language in Medieval English Prose*, 163–76, examines the semantics of two borrowed concrete nouns, *olfend* 'elephant' and *fic* 'fig (tree)', which Nagucka assumes Old English speakers had no direct experience of and concludes: "Although lexical items which refer to the object of the physical world may be simple to cognitively encode by ostentation, they are extremely complex when no visual perception is possible." This complexity increases considerably as Nagucka turns to the more abstract noun *paraclitus*, OE *frofor-gast*, a term for the Holy Ghost as 'spirit of comfort' seen in Ælfric's *Homilies*, the interpretation of which presumably required a greater exercise of imagination and creativity on the part of the Anglo-Saxon audience.

In "The problem of the English *dribble, drivell, drizzle* and *trickle*: the role of semantics in etymology" *Anglia* 123: 191–203, William Rothwell concludes that "from a semantic rather than merely orthographic standpoint, it can be shown that the four words had much in common during the medieval period before the introduction of dictionaries led eventually to the establishment of more precise spellings and meanings" (191). He also points out how widely and wildly the spellings of these forms varied and overlapped in the early period, and how thin the earliest evidence is in some cases.

In "Orm's *wikken* and Compounds with *-wican* in Annal 1137 of the *Peterborough Chronicle*," *N&Q* 52: 10–11, Derek Britton investigates two "distinctly odd" instances of the "apparent persistence in post-prepositional contexts of a descendant of the dative singular form of OE weak feminine *wice*" (10): *to þe circewican* 'to the office of sacrist' and *of þe hoderwycan* 'of the

office of steward'. Britton suggests that, rather than being derived from *wice*, the second elements in these compounds should be connected with another word with the same meaning of "office, duty, function"—*wikken*, known otherwise only in the *Ormulum*, a text close in time and space to the *Peterborough Chronicle*.

W. B. Lockwood in "The Scandinavian Names for the Rainbow," *Maal og Minne*, 195–97, following up on earlier studies in this area, concludes that the common Scandinavian names for 'rainbow' were all borrowed (or calqued), along with Christianity, from Old English *regnboga*, Old Saxon **reganbogo* or, in the case of Faroese *ælabogi*, from Irish. He further explains OE *scurboga* as a Gaelicism (cf. Irish *tuagh ceatha* 'rainbow' from *cioth* 'shower') "coined in contradistinction to the native *regnboga* employed by the rival (and victorious) Roman church" (197).

After clarifying the meaning of the Greek of John 4.9 by referring to rabbinical purity laws prohibiting Jews from sharing vessels with Samaritan women, Valentine A. Pakis in "Sharing Vessels with an *Armas Wib*: Jesus and the Samaritan Woman in Medieval Germanic," *JEGP* 104: 514–27, points out that in the Lindisfarne and Rushworth translations of this verse, *gebyrellic* probably does not mean "fit" (as if from *gebyrdelic*), but rather this term should be connected with *byrle* 'cup-bearer'.

Dennis Philps in "From PIE *(s)kel- 'to cut' to Germanic and Baltic *(s)kel- 'to owe', An Hypothesis Based on the Concept of 'Notional Chronology,'" *Jnl of Indo-European Studies* 33: 1–26, makes a compelling argument that the well attested practice of notching stick to keep track of debts connects the root of English *shall* (OE *scal*) and OE *scyld* 'obligation' to the Proto-IE root *(s)kel- 'to cut'. A semantic parallel (and possible cognate) can be seen in the two meanings of Modern English *score*. The verb form in Germanic goes back to a perfect meaning 'being in a state that has resulted from the action'. Much of the rest of the article indulges in speculation that does more to obscure this promising proposal than to elucidate it.

Sara M. Pons-Sanz has three etymological studies in this section. In "An Etymological Note on OE *of life forrædan*," *ANQ* 18.2: 6–9, she rescues the phrase in the title from the presumption of Old Norse origin, noting that similar collocations of *forrædan* 'condemn' with prepositional phrases occur throughout the text (Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*), the title phrase appears to be mere variations of these, and their native origin has never been doubted. In "The Norse Origin of OE *afol* / ME *afell*: Is Evidence Strong Enough?" *ELN* 43.2: 1–8, Pons-Sanz argues that these words (which mean 'power, might') need not be derived from Old Norse. Though its

only attestation in Old English is in *Genesis B*, a translation from Old Saxon, Pons-Sanz argues that, because the translator did not replace the Old Saxon *abal* with an unrelated but more familiar OE word, and since the word continued to be faithfully copied in later manuscripts, *afol* must have been a native, if perhaps rare, word. In “Friends and Relatives in Need of an Explanation: Gr. *anagkaïos*, L. *necessarius*, and PGmc **naud-*,” *JEGP* 104: 1–11, Pons-Sanz attempts to extricate the history of the OE word *nydmæg* ‘blood-relation, cousin’ from what she calls a “vicious cycle”: assuming ON ancestry of OE words when no other is readily available. After exploring the histories and uses of the Greek and Latin words in her title as well as Germanic words related to OE *nyd*, she concludes that when *nydmæg* is placed in this wider context “the extant evidence suggests that its identification as a loan-translation of an ON compound is, to say the least, improbable” (11).

In “Another French Word from an Anglo-Saxon Manuscript: *gravirs*,” *NM* 106: 23–25, David W. Porter concludes that, because of its uniformity with the other French glosses in the manuscript, this gloss was added at the same time as the others—roughly mid eleventh century.

JUH

Works not seen

Клѣмина, Е. Н. [Klyomina, E. N.] “Семантика и методы изучения древнеанглийской поэтической лексики (в словаре и тексте)” [“Semantika i metody izucheniya drevneanglijskoi poeticheskoi leksiki (v slovare i tekste)” = “Semantics and Methods of Studying Old English Poetic Vocabulary (in the Glossary and the Text)”]. *Лексика, лексикография, терминография в русской, американской и других культурах: Материалы VI Международной школы-семинара, Иваново, 12–14 сентября 2005 г.* [Leksika, leksikografiya, terminografiya v russkoi, amerikanskoi i drugikh kulturakh: Materialy VI Mezhdunarodnoi shkoly-seminara, Ivanovo, 12–14 sentyabrya 2005 g. = *Vocabulary, Lexicography, Terminography in Russian, American, and Other Cultures: Proceedings of the 6th International School-Seminar, Ivanovo, September 12–14, 2005*]. Ivanovo: n.p., 2005. pp. 156–59.

Lendinara, Patrizia. “Glosse o traduzioni.” *Tradurre testi medievali: obiettivi, pubblico, strategie*. Ed. Maria Grazia Cammarota and Maria Vittoria Molinari. Bergamo: Bergamo Univ. Press and Edizioni Sestante, 2002. pp. 249–77.

_____. “Teoria e prassi dell’attività glossatoria nel mondo germanico medievale.” *Antichità germaniche: II parte*.

Il Seminario avanzato in Filologia germanica. Ed. Vittoria Dolcetti Corazza and Renato Gendre. Bibliotheca germanica 12. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso, 2002. pp. 3–29.

Pijnenburg, Willy J. J. “Germanic **kalb-az-* ‘Calf’ and Slavic *zrebe* ‘Foal.’” *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 60 (2005): 5–10.

Taeymans, Martine. “On Old and Middle English *need* in Positive and Negative Contexts.” *Belgian Jnl of English Language and Literature* 3 (2005): 105–21.

Terasawa, Jun. “Some Notes on A *Thesaurus of Old English*: With Special Reference to Words Denoting ‘Drink’ and ‘Food.’” *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. I, 239–48.

Teresi, Loredana. “The Old English Term *heoru* Reconsidered.” *Bull. of the John Rylands Univ. Library of Manchester* 86.2 (Summer 2004): 127–78.

Toupin, Fabienne. “Was Deicticity a Semantic Component of the Old English Motion Verb *cuman*?” *Bulletin des anglicistes médiévistes* 60 (Winter 2001): 1–24.*

b. Syntax, Phonology, Other Aspects

In “Die altenglischen Nominalpräfixe *æ* und *ō-*, das Verbalpräfix *a-* und ihre althochdeutschen Entsprechungen: Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Wortbildung der altgermanischen Sprachen” (*Sprachwissenschaft* 30: 1–47), Klaus Dietz provides a valuable review and revision of morphological and semantic properties in Old English using comparative evidence from Old High German. Some of Dietz’s results are unsurprising, such as the assertion that adverbs of place are the source of several of the prefixes under discussion. Interestingly, though, the author shows that Old English and Old High German preserve different developments of the system of prefixation from the Germanic parent language (in which Dietz suggests all three prefixes under discussion descend from Germanic **uz-*)—in Old English the semantic distinctions between the prefixes collapses, while Old and Middle High German retain the semantic distinctiveness of the original system.

2005 was a fruitful year for historical dialectology, and the volume *Methods and Data in English Historical Dialectology*, (ed. Marina Dossena and Roger Lass [Bern: Peter Lang]) neatly describes some of the currently shifting ground on which linguists view English dialects of the past. Particularly useful is the extensive discussion of several ongoing projects in English historical dialectology, especially of the *Linguistic Atlas of*

Early Medieval English. To the uninitiated, many of the essays, but most particularly the discussion at the end, must seem so tentative that the field of English historical dialectology could be said hardly to exist at all. In some ways, this would not be an entirely false impression, since several of the scholars whose work is collected here are currently re-making the discipline from scratch, as it were, dismantling the old edifice which has housed work on English historical dialects and rebuilding from a foundation made largely of electronic corpora. The two sections of the volume, "Methods" and "Data," feature thirteen essays and a lively and illuminating panel discussion between the principals: Roger Lass, "*Ut custodiant litteras: Editions, Corpora, and Witness-hood*"; Margaret Laing, "Multidimensionality: Time, Space and Stratigraphy in Historical Dialectology"; Keith Williamson, "On Chronicity and Spaces in Historical Dialectology"; Mieko Ogura (Yokohama) and William S-Y. Wang, "Dynamic Dialectology and Complex Adaptive Systems" (reviewed below); Anneli Meurman-Solin, "Towards a Variationist Typology of Clausal Connectives: Methodological Considerations based on the Corpus of Scottish Correspondence"; Raymond Hickey, "Standard Wisdoms and Historical Dialectology: The Discreet Use of Historical Regional Corpora"; Peter Kitson, "On the Margins of Error in Placing Old English Literary Dialects" (reviewed below); Richard M. Hogg, "North Northumbrian and South Northumbrian: A Geographical Statement?" (reviewed below); Merja Stenroos, "Regional Dialects and Spelling Conventions in Late Middle English: Searches for (th) in the LALME Data"; Julia Fernández Cuesta and M^a Nieves Rodríguez Ledesma, "Northern features in 15th–16th-Century Legal Documents from Yorkshire"; Jeremy J. Smith, "Phonological Space and the Actuation of the Great Vowel Shift in Scotland and Northern England"; Joan C. Beal, "Marks of disgrace: Attitudes to Non-Standard Pronunciation in 18th-Century English Pronouncing Dictionaries"; Susan M. Fitzmaurice, "Orality, Standardization, and the Effects of Print Publication on the Look of Standard English in the 18th Century"; and "The Principles and Methodology of English Historical Dialectology: a discussion."

The essays by Lass, Laing, and Williamson stand out as charting new methodological paths for historical dialectology, while those by Beal and Fitzmaurice further demonstrate the application of sociolinguistic models to historical data. The volume is based on papers presented at the First International Conference on English Historical Dialectology (University of Bergamo, September 2003), and it certainly has the feel of the inauguration of a new endeavor. As the introduction states,

the exchange of information between scholars working on rather different projects should lead to a set of best practices for historical dialectology in general. Some of the best practices taking shape, according to the essays, are the compilation of corpora designed for linguistic use, the increased use of non-literary texts, and a commitment to the untenable status of geolinguistic historical representations. This final point is of particular importance because it underscores the ongoing re-invention of English historical dialectology that is forcefully articulated by several scholars in the volume, but it also leads to a sweeping epistemological dilemma: since most now agree that what was once recognized as the ends of historical dialectology—mapping isoglosses and compiling atlases—are misguided, what should stand in their places? With no very clear objective in sight, many of these scholars wonder about the very nature of the object of their study. As Fitzmaurice earnestly asks, "Are we studying words, texts, scribes, speakers or systems?" (385). Bewilderment can be instructive because it forces us to imagine anew the way ahead, which always seemed predetermined by what came before. The essays of *Methods and Data in English Historical Dialectology* reflect both bewilderment and a commitment to a revivification of a discipline.

Richard M. Hogg examines the long-standing claim that Owun's gloss on the *Rushworth Gospels* and Aldred's glosses to the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and the *Durham Ritual* represent two dialectal varieties of Northumbrian in "North Northumbrian and South Northumbrian: A Geographical Statement?" (*Methods and Data*, 241–55). Hogg points out that the three presumed phonological indicators of dialectal difference between these two varieties are the development of diphthongs, palatal diphthongization, and *w*-rounding. Hogg questions the usefulness of the detailed phonological analyses posited in the standard sources on these Northumbrian glosses authored by Lindelöf and Bülbring at the turn of the twentieth century. Since phonological interpretations of the data with respect to the three sound changes noted above present some phonologically unexpected (and unresolved) conclusions, Hogg suggests that we interpret the variation between these texts as "graphical variation" (249) à la *The Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English*. The author argues that there seems to be considerable confusion over the entire Anglian area about how to represent the original diphthongs, rendering the variation that we observe a matter of scribal preference rather than phonological significance.

Few areas in the study of Old English inspire more guarded qualification than the study of Old English dialects. Peter Kitson's work on Old English dialects,

however, has never become bogged down in circumspection. Kitson has made some big claims over the years about what his study of the Old English boundary clauses of the charter materials reveals about Old English dialects, though his long-promised guide to the charter boundaries has yet to appear in print (despite the publication of several lengthy articles and the presentation of many papers). In “On Margins of Error in Placing Old English Literary Dialects” (*Methods and Data*, 219–239), Kitson presents a sampling of some of the findings of his earlier articles by correlating what he sees in boundary clauses with the presumed dialectal provenance of some literary texts. In this way, the author uses evidence from the boundary clauses as anchoring points, providing fixed points of reference against which he plots linguistic correlations in a manner not exactly the same as but substantially similar to the “fit” technique devised by the compilers of *The Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediæval English*. Kitson often appeals to “science” and “scientific” methodology and “scientifically” accurate representations, which is simply a way of saying that approaches to Old English dialectology that are not his own are unscientific and, therefore, specious. In Kitson’s mind, “Unscientific” methods—like paleography and history—render the Old English dialects handmaidens to various sorts of scholarly historiographies. When Kitson refers to the science of his methodology, a more specific label would be “probabilism.” The “fit” technique and Kitson’s similar method are roughly analogous to regression to a mean that, in this case, yields a probability of a localization of the language of the text, and the margin of error diminishes with an increasing number of variables that can be fitted. But it is a mistake for the author to presume, as he apparently does, that other approaches to the study of Old English dialects are wholly unsound because they do not deploy conspicuous probabilistic models—just as it would be mistaken for the author to believe that his own model contains no trace of subjectivism. On the inherent probabilism in the work of a scholar like Neil Ker, for instance, little should need to be said. But the subjectivism of Kitson’s work is less obviously embedded in rhetoric designed to emphasize its function as science. The hypothesis in question is the degree of reliability that the Old English boundary clauses provide as fixed points in the linguistic geography of Anglo-Saxon England. There is some reason to doubt their reliability since most charters from Anglo-Saxon England survive in much later cartularies, which introduces a raft of textual difficulties. Kitson is persuaded that his study of the charter boundaries overwhelmingly indicates that they are of local origins, even

in the cartularies. The greatest obstacle to persuasion for the scholarly community, however, is that Kitson’s comprehensive study, his book, remains unpublished.

Meiko Ogura and William S-Y. Wang seek to explain some very early English linguistic phenomena (several from Old English) in terms of a dialectology that views language change and variation as complex adaptive systems “made up of a large number of entities that by interacting locally with each other give rise to global properties that cannot be predicted or deduced from an even complete knowledge of the entities and of the rules governing their interactions” (137) in (*Methods and Data*, 137–70). The authors examine the Great Vowel Shift, the change from OV to VO in Old English, inflectional loss, and the development of the *-ing* present participle as examples of linguistic selection (“unconscious functional selection between available variants by learners,” 163) while vocabulary emergence, the development of the *-s* ending of the third person singular of verbs and the development of West Germanic **a* before nasals in Mercian provide evidence of linguistic games as two types of language evolution. This essay synthesizes some significant recent research on linguistic evolution and explanatory models for language change and variation and adapts this research to some synchronic and diachronic problems in the history of the English language. Recent theories of language evolution ride the rising sociolinguistic tide in historical linguistics by focusing on the speaker, since many earlier explanations of change and variation tend to be decidedly asocial. But this essay also positions itself within a much wider discussion of principles of self-organization not just in language but in other human phenomena, like cultural systems and economies, and, accordingly, contributes to moving the discussion of linguistic history further still from a basic Chomskian perspective of the uniqueness of human language.

In a review for the *YWOES 2004*, I noted Roger Lass’s startling (to him) observation that medieval texts, such as we have them, do not provide us with a perfect record of medieval languages for the purposes of modern linguists. This dawning thought, committed to print in 2004, becomes a more fully elaborated polemic against modern editions as a “methodological prolegomenon to certain basic aspects of historical dialectology” (22) in “*Ut custodiant litteras: Editions, Corpora, and Witnesshood*” (*Methods and Data*, 21–48). Lass is correct, of course, that the design and purpose of modern editions do not ideally meet the standards of a data-source for contemporary historical linguists—most modern editions are created by literary scholars for the use of students and scholars of medieval literature. But Lass

describes this situation in rather sinister terms, as if generations of ratiocinative historical linguists have been led astray and duped through the machinations of the touchy-feely literary hordes. Lass argues, in effect, that medieval texts, by themselves, are poor enough sources of linguistic data and that modern editors have impoverished them even more severely through modernization, emendation, normalization, or alteration of any kind for almost any reason. Such editorial intervention creates, for Lass, “fictitious objects” (24). This may well be true for linguists more often than not, but some ten pages (28–38) on the evils of what we may call “literary editions”—as if what is wrong for linguists must also be wrong for anyone else who wishes to use a medieval text for any purpose—are so simplistic and reductive (to be fair, in a transcription of a panel discussion later in the volume, Lass calls this section “slightly specious puritanism” [393]) that they do rather less to make the point than Lass might suppose. (For example, what scholar of the history of the English language would use a student reader as a source of data?) The litany of differences between edited text and manuscript that Lass recites is strictly *condicio sine qua non*, for literary scholars most especially. In short, Lass’s overwrought point is that linguists need texts designed for linguistic investigation, and his example of a text in a corpus intended for linguistic study neatly demonstrates how an electronic corpus (in this case prepared for the *Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English* being readied at the University of Edinburgh, for which Lass is now a principle collaborator) can serve linguists as well as others who require a “reading text.” It is not surprising, then, that Lass adopts much of the same rhetoric that has been so fashionable in recent years among literary scholars who also view modern editorial practices as the work of a cabalistic few reaching back to the nineteenth century, bent on concealing from the public’s eyes what the manuscripts actually say. Although linguists and contemporary literary scholars usually appear to be working towards opposite goals (i.e., the systematic elimination of interpretive possibilities for the former and the systematic multiplication of interpretive possibilities for the latter), Lass articulates the critical point that he now shares with literary scholars who promote a theoretical orientation toward the primacy of the manuscripts: “No modern (or any) editor can be said to know the language of a scribe better than the scribe did” (25). But the too-simple truth of this oft-repeated sentiment (especially among scholars of Old English literature) reduces to absurdity in denial of other simple truths, such as the fact that modern scholars do have many advantages over medieval

scribes while not possessing the scribes’ competence as native speakers, such as comparative-linguistic methodologies and various sorts of historical evidence. With regard to such absurdity, let Lass speak for Lass: “Since none of the Exeter Book pieces are lineated as poems, even calling them that is an editorial decision” (32, n. 10). Yes, of course—if we are prepared to say that alliteration and the alternation of stressed and unstressed positions and the grouping of particles and the deployment of specialized vocabulary, among other observable regularities, are not properties of versification, then we should all agree that the Exeter Book contains no poems, since the scribe chose to preserve these texts in a layout that modernity associates with prose. Naturally, this is a manifest absurdity, but it is the logical conclusion of Lass’s (and others’) position on the absolutism of scribal authority. In the middle of the last century, C.L. Wrenn inveighed against what he called the “philological scribe,” a scholarly construct “whose every orthographic divagation from the expected has phonetic or phonological significance.” Subsequent scholarship’s abandonment of philology for literary-critical pursuits killed the philological scribe, but a changed being has reanimated, zombie-like, in his place—the unimpeachable scribe, whose every effort bears the imprimatur, however opaque to us, of a Great Design, rendering all other epistemologies (historical and comparative linguistics especially) mere whimsy by comparison. Lass’s basic point is entirely correct, but it is unfortunate that he has chosen to add his influential voice to an increasingly deafening echo chamber resounding with cries of scribal preeminence at a time when his uncommon learning is needed to provide some moderation in thinking that seems, in some respects, to be veering toward over-correction.

Roger Lass and Margaret Laing provide an extremely interesting glimpse of the uses of the electronic corpus prepared for the *Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English* in “Are Front Rounded Vowels Retained in West Midland Middle English?” (*Rethinking Middle English*, ed. Nikolaus Ritt and Herbert Schendl [Bern: Peter Lang], 280–90). This paper examines the claims frequently encountered in the handbook tradition that western and southwestern varieties of Middle English retained the front rounded Old English /y(:)/ as (usually) <u> and that Old English /e(:)o/ monophthongized to a front rounded [ø] or [œ], spelled <eo, oe, o, ue, u>. And it is also part of the philological lore of early Middle English that the reflexes of Old English /y/ were dialectally restricted as western /y/, northern and eastern /i/, and southeastern /e/. Lass and Laing maintain that their corpus-based research sharply contra-indicates

the received view of the early Middle English development of /y(:)/ and /e(:)o/: “[T]he existence of distinctive front rounded vowels is at best ‘not proven.’” Lass and Laing find that their corpus shows that all of the southwest Midland texts examined spell the high-frequency ‘king’ (Old English *cyning*) as <i/y> but that many use <u>, <e>, and <i> for the same Germanic stem **kun-i-*. Their preliminary study reveals that the orthography of early Middle English is rather more complicated than the “philological oral tradition” (285) has suggested in that phonological conditioning seems to play no part in variation between <i>-spellings and <u>-spellings. Rather, the authors point out that “there is a strong element of lexical specificity in the set of reflexes” (281), indicating that early Middle English orthography was organized around principles that allowed considerable variation from purely phonological ones. It is right to maintain a standard of agnosticism about the phonological implications of orthography, and, at the very least, Lass and Laing demonstrate why one should view with a rather jaundiced eye the frequent sweeping pronouncements of phonological salience found in the handbooks and in many other sources. The great virtue of corpus-based research of this kind is that it reveals in detail complexities which for various reasons—some methodological, some ideological—have been obscured in the intellectual history of the discipline. The authors posit no phonological explanation for the distributions of the spelling reflexes that they find, but one of the principles of variationist linguistics is that phonological systems themselves are multivariate and that individual *varia* are speaker-selected through the complex interaction of internal and external conditions. That Lass and Laing wish to abjure part of the inherited phonological mythology of English is clear enough, and entirely justifiable, but a strident reluctance to impute some phonological significance to spelling variation is simply another kind of mythmaking in itself.

Lass and Laing’s essay appears in a volume edited by Nikolaus Ritt and Herbert Schendl, which collects twenty-two essays on the subject of *Rethinking Middle English: Linguistic and Literary Approaches*, Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature 10 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang). Drawn from the Fourth International Conference on Middle English, held at the University of Vienna, 4–7 July 2002, the essays record some important current scholarship, and many are authored by some of the world’s leading scholars. The editors have divided the volume into four major sections: “Text types, texts, and text explication,” “Words: meaning, use, and context,” “Syntax and morphology,” and “Phonology

and orthography.” It is notable that “phonology” now shares billing with “orthography,” since fewer scholars today are willing to posit, unselfconsciously, phonological explanations for the graphemic record of medieval Englishes than was once the case. The essay by Roger Lass and Margaret Laing (reviewed above) exemplifies the shifting ground on which historical phonology currently dwells. Part of this change is being driven by corpus-based analysis, and as the creation of computer corpora picks up speed, we can expect scholarship that more accurately reflects the general heterogeneity of the manuscripts’ orthography. Historical linguists have taken their cue in recent years from sociolinguists, integrating notions of linguistic variability into their view of the diachronic state. But the “new phonology” looks a lot like the New Philology first articulated by literary and textual scholars nearly two decades ago. As literary scholars today prize the total materiality of the medieval manuscript, historical phonologists are learning to value the inherent variability of the orthography of the medieval text. Where earlier scholars explained orthographic variation (when they did not ignore it altogether) as substantially systematic and conditioned by an underlying phonology, scholars like Lass and Laing are content to make little or no claims about the phonology represented in their records. As a volume on Middle English, Old English, naturally, receives no direct treatment. But a number of essays deal substantially with aspects of Old English as the linguistic precursor and literary substrate of Middle English, such as: Frances McSparran, “Following the scribal trail: the BL Cotton Caligula A.ix copy of Lazamon’s *Brut*”; Maurizio Gotti, “Prediction in Middle English: a comparison between *shall* and *will*”; Lilo Moessner, “The verbal syntagm in ME conditional clauses”; Donka Minkova and Robert Stockwell, “Clash avoidance in morphologically derived words in Middle English. (Why [-hʊd] but [-dɪp]?), reviewed below”; Roger Lass and Margaret Laing, “Are front rounded vowels retained in West Midland Middle English?” (reviewed below); and Jerzy Wefna, “Now you see it, now you don’t, or the fates of the ME voiced labial stop in homorganic clusters.” The other essays of the volume deal very little or not at all with aspects of Old English but are fine contributions to the study of Middle English: Derek Brewer, “Understanding chivalry in earlier English literature”; David Mills, “Playing the Show, showing the Play: the Chester Plays in search of a genre”; George R. Keiser, “Robert Thornton’s *Liber de diversis medicinis*: text, vocabulary, and scribal confusion”; Christian Liebl, “Two unnoticed Early ME versions of *Candet nudatum pectus*”; Joanna Bugaj, “Middle Scots burgh court records: the

influence of the text type on its linguistic features"; Irma Taavitsainen, "Standardisation, house styles, and the scope of variation in ME scientific writing"; Hans-Jürgen Diller, "Chaucer's emotion lexicon: *passioun* and *affeccioun*"; Przemysław Łozowski, "Polysemy in context: *meten* and *dremen* in Chaucer"; Rafał Molencki, "The confusion between *thurven* and *durren* in Middle English"; Tibor Őrsi, "Ways and means of French lexical influence in the Cotton version of *Mandeville's Travels*"; Thomad Honegger, "wyȝe welcum iwys to this place'—and never mind the alliteration: an inquiry into the use of forms of address in two alliterative ME romances"; Cynthia Lloyd, "*Experience or experiment?* Some distinctions between French nominal suffixes in Middle English"; Letizia Vezzosi, "The development of *himself* in Middle English: a 'Celtic' hypothesis"; Hans Platzter, "The development of natural gender in Middle English, or: sex by accident"; Merja Stenroos, "Spelling conventions and rounded front vowels in the poems of William Herebert"; and Albertas Steponavičius, "The Great Vowel Shift as a paradigmatic restructuring of the Late ME vowel system." An uncommon characteristic of this volume (and of ICOME) is the dialogue between linguists and literary scholars that takes place in it, even when it is indirect. Indeed, this collection is a forceful reminder of the productiveness of mutually informed literary and linguistic scholars of the medieval period.

The scholarly team of B. Elan Dresher and Aditi Lahiri has had a profound influence on recent discussions on prosodic processes and phenomena in the Germanic languages and especially in the history of the English language. Their 1991 paper on the "Germanic foot" is frequently cited, and they continue to make use of this theoretical notion in "Main Stress Left in Early Middle English" (*Historical Linguistics 2003: Selected Papers from the 16th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Copenhagen, 11–15 August 2003*, ed. Michael Fortescue, Eva Skafte Jensen, Jens Erik Mogensen, and Lene Schøsler [Amsterdam: John Benjamins], 75–85). The authors, using the framework of the Germanic foot—"a resolved and expanded moraic trochee of the form ([head] dependent), where the head must consist of at least two moras and the dependent may have at most one mora" (79)—argue that English has not undergone a radical shift in the computation of stress, a long-standing position expressed in various forms by different scholars but usually tied to massive borrowing from French (and later from Latin) after the Anglo-Saxon period. Instead, Dresher and Lahiri posit that the underlying "pertinacity" of the Germanic foot continues throughout the history of English but that

its realization changed as native speakers assimilated greater numbers of polysyllabic words than was contained in the native word-stock. The authors suggest that changes in the direction of parsing and the placement of main stress occurred gradually from the late-fifteenth or early-sixteenth century until the end of the seventeenth century, by which time it seems clear that both direction of parsing and stress placement were right-edge sensitive. Crucially, though, the Germanic foot remains the pertinent structure that determines the stress computation throughout although loan words with Latin stress "eventually caused the resetting of the directionality and main stress parameters" (82). That the resetting of the directionality parameter preceded that of the main stress parameter explains the difference between early borrowings like *sevérité* (ca. 1530) and later ones with final stressed suffixes like *parade* (1656) and *grenadier* (1676). The authors allow that why the main stress parameter should have finally switched to *right* is a puzzle. Still, one of the attractive qualities of their Germanic foot theory is that, more than fifteen years after it was first proposed, it continues to provide simple, unitary explanations for stress changes through the history of the language, whereas most competing explanations for the development of English stress, by comparison, seem *ad hoc* and excessively complex.

Terry Hoad examines two syntactic patterns in "Notes on Some Features of the Language of the *Kentish Sermons* (MS Bodleian, Laud Misc. 471)," (*Text and Language in Medieval English Prose*, ed. Oizumi *et al.* [see sect. 2], 77–87). The phonology and morphology of the *Kentish Sermons* have been carefully studied for the retrodictive information they yield about a mostly poorly attested dialect of Old English. The question, then, is if the distinctive linguistic characteristics of the text are true Kenticisms or simply the result of the Middle English translator's version of Maurice de Sully's French homily writing. The author, however, studies some of the much-neglected syntactic aspects of the text with this question in mind. Hoad carefully considers the conjunctions *ase* and *swo* in the opening passage, pointing to several other instances in the *Kentish Sermons* where *swo* seems to be in correlative constructions that, the author shows using evidence from the *Middle English Dictionary* and the *Dictionary of Old English*, are temporal. The temporality of the construction in Middle English and in Old English seems usually to refer to simultaneous events, while the same construction in the *Kentish Sermons* (and that found in the opening passage) often seems to refer to consecutive events. While the edition of Bennett and Smithers somewhat glibly refers to this construction as a

Galicism, Hoad shows that although it is marginally present in Middle and Old English and has correlates in other Germanic languages, every unambiguous example of the construction in the Kentish Sermons has *com ... si* in the French source. Still, the author tentatively suggests that “[i]t may be appropriate to assume that to whatever extent the resulting constructions may have deviated from idiomaticity in English, they were sufficiently aligned with English usage to be adequately meaningful” (85).

The essays in *Englische Sprachwissenschaft und Mediävistik: Standpunkte—Perspektiven—Neue Wege / English Linguistics and Medieval Studies: Positions—Perspectives—New Approaches. Proceedings of the Conference in Bamberg, May 21–22, 2004*, ed. Gabriele Knappe (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang), are wide-ranging and variously useful, but several address the present-day relevance of English medieval studies in German-speaking countries. On this point, the questions entertained by several of the authors will be familiar to scholars of medieval studies everywhere, since the increasing marginalization of medieval languages and literatures in academe expands beyond national borders. The volume contains twenty-five papers, a few by major scholars like Helmut Gneuss. The small number of papers that pertain in some limited ways to Old English phonology include: Dominik Kuhn, “Die altenglischen Glossen der Gebete in London, British Library, Arundel 155 in ihrem sprachlichen und kulturhistorischen Kontext”; Helmut Gneuss, “Englische Sprachwissenschaft und Mediävistik: Vom Blick zurück zu den Aufgaben für Gegenwart und Zukunft”; Janna Riedinger, “Die altenglischen Interlinearversion der Benediktinerregel: Edition und Kommentar”; and Winfried Rudlof, “Altenglische Themapredigten als unfeste Texte—ein elektronisches Textkorpus.” Several other articles on additional aspects of Old and Middle English language and literature are also present. As a conference proceedings, the essays tend to be somewhat uneven, as one may expect. Topics range from pedagogy to film studies to literary theories, and even the subtitle of the volume does not capture the breadth of positions, perspectives, and new approaches suggested. Still, the theme of the shrinking place of *Anglistik* in German higher education, but most especially in graduate study, pervades the book. And like their British and American colleagues, German scholars of the English Middle Ages are struggling to articulate their relevance to an increasingly disinterested academic structure that privileges professional studies of various kinds.

Helmut Gneuss’s contribution to this volume, “Englische Sprachwissenschaft und Mediävistik: Vom Blick

zurück zu den Aufgaben für Gegenwart und Zukunft” (*Englische Sprachwissenschaft und Mediävistik*, 37–50) seeks to demonstrate the value of a field that once shone as one of the brightest stars in the universe of German academe but that is now marginal in German universities. Gneuss makes many of the same arguments that we hear being made for the preservation and continuation of what can be more broadly construed as medieval studies in the United Kingdom and in North America, which has also been marginalized in recent decades. Part of Gneuss’s goal is to suggest that ongoing large-scale projects in medieval studies, like the *Dictionary of Old English*, will provide research tools unknown to scholars before, so that a field that can seem to others (be they departmental colleagues or administrators) as very tired is viewed as currently quite vigorous. Gneuss also addresses the diminution of advanced study in *Anglistik*, which he sees as symptomatic of undergraduate education in literature that is prohibitively tilted toward recent and contemporary literatures.

James Milroy writes on the ideological underpinnings of the history of the English language in “Some Effects of Purist Ideologies on Historical Descriptions of English” (*Linguistic Purism in the Germanic Languages*, ed. Nils Langer and Winifred V. Davies [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter], 324–42). Though there are no very original thoughts on scholars’ ideological motives in studying the history of the English language expressed in the essay, the author, a distinguished sociolinguist, provides a concise and articulate statement of the lasting, pervasive effects of some “purist” ideologies in historical linguistics. For Milroy, linguistic purism descends from mistaken notions about the nature of language, particularly that language is a “thing,” a monolithic, substantive entity, rather than an abstract entity with multivalent contingencies. Only when language is thus reified is it possible to describe language in terms that imply “pure” or “impure” states. As Milroy shows, many popular and scholarly approaches to the English language take this basic misapprehension as their starting points, and a substantial contribution of sociolinguistics has been to show that language is *ipso facto* a gradient and highly contingent phenomenon. Milroy further defines “sanitary” purism as “eliminating what are thought to be *corruptions* or mistakes in usage, and cleansing or purifying extant records of language and, hence, the descriptions of language history that are based on these records” (324). And, here, Milroy joins a loud chorus in the derogation of editorial interventions based on Lachmannian principles of textual heredity. “Genetic” purism, for Milroy, is yet another injurious ideology that forms part of the intellectual history of

the study of the English language in that this conceptualization of language invariably finds explanations for change as internally motivated instead of caused by external social conditions. Obviously, and as Milroy points out, earlier structuralist accounts of language change were deeply implicated in such genetic purism, since language itself was thought to be a self-contained, clearly bounded system of exact relationships. Milroy uses several examples from Old and Middle English studies to demonstrate the two sorts of purism that are the focus of his essay, and readers will appreciate the aplomb with which he synthesizes different stages of the language as connected by the scholarly ideologies at issue.

Terttu Nevalainen and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg review research on the sociology of English in "Sociolinguistics and the History of English: A Survey" (*International Journal of English Studies* 5: 33–58). The team of Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg has contributed much to our increasing awareness of embedded sociologies in the history of the English language. In this article, the authors briefly survey especially recent sociolinguistic studies of English; the section on Old English is understandably brief given the inherent difficulties of applying sociolinguistic models to the study of Old English, but, accordingly, sections on Middle English, Early Modern English, and Late Modern English are much more substantial. Far from exhaustive, as the authors themselves state (45), this article would be particularly helpful to undergraduate students for the general orientation to the historical sociolinguistics of English that it provides. An introductory discussion of the uniformitarian hypothesis in linguistics—languages of the past are not different in nature from languages of the present—provides sound theoretical grounding for variationist approaches to the history of the English language, and it is followed by a discussion of research paradigms in sociolinguistics.

Graeme Trousdale endeavors to incorporate genetic anthropology into the study of Old English dialects in "The Social Context of Kentish Raising: Issues in Old English Sociolinguistics" (*International Journal of English Studies* 5: 59–76). Old English dialectology attracted a lot of attention in 2005, and no other work comes close to attempting what Trousdale does in this paper. The implications of genetic anthropology in historical linguistics are significant, and the discipline is only just beginning to comprehend and make use of research into present-day genetic data for historical patterns of migration and settlement, for instance. The author attempts to account for the tenth-century Kentish raising of /æ/ > /ē/, as suggested by problematic

spellings from a series of charters from Christ Church, Canterbury. The relationship of this change to the Mercian "second fronting" of æ to e and a to æ has long been a matter of dispute, and at least one attempt to link the change to the eighth-century Mercian hegemony as a matter of Kentish imitation of a prestige variety has been roundly criticized. Still, the similarity of the two changes has led a number of scholars to suggest that they are related, though the very limited scope of second fronting (only found regularly in the *Vespasian Psalter* gloss) casts substantial doubt on how it could become manifest in the spellings of tenth-century charters written in Kent. These questions of phonology and orthography have led to some sociolinguistic explanations, as mentioned above. The social dimension of historical linguistics is a very tough nut to crack—the evidence for plausible external motivations for language change (especially in the Anglo-Saxon period) in the Labovian variationist mode rarely exist. And where sociolinguistic explanations for Old English language analysis exist in scholarship, they are often so speculative as to be of little value. Using David DeCamp's 1958 analysis of Kentish raising as a contact change actuated by a substantial presence of Frisians in Kent which then spread northwards, Trousdale cites a genetic study that finds that "there is a clear indication of a common line of descent between inhabitants of Central England and Friesland" (72). The implication of this, then, is that the Frisians contributed to the migration and settlement by the other Germanic tribes of the region; the further implication of this point, therefore, is that some of the similarities between Frisian and Kentish Old English (such as the development of Germanic a to e) may be due to the migration of Frisians first to Kent and thence to the north. And, thus, is the rabbit withdrawn from the hat: this reviewer, at least, though entirely aware of the deep social embedding of language change, cannot escape the feeling that, because the social factors conditioning and actuating change cannot be recovered, a kind of magic trick is being performed, wherein scant evidence from texts is transformed into sweeping social and cultural ethnographies. But the transformation has taken place out of our view, and we are meant to accept that the appearance of a relationship means that there was one.

In "Diachronic Evidence in Segmental Phonology: The Case of Obstruent Laryngeal Specifications" (*The Internal Organization of Phonological Segments*, ed. Marc van Oostendorp and Jeroen van de Weijer [Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter], 317–51), Patrick Honeybone uses evidence from German consonant weakening and from Old English fricative voicing to argue for some

recent formulations of laryngeal specifications for series of obstruents. Honeybone insightfully reviews a prodigious amount of recent theoretical scholarship on segmental phonology, identifying differences and similarities and grouping the research. Feature specification in phonology is an area of vigorous theoretical debate, and like most linguistic theories, its exposition is normally accomplished through evidence from contemporary languages. As the author states, “[d]iachronic data is sometimes dismissed as uninteresting in phonological theorising,” but he demonstrates in this essay that “such data can provide crucial evidence on one side or the other of a phonological debate” (336). Honeybone coins the expression “Southern English Fricative Voicing” to describe the much-studied apparent voicing of initial fricatives as indicated in the orthographic record of texts associated with southern England, where some forms of fricative voicing remain. The main reason that this change has attracted so much attention from historians of the English language is that, as Honeybone points out, it results in a system that seems to violate a basic cross-linguistic universal that the presence of voiced obstruents entails the presence of voiceless obstruents, since “it is not clear that *any* ‘voiceless’ fricatives remained on the surface in the varieties where this process innovated” (Honeybone’s emphasis, 340). Honeybone suggests that this apparently intractable problem (which is also manifest in German consonant weakening) can be resolved, without doing violence to accepted universal principles of markedness in obstruents, by accepting the formulation of such changes as a process of delaryngealization, which is best represented in a related set of theoretical descriptions of segmental phonology that the author calls “tradition” (ii).

Few topics in the study of the medieval Germanic languages have occasioned more commentary—or more rebuttals—than the subject of *i*-umlaut in Old Norse-Icelandic. A frequent combatant in the umlaut wars is Joseph Voyles, who makes another contribution in “The ‘Conundrum’ of Old Norse *i*-Umlaut: A Reply to Iverson and Salmons” (*Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 17: 265–77). The antipodean nature of much recent scholarship on umlaut leaves me somewhat benumbed—the competing theories can be so radically different from each other that one sometimes wonders if the same set of data is being examined by all parties. The study of Old Norse-Icelandic umlaut particularly lends itself to a certain hocus-pocus historical phonology, since the problem rests in the explanation of why the long-stemmed masculine *i*-class nouns usually evidence umlaut (as in *gestr* < *gast* + *iR*) but short-stemmed nouns

of the same class usually do not (as in *staðr* < *stað* + *iR*). As this phenomenon is substantially restricted to a single noun class in the grammar of Old Norse-Icelandic, many scholars have suspected analogy may play a crucial role. Of course, the problem with analogy is that it does not operate with the same degree of mechanical certainty as sound change, and so explanations via analogy are always open to the criticism that they lack any traceable mechanical path and rely too much upon the vagaries of speakers’ psychologies. And yet, as sociolinguistic explanations for historical phenomena have become more and more commonplace in the literature, appeals to speaker psychology increasingly pervade analyses of sound change. Though he does not frame his objections to Iverson and Salmons’ analysis in just this way, speaker psychology forms a crux in their arguments about the operation of umlaut in Old Norse-Icelandic that Voyles queries and finds lacking not in plausibility (since it is, of course, beyond all question that speakers deploy self-conscious strategies in negotiating language change) but in persuasiveness since it is an irretrievable factor in language change. The core of Iverson and Salmons’ explanation of umlaut rests on the belief that all forms originally umlauted and that short-stemmed forms like *staðr* reverted to non-umlauted forms by the date of our Old Norse-Icelandic texts (excepting runic inscriptions, where an umlauted short-stem form like **steðr* is nowhere attested) in a process like the Old High German *Rückumlaut* verbs where previously umlauted forms revert to umlautless ones to avoid ambiguity. Obviously, that kind of reversion is widely attested in sound change even in cases where ambiguity cannot be considered a motivating factor. Voyles does not question the plausibility of their analysis. Rather he suggests that, all things being equal, we should not reject the possibility of a phonologically conditioned change (for which there does seem to be some empirical evidence) in favor of a kind of change that, while confirmable as operative from comparative evidence, is not suggested by the data itself. The author reasserts his own phonologically conditioned, carefully ordered analysis of Old Norse-Icelandic umlaut (for which in detail see his 1982 article and relevant portions of his 1992 book cited) as both plausible and preferable to that of Iverson and Salmons on the grounds that the data itself recommends it. Voyles also addresses three of Iverson and Salmons’ criticisms of his phonologically conditioned analysis of umlaut, and he demonstrates fairly persuasively that their objections are at times trivial, at times even fatuous.

John Anderson makes another pitch for his theory of *i*-umlaut in a dependency phonology framework in

“Old English *i*-Umlaut (for the Umpteenth Time),” *English Language and Linguistics* 9: 195–227. Anderson’s analysis appeals to “lexical minimality” as the determining motivating factor in the sound change. “Lexical minimality” refers to the elimination of redundancies in lexical representations as a means of achieving underspecification. As a theoretical formalism, dependency phonology has been superseded by more recent elaborations of the sort of phonetically driven phonology that usually can be collected under the rubric of “feature geometry.” So the notational devices employed by Anderson may look unfamiliar to phonologists who are not steeped in less recent phonological theories. The author states that he also adopts “interpretive minimality, which involves the intention to avoid the positing of phonetic attributes for reconstructed languages that are not warranted by the historical evidence” (196). It is common in this day for phonologists working with historical data to differentiate their work from that of the standard handbook accounts of historical phonology, which often seem to impute little (or sometimes non-existing) evidence with phonetic import at every opportunity. But in this statement Anderson also seeks to differentiate his theoretical perspective from the phonetically detailed work of feature geometry and its offshoots. A unitary explanation of umlaut in Old English is elusive, since the data show a rather uneven distribution of outputs, especially in the diphthongs, where, for example, West Saxon umlauts *ĕa* and *ĭo* of any origin to *īe*, while non-West Saxon *ĕa* generally surfaces as *ē* and *ĭo* does not show umlaut at all. Anderson’s article, which relies on much of his own work, is an intensely theoretical explanation of umlaut, and he expends a good deal of effort simply explaining the notational devices he employs. In short, Anderson explains umlaut as the spreading of the extrasegmental simplex feature {i} to accented vowels, where “variations in manifestation [are] associated with variability in the system of vowels in different syllable types and different dialects” (222). To say that Anderson’s theory lacks a certain elegance, though, is by no means uncharitable since the opacity of his explanations is sure to cause some headscratching. Furthermore, although the author proclaims his fidelity to the data, many would suggest that a stridently phonological theory is, at best, inadequate to cope with the linguistic and non-linguistic phenomena in the written texts of ancient languages and, thus, hardly faithful to the data. Anderson discredits the “[m]any descriptions of earlier stages of languages [that] invoke detailed phonetic descriptions—in some cases, extensive phonetic fantasies—that in their speculations concerning substantive detail go way beyond

what is attested by surviving texts or directly inferable from internal and comparative evidence” (196). Fair enough. But many readers will not find much difference between “phonetic fantasies” and phonological daydreaming as both pertain to the data. Phonology is theoretical by definition, of course; but theory should serve the data—not the other way around. That Anderson has attempted to explain his notion of umlaut for, now, the “umpteenth” time may be an indication of its unpersuasive formulation.

Donka Minkova and Robert Stockwell revisit early English patterns of stress, with an emphasis on the role of morphology in secondary stress, in “Clash Avoidance in Morphologically Derived Words in Middle English. (Why [-hūd] but [-d̩]?)” (*Rethinking Middle English*, ed. Nikolaus Ritt and Herbert Schendl [Bern: Peter Lang], 263–79). The paper investigates the different Middle English reflexes of the Old English suffixes *-hād* and *-dōm*, which should both surface with either full vowels or reduced vowels, since both contain etymologically long vowels, the frequency and productivity of both are similar, and both belong to the same word-formation category. Using an Optimality Theory framework, which Minkova has employed elsewhere very substantially in her recent scholarship, the authors analyze this difference as a function of the constraint *CLASH, which requires that adjacent stresses be avoided. Their survey of the two suffixes in question in verse reveals that *-hād* derivatives in Old English and *-hōd/-hēd* derivatives in Middle English overwhelmingly conform to the pattern Sws (as in Old English *apostolhad* and Middle English *bishophod*), while *-dōm* derivatives in Old English and *-dom/-dam/-dum* derivatives in Middle English show a substantially higher incidence of Ss patterns (as in Old English *ealddom* and Middle English *cherldom*). The result of this uneven distribution of patterns accounts for the full-vowel [-hūd] reflex and the reduced-vowel [-d̩] reflex, since *CLASH functions to reduce the vowel of the *-dōm* suffix in Ss patterns due to the clash of primary and secondary stresses, whereas the “buffer” syllable in Sws patterns maintains the long vowel in the *-hād* suffix for which there is no stress clash. The result of the authors’ clear demonstration of patterns of *-hād* suffixation and of *-dōm* suffixation is that *CLASH was apparently productive in the phonology of English much earlier than has been supposed.

Daniel Schreier’s “On the Loss of Preaspiration in Early Middle English” (*Transactions of the Philological Society* 103: 99–112) investigates the reduction of the clusters /hn-/ , /hr-/ , and /hl-/ in Early Middle English as the result of both language-internal and language-

external forces. Accordingly, this paper only touches on Old English as a starting point, and its implications for the study of Old English language are minimal. Schreier rightly points out that the status of such initial clusters is uncertain in Old English since it is debatable whether or not the scribes' intent was to represent a sequence of fricative and following sonorant or to represent voiceless [n, l, r]. In any event, as others have pointed out before, by the end of the eleventh century a process of reduction is observable, and by the beginning of the twelfth century <n-, r-, l-> spellings increase in frequency. The author makes all of the expected gestures toward the evidence of alliteration in Old English verse (which does not help much with cluster reduction, since even very late verse is linguistically conservative) before pushing on to consider the implications of recent sociolinguistic research to the reduction of /hC-/ clusters. Schreier suggests that "the point can be made that the continuation of this innovation has a language-external motivation, which accounts for the timing and trajectory of this change" (105). This may indeed be true, but as is ever the case, the status (or even the existence) of the social factors that condition linguistic changes of the ancient past are highly speculative, and nowhere are they more speculative than in the first 100 years in the history of the English language after the Conquest. The author argues that the rapid adoption of reduced forms in the earliest stages of English speakers' contact with Norman French speakers is a trademark not of contact innovation but of the acceleration of patterns of variation already present in English. He anticipates at least one objection to his theory—that "other contact-derived innovations (perhaps most notably large-scale lexical borrowing) only manifested themselves from the 1300s onwards" (109)—by appealing to what he sees as similar social conditions in East Anglia in the Early Modern English period (with Dutch and French Protestants), resulting in a similar trajectory and rate of change, and to /hw-/ maintenance in New Zealand, the distribution of which seems to map to population demographics and relic areas.

In "Now You See It, Now You Don't Once More: The Loss and Insertion of Dental Stops in Medieval English" (*Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 41: 71–84), Jerzy Welna addresses the loss of [d] in homorganic clusters in Middle English, and attention to Old English is, thus, mainly limited to listing earlier forms that later show reduction of word-final clusters with [d]. Welna makes use of the *Middle English Dictionary* to generate data for comparison with earlier forms: after considering the standard accounts of homorganic cluster reduction in the history of English, he examines instances

of sporadic [d]-loss, the evidence of permanent [d]-loss, and, finally, the relatively rare cases of insertion of [d] after /n/. This brief paper concludes that [d]-loss in the word-final cluster /-nd/ occurred earlier in the history of the English language (the thirteenth century) than has been presumed; that [d]-loss is not of Northern origin, since the earliest forms are most often found in non-Northern texts; and that [d]-less forms become only very frequent in Northern texts in the Early Modern English period. Welna's paper follows a now-familiar pattern of examining the seemingly over-particular descriptions of English historical phonology, such as those found in Karl Luick's *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*, against a heightened sensitivity to scribal behavior as partly non-linguistic in character and, most importantly, using the data-generating power of electronic corpora. The discipline is rapidly revising the handbook tradition of English historical phonology through applications of corpus linguistics. The criticism of earlier work in this approach is that earlier scholars simply lacked the research tools to describe adequately the evidence found in the texts. And, more often than not, recent corpus research is demonstrating that some important and influential earlier scholars' work cannot hold up to the scrutiny that today's scholars can bring to bear through contemporary research methods.

The spike of classroom grammars of Old English published in recent years would suggest a concomitant spike in the number of students enrolling in an increasing offering of introductory Old English courses at colleges and universities. The image of such a renaissance of matriculation, however, would be but a counterfeit presentment, since, in fact, recent years have witnessed a declining number of students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels in the increasingly marginal business of teaching Old English in the English departments of institutions all over the world. So what accounts for the relative glut of Old English classroom grammars, most of which are destined to remain unsold and unused? In a word, it is, I believe, dissatisfaction—a frequent complaint of many of those who have taught an introductory Old English course is that the available classroom grammars are insufficient to meet the needs of today's students, who are generally ill-prepared to cope with the philological and linguistic intensity of a course that is usually designed to make beginning students competent sight-readers of an ancient language in as short a time as possible. True enough, the Wheelockian sturdiness of an older classroom grammar like Moore and Knott's *The Elements of Old English* was not designed with the particular

lacunae of today's students in mind, and, even though it is now in its seventh edition (making it, by far, the most widely used introductory grammar,) Mitchell and Robinson's *A Guide to Old English* seems, to some at least, rather too oblique in its approach to impressing the essentials for reading comprehension upon beginning students. Three more new classroom grammars appeared in 2005: Robert Hasenfratz and Thomas Jambeck's *Reading Old English: A Primer and First Reader* (Morgantown, WV: West Virginia UP), Chris McCully and Sharon Hilles's *The Earliest English: An Introduction to Old English Language* (Harlow: Pearson/Longman), and the third edition of Stephen Pollington's *First Steps in Old English* (Hockwold-cum-Wilton: Anglo-Saxon Books). Hasenfratz and Jambeck's book features eleven chapters followed by two appendices ("A Basic Introduction to Traditional Grammar" and "A Summary of Sound Changes"), a section of additional readings, and a glossary. The pedagogical emphasis of the authors is quite apparent. The chapters themselves are organized as individual lessons offering instruction on discrete components of Old English grammar, such as those which might form the organization of classroom instruction. In fact, the greatest strength of the book is that its organization easily substitutes for a well-designed syllabus. Each chapter includes exercises and a brief reading that focuses on the grammatical structures most recently discussed. Some of the lessons include excerpts from Ælfric's grammar, such as "Ælfric on the Concept of Case" or "Ælfric on Adverbs." The chapters end with a section on "Lessons Learned" and often include "Timesavers" to help students short-circuit potential problems of reading. Chapter 5 "Learning How to Translate" is particularly useful, as it provides a step-by-step set of instructions for how to go about reading Old English by locating the major syntactic constituents. This makes sense because it is not practical to assume that today's students have much if any experience translating texts in ancient languages. Even students with extensive study of modern foreign languages have little practice with textual translation, since immersion techniques with a conversational emphasis do little to develop the sort of parsing skills required to read Old English and other ancient languages. Of this most recent crop of classroom grammars of Old English, that of Hasenfratz and Jambeck is the most impressive.

McCully and Hilles's book is rather different in orientation. Though it purports to be an introduction to Old English, it is substantially concerned with presenting Old English in its diachronic context in the history of the English language, and it is organized in a

manner that is more consistent with self-study than with use as a classroom grammar. The design of the book's chapters does not recommend it for classroom use: "1. Thinking about the earliest English," "2. History, culture, language origins," "3. Nouns," "4. Verbs," "Interlude. Working with dictionaries," "5. OE Metric," "6. Standards and Crosses," "7. Twilight," "8. Rebuilding English." The authors also often refer to various sorts of cross-linguistic comparisons of Old English with, especially, other Germanic languages. Illuminating as these comparative features can be for students of the history of the English language, it is less certain that they are of any real use in an introductory Old English course. Though the book includes many translation exercises of the sort that form a now-standard component of recent classroom grammars of Old English, the authors have contributed less to the beginning study of Old English than to the beginning study of the history of the English language.

Stephen Pollington's *First Steps in Old English* has the more conventional design of a classroom grammar. The third edition includes some reorganization of the early sections of the book and some additional minor changes in detail throughout. The book is divided into five sections: "One: Old English Course," a series of nineteen lessons on the components of the formal grammar of Old English required for reading comprehension; "Two: Old English Grammar," a sort of reference grammar of Old English that—somewhat confusingly following the first section—focuses on pronunciation, script, and accident; "Three: Old English Texts," a collection of Old English poetry and prose for translation, including a glossary and texts that go with an accompanying audio cassette recording, *Ærgeworc*; "Four: Answers to Translation Exercises"; and, finally, a glossary of Old English used in part one. The first part of the book can be used for the day-to-day activities of the early weeks of an introductory Old English class, and it, too, includes translation exercises at the end of each section. In his "Introduction" to the book, Pollington states that it is for "the more serious student of the language who has tried the commonly available grammars and guides, but who would feel more comfortable starting with a book which gives a general background in the subject, without too much jargon" (7). Such students may indeed feel more comfortable with Old English after working through this author's book, but they may also be little more prepared to read Old English texts than they were in the beginning. Each of these three new books demonstrates an awareness that today's students are generally unschooled in the sort of grammatical and philological instruction that

older grammars regarded as standard learning for anyone who might take a course on Old English in the first place. In addition to this, there is the perception that introductory grammars must cater to students' interests, which generally embrace subjects like literature, history, and culture as opposed to matters like Anglo-Frisian brightening and *i/j* umlaut and back umlaut and breaking. Pollington's view of these details is extreme in that he makes hardly any mention of the phonological and morphological rules that in no small part contribute to students' reading comprehension of actual Old English. How is it possible to use a dictionary of Old English if one is completely unaware of the morphophonemic alternations that arise from easily traceable sound changes, like nominative and accusative singular *dæg* versus nominative and accusative plural *dagas* or the root vowel in the 2nd and 3rd person singular forms of some strong verbs (such as infinitive *beran* versus *bir(e)st* and *bir(e)þ*? and what about the forms *byrest* and *byreþ* versus *byrst* and *byrþ*, while we're at it)? Hasenfratz and Jambeck cleverly disguise the intensity of philological learning that the beginning study of Old English requires by presenting such information always within the context of achieving reading comprehension as rapidly as possible, thus allowing students to go on to the more compelling aspects of Old English that probably drew them to its study in the first place. But one feature of most of the "new school" classroom grammars of Old English that strikes this teacher of Old English, at least, as deficient in comparison to older grammars is the decreased emphasis on immediate and immersive translation. The irony of new approaches that de-emphasize grammatical and philological intensity is that so much effort is put into the avoidance of complexity through a pronounced overabundance of simple explanations that students spend far less time on the one activity that relates most directly to reading comprehension—namely, translating Old English texts. Students generally manage to assimilate all of the philological minutiae that they need to know through immersive translation: students who go on to achieve competence as readers of Old English cannot but become thoroughly acquainted with all of the sound changes and morphosyntactic phenomena of which some recent classroom grammars dare not speak. Perhaps by approaching these issues less directly than their predecessors, these grammars are, in fact, doing a disservice to students, contrary to their expressed intention.

One other publication can be mentioned here. The second edition of Jeremy J. Smith's *Essentials of Early English: An Introduction to Old, Middle and*

Early Modern English (New York: Routledge) is the book that would render unnecessary the elaborate anti-philological subterfuges of some recent classroom grammars of Old English, if today's students read it before enrolling in introductory Old English courses. Smith justifiably calls his book a "primer" in Early English" designed to demonstrate "the essential characteristics of each stage of the language" and the "differences and similarities between the stages." The book is concise (248 pages) and very clearly written, and it focuses on the chronological development of the language from Old English to Early Modern English. It is too general and far too simplified for use as a textbook in a course on the history of the English language, but it is more than an adequate introduction to the subject of the first twelve centuries of the language for students who might otherwise have no introduction to the subject at all. The first part of the book includes a short introduction to the scientific description of language. This is a particularly useful part of the book, since it very clearly and quickly explains the most salient concepts and terminology required to study the history (or the historical stages) of any language. The next three chapters of this section provide a broad overview of the orthography, pronunciation, syntax, morphology, and lexicon of Old English, Middle English, and Early Modern English. These descriptions achieve the simplicity and general coherence that students new to this kind of study need while not sacrificing the brisk pace required to cover so much ground. These chapters are very well organized, and the chapter on Old English, for example, which is only forty pages, would provide an excellent 30,000-foot vantage point for students on the cusp of beginning an introductory Old English course. The second part of the book includes an ample number of illustrative texts from each of the three periods of the English language described (the Old English texts are accompanied by sufficient glossing and notes to aid translation). Smith's book very neatly captures the basics of the early history of the English language that was once a part of the required curricula of most college and university courses of study on English. Since teachers can no longer assume that students have been exposed to any direct or formal instruction on the history of the English language, Smith's book offers a footbridge over the fissure between what today's students generally learn and what they might wish to learn.

CC

In *The History of English: A Student's Guide* (London: Hodder Arnold) Ishtla Singh tries to "consider areas

in conventional histories where 'orthodox beliefs' and approaches could make room for updated and/or somewhat different perspectives." To this end Singh pares down the linguistic detail in her textbook by providing only a sketch of each historical period and entirely omits some commonly covered subjects like the development of American English. But in keeping with her goals, Singh presents a balanced history that stresses the involvement of its speakers in both internally and externally induced change. She accomplishes this with "snapshots" of particular issues in the English language and of certain individual threads in the spread of English around the globe. The book is appropriate for advanced undergraduates and beginning graduate students, but presupposes some familiarity with linguistic methods including phonetic transcription. The strength of this text is its non-traditional material, which draws on recent scholarship in the field and demonstrates the breadth of the history of English. The text is divided into an introductory chapter followed by five period chapters. Each chapter closes with a list of research questions that address some familiar subjects omitted from the body of the text. The first chapter outlines types of linguistic change in considerable detail for a book of this size. It draws on historical and current changes in English as well as other languages for its examples. Chapter two is devoted to genetic classification, reconstruction, and the pre-history of English including discussions of new quantitative methodologies in the genetic classification of language. The Old, Middle, and Early Modern English chapters (3-5) are based on the period chapters in other common History of the English Language texts and the author cites them freely. The section on the pronunciation of Old English is especially brief with no discussion of sound change. The last part of each chapter is devoted to particular issues or individual histories in the story of English. The first of these argues that there was an emerging natural gender system in Old English which overshadowed grammatical gender, while in the Middle and Modern English chapters these sections are devoted to the claim that English is a creole and to the development of English in Barbados as an example of how Englishes emerge. These sections and chapter Six's history of Singlish introduce many concepts of sociolinguistics, language contact, and language mixture. The book closes with a bibliography and an index.

Gregory K. Iverson and Joseph C. Salmons examine how words coined and borrowed in Modern English have been eradicating an old phonological gap in "Filling the Gap: English Tense Vowel plus Final /s/" (*Jnl of English Linguistics* 33: 207-21). English historical sound

change resulted in the near-absence of tense vowels followed by voiceless alveopalatal fricatives. While sequences of lax vowel + final /s/ are relatively common, most Present Day English words with a tense vowel in this position, e.g., *swoosh*, *capiche*, and *gauche*, have a marked foreign, learned, or onomatopoeic feel, the one exception being the word *leash*. Iverson and Salmons describe the restrictions which the original /sk/ cluster imposed on the preceding vowel's length/tenseness. They then examine the distribution of the resulting sequence in Modern English, drawing parallels and contrasts with other gaps in the inventory of English such as word-initial /ŋ /, /ʒ/, /vʌ/, and /zʌ/. The authors refine the description of a phonological gap by differentiating two sub-types of gap: 1) systematic gaps that are phonologically motivated and tend to be maintained by speakers; 2) accidental gaps that have no direct or current phonological motivation and are therefore easily overcome by speakers. While words with final /s/ that were borrowed or coined in the Middle and Early Modern English periods tended to have short, lax vowels, e.g., *push*, *finish*, *mesh*, *sash*, *clash*, newer words like *brioche*, *douche*, and *quiche* may now have tense vowels before the fricative. Similar gaps are seen in the paucity of words ending in liquid or nasal + /s/ and in the total absence of words ending in diphthong + /s/. The article closes with a reference to Blevins's *Evolutionary Phonology* (2004) framework in reiterating that the phonological gap found with tense vowels before /s/ is due to the residue of historical sound change rather than a synchronic phonological prohibition. The filling of this gap has therefore been ongoing and systematic.

JMD

Jeong-Hoon Lee's *Periphrastic Perfect Tense in English: A Historical Perspective* (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 2004, *DAI* 65A: 2968-69) is concerned with the history of the periphrastic perfect construction in the history of English through an examination of the grammaticalization of the English perfect, semantic changes in *have* and *be* perfects, and the standardization of the English perfect. The point of departure from previous work includes the argument that Old English did have an established perfect construction and that the *have* perfect in Old English encoded the semantic possibilities of the Modern English perfect. In addition, the author argues that the *have* perfect auxiliary was established far earlier in the history of English than in generally assumed, by the 14th century rather than by the 19th century. The groundwork for an analysis of the Old English perfect is established by a semantic analysis

of the Modern English concluding that it carries tense information and that it can be associated with existential, universal, and resultative readings. These semantic possibilities are then argued to be present in the Old English perfect, contrary to prior accounts.

A number of articles and at least one dissertation are concerned with the transition from OV to VO word order in the history of English, which has been a topic of intense discussion in previous work on syntactic change in the history of English. In *A Stochastic Optimality Theory Approach to Syntactic Change* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 2004, DAI 65A: 3357), Brady Z. Clark employs a Stochastic Optimality-Theoretic Lexical Functional Grammar approach to syntactic change that takes account of the nature of inherent variability. Chapter two of the thesis builds the formal framework on which the analysis of two case studies is based. The case studies in question are: the gradual decline of right-headed structures including OV structures, and change and variation in the syntax of subjects. The studies are partly corpus-based and partly draw on data from earlier sources. The study of the syntax of subjects is concerned with the status of pronominal elements and the variation in the clausal position of subjects particularly with respect to the loss of subject verb inversion in topicalization structures. Further issues that are considered in this thesis are that variation and change is structured, that some possible variants are not attested, that variation shows up in individual texts, and that syntactic change is gradual. The approach argued for here does not require positing competing grammars to account for the patterns of variation and change.

Theresa Biberauer and Ian Roberts, in “Changing EPP Parameters in the History of English: Accounting for Variation and Change,” *English Language and Linguistics* 9: 5–46, present an analysis of Old English word order based on a Kaynian approach that requires all OV orders attested in Old English to be derived by leftward movement of various constituents. The argue that large XP movement was possible in OE, namely of a VP constituent to either SpecvP or SpecTP leading to the West Germanic type OV order that exists alongside VO order in Old English. The leftward movement that derives OV order is, under their analysis, DP movement that pied-pipes further material leading to large XP-movement. They further argue that the loss of this type of large XP movement together with increased stranding possibilities leads to the VO order that is seen in PDE resulting in DP movement only of subjects and not objects and not the large XP movement seen in Old English. They argue that one reason for the loss of OV order is the fact that SpecTP becomes

a position restricted to subjects only disallowing other XPs. This latter fact taken together with the restriction on object movement that occurs in ME leads to the wholesale loss of the Old English OV order. Biberauer and Roberts argue that availability of pied-piping in certain contexts in Old English gives an account of the OV/VO word order variation seen over a long period in the history of English that does not rely on the double-base hypothesis (stable structural variation) proposed in Pintzuk (2002). XP pied-piping is lost after the OE period. The theoretical framework that this article is couched in is Minimalist in approach and they provide extensive discussion of the feature-driven approach to syntactic movement that they adopt. Of importance is the D-related EPP features on T and v and whether pied-piping occurs along with DP movement (large XP movement in Old English), or not (Modern English). The stable and long-standing variation exhibited in the VO/OV words orders under this analysis is a function of the fact that in Old English there are two ways of satisfying the feature requirements of a given functional head. This entails that a competing grammars approach is not necessary to account to the observed word order variation. The loss of one of these ways of satisfying feature requirements leads to the loss of one of the observed word order patterns, namely the Old English OV word order.

Willem Koopman’s “Transitional Syntax: Postverbal Pronouns and Particles,” *Old English in English Language and Linguistics* 9: 47–62, provides support for the double-base approach to OV/VO variation in OE of Pintzuk (1990) based on a quantitative analysis of the types of elements that occur post-verbally in Old English and give rise to the observed VO word order that exists alongside the OV order. Among the observed post-verbal elements are light pronouns and particles, which are argued to be base generated in that position and thus provide support for VO existing alongside OV order in Old English. Although initially rare in post-verbal position, Koopman argues that the frequency of the post-verbal position of these light elements increases over time during the Old English period, particularly the frequency of particles in ACI constructions. In particular, the frequency of pronouns that follow a non-finite and therefore non-raised verb increases from a low figure in the Old English period, but nonetheless attested, to the point where the post-verbal position for pronouns becomes the norm in later Middle English. Koopman concludes that we must allow for OE as both OV/VO based on the possibility of post-verbal pronominal elements and particles in Old English and INFL-medial and INFL-final.

Arguments against the loss of OV word order in the history of English being tied to the loss of rich morphological case are put forth in Thomas McFadden's "OV-VO in English and the Role of Case Marking in Word Order," *English Language and Linguistics* 9: 63–82. He argues based on an analysis of a variety of word order patterns in Old English taken together with comparative Germanic evidence that any formulation of the connection between rich morphological case and positions in which arguments of the verb appear does not account for the word order variation found during the loss of OV order in English. He takes as a starting the proposal of Roberts (1997) that OV orders in Old English are all derived by leftward movement of the object, which Roberts links to rich case-marking and the need for the object to check its case feature overtly. McFadden argues that the loss of case marking and the loss of rich case marking in the history of English follow independent tracks. He argues that in early ME there is persistence of the OV up to 25% as shown in Kroch and Taylor (2000), whereas there is wholesale collapse of the morphological case system by the mid thirteenth century (Allen, 1995). These residual OV orders however are mostly due to negative and quantified objects and object topicalization that is not the type of movement that is driven by object case checking requirements. McFadden points out that what remains to be accounted for are the low frequency but attested VO orders in Old English. These should not occur if object movement is case-driven. In particular is the small but important number of pronominal objects that occur in post-verbal position as these would not be expected to occur post-verbally as the result of either focus movement or heavy-NP shift of some type. In addition, a significant percentage of post-verbal full NP subjects are attested in the Old English period when the case system was still intact. McFadden then concludes that the connection between object placement in pre-verbal position and rich morphological case is lacking for Old English and that further support for this conclusion comes from comparative Germanic evidence.

In "Prosodic Evidence for Incipient VO Order in Old English," *English Language and Linguistics* 9: 139–56, Anne Taylor investigates the prosodic structure of OV sequences in three Old English metrical texts, and shows that while OV sequences are rarely separated by a line break and thus form a prosodic unit with the verb, VO sequences occur with varying frequencies across a line break. She concludes that separated VO sequences are derived by object extraposition which right adjoins the object DP outside the verb phrase arguing for a head final verb phrase as the base. Taylor argues that the

high incidence of separated and VO sequences derived by movement of the object in *Beowulf* compared with somewhat higher instances of non-separated and thus base generated VO sequences in other texts argues for a snapshot of the earliest stage in the shift from OV to VO in the history of English.

In "Arguments against a Universal Base: Evidence from Old English," *English Language and Linguistics* 9: 115–38, Susan Pintzuk presents arguments against a uniform head-initial VO analysis of the OE clause. She discusses earlier analyses of Old English as uniformly head-initial with object movement to derive OV orders (Roberts 1997), or with DP-movement with pied-piping to derive attested OV orders (see Biberauer and Roberts above). She bases her arguments against these derived orders on an analysis of the position pronominals, particles and quantified and non-quantified objects relative to the positions of verbal elements. First, Pintzuk notes that the object raising type derivation predicts one unattested order in OE, namely the V-O-Aux surface order, which she notes, however, is blocked under the pied-piping analysis. Pintzuk then goes on to analyze the position of quantified, positive, and negative objects in OE clauses that contain an auxiliary verb. She then discusses the distribution of pronominal elements and particles with respect to verbal elements. The results are quantified and set out in various tables that show the distribution of various types of object elements with respect to verbal elements. She concludes that some word orders possible with AUX-V head initial structures are not permitted with V-AUX head-final structures and *vice versa*.

Concha Castillo's "The Ban on Preposition Stranding in Old English," *SN* 77: 2–10, presents a minimalist case-based analysis of the change in preposition stranding that has taken place in the history of English. As Castillo notes, preposition stranding is highly restricted in Old English when compared with Modern English. In Old English, she notes that there is no prepositional passive, in *Wh*-questions or relative clauses introduced by *Wh*-words, or in topicalization structures with non-pronominal DPs in first position. Preposition stranding may occur in OE in relative clauses introduced by *þe* and other structures, but the aim of the paper is to explain the restricted distribution of preposition stranding in OE. Castillo proposes that prepositions in OE assign inherent case to their complements DPs; however, unlike verbs in OE, prepositions check the inherent case feature of their complement DP covertly rather than overtly. The fact that the inherent case feature of the object of an OE preposition is not checked overtly means that it cannot move higher

in the structure either by A or A-bar as the direct object DPs of verb can as their case feature is checked overtly by the verb. As the author notes, preposition stranding begins to operate in the ME period once prepositional objects are assigned structural rather than (covertly checked) inherent case.

Richard Ingham's "The Loss of Neg V \rightarrow C in Middle English," *Linguistische Berichte* 202: 171–205, is concerned with the loss of NegV1 as a raising to C in Middle English. The central proposal is a Minimalist feature-based account that loss of NegV1 follows loss of an interpretable [+neg] feature in the CP domain. Later, in ME, under this proposal, the interpretable [+neg] feature became a Spec feature of NegP and lower in the clause. This latter change entails that verb raising to C was no longer triggered leading to the loss of NegV1. Ingham proposes that this change was independent of any morphological change. The second section of the paper provides an overview of the distribution of negation in Middle English; the author shows that although NegV1 is attested in early ME, it has disappeared by the end of the ME period. Ingham's quantified analysis shows the NegV1-subject order vs. the non-inverted order is somewhat constant until a "large-scale collapse" of NegV1 in early 14th century verse manuscripts. However, he also proposes a period of grammar competition when an interpretable [+neg] feature was a head feature in NegP in one grammar, and a specifier feature in the other where it was spelled out at *noht*. He concludes that loss of NegV1 followed change in the grammar of the [+neg] to SpecNegP and that further work is necessary to identify the cue responsible for the change.

Aspects of English Negation edited by Yoko Iyeiri (Amsterdam: John Benjamins; Tokyo: Yushodo) contains three chapters with negation in Old English as their focus. Yoko Iyeiri's "'I Not Say' Once Again: A Study of the Early History of the 'Not + Finite Verb' Type in English" (59–81) discusses the type of negation where the negative adverb *not* precedes the finite verb as in *I not say*. It is first attested in late Middle English, occurs in Shakespeare and survives later in non-standard varieties. The goal of Iyeiri's study is to show that *not*+finite verb goes back earlier Middle and Old English. The hypothesis presented is that the construction declines from the Old English period on and its occurrence in early Modern English is a remnant of the earlier Old English construction. In a detailed study of the Shakespeare corpus, Iyeiri finds that the occurrence of *not*+finite verb is, in fact, very low (21 out of 1,829 relevant examples from nine texts). The author then examines *na* and *ne* preceding the finite verb in Old English where it commonly occurs. By the ME period, he finds

it was more common to find *ne* before the finite verb but *na* following. In ME verse texts the author shows frequencies for *not*+finite verb or *not ne*+finite verb ranging from around 1% to 14%. Iyeiri concludes that *not*+ or *ne not*+finite verb pattern is at its peak in the late OE/early ME period, and not becomes increasingly post-verbal after this period.

In the same volume Jun Terasawa writes on "Negative Constructions in Old English: The Question of Cynewulf's Authorship" (15–25). Three types of negative construction are examined: the adverb *ne* occurring alone; other negative elements used alone; adverb *ne* with other negatives. The distribution of these three types of negative construction are examined in a range of texts; the conclusion is that the texts *Elene* and *Juliana* show "striking similarities" with respect to negation type whereas *Christ II* and *The Fates of the Apostles* used quite distinct forms of negation.

Masayuki Ohkado, "On grammaticalization of negative adverbs, with special reference to Jerspersen's cycle recast" (39–58), writes on the question of the developmental relationship between *no/na* in Old English and *ne* in Old English. While *ne* in initial position in Old English generally triggers subject-verb inversion, *no/na* generally does not. Ohkado discusses counterexamples to this tendency of *ne* to trigger inversion. The author goes on to discuss the similarities between *no/na* and adverb-initial clauses that do not trigger inversion of the subject and verb and argues that this is evidence that *no/na* and *ne* should be treated separately and not connected developmentally.

In his dissertation "Negation in Early English: Parametric Variation and Grammatical Competition" (Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of York, *Index to Theses* 55: 10154) Philip Wallage presents a large-scale empirical study of negation in the history of English. It combines quantitative methodology and the theoretical approach of the Minimalist framework to syntactic change in English negation. His approach is to account for the changes by means of change in formal morphosyntactic features. The quantitative aspect of his study has the goal of determining the relationships between clause structure, syntactic positions of negation and the forms of negation. The model of grammaticalization to account for changes in negation involves change in the formal features of the polarity heads and depends on whether the heads bear interpretable or uninterpretable formal features. This thesis thus combines a quantitatively based data study with a Minimalist approach to syntactic change.

Julia Schlüter's *Rhythmic Grammar: The Influence of Rhythm on Grammatical Variation and Change in*

English, Topics in English Linguistics 46 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter) is centrally concerned with the relationship between phonological and morphosyntactic representations through an examination of grammatical variation and change in English. The first three chapters of this seven chapter volume are introductory in nature. They include an introduction to the Principle of Rhythmic Alternation operating within the domain of prosody or supra-segmental phonology that is central to the analysis (chapter 2), and a chapter dealing with the methodology of corpus linguistics (chapter 3). The central core, as noted by the author, is the empirical part (chapters 4 and 5) containing twenty case studies that examine grammatical variation argued to be susceptible to rhythmic influences. The grammatical phenomena examined include attributive structures and other constructions involving adverbs, and verbal structures. The sixth chapter relates the empirical findings to two theoretical models: *Optimality Theory* and *Spreading Activation Models*.

DJ

Works not seen

- Kim, Yookang. "High Vowel Deletion in English." *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature in Honour of Young-Bae Park*. Ed. Jacek Fisiak and Hye-Kyung Kang. 2 vols. Seoul: Thaeaksa. Vol. II, pp. 109–38.
- Schiltz, Guillaume. "Der Canterbury Spruch oder 'Wie finden dänische Runen und englische Komputistik zusammen?' Ein Beitrag zur historischen Textlinguistik." *Riddles, Knights and Cross-Dressing Saints: Essays on Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Thomas Honegger. Sammlung/Collection Variations 5. Bern: Peter Lang, 2004. Pp. 115–38, ill.
- Waxenberger, Gaby. "Towards a Phonology of the Old English Runic Inscriptions (Epigraphical Material): The Phonemic Inventory." *Englische Sprachwissenschaft und Mediävistik: Standpunkte—Perspektiven—Neue Wege / English Linguistics and Medieval Studies: Positions—Perspectives—New Approaches. Proceedings of the Conference in Bamberg, May 21–22, 2004*. Ed. Gabriele Knappe. Bamberger Beiträge zur Englischen Sprachwissenschaft 48. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2005. Pp. 157–66, ill.
- Welna, Jerzy. "Ingländ, English and ... What Else? (Pre-nasal e-Raising in Early English)." *Text and Language in Medieval English Prose: A Festschrift for Tadao Kubouchi*. Ed. Akio Oizumi, Jacek Fisiak, and John Scahill. Studies in English Medieval language and Literature 12. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2005. Pp. 307–16.

Wischer, Ilse. "Die Anwendung moderner Tempusund Aspekttheorien auf die altenglische Sprache." *Englische Sprachwissenschaft und Mediävistik*. Ed. Knappe. pp. 167–81.

Works deferred until next issue

- Alexiadou, Artemis. "On the Development of Possessive Determiners: Consequences for DP Structure." *Diachronic Clues to Synchronic Grammar*. Ed. Fuß and Trips. pp. 31–58.
- Allen, Cynthia L. "Changes in Case Marking in NP: From Old English to Middle English." *Competition and Variation in Natural Languages: The Case for Case*. Ed. Mengistu Amberer and Helen de Hoop. Perspectives on Cognitive Science. Amsterdam: Elsevier. pp. 223–49.
- _____. "Loss of the Post-Head Genitive in English." *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. I, pp. 203–22.
- Bergeton, Uffe. "The Independence of Binding and Intensification." Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Southern California, 2004. *DAI* 65A: 2582.
- Bergs, Alexander. *Social Networks and Historical Sociolinguistics: Studies in Morphosyntactic Variation in the Paston Letters (1421–1503)*. Ed. Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Kortmann. Topics in English Linguistics 51. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2005. 318 pp.
- Brinton, Laurel J., and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. *Lexicalization and Language Change*. Research Surveys in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2005. xii, 207 pp.
- Brooks, Daniel R.; Esra Erdem, James W. Minett, and Donald Ringe. "Charter-Based Cladistics and Answer Set Programming." *Practical Aspects of Declarative Languages: 7th International Symposium, PADL 2005 Long Beach, CA, USA, January 10–11, 2005. Proceedings*. Ed. Manuel Hermenegildo and Daniel Cabeza. Berlin: Springer, 2005. pp. 37–51.
- Chang, Keun-Cheol. "A Pragmatic Study of Chaucer's English: A Morphological Analysis." *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. II, pp. 449–81. [in Korean]
- Chapman, Don. "Composing and Joining: How the Anglo-Saxons Talked about Compounding." *Verbal Encounters*. Ed. Harbus and Poole. [see sect. 2] pp. 39–54.
- Cho, Nahm-Ho. "The Origin of Modern English Periphrastic DO." *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. II, pp. 483–517. [in Korean]

- Choi, Byong-Jung. "A Diachronic Study of English Infinitives and Their Isomorphism." *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. II, pp. 519–44. [in Korean]
- de Haas, Nynke. "Dialect Variation and Language Contact: The Influence of Old Norse on Medieval English." *Current Research in Dutch Universities and Polytechnics on Old English, Middle English, and Historical Linguistics. Papers Read at the 26th Research Symposium Held in Utrecht on 17 December 2004*. Ed. Erik Kooper. Utrecht: Universiteit Utrecht, 2005. pp. 7–19.
- Eythórrsson, Thórhallur, and Jóhanna Barðdal. "Oblique Subjects: A Common Germanic Inheritance." *Language* 81: 824–81.
- Fischer, Olga. "Developments in the Category Adjective from Old to Middle English." *Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature* 19 (2004): 1–36.
- _____. "Grammaticality and Iconicity: Two Interacting Processes." *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. I, pp. 249–82.
- _____. "The Position of the Adjective in (Old) English from an Iconic Perspective." *The Motivated Sign*. Ed. Fischer and Nänny. pp. 249–76.
- _____, and Max Nänny, eds. *The Motivated Sign: Iconicity in Language and Literature* 2. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001. xiv, 387 pp.
- Fuß, Eric, and Carola Trips, eds. *Diachronic Clues to Synchronic Grammar*. Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 72. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2004. 226 pp. ill.
- Goh, Kwang-Yoon. "The Advent of the Prepositional Passive: An Innovation of Middle English?" *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. II, pp. 21–51.
- Haeberli, Eric. "Syntactic Effects of Inflectional Morphology and Competing Grammars." *Diachronic Clues to Synchronic Grammar*. Ed. Fuß and Trips. pp. 101–30.
- Hinterhölzl, Roland. "Language Change versus Grammar Change: What Diachronic Data Reveal about the Distinction between Core Grammar and Periphery." *Diachronic Clues to Synchronic Grammar*. Ed. Fuß and Trips. pp. 131–60.
- Hotta, R. "The Development of Nominal Plural Forms in Early Middle English." Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Glasgow, 2005. *Index to Theses* 55: 5334.
- Hotta, Ryuichi. "A Historical Study on 'Eyes' in English from a Panchronic Point of View." *Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature* 20: 75–100, ill.
- Hwang, Intae. "Old English Conjunction *ðeah*." *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. II, pp. 581–606. [in Korean]
- Iverson, Gregory K., and Joseph C. Salmons. "Filling the Gap: English Tense Vowel Plus Final /s/." *Jnl of English Linguistics* 33: 207–21.
- Jefferson, Judith A., and Ad Putter. "The Distribution of Infinitives in *-e* and *-en* in Some Middle English Alliterative Poems." *MÆ* 74: 221–47.
- Josefsson, Gunlög. "How Could Merge Be Free and Word Formation Restricted: The Case of Compounding in Romance and Germanic." *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 75: 55–96.
- Kim, Hyeree. "Case Government of Old English Compounds." *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. II, pp. 237–69. [in Korean]
- Kim, Myung-Sook. "Explaining Sound Changes in English." *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. II, pp. 81–107. [in Korean]
- Kim, Taejin. "Old English Alliteration: A Pragmatic Study." *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. II, pp. 197–214. [in Korean]
- Lee, Pil-Hwan. "Preposition-Stranding, Split Infinitives, and Loss of Morphological Cases." *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. II, pp. 385–421. [in Korean]
- Lim, Hyee-Soon. "A Historical Development of *Have to*." *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. II, pp. 423–48. [in Korean]
- Los, Bettelou. *The Rise of the 'To'-Infinitive*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2005. xv, 335 pp.
- Loureiro-Porto, Lucia. "Force-Dynamics: The Key for an Interpretation of Modal Necessity in Old English." *NM* 106: 211–27.
- Moon, An-Nah. "A Reconsideration of High Vowel Deletion in Old English." *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. II, pp. 271–98. [in Korean]
- Nakhleh, Luay; Don Ringe, and Tandy Warnow. "Perfect Phylogenetic Networks: A New Methodology for Reconstructing the Evolutionary History of Natural Languages." *Language* 81: 382–420.
- Ogura, Michiko. "Afeard or Afraid? Rivalry and Super-session." *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. I, pp. 189–201.
- Padilla Cruz, Manuel. "Relevance Theory and Historical Linguistics: Towards a Pragmatic Approach to the

- Morphological Changes in the Preterite from Old English to Middle English." *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 51: 183–204.
- Pysz, Agnieszka. "Noun Phrase Internal Gender Agreement in Late Old English and Early Middle English." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 41: 85–97.
- Schiltz, Guillaume. "Der Canterbury Spruch oder 'Wie finden dänische Runen und englische Komputistik zusammen?' Ein Beitrag zur historischen Textlinguistik." *Riddles, Knights and Cross-Dressing Saints*. Ed. Honegger. [see sect. 4a] pp. 115–38, ill.
- Schwytter, Jürg Rainer. "Direct ou indirect? Possibilités de *slipping* dans les textes de loi anglo-saxons." *Le slipping dans les langues médiévales*. Ed. Erich Poppe, Jürg Rainer Schwytter, and Sandrine Onillon. Cahiers de l'ILSL 18. Lausanne: Université de Lausanne. pp. 5–16.
- Simargool, Nirada. "Historical Development of the English Middle Construction." Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison, 2005. *DAI* 66A: 1745.
- Simpson, Andrew. "The EPP, Fossilized Movement and Reanalysis." *Diachronic Clues to Synchronic Grammar*. Ed. Fuß and Trips. pp. 161–89.
- Singh, Ishtla. *The History of English: A Student's Guide*. London: Hodder Arnold, 2005. 226 pp.
- Stanton, Robert. "Linguistic Fragmentation and Redemption before Alfred." *YES* 36: 12–26.
- Ukaji, Masatomo. "The Making of the Semi-Auxiliary *Have to*." *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. I, pp. 57–73.
- Waxenberger, Gaby. "Towards a Phonology of the Old English Runic Inscriptions (Epigraphical Material): The Phonemic Inventory." *Englische Sprachwissenschaft und Mediävistik*. Ed. Knappe. pp. 157–66, ill.
- _____. "Now You See It, Now You Don't Once More: The Loss and Insertion of Dental Stops in Medieval English." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 41: 71–74.
- Westergaard, Marit R. "Norwegian Child Language and the History of English: The Interaction of Syntax and Information Structure in the Development of Word Order." *Contexts—Historical, Social, Linguistic: Studies in Celebration of Toril Swan*. Ed. Tove Bull, Kevin McCafferty, and Kristin Killie. Bern: Peter Lang. 293–310.
- Yonekura, Hiroshi. "On the Definition of the So-Called Zero-Derivation in English." *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. I, pp. 37–55.
- Yoon, Hee-Chol. "Object Personal Pronouns in Old English." *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. [see sect. 2] Vol. II, pp. 317–48.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter. "A Comparative Approach to Syntactic Change in the History of English." *English Language and Linguistics* 9: 157–79.

4. Literature

a. General and Miscellaneous

John Hines has produced an intriguing book, *Voices in the Past: English Literature and Archaeology* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2004), an interdisciplinary study of cultural history which focuses on five archaeological and literary moments in England. These include Victorian archaeology and *Bleak House*; the year 1666 and *The Winter's Tale* as performed; space, furniture and contemplation in *Troilus and Criseyde* and John Gower; and the buildings and ideas in the area around Pendock and Ludlow of the Southwest Midlands in which MS Digby 86 and MS Harley 2253 were written in the twelfth and fourteenth centuries, respectively. The opening chapter "Text and Context" (9–36) introduces archaeology as the study of human culture and gives examples of its principal aspects, briefly introduces a linguistic model of literary analysis and the notion of literary criticism, and suggests that "we recognize a

spectrum of categories for cultural products, running from the predominantly utilitarian at one end to the primarily artistic at the other" (24). The third section of the chapter introduces interdisciplinary cultural history, starting with Le Goff and Foucault, and then turning to Marxist consideration of material culture. Hines objects to the notion that archaeology is only useful to literary analysis when it involves the dating of texts (citing the annoying example of *Beowulf* and Sutton Hoo), and quotes Anders Andrén's division of artifactual-textual relationships into three categories: object-centered, text-centered, and balanced. However, here too the analysis gets boxed in, so Hines argues for the approach championed by Lee Patterson, in which history and criticism are married "without seriously swerving from sound, and conventional, historical practice" (34). His first example of this cultural historicism is Old English poetry in Chapter 2, "Knowledge and Vision in Old English Poetry" (37–70). Hines

begins with an elegant short account of the archaeology and history of England from the collapse of the Roman empire through the development of what might be called English communities, incorporating literary culture and the production of poetic manuscripts in his account of the re-establishment of a secure English state. The settlement patterns and burial sites of early Anglo-Saxon England demonstrate “a clear decline in the technical capacities of material life” (49), although the seventh century already saw increasing specialization of activity and incipient urbanization (especially, as recently determined, the establishment of fairs and markets). A gradual rural reorganization led steadily to “substantial nucleated villages” (53) and local estates. Hines concludes that the socio-economic relationship to the land and landscape of England was as complex as the ideological dimensions, and turns to the topic of place and structure in literary studies. Previously much discussed in this regard, he argues, is the centrality of the human subject and the persistent idealism rather than realism of Old English poetry. There are, he argues, few reflections in these texts of contemporary circumstances. One such reflection that Hines identifies is *The Phoenix* lines 242–64, which does refer to agricultural productivity and its importance, although elsewhere the landscape is notional or a *wong* ‘plain’. More specifically Hines discusses the imagery of consumption and cultivation in *Andreas* and in *Guthlac A*, arguing that both are “firmly rooted in the Anglo-Saxon organization and use of the landscape despite its idealism and its desire to transcend the worldly” (62). For *Guthlac*, Hines briefly highlights some examples of realistic imagery, and turns to discussion of the monastery at Crowland and the unusual nature of the choice of such a wild and isolated place for a monastic establishment. Hines argues for a realism implicit in the poetry. He makes interesting points, albeit briefly, in this section; the book lacks a bibliography so it is difficult to be certain, but there are no footnote references to the work of Nicholas Howe, among others, on these issues of landscape and geography in OE poetry. Much of the argument focuses on the interpretation of *beorg*, and might also have been strengthened by reference to the superb and relevant entry in the Dictionary of Old English.

André Crépin’s *Old English Poetics: A Technical Handbook* (Paris: Publications de l’Association des médiévistes de l’enseignement supérieur) is a rare work: a new, crisp, systematic and clear introduction to all the vernacular poems of Anglo-Saxon England. He starts by identifying the corpus, the manuscripts, the layout of the prose and poetry on the page (a particularly fine exposition), and the editing and printing issues for OE poetry. The

next five brief sections consider poets at work, beginning with Cædmon, Cynewulf, Alfred the Great, the *Beowulf* poet on verse-making at lines 867b–876, terminology referring to poets and poetry, and the linkage with music. Crépin then turns to the meat of his argument, the section on verse structure starting with a very clear and helpful discussion of the half-line, then alliteration, stress, volume (referring to the weight of a syllable and the minimal and maximal size of the half-line) and rhythms (which analyzes the metrical structures as falling rhythm or even structure or interplay between the two). The section on meter, while perhaps simplistic for the scholar, provides the beginner with a sense of the principal contours of OE verse, and the analysis of verse structure uses terminology that literature students should find readily accessible. There are certainly criticisms that could be made of the presentation and scholarship (the analysis of kinds of alliteration can be confusing and does not reflect recent articles in the field), but there are many examples and careful discussion, the product of a lifetime of teaching and thinking about Old English. The next section addresses differences from prose in terms of grammar, lexical specificity, and stylistic issues, including variation. Crépin then turns to ornaments, which are divided into phonic and rhetorical devices. Section VI considers macrostructure, with chapters on patterns such as interlacing, envelope patterns, parallel patterns, speeches, and overall patterns; formulas; motifs; typescenes, themes, topics, and *topoi* (it will by this point be obvious that Crépin is quite happily combining the terms used by many different scholars into a joyous conglomeration); and, very cursorily, orality.

Part II of the book engages in a more traditional approach, introducing and discussing each OE poem by way of a taxonomy based on genre. Crépin begins with the argument that Hrothgar gives a partial classification by genre in *Beowulf* 2101–2117a, then reviews the many modern classifications from Conybeare onwards. Heroic poems are discussed in two chapters, then historical poems and poetic passages from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Section IX considers biblical and liturgical poetry, describing the content, the religious implications, the style, providing information about the manuscript and biblical context of each poem. Psalms and prayers, unusually, get an entire chapter. The next section is a catch-all category of other religious poems, with chapters on Cynewulf, the lives of saints (the most popular genre of the Christian Middle Ages, according to Crépin), devotional poetry including worship of the cross and poems on Judgment Day, and allegorical poems including the poems from the *Physiologus*, *The*

Phoenix, and most of the so-called elegies including *The Wanderer* (an unusual classification). The last two sections pick up sets, lists, and catalog-poems including the riddles as examples of the former and *Widsith* (with an elaborate analysis of the structure) as a catalog-poem along with *Wulf and Eadwacer*; and varia, the term for prose-verse alternations such as *The Meters of Boethius*, prefaces, charms, and finally inscriptions including the Franks Casket and the Sutton Disc Brooch.

There are some lovely moments in this book, and although it will be hard for many scholars to locate the monograph, the effort should be made both because the logic of the argument's development is very strong and because many good examples along the way offer new insight. Some of my favorite remarks: *Godric's Hymn* is a "mere mishmash" (13); "Old English written poetry begins its existence in an abbey" (179); "We know nothing of Cynewulf except his name and four poems. Can there be a better fate for a dead writer?" (199); "*The Metrical Charms* illustrate the proximity between prose and verse. In magical prescriptions prose gradually changes into verse, and vice versa" (254); the poems are "didactic and Christian, which should not, however, detract from their appeal" (260). The monograph could have used another round of proofreading, and there are some incautious asseverations. The greatest strength is the careful stylistic analysis which is often represented by very brief and astute observations.

MJT

Meter

Thomas Bredehoft has three contributions to metrical studies this year. The first attempts to answer the vexed question †"What Are Old English Metrical Studies For?" (*OEN* 39.1: 25–36). Our understanding of meter is almost entirely inductive, and basing our analysis on a text such as *Beowulf* produces far different "rules" of meter than would a text such as the *Metrical Psalms*. Nonetheless Bredehoft begins with Sievers and his five types and very briefly reviews the approaches to meter of more recent scholars as a way to consider what Old English meter measures. His conclusion is that "there is still surprisingly little consensus about what is measured by Old English meter" (27). Nonetheless he turns to metrical description or scansion, and in particular to the way in which metrical and linguistic—especially lexical—stress correlate. Using *Beowulf* 755–61, he works from marking the stresses to developing a system of stress types (in the same way in which most of us work when teaching meter) by explaining resolution (very well), secondary stress, and the promotion of naturally unstressed elements or demotion of naturally

stressed elements. The treatment of unstressed syllables marks the major difference between scansion systems, and at this point Bredehoft explains Sievers/Bliss, based on the location of the stressed syllables, and Russom's system of word-foot analysis. Bredehoft's own system is a modification of Russom's which attempts to take into account the opening finite verb and its uncertain treatment. The paper then turns to an issue which might usefully have been raised earlier: the question of the integrity of OE verse as written by scribes, and more generally the role of scribes as intelligent copiers of texts. Using *Beowulf* 758a as an example, Bredehoft explores the implications of a lack of double alliteration when expected (whether to emend, comparison to an analogous verse in the *Metrical Psalms* which would not be anomalous in that poem but is often taken as anomalous in *Beowulf*, and considering whether late OE verse patterns might impel a scribe not to perceive a particular verse structure as a problem). Finally, having looked at late OE verse and its different structures, Bredehoft tackles the prose/poetry divide, which he sees as a solely metrical issue. Written in clear prose that acknowledges the difficulties of tackling metrical issues, Bredehoft's paper is a good introduction to metrical approaches. It may not be appropriate for undergraduate students, but beginning graduate students would find it a soothing start. The opening sections are particularly helpful; towards the end of the piece, personal axes begin to grind and the argument for a different tradition in late OE verse (which is probably correct) begins to overwhelm the analysis—the exemplum, not for the first time, proving more memorable than the thesis.

‡*Early English Metre* (Toronto: U of Toronto Press) makes a similar but more leisurely start, as Bredehoft explores the failure of the "five-types" formalism of Sievers and complains that the complexity of interlinking theories of meter proposed by metrists to replace or modify aspects of Sievers has resulted in a discourse inaccessible save to those self-same metrists. In particular, Bredehoft notes the rigidity of Sievers/Bliss scansion and the falsity of its first principle, that every verse has two accented syllables; he also objects to the rhetoric of decay which surrounds discussion of late Old English verse. He proposes a new metrical formalism, starting with the assumption that individual poets and poems varied in their practice, and based on a notion of classical OE meter and postclassical verse (a term which unfortunately seems to embody the argument Bredehoft is attempting to leave behind). Despite the objections to Sievers, Bredehoft reviews that scansion and remarks especially on its admirable simplicity,

before providing a conspectus of its insufficiencies with respect to tertiary stress, anacrusis, secondary stress in compound personal names, the dependence of meter on alliteration, and required patterns of alliteration in particular types. Next Bredehoft presents his new formalism, beginning with three general principles which bear a very close resemblance to the word-foot theory of Geoffrey Russom. Bredehoft's only significant difference from Russom lies in the group he calls *s*-feet, which are the patterns involving finite nonauxiliary verbs, which sometimes alliterate and sometimes do not. He begins his demonstrative scansion with the opening lines of *The Wanderer*, then considers the advantages of his integration of Calvin Kendall's observations about the alliteration of finite verbs into Geoffrey Russom's metrical formalism by addressing metrical auxiliaries or finite verbs scanned on *x*-positions and on *s*-positions (and marked as secondary with respect to alliteration), anacrusis, and some tricky passages. Thus Bredehoft examines *Elene* 531b-5 and *Beowulf* 1724-9 to elucidate the ways in which this scansion advances on the five types (which still lie in the background), Russom, and Kendall. Next he addresses hypermetric verses, rhyme, and alliteration in this classical OE verse system. The section on hypermetric verses begins with Bredehoft's previously published five basic rules of Type 1 hypermetric verses, then demonstrates their use in *Beowulf* 1162b-9b. Three rules address Type 2 hypermetric verses, and two more define Type 3 hypermetric verses. Given the percentage of hypermetric verses in the existing OE corpus, ten rules to identify and define their usage may not be an advance on previous scholarship, especially since he concludes that hypermetric verses work in concert with normal verses. What Bredehoft does usefully identify, however, is differing usage of hypermetric verses in different OE texts. Bredehoft then discusses rhyme and secondary alliteration, particularly cross alliteration, as possibly substituting in what would be a metrical situation for double alliteration, and provides useful examples (although few can be found which are unambiguous) of this stylistic effect. The section on classical OE poetics ends with a brief analysis of these effects as applied to some passages in *Judith* and *The Ruin*; Bredehoft follows Griffith's edition of the former in noting many such effects in *Judith*, and identifies the remarkable efficiency in the use of compounds, alliterative effects, and rhyme of the latter.

The second half of the book addresses postclassical or late OE verse and *Lazamon's* usage in early Middle English. Although the analysis of postclassical verse overlaps extensively with Bredehoft's previous work on the verse usage in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the

argument here is both interesting and potentially very productive indeed. The metrical changes in late OE verse include a complete loss of resolution (the absence of distinctions among stressed syllables based on their length); the use of only two levels of metrically significant stress, as reflected in the relative absence of the Sievers verse-types with secondary stress and in the changes in alliteration patterns, such that what would have been subordinated elements of compounds earlier now may alliterate; and the development of anacrusis in B and C verses in addition to its previous usage in A verses. Bredehoft also notes changes to alliteration on *s* and *s*-clusters. He then describes the scansion and foot-forms that exist in late OE verse, identifying particular forms as diagnostic of the late date, and further argues for differences in the rules for verse combination in late verse. Rhyme is also more broadly interpreted in late verse. Bredehoft's proposals are a good start towards a new way of thinking about changes over time in OE meter, but they do require evidence and detailed scansions (the trappings of metrical analysis, however arcane the study might be for non-metrists), which is not provided in the text or notes.

The book next turns to the relationship between *Ælfric's* writing and OE verse. Contrary to the argument made by Bruce Mitchell (reviewed below), Bredehoft argues that *Ælfric* was writing good late verse, and that his work should be taken as part of a progression through to early Middle English meter. He chose not to use rhyme as *Lazamon* did, but favored alliteration. Bredehoft scans a passage from *Life of Cuthbert* and analyzes its formal similarities with the *Metrical Psalms*. He then argues for scribal activity as also reflecting the treatment of *Ælfric's* work as poetry, citing the pointing in the manuscripts and the treatment of transitional points between prose and this material. Finally, the chapter analyzes the *Life of St. Sebastian*, asserting that 395 of the 472 full lines are "clearly linked by alliteration across the caesura" (87), and providing three lines with rhyme as the link. Alliteration on normally unstressed particles appears to be part of the homilist's practice, and after working through the remaining lines Bredehoft concludes that fewer than 5% of the total lines in the homily do not conform to the alliterative structure. The obvious problem with this conclusion is that Bredehoft himself has argued for meter as well as alliteration as fundamental to OE verse, but the consideration of *Ælfric* does not move beyond alliteration. The section on late OE verse ends with a detailed stylistic and metrical analysis of four texts: the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle poem *The Death of Alfred* from annual 1036, the 1086 poem *William the Conqueror* from the Peterborough

Chronicle, the end of Ælfric's *Life of Oswald*, and the first alliterative paragraph of *The Life of Edmund*.

The last section of the book makes a much-needed leap to Lazamon, following Moffat in arguing for a linkage with late OE verse beyond what has usually been argued. Bredehoft rightly points out the problems inherent in the length of the *Brut* and in the different approaches of the scribes of the two extant manuscripts, which show extreme metrical divergence. Bredehoft argues that although his late OE scansion system does not scan all of Lazamon's verses, a system like it underlies the form of the poem. He develops a series of rules for the meter, including foot structure, foot combination, verse combination, and rhyme rules. He does some preliminary analysis of Lazamon's verses, noting that the most significant difference is "its complete abandonment of the principle of two-stress verses" (106). The chapter concludes with a detailed analysis of Arthur's speech taunting Balduf, lines 10638–10652. Bredehoft's last chapter argues that Lazamon was well aware of the late OE poetic tradition, and was directly familiar in particular with the poems of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. He uses formulas and especially rhymes that derive from the OE tradition; in particular, two dozen or so of his verses resemble lines from the Chronicle poems. Bredehoft provides three detailed examples from *Brut* and the 1086 poem, *William the Conqueror*, and offers several specific lexical and thematic items which may demonstrate the Chronicle poems as being direct sources for his work. Thus, Bredehoft argues for Lazamon as the last Old English poet.

A notable feature of the book is that Bredehoft leaves all the details and possible objections to his argument for the notes, which means that the text itself is only 120 pages, but the notes add fifty closely-argued pages which will be critical for those assessing his approach. The bibliography is somewhat cursory; the only work in a language other than English is a single entry for Sievers' *Altgermanische Metrik*. The argument largely repeats points Bredehoft has made elsewhere, and may not have sufficient heft. The greatest strength is the detailed analysis of the metrical and stylistic features of OE texts, which are particularly sensitive and illuminating. The oddest feature of the book is that the paper stock varies, and one quire is printed on paper noticeably lighter in weight and color. We may have to live with the garish orange covers and the bizarre design choices which involve font changes from tables to examples (which are distracting in a book on meter where a set of examples can run longer than the examples in a table; see, for example, pp. 36–37, or pages 54–55, where the fonts used for hypermetric verses are

genuinely too small for any eyeballs over thirty years of age), but surely the press can afford to buy enough paper for the print run—and to proofread (e.g. p. 36 "thoeries", p. 40 "Geofrey").

Bredehoft's third and final contribution this year addresses ‡"Old English and Old Saxon Formulaic Rhyme" (*Anglia* 123: 204–29), and argues that rhyme within the half-line occurred with sufficient frequency in texts in the two languages that it must have been a "traditional, formulaic component" (205) of the verse-craft. His opening example, which works in both languages, is *god/mod* verse-internal rhyme, which occurs three times. Although other scholars have focused on verse rhyme, or rhyme at the end of the line or half-line, Bredehoft proposes that verse-internal rhyme is more likely to be a traditional element of West Germanic versification, perhaps formulaic. He defines rhyme and some off-rhyme, especially hending rhyme, (e.g. *heorodreor*) as relevant for his purposes, and argues that rhyme can substitute for double alliteration, as far as some poets were concerned, in verses such as *floed blode weol* (*Beo* 1422a) and *brimrad gebad* (*And* 1587a). Moreover, at least one formula appears to demand rhyme, as four examples including *bord ord onfeng* (*Mald* 110b) attest. The clashing or crashing encounter in this formula, dubbed by Bredehoft the *feng*-formula, means that the rhyme is a particularly productive effect. Bredehoft provides an appendix (224–29) listing the thirty-nine formulaic full rhymes he has identified, all of them occurring at least twice and some, such as *mihdig drihten*, over eighty times in the OE corpus. Some have the rhymes linked by coordinating conjunctions (e.g. *wide and side*, *frod ond god*); intriguingly, the alliterative order tends to remain the same, reinforcing the idea that these are also formulas. Semantic redundancy in rhymes such as *healdan and wealdan* or *blowan and growan* also implies a formulaic basis, as do the antonymic meanings of *hider ne þider* or *freonde ne feonde*. Powerful semantic linkages such as *bord/ord*, *sund/grund*, *eard/weardian*, *broðor/oðer* also produce noteworthy verses. A majority of these verse-internal rhymes does involve a semantic linkage in Bredehoft's analysis. For the Old Saxon there are five or six rhyme pairs in existence, many of them closely parallel to the Old English, and Bredehoft argues for some semantic linkages here too. The paper makes a convincing argument for the existence of these verse-internal rhyming pairs; whether this stylistic feature is as deeply grounded in West Germanic verse as Bredehoft proposes may remain an open question, but it is certainly clear that rhyme was an option for OE poets as a stylistic elegance and perhaps as a replacement for

double alliteration. Given the extent to which the poetry depends on the sonic repetition that is alliteration, this discovery should not be surprising—and yet it is.

MJT

One might say that Thomas Bredehoff's apologetic piece †“What are Old English Metrical Studies For?” (*OEN* 39.1: 25–36) has nothing to apologize for. This article is of interest to metrist and non-metrist alike. For the non-metrist Bredehoff has summarized a tremendous amount of sometimes abstruse material and has presented it in a manner which makes it accessible to anyone with a basic familiarity with Old English alliterative verse. As Bredehoff surveys “some of the central questions of metrical inquiry, as well as its methods and forms,” (25) he has the great foresight to remove the technical and potentially intimidating terminology and discussions to end-notes. The majority of the article focuses on a sample of *Beowulf* which Bredehoff scans metrically, roughly at first, and subsequently with more refined scansion in order to demonstrate the fine distinctions between certain metrical theories (including his own). At the conclusion of the article Bredehoff presents a clear explanation of how metrical studies play into issues of wider interest to Anglo-Saxonists, such as textual editing and the consequences for interpretation (31–34). Bredehoff also emphasizes that there may have been more variation in poetic form among the Anglo-Saxons than metrical theories might lead us to assume. It is a healthy reminder to “conceptualize Old English verse as a complex system of traditions which changed over time, probably varied across the social spectrum, and probably even countenanced different contemporary opinions about what constituted a ‘correct’ verse or line of poetry” (33). For the metrist this article is of great assistance in focusing on the little things which set the theories of various metrists apart. Far more helpful, perhaps, is that this article aids metrists in conveying the importance of their work to the greater community of Old English studies.

Thomas Bredehoff addresses the relatedness of Saxon and Anglo-Saxon poetic traditions in †“Old English and Old Saxon Formulaic Rhyme,” *Anglia* 123: 204–29. Whereas most previous studies of rhyme in Old English verse concern themselves with verse-rhyme, as found, for example, in the rhymes of Cynewulf and *The Riming Poem*, Bredehoff focuses exclusively on full-rhyme pairs within a single verse in order to argue that this feature was inherited by both the Old Saxon and Anglo-Saxon poetic traditions from their common West Germanic predecessor (205). It is understandable

that considerable attention has been given to the alliteration of early Germanic verse; however, Bredehoff's study provides a new approach to sound-patterning in alliterative verse by analyzing full-rhymed word pairs within a single verse. One of the most telling characteristics is in poems such as *Andreas*; a rhymed word pair could be used in lieu of double alliteration where required by the meter (210). The prevalence of one rhyming word-pair over another in the two poetic traditions, Bredehoff argues, is also linked to the degree of semantic relatedness: “In both languages, the ‘semantic connection’ ... did play a powerful role in promoting certain rhyming pairs into the realm of formulaic usage, in that rhyming verses without such a semantic connection were used and reused with less frequency” (222). Formulaic pairs in Old English poetry do not always rhyme in Old Saxon, and vice versa. In fact, a word-pair formula is less frequently encountered in the language where it does not rhyme (223). To be sure, Bredehoff's analysis of rhyme in a metrical context is providing a richer view of the complexities and capabilities of alliterative verse.

Bruce Mitchell in “The Relation between Old English Alliterative Verse and Ælfric's Alliterative Prose,” *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O'Brien O'Keefe and Orchard, II:349–62, tackles Peter Clemoes's 1966 characterization of the homilist's alliterative prose as the rhythm and alliteration of poetry divorced from its poetic vocabulary and syntax (349). As we progress through the article, Mitchell first provides an antithesis of Ælfrician alliterative prose with a sample from Cynewulf's *Christ II*, to highlight the difference between Old English poetry and prose, with particular focus on poetic vocabulary (350). However, following close in step, Mitchell also brings forth a snippet from *Christ II* which also lacks poetic compounds, thus demonstrating that they are not requisite for poetry to be poetry (350). Mitchell goes on to ask “in what sense can anyone ‘divorce the rhythm ... of Old English poetry from its traditional vocabulary and syntax?’” For Mitchell it is quite simple that “Ælfric's alliterative practices are not those of the poets, and Ælfric's rhythms are not those of the poetry” (356). More salient differences between alliterative verse and alliterative prose are those found in the realm of a text's morpho-syntax. Old English poetry uses fewer “prop” words than the prose, in part to keep the number of unstressed syllables to a minimum. Pro-drop of subject pronouns is more frequent, demonstratives are absent before weak adjectives, fewer multiple negatives exist, and multisyllabic conjunctions are disfavored (358). Mitchell finishes off with two clear points: Ælfric's prose is good prose because it lacks

the “alliteration and rhythm of poetry,” and “Clemoes’s statement with which [he] began is unhelpful, misleading, and wrong” (359).

DPAS

General and Miscellaneous

In “More Diagrams by Byrhtferth of Ramsey,” *Latin Learning and English Lore*, II: 53–73, Peter Baker argues that three diagrams (MSS Cotton Tiberius C.i fol. 5r, Cotton Tiberius C.i fol. 5v, and Harley 3667 fol. 7v) are part of Byrhtferth of Ramsey’s computus. In addition to presenting the evidence which leads him to view Byrhtferth as the author of these diagrams, Baker provides commentary on the text, and a short edition with illustrations of the diagrams and brief textual notes. One clue to Byrhtferth’s authorship lies in the allusion to a sermon by Haymo of Auxerre quoted on diagram no. 2, where statements regarding numerological interpretation are altered in ways which accord with peculiarities of Byrhtferth’s numerological views (54–58). Secondly, diagrams no. 2 and no. 3 are accompanied by a quotation from Sedulius’s *Carmen Paschale* which share identical, and in some cases similar, textual errors, suggesting a common source. This of course does not suggest Byrhtferth’s authorship, but does tie the two diagrams together (58–59). One further characteristic tying diagram no. 3 to Byrhtferth is that the diagram is rectangular and accompanied by the Latin word *alea*, understood here as ‘gameboard’, which Baker argues is in line with Byrhtferth’s fascination with the connections between arithmetic and calculi, or ‘gaming stones’ (60–61). Perhaps most suggestive of Byrhtferth’s style is the inclusion within the diagrams of the names of the twelve patriarchs. The names in each of the three lists partially overlap. Baker takes this as indicating authorship not “by three writers all suffering the same misconception; rather, they were produced by one man returning obsessively to this topic as he laboured to get it right” (63). Baker closes his argument with a similar statement, in that it is not that these diagrams participate in such obsessions, but the obsessive and repetitive way in which they handle the material not found outside of Byrhtferth’s works that speaks “so eloquently for his authorship” (64).

Michelle Brown presents a socio-historical overview of the of written vernacular languages in “Building Babel: The Architecture of the Early Written Western Vernaculars,” *Omnia disce—Medieval Studies in Memory of Leonard Boyle, O.P.*, ed. Anne J. Duggan, Joan Greatrex, and Brenda Bolton (Aldershot: Ashgate), 109–28. In this piece Brown addresses “central issues

of communication history ... the establishment of cultural and scriptural imperialism, of emergent regionalism, information elitism and democratization, of transmission processes, and of the complex interaction of word, sound and image” (109). The scope of Brown’s work starts broad with examples of the importance the written word plays in society from the ancient world as well as the modern world (110–12). Thereafter the primary focus of the work is the coming of literacy in Britain, emphasizing the role played by both Church and state in the employment of written vernacular. Brown gives a survey of the earliest English texts along with their paleographical and social contexts (112–16). In her discussion of runic inscriptions, Brown also points out the distinction between texts meant to be read versus texts meant as objects of public display (114). In keeping with the function of literacy within a regional and cultural identity, Brown also provides an overview of other vernaculars in the British Isles and Ireland: Pictish, Irish Ogham, Old and Middle Irish, and Old and Middle Welsh (118–21). Seeking a motivating force behind the tremendous interest in literacy in early Britain, and in the development of vernaculars elsewhere, Brown sees the Carolingian Empire as a driving force. In non-Carolingian regions vernaculars flourished, whereas the multilingual and multiethnic composition of the Carolingian Empire led to an increased importance in the use of Latin which held back the development of vernacular text production (123).

With an analysis focusing on *Maxims I* and *The Fortunes of Men*, Susan Deski’s “Exploring Text and Discourse in the Old English Gnostic Poems: The Problem of Narrative,” *JEGP* 104: 326–44, approaches these knotty poems with an eye toward their “use (or nonuse) of narrative” (326). Deski adopts the textual-critical model set forth by Tuija Virtanen (1992) in which texts are seen as capable of possessing several discourse types simultaneously. A given text would be assigned to a particular type according to which type is the dominant. This is of benefit to analysis of the Old English gnostic poems, as “the genre of gnostic poetry remains ill-defined” (236–27). Of primary interest to Deski is the division of the poem into gnostic and narrative types. Deski defines a gnome as “an independent (or potentially independent), present-tense, declarative sentence of general applicability” (329). Later within the article, Deski notes as well that “tense is not the only factor distinguishing narrative from gnostic” (336). The definition of narrative in her study is sociolinguistic in origin. For this study of the gnostic poems Deski adopts the Labovian definition of narrative, according to which narrative “comprises a sequence of at least

two independent clauses temporally arranged so that altering their order would change the original semantic interpretation of the sequence” (329). The Labovian definition of narrative presents some interesting difficulties for the study of Old English poetry, where variation is often used as a stylistic component. As Desks points out: “When one is faced with parallel clauses, are they both narrative clauses, or only the first?” (333). The method of analysis adopted here leads Desks to differentiate *Maxims I* from *The Fortunes of Men* in that *Maxims I* demonstrates a greater variety in the usage of “near-narrative,” whereas *The Fortunes of Men* relies heavily on the use of gnomic markers such as *sceal* (341). A puzzling passage, *Maxims I* ll. 146b–47a, is given perhaps a bit more significance than may be present: Desks sees here “a device not previously seen: a change of number” which she claims disrupts the narrative where plural *wulfas* stands as an appositive to *felaƿæcne deor* (interpreted by Desks as a singular) ‘a very treacherous beast’ (338). A quick solution presents itself in reading *deor* as the typical endingless plural of a neuter *a*-stem, further indicated by the adjective ending on *felaƿæcne*. In her conclusion Desks puts forth the possibility that narrative itself was a problem for the gnomic poets, who “exploited the tension between text type and discourse type to add energy to their works, recognizing the power of narrative but at the same time subjugating it to their instructive purposes” (344).

Robert DiNapoli in “Odd Characters: Runes in Old English Poetry,” *Verbal Encounters: Anglo-Saxon and Old Norse studies for Roberta Frank*, ed. Poole and Harbus [see sect. 2], 145–61 adds to our understanding of the practice of including runes in poetic texts and how “the poets regarded this strange and limited inheritance of pre-Christian literary.” Five texts are the focus of this piece: *The Rune Poem*, Exeter Riddle 19, Exeter Riddle 64, Exeter Riddle 24, and the end of Cynewulf’s *Elene*. In his discussion of *The Rune Poem*, DiNapoli points out that the poet’s use of runes allows him to present verses possessing multiple interpretations, often in pairs of Christian and secular readings. This relationship is iconic of monastic scribes employing pre-Christian letters in their writing, indicating that they exist in a transitional state of being Christian, yet cognizant of a pagan antiquity (148–51). DiNapoli then turns his attention to two of the Exeter Book’s riddles, Riddle 64 and Riddle 24. Exeter Riddle 19 serves as an introduction to the genre, whereas Riddle 64 is of greater interest, in that to “solve the riddle is therefore to shatter the poem as a metrical construct, an extreme form of ‘code breaking,’ and the runic characters map out the conceptual and linguistic (and almost visual) fault line

along which this fracture must occur” (153–54). Likewise Riddle 24 is iconic, in that its answer, “a jay,” is a creature that hides its identity through call mimicry, just as the Anglo-Saxons have adopted writing traditions from outside (154–55). The runic signature concluding Cynewulf’s *Elene* is DiNapoli’s final focus, and in keeping with the piece’s title, Cynewulf is presented as an odd character. Despite many answers to the question of why Cynewulf would have encrypted his name if he wished for the prayers of others, DiNapoli proffers the possibility that Cynewulf was using “the cultural associations of the runic alphabet here to locate himself with a poignant exactitude on the mental watershed that divides the Anglo-Saxon poet’s pagan past from his Christian present and future” (161).

Takako Fujii in “Wulfstan’s Latin and Old English texts of *De Cristianitate*,” *Text and Language in Medieval English Prose: A Festschrift for Tadao Kubouchi*, ed. Akio Oizumi et al. (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang), 35–47 presents a cursory analysis of the relationship between punctuation and syntax in both the Latin and Old English versions of the sermon. Because Wulfstan composed both the Latin and Old English versions of this sermon, and because both the Latin and Old English versions contain punctuation, these texts provide a potential tool in interpreting Old English syntax (35). The punctuation marks present in these texts are the *punctus*, the *punctus elevatus*, the *punctus versus*, and the *punctus interrogativus* (36). Of the two Latin versions of this text MS Hatton 113 is the more reliable (36–37). The punctuation of the Old English text varies widely among the four extant versions; however, each manuscript adheres more or less regularly to its own punctuation system. It is also notable that no Old English text employs the *punctus interrogativus* to mark questions (36–37). Although Wulfstan provided this sermon in both Latin and Old English, the Old English is not simply a translation of the Latin, but rather a much more elaborated text which builds on the Latin text. At times statements are added for emphasis of a point, in other cases Wulfstan provides a little exegesis for foreign words that his audience may not understand. In any case, additions made to the text in the Old English version rarely affect the syntax (40–43). Although the corpus size is too small to provide definitive answers to larger syntactic problems, Fujii presents evidence that the punctuation indicates syntactic units which we “recognize as clause and sentence boundaries” and that “Wulfstan was alive to the flexibility of sentence structure” (43–46).

The Regius Psalter and its glosses provides the impetus for Mechthild Gretsch’s “The Roman Psalter, its Old

English Glosses and the English Benedictine Reform,” *The Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Helen Gittos and M. Bradford Bedingfield (London: Boydell), 13–28. Gretsch presents a concise history of Western European psalters in general with, naturally, considerable focus on Anglo-Saxon psalters (13–18). Curious among glossed psalters is the Regius Psalter (MS Royal 2.B.v), whose text comes from the older *Psalterium Romanum*, yet was clearly glossed by someone who was familiar with the *Psalterium Gallicanum*, which was gaining more usage on the continent and spreading to England (20–21). Gretsch proposes that the Royal Glossator’s “orientation towards Benedictine monasticism,” among other things, was part of the reason behind his choice of the *Romanum* over the *Gallicanum*. Furthermore, as a well educated Benedictine he would have noted that St. Benedict had always quoted from the *Psalterium Romanum* (25). Æthelwold also made use of the *Romanum* in his translation of the *Regula St. Benedicti* and had demonstrable knowledge of the close historical connections between the English and the Church of Rome (23–25). The continued usage of the *Psalterium Romanum* at a time when it was losing out to the *Psalterium Gallicanum* would have indicated an understanding of the “venerable heritage of the English church” (25). Gretsch concludes that the history of the psalters and liturgical details of late Anglo-Saxon England may have been “linked with contemporary intellectual activities and even political conditions” (28).

The Old High German glosses to the Theodorean poem *Sanctus Sator* (MS BSB Clm 19410) may hold evidence of Anglo-Saxon scholars and *scholia*, in that many reasonable explanations to textual difficulties point to an Anglo-Saxon intermediary. This is the topic of Mechthild Gretsch and Helmut Gneuss’s philologically and codicologically well researched and argued article “Anglo-Saxon Glosses to a Theodorean Poem?” (*Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O’Brien O’Keefe and Orchard, 1:9–46). Although the German glossator’s performance has drawn tremendous critique by scholars over the years, the textual problems in several instances offer evidence “for lost Anglo-Saxon glosses and annotations” (21). The first set of evidence presented by Gretsch and Gneuss points to the possibility that the poem was transmitted to the continent together with Latin annotations by Anglo-Saxon missionaries (22–28). One example of this is the phrase *gratis geo* and its corresponding OHG gloss *danche toon for* ‘I give thanks’, where the verb *geo* is certainly not a known Latin verb, and is either a borrowing of Gk. *χίω* ‘I pour’ (a grecism pointing perhaps to Theodore of Canterbury’s authorship) or, more likely, a verb not

uncommon in Insular Latin meaning ‘I do/make/give’ and derived from prefixed verbs such as *degeo*, *exgeo*, *indegeo*, etc. Pace Gretsch and Gneuss, who write regarding the OHG gloss *toon* that “the infinitive form of the Old High German gloss (which is wrong in the context) may perhaps permit us to suspect that *geo* in the in the glossator’s exemplar was explained by the Latin infinitive *agere*” (27), *toon* is in fact an earlier version of the first person singular form used by Notker and the author of *Tatian*, OHG *tuon* ‘I do, make’ (W. Braune, *Althochdeutsche Grammatik*, 14th ed. rev. Hans Eggers [Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1987], 303–5). Nonetheless, Gretsch and Gneuss present convincing arguments for lost Latin annotations and Old High German glosses influenced by the lexicon of speakers of Old English. The authors are careful to point out that due to the linguistic similarity of Old High German and Old English, it is difficult to demonstrate that a given German form is the result of English influence. Accordingly they establish three criteria in viewing a word as a potential Anglicism: that the words are morphologically identical, that the OE word is frequently attested and its OHG cognate is not, or that the OHG word has a meaning corresponding to the meaning of the OE word, but that this meaning is not or rarely attested outside of the *Sanctus Sator* gloss (29). With these rules in mind, the authors have identified at least eight likely Anglicisms in the glosses (OHG *kepo* = OE *gifa*, OHG *scozil* = OE *scytel*, OHG *porge*, *frido*, *spare* = OE *beorgan*, *frīðian*, *sparian*, OHG *fornimu* = OE *fornime*, OHG *cheol* = OE *ceol*, OHG *rantbouc* = OE *randbēag*) (30–32). The sum total of these fascinating correspondences is that the OHG glosses of *Sanctus Sator* could have been produced either by “a German scholar who had enjoyed some training by an Anglo-Saxon teacher” or by “a German student under the direct supervision of his Anglo-Saxon master” (37).

With considerable philological research and precision, and building on his 2004 dissertation “The Meanings of Elf, and Elves, in Medieval England,” Alaric Hall presents arguments in his “Calling the Shots: The Old English Remedy *Gif Hors Ofscoten Sie* and Anglo-Saxon ‘Elf-Shot,’” *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 106: 195–209, that the OE remedy *Gif hors ofscoten sie* in no way presents evidence of ‘elf-shot’ (195–96). He begins by tracing a series of mistranslations and misunderstandings of OE *ofscoten*. Cockayne’s 1864–66 translation of *ofscoten* as ‘elf-shot’ was meant in the Scottish sense of ‘elf-shot’, i.e. “dangerously distended by greedy devouring of green food” (198). Misunderstandings of Cockayne’s gloss combined with the difficult syntax of the remedy’s final line, *sy þæt ylfa þe him sie þis him mæg to*

bote, have led other scholars to view *Gif hors ofscoten sie* as evidence of an Anglo-Saxon belief that supernatural creatures caused physical maladies by means of projectile attacks (198–200). Hall argues that this charm in no way provides evidence for such an interpretation, but rather the text is for a livestock affliction and ends with a statement to the effect that the remedy is also good for afflictions caused by elves as well (200–1). Hall's second focus is to formulate a sense of what Anglo-Saxons assumed the effects of *ælf* were. Turning attention to the opaque compound *ælfsoġoða* found in a remedy contained in the *Læceboꝥ III*, *Wið ælfsoġoða*, Hall notes that it seems to be a subset of *soġoða*, a "pain within the torso," caused by elves and a subset of the general *æfladl* or 'elf-ailment' (202–4). Hall stresses that *Gif hors ofscoten sie* and the *Wið ælfsoġoða* provide no evidence of how elves caused afflictions, especially that there is no indication of any projectile (205). In his conclusion Hall finishes off with some notes on the well-known OE metrical charm *Wið færstice* "Against a Sudden Stitch," an elf-related remedy which does make overt reference to projectiles. Although one would see the *sper*e 'spear' of *Wið færstice* as evidence of elven darts, the polysemy of *gescot* as either 'shot' or 'distension, internal pains' (as in the *Gif hors ofscoten sie* text), suggest a likely scenario that *gescot* is synonymous with *færstice* 'a sudden-pain', rather than with *sper*e. Hall's second point is that 'elf-shot', as in *Gif hors ofscoten sie* and *Wið ælfsoġoða*, is only one possibility among several, not the only possible cause of the affliction, and that we must be willing to examine Old English medical texts "with an eye to the semantic complexities of its vocabulary" (205–7).

Ursula Lenker's "The Rites and Ministries of the Canons: Liturgical Rubrics to Vernacular Gospels and their Functions in a European Context," *The Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Gittos and Bedingfield, 185–212, examines the origin and usage of liturgical rubrics in vernacular Gospels in the late Anglo-Saxon, twelfth-century German, and tenth-century French traditions. The West-Saxon Gospels and a twelfth-century German Gospel have much in common, in that in each tradition, the text has been augmented with marginal rubrics indicating the pericopes according to the liturgical year. This is curious, as this would be of no use for a mass, which would have had the Gospel passages read in Latin. Lenker's article focuses on a comparison of the English and German texts to gain a sense of the similarity of their form and function, explores a tenth-century French homiletic fragment in order to gain insight into the actual practice and preparation of vernacular homilies, and finally attributes the existence of similar manuscripts in England and Germany to the influence of

the *Rule of Chrodegang*, which supported the preaching of the Gospel to the laity. The Gospels marked with liturgical notes were used by preachers not "during, but outside, the liturgy of the mass, and not instead of, but in addition to, Latin mass-books" (199). A homily on Jonah in the tenth-century French MS Valenciennes 571 provides valuable insight on the preparation of such vernacular homilies. In this Latin-Old French bilingual text "jottings were intended for the preacher's own private use on the special occasion of delivering the homily." Such texts are rarities, because after their use, "they become redundant," and are not preserved, providing few surviving examples (204). Finally, another drive for the creation of liturgical Gospels was the *Rule of Chrodegang*, known well by Bishop Leofric of Exeter, where many homilies were produced. The division of the Gospel into pericopes follows exactly the precepts set forth by the *Rule*, and would have been known in Germany as well, thus accounting for the strong similarities evidenced in the manuscripts (204–11).

Alexandra Hennessey Olsen's "Proteus in Latin: Vernacular Tradition and the Boniface Collection," *New Directions in Oral Theory: Essays on Ancient and Medieval Literatures*, ed. Mark C. Amodio (Tempe: ACMRS), 107–124, examines the often overlooked imprint of vernacular literature and culture present in the Latin works of medieval Germania. Olsen provides a detailed look at a group of approximately 150 letters written in Latin by St. Boniface, his successor, members of their mission to Germany, and friends in England, all of which date to the first decades of the eighth century (108). Despite the view that epistles are an unlikely place to look for Germanic influence, given the writers' adherence to the classical epistolary tradition (109–110), Olsen provides ample evidence of Anglo-Saxon poetics within the corpus. In addition to pointing out the very clear influences of Old English poetry such as alliteration, Olsen looks mainly to themes and *topoi* more at home among the dolorous *scops*: the Journey to Trial, the Sea Voyage, and Exile (110). That these themes hint at an Anglo-Saxon origin is bolstered by Olsen's assertion that these characteristics are found only in letters to and from Boniface's friends and fellow missionaries, whereas Boniface's letters to others are devoid of this imagery (111). Throughout her article Olsen supports each of the three themes with ample examples from the Boniface collection, which allow her to conclude that "the monks and nuns associated with the Boniface collection experience a spiritual crisis analogous to what later writers call the Dark Night of the Soul" and that "it was the tradition of participation in the composition of poems that enabled [them] to

engage the poetic tradition although writing in a different language and to speak of their own Dark Night of the Soul" (124).

Kathrin Prietzel provides a summary of her master's thesis in the article of the same name "Habban ond healdan"—Gefolgsherren und Gefolgsmänner in der altenglischen Literatur," *Englische Sprachwissenschaft und Mediävistik*, ed. Gabriele Knappe (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang), 325–36. Prietzel poses several questions in her examination of the Anglo-Saxon lord-retainer relationship: How is the relationship between lord and retainer represented in the fictional and non-fictional literature? Which moments define the relationship? How do the various mechanisms within the retinue function? and, finally, What sort of picture of society can one derive from these examinations? (327). Prietzel draws on the poetic texts *Beowulf* (including its *Finnsburh Episode*), *The Finnsburh Fragment*, *The Battle of Maldon*, on the one hand, and the primary historical texts *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, on the other. These two categories of texts are meant to provide Prietzel the chance to compare "factual" representations of the lord-retainer relationship against the poetic representations of the *comitatus*. Other poetic texts such as *Christ and Satan*, *Deor*, and *The Wanderer* are also addressed. Prietzel views the lord-retainer relationship as an historical extension of the loyalties present in the kinship group. The strife between Cynewulf and Cyneheard in the *Chronicle*, and its problem of kinship loyalty versus loyalty to one's lord are seen as evidence that Anglo-Saxon society had already begun to step away from traditional systems of social organization and toward a society built on political institutions (328–29). The rituals, e.g. gift-giving and oath-swearing, and perhaps more importantly, the locus of these rituals—the hall—present another important source of information regarding the retinue, where the hall "functions as a symbol and architectonic manifestation of the mutual bond between retainer and lord" (331). Prietzel's final focus is on the issue of loyalty as presented in her corpus, as well as its opposite in the form of betrayal. Her conclusions are that there exists an asymmetrical duty between lord and thane, where the retainer is obligated to fight for his lord, to seek revenge for his death, and to serve him until death, yet the lord is in no way beholden to the same obligations. Lords, however, are bound to provide their retainers with protection (331). It is telling that whereas the death of a retainer means to the lord merely the death of a friend or warrior, the death of the lord represents the annihilation of the retainer's position in society. Moreover, a retainer without a

lord is as alone as a man without a kinship group (333). One can return here to the *habban ond healdan* of the title, where a lord possesses a retinue until the retainer's death (*habban*), yet a retainer's obligations to his lord endure and continue to exist past the death of the lord, often into exile (*healdan*) (327, 335).

Two key focal points of Paul Remley's "Aldhelm as Old English Poet: *Exodus*, Asser, and the *Dicta Ælfredi*," *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O'Brien O'Keefe and Orchard, I: 90–108, are the Aldhelmian style of the Old English poem *Exodus* and the tracing of the lost hagiographical tradition which preserved Aldhelm's notoriety as an accomplished vernacular poet well into the twelfth century. Anecdotal evidence of Aldhelm's vernacular poetry is present in John of Worcester's *Chronica chronicarum* and William of Malmesbury's *Gesta pontificum Anglorum* to the effect that Aldhelm's poetry was highly regarded and that the subject matter of his compositions was biblical (90–92). Strong lexical similarities between the Old English *Exodus* and Aldhelm's *Carmen de virginitate* and other Latin compositions suggest three principal explanations: Aldhelm himself is the author of the *Exodus*, the *Exodus* poet drew on Aldhelm's Old English poetry as a model, or the *Exodus* poet was intimately familiar with Aldhelm's Latin poetry. Remley is cautious in not settling on an explanation, but does emphasize that Aldhelm's familiarity with vernacular poetry and the possibility of his being a famed vernacular poet. The remainder of the article focuses on how writers of the twelfth century could have been aware of Aldhelm's vernacular poetry, and the hagiographical ties between Aldhelm's period, the late ninth century and post-Conquest England. Drawing on evidence from stylistic similarities between the twelfth-century *Dicta Ælfredi* (included in MS CUL Kk. 4.6) and Asser's writings, Remley suggests that after Aldhelm's death, a hagiographical account of his life existed and which Asser and possibly King Alfred revised and included in an all but lost work known as the *dicta regis Ælfredi*. Although William of Malmesbury identifies the sources for his knowledge of Aldhelm as Alfred's *enchiridion*, it may be in actuality the *Dicta Ælfredi* (95–101). Remley's work provides not only additional insights into Aldhelm's ability as a poet in Old English, but also uncovers lost portions of the Anglo-Latin hagiographical tradition.

Bede's parable of the sparrow and the meadhall, a piece well-known to students of Old English language and literature, provides the basis for Fred Robinson's "Possible biblical resonances in Bede's presentation of the conversion of the English," *Text and Language in Medieval English Prose: A Festschrift for Tadao Kubouchi*,

ed. Oizumi et al., 207–13. After comparing the Latin text of Bede and its Old English translation, Robinson contends with Donald Fry's (1979) statement to the effect that the sparrow and the hall are an allusion to Psalm 83, and that the wise counselor might have already been a Christian living among pagans (209). Robinson is quick to point out that there is good reason to view the counselor as still pagan, e.g. he includes himself among the pagans with statements such as *we ne cunnon* 'we know not', and that there are other Psalms which could serve as better allusions than Psalm 83. Robinson follows this critique by demonstrating that a phrase with greater potential to be a biblical allusion, the Old English text's *bið an eagan bryhtm ond þæt læsse fæc* and I Corinthians 15:52 *in momento, in ictu oculi* 'in an instant, in the blinking of an eye', is more likely a coincidence, as numerous Germanic languages possess similar idiomatic phrases (209–10). However, Robinson does not leave the discussion here; rather, he argues that the words of the counselor represent Bede's ingenuity in writing a text which enables the Christian Anglo-Saxons to come to terms with their pagan past and still retain a sense of dignity and pride in their forebears (210–11).

Angelika Schröcker has provided a portion of her dissertational work in "MS Cotton Tiberius C.i and questions of (public) penance in late Anglo-Saxon England," *Englische Sprachwissenschaft und Mediävistik*, ed. Knappe [see sect. 3b], 337–50. Despite the existence of several penitential texts from the Anglo-Saxon period, there is scant information regarding the actual process of confession. Schröcker seeks to add to our knowledge of the act of public penance in England of this time through close analysis of a text contained in the manuscript of the title (338–39). After providing an overview of the three types of penance (personal, public, and private) in existence in Insular and Carolingian Europe of the time, Schröcker notes that most scholarship has been conducted with an emphasis on tracing the evolution of private confession in early medieval Europe. Her analysis of Cotton Tiberius C.i seeks to demonstrate that public confession was present in eleventh-century England (339–42). The key to identifying evidence for public penance is demonstrating that the penitential text was for episcopal use only, as only bishops were entitled to provide public penance (342). Schröcker follows the overview of the problem with an extremely detailed codicological analysis of Tiberius C.i, pointing out that the Old English penitential texts were written for use by a bishop (343–45). There are five texts relevant to Schröcker's study, designated *Lit. 4.3.4, Conf 9.4, Conf 9.1, HomM 7, and Conf 10.4*, respectively. An analysis

of *Conf 9.1* suggests that the changes in pronoun usage, first person singular at the beginning in the phrase "I confess," then switching to first person plural at the end of the confession, and a final absolution addressing the second person plural *eow*, indicate a text for congregational recitation followed by public absolution by a bishop (347–48). Schröcker concludes that the "textual evidence in Tiberius C.i could therefore point to a mixture of both 'private' and 'public' penance and a liturgical administration that combined elements of both procedures," thus adding to our understanding of public penance in Anglo-Saxon England.

DPAS

Michael Alexander's short, impressionistic essay, "Angels in Bede, Demons in *Beowulf*," *Anges et Démons dans la littérature anglaise au Moyen Âge*, ed. Leo Carruthers (Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2002), 29–37, muses over "unexplained wonders" in the forms of angels and demons in Bede's *Historia* and in *Beowulf*—wonders, moreover, that Alexander believes we should hesitate to ascribe to the credulity of an earlier age that we assume was less skeptical than ours regarding the supernatural world. Alexander briefly recounts instances of references to angels (and some miracles) in Bede's *Historia* (as well as in *Dream of the Rood* and *Chanson de Roland*) that, in Alexander's mind, "appear to those who need direction—to thinking figures like Edwin [Book 2, Chapter 12], solitary, turning things over in their minds like Aeneas, seated like Rodin's *Le Penseur*: dreamers." Further, it is "to such solitudes, not the feasters and fighters of Old English poetry, that messages are sent." *Beowulf*, by contrast, "has no ... black devils, and no archangels," because "it is set in a pre-Christian world" in which "there are no demons, only monsters" (32). Alexander admits that Grendel is often "given names consistent with demonic status" (33), but he is also a stranger, a monster, a beast (maybe even a wolf or a bear), a troll, an enemy, a man-eating animal, a man. Ultimately, "Old English poetry is enigmatic in style, and the borders of orders of being are hard to determine" (34), but we can affirm nevertheless that "both angels and demons appear in human form in Anglo-Saxon culture" (35). Alexander concludes his essay with a consideration of the dragon in *Beowulf* as, alternatively, possessiveness and meanness, "a mythical encounter with death," curses upon grave-goods, and "more pointedly," the "threat of a coastal raid from the hall-burning Vikings in their dragon-ships" (36).

In her essay "A Millennium in Medicine? New Medical Texts and Ideas in England in the Eleventh Century," *Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Cyril Roy Hart*, ed.

Keynes and Smyth [see sect. 2], 230–42, Debby Banham's aim is to "establish the character and extent of ... important but previously obscure changes in early medieval English medical knowledge" close to the "supposedly momentous" arrival of the year 1000. These changes "represent a process whereby English medical thought moved into [the] mainstream" of Latin west European medicine, "or at least made contact with it" (230). In her work on the electronic Thorndike and Kibre project (a revised and expanded electronic edition of Lynn Thorndike and Pearl Kibre, *A Catalogue of Incipits of Medieval Medical and Scientific Texts in Latin* [London, 1963]), Banham has "realized that the medical writings in eleventh-century English manuscripts are by and large very different from the well-known tenth-century Anglo-Saxon medical texts," and these differences may very well "represent considerable changes in English medicine toward the end of the Anglo-Saxon period" (231). In Banham's mind, there are only a few tangential relationships between texts such as the *Herbarius* and Bald's *Leechbook* and the ones that came into England in the eleventh century—primarily, the *Passionarius Galieni, Liber tertius, Practica Petrocelli, Liber Aurelii, Liber Esculapii, Peri didaxeon*, Byrhtferth's "Ramsey Compendium," and the fragments from pseudo-Soranus, *In artem medendi isagoge* (all of which are listed in a table Banham provides of "Manuscripts containing medical material in Old English, or deriving from England before the end of the eleventh century," 236–38). As to the primary differences between the two groups: 1) "there is hardly any Latin medicine in tenth-century or earlier manuscripts" with the exception of the Latin *Herbarius* and prognostics; 2) "new types of text appear in English manuscripts of the eleventh century" which are much more theoretically and systematically sophisticated; 3) the eleventh-century manuscripts are more "cosmopolitan" in their use of attribution and are "much more aware of their place in a tradition going back to Greek texts and practice"; 4) the recipes included in the eleventh-century manuscripts are much more "polypharmic" and also include more exotic ingredients, whereas the recipes in tenth-century manuscripts are more suited to native English ingredients; 5) the eleventh-century texts are much more scrupulous with regard to units of measurement; and 6) "the vocabulary of the new texts is much more technical than that of those already known in England" (233–35). Banham considers the establishment "on textual grounds" of "what the continental sources of the new texts might have been" to be an "urgent desideratum"; yet it might be possible to say something at present, based on other kinds of evidence,

about continental connections (236). It is possible, Banham conjectures, that Latin-educated physicians may have immigrated to England in the eleventh century (both before and after the Norman Conquest), bringing their books with them. Banham notes the mention in Ælfric Bata's *Colloquies* of a gardener (*hortulanus*) who is also a physician (*medicus*), and who is "*francigena*, rather than English or Greek" (240), indicating both the influence of Continental medical knowledge as well as the possibility that Greek medicine may have been known in England in the early eleventh century. Banham also conjectures that Abbo of Fleury, who taught at Ramsey in 985–87, might have brought into England the type of more precisely measured medical recipes that find their way into manuscripts such as Byrhtferth's "Ramsey Compendium." Although it would still be "some half a century (discounting the contribution of Bata's *medicus*, if he existed) before more substantial manifestations of up-to-date European medicine arrived" in England (242).

The Anglo-Saxon view of paradise as a "deeply rural idyll," and the possibility that this is "in some significant degree idiosyncratic," is the subject of Kathleen Barrar's essay, "A Spacious, Green and Hospitable Land: Paradise in Old English Poetry," *Bull. Of the John Rylands Univ. Library of Manchester* 86.2 (Summer 2004): 105–25. Barrar searches for the provenance of formulaic descriptions of paradise in Old English poetry and discovers that certain "motifs and ideas" are from "cultures which came to England with Christianity" and others "seem to be particularly Anglo-Saxon." More specifically, Barrar looks to external sources which may have "fed ideas into the stockpot of Old English poetry on paradise," which include the Vulgate Bible, apocryphal and patristic literature (especially of the hexameral tradition), late Latin poetry, and Latin hagiography and sermons (105). Reviewing the Vulgate Book of Genesis, which likely influenced the author of the Old English *Genesis* poems, Barrar nevertheless discovers that it is the Garden of Eden as the site of human sin and alienation from God, rather than as a heaven-like paradise, that receives the bulk of the narrative attention. It may be, as Barrar notes, that the Old Testament may not be the best source for lush descriptions of paradise, since when these do appear in early Christian writings, they are typically derived from the Apocryphal tradition and from classical notions of the *locus amoenus*, which include the motifs of: sweetly odiferous and ever-blooming vegetation, temperate weather, friendly and attractive birdlife, and ground watered by natural springs. These are the motifs that also show up, frequently, in Old English poems that treat the theme

of paradise. Most important, the Anglo-Saxon paradise is always “green,” and a “composite picture would show it as a wide open plain, decorated by trees permanently in leaf; irrigated by streams; filled with blossom and fruit; scented; filled with birdsong and characterized by lists of negative formulas” (108). Barrar notes Hugh Magennis’s discussion of the “formulaic regularity with which green landscapes occur throughout the religious poetry and particularly in *Genesis A*,” which he sees “as coming from both the imported Romano-Christian tradition and a native Germanic tradition” (109). In addition, the notion of hospitality is central in the paradise of *Genesis A* (especially at lines 208–17), such that we might conclude that “the notion of a rural paradise which is particularly welcoming to guests appears to combine the notion of the rural classical paradise with the importance that Germanic societies gave to hospitality and exchange of gifts.” Also particular to the Anglo-Saxon representation of paradise is the idea of spaciousness, *ofer rumne grund*, which is somewhat antithetical to the Christian/classical idea of an enclosed or gated garden: “in the *Genesis* poems alone there are approximately thirty-nine references to the quality of broadness in land and sea” (111). In the wide use in Old English poetry of the classical paradisaic woodland element, Barrar sees a “peculiarly Old English flavor” in, for example, the suggestion of “a flat earth, decorated at the corners with branches and leaves” in the Song of Creation in *Beowulf* (114). In Barrar’s view, it seems “very likely that woodlands would have had a symbolic value for Anglo-Saxons that well preceded the advent of Christianity,” especially if we believe, following the thought of certain anthropologists, that “amongst Teutonic tribes the oldest sanctuaries were woods” (116, 117). There are also quite a few references in the Christian literature of the Anglo-Saxons that bears out the idea that part of the conversion process involved dispelling (or syncretizing with stories of the Cross) the myth of trees possessing sacred power. Barrar next considers what she sees as “the remarkable similarity” between Eden and postlapsarian earthly paradises in such works as *The Phoenix* and the Guthlac poems, and she also reviews images of the paradise of the afterlife—the celestial heaven—in *Genesis A*, *Judgement Day II*, and *Christ and Satan*, where she finds the recurrence of the images of “green ways” and “green streets,” which have parallels in Old Norse and Old Saxon poetry. In the *Genesis* poems and in *Christ III*, Barrar details references to God “settling” his people, which is always connected to the paradisaic motif of spacious land, and this would appear to be conversant with the “language of a people for whom expansion through migration still

seemed desirable.” Therefore, this view of the land “became central to their view of paradise” (125).

Jerome’s *Vita Malchi monachi* and its relation to an emphasis on the cenobitic and more “ordinary” monastic lifestyle in the tenth-century English Benedictine Reform is the subject of Katharine Scarfe Beckett’s “Worcester Sauce: Malchus in Anglo-Saxon England,” *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O’Brien O’Keefe and Orchard, II:212–31. Although, as Beckett points out, stories of the Desert Fathers clearly inspired in Ireland and England certain anchoritic tendencies (think of native hermits such as Cuthbert and Guthlac), by the end of the Anglo-Saxon period (and thanks partly to writings by Bede and Ælfric that promoted “teaching and preaching” over solitary contemplation), “the Benedictine Reform had brought the obligations and regulations of monastic community prominently to the fore” (214). The Latin *Vita malchi monachi*, which may have been known in England by the end of the eighth century, would have been particularly appealing to those interested in the life of a more “ordinary” and “human” saint. This *Vita* concerns the story of a sort of accidental desert saint, Malchus, who, after leaving his monastery against the orders of his abbot, is kidnapped by Saracens as a slave and forced to herd sheep in the desert. He is also coerced at sword-point to take another kidnapped slave, a young married woman, as his wife. Agreeing to live together in chastity, they eventually escape their captors, fleeing across river and desert, and Malchus makes it back to his monastery with his chastity intact. By way of demonstrating how Malchus’s story may have been well-known in Anglo-Saxon England, Beckett discusses Aldhelm’s treatment of Malchus in the thirty-first chapter of his prose *De laudibus virginitate*, as well as Ælfric’s version of Malchus’s life (a companion to his *Judith*), which, unfortunately, has not survived to the present day except as a fragment. Because the Cotton Otho B.x manuscript is believed to have originated in Worcester around the middle of the eleventh century, Beckett believes that Ælfric’s *Judith* and *Malchus* “are clearly relevant to nuns at Worcester as elements in a ‘feminine library’ along with, for example, copies of Æthelwold’s translation of the *Regula S. Benedicti*” (218). Beckett turns next to the anonymous translation into Old English of Jerome’s *Vita Malchi monachi* which survives in one manuscript: BL Cotton Otho C.i, vol. 2, fols. 139v–143v. Although this translation has attracted little scholarly attention, Beckett believes that Aldhelm’s and Ælfric’s interest in Malchus’s *Vita* necessitates giving this text a “closer look” especially given its inclusion in a manuscript that is a miscellany of texts “useful for cultivating monastic virtue in the vernacular”

(219): a copy of the Old English translation of Gregory's *Dialogi*, Old English translations of two other stories concerning the chastity of desert hermits from Book V of the *Vitae Patrum*, a translation of Boniface's letter to Eadburga, and several homilies in Old English. Beckett details the alterations of the Latin legend in the Old English translation, paying special attention to references to chaste behavior, which, in the Old English version, display more "sensitivity concerning physical closeness" and also tone down "any suggestion of physical intimacy" (222). By the time the Old English *Malchus* was copied, "the Worcester scriptorium had acquired or produced a large number of reform-related books and documents, most likely under the direct influence of Wulfstan," and although Wulfstan himself led a strict ascetic lifestyle, in Beckett's view, "his choice of vernacular examples from the *Vitas Patrum* argues for a teacher who was aware of ordinary human circumstances among his flock, such as a deficiency of Latinate monastic heroism" (224).

Calling into critical question the supposed diachronic transition from the "ritualized" elements of ninth- and tenth-century liturgical practice to the more representational religious "dramas" of later periods, by which many scholars extrapolate a kind of Darwinian development of the genre of drama (from liturgical ritual to secular theater) is the objective of M. Bradford Bedingfield's "Ritual and Drama in Anglo-Saxon England: The Dangers of the Diachronic Perspective," *The Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Gittos and Bedingfield, 291–317. The problem with this diachronic perspective (exemplified in significant works such as O.B. Hardison's *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages* [Baltimore, 1965]) is that it "examines these rituals as if they were proto-plays, rather than liturgy, giving more weight to dramaturgical tricks such as designation of roles, costuming, and scenic elaborations," which are essentially anachronistic criteria (296). Bedingfield argues that those who developed dramatic "ceremonies" for their medieval congregations, such as the *Quem quaeritis* rituals, "were not interested in creating a 'logical sequence based on cause and effect' or unity of time, but rather in strengthening the faith of the congregation by giving them multiple opportunities to see the proofs of Christ's resurrection" (298). Bedingfield admits that he is not the first critic to point out the deficiencies of such anachronistic readings, yet the "perception of the fledgling development of these liturgical plays remains, as is evident in the way critics [still] refer to them as 'quasi-plays,' or 'proto-drama,'" and this "forces upon us a diachronic view of this 'church drama,' leading up to the cycle plays." It is important to

"appreciate ceremonial and formulaic devices as ritually powerful rather than dramatically unrealistic" (300). Further, "[i]t makes a difference, in understanding the functions of liturgical elaborations and innovations, that the participants in the Concordia's *Visitatio* were Anglo-Saxons, and that those in the Fleury plays were twelfth-century Frenchmen." (And yet to imply there was no cultural traffic between England and France both before and after the Norman Conquest, or to discount its possible effects, begs quite a few questions.) So, to understand fully the meaning and use of the *Visitatio*, "we must look at whatever contextual material we can find, and then ratchet our own interpretations to the liturgical, aesthetic, and social predispositions of those who make the liturgy a performative action, rather than simply a set of forms in a book" (302). What emerges from the study of the performative aspects of Anglo-Saxon liturgy, which has received scant critical attention, in Bedingfield's view, are two perspectives: "(1) Some Anglo-Saxon redactors and interpreters of the liturgy emphasized the participatory role of the congregation over the actions of priests and deacons, who, misleadingly, tend to draw critical focus in diachronic surveys of liturgical drama; (2) Some Anglo-Saxon innovations to the liturgy indicate an interest in a more 'dramatic' participation in the liturgy that is not confined to the period around Easter" (303). Moreover, "in forms inherited from continental models and in those developed creatively by the Anglo-Saxon church (insofar as we can identify these), it is [the] strategy of sympathetic connection [between the congregants and biblical figures], a sort of ritualistic role-playing, that allows us to describe liturgical ritual in dramatic terms" (305). Bedingfield admits the difficulties of trying to discern dramatic, participatory aesthetics from inert texts, raising the question of whether or not it is possible to "determine in any way what the Anglo-Saxons thought themselves to be doing in the commemoration of biblical events in the liturgy" (305). Nevertheless, Anglo-Saxon England "is unusual (in terms of what evidence has survived) in the tenth and eleventh centuries in that only here [and not on the Continent] do we find a body of commentary (both direct and indirect) on what is being done in these ceremonies" (306). The *Regularis Concordia*, for example, has very detailed instructions for its performance—instructions that indicate the interest of the Anglo-Saxon church in sympathetic "participatory interaction with biblical events" (307). Bedingfield then goes on to analyze more closely the instructions in the *RegC* for three festivals—Palm Sunday, Candlemas, and Easter—which he supplements with an emphasis

on Ælfric's discussions of the congregation's role in the liturgy. Ultimately, it would appear that many Anglo-Saxon preachers and liturgical redactors were attempting to nurture "the consciousness of the participants that what they are doing involves an assumption of roles, a 're-enactment,'" and those "enhancements to the liturgy that seem to many critics to harbingers the birth of drama are there not for the sake of representation, but rather to facilitate this dynamic" (314).

Melissa Joy Bernstein's Ph.D. dissertation, "Concealment and Revelation: Fatherhood in the Literature of Anglo-Saxon England," Univ. of Rochester, 2004 (*DAI* 65A: 2981) "examines paternity in Old English literature, especially in terms of how clerical texts model 'fatherhood' for priests and abbots, and secular texts model 'fatherhood' in terms of kingship" (viii). Chapter One, "Concealment and Revelation: Father and Son in the Secular-Religious Text," reviews the appearance of these concepts in early Christian commentary on the binding of Isaac by Abraham, in two Old English homilies, and in the Old English *Maxims*. Chapter Two, "Sheep in Wolves' Clothing: Concealment and Revelation in the Lives of Saints Eugenia and Eufrasia," looks at two Old English female saints' legends that are about women who disguise themselves as men in order to enter monastic life and that also "allegorically allow us to see the female body comprising wolfish sexual temptation" (viii). Exploring "non-biological fatherhood," this chapter also investigates women who take on paternal, "fathering" roles in the Church community. Chapter Three, "Concealment and Revelation: Kingship, Fatherhood, and Anglo-Saxon Secular Literature," explores men who "father" through kingship in the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre* and *Beowulf*. Ultimately, Bernstein offers a model of reading these texts that incorporates certain aspects of medieval exegesis in order to get at the "concealed" truth about fatherhood in these narratives—that for the monastic communities that produced them, fatherhood on earth mirrored a divine patriarchy.

The "dynamic," "living," and "flexible" documents of the evolutionary transformations of the traditional legends of three saints culted in medieval England—Mary of Egypt, Guthbert, and Guthlac—are the subject of John R. Black's Ph.D. dissertation, "Tradition and Transformation in Text and Image in the Cults of Mary of Egypt, Guthbert, and Guthlac: Changing Conceptualizations of Sainthood in Medieval England," U of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004 (*DAI* 65A: 2595). By examining the corpus of materials, both narrative and visual, for each saint, and by "analyzing the variations introduced into the corpus from c. 700 to c. 1300 in medieval

England," Black explores "how changes introduced into selected representations of each saint in text (Latin, Old English, and Middle English) and image (illuminated manuscript, stonework, stained glass, fresco, and wax) over the course of the period indicate that the traditions of the saint were being told and retold, written and rewritten, and imaged and re-imaged for many different purposes" (iii). More specifically, his dissertation focuses on "how changes in the presentations of the selected saints reflect ongoing discussions within the early Church over the *via sancta* (as exemplified in the tensions between cenobitism and eremitism) and evince appropriation of saints' cults for non-devotional purposes in the later Middle Ages" (iii–iv).

Readings in Medieval Texts: Interpreting Old and Middle English Literature, edited by David F. Johnson and Elaine Treharne (Oxford: Oxford UP) is "intended principally for literature students undertaking courses in Old and Middle English, and aims to assist them in reading a body of literature that can often appear alien at first glance." All of the chapters are written by "experienced university teachers, who bring to bear on their chapters a knowledge of the difficulties encountered by students on their introduction to medieval literature." Each chapter addresses a specific genre and a set of texts associated with that genre: "Characteristics of the particular work under consideration are elucidated, scholarly criticism is evaluated, and reading strategies are proposed to highlight particular methods and approaches of understanding the nature, form, and function of the texts." These "reading strategies" can then "be applied to numerous other medieval texts" and can also provide "a useful starting-point for students in their work on this substantial corpus of literature" (Johnson and Treharne, 1). This reviewer would add that, in addition to providing helpful points of introduction for reading medieval literature, more than several of the chapters make entirely new and provocative arguments about certain texts. Treharne supplies the opening chapter, "The Context of Medieval Literature" (7–14), which provides a brief overview of the key aspects of manuscript culture in a period in which all texts were produced by scribes, covers the concepts of date, authority, audience, and authorship, and briefly treats the themes of tradition and innovation.

In his contribution, "Old English Heroic Literature" (75–90), Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr. begins with the fact that there is no word for "hero" in Old English, although for "warrior" there are at least seventy or so, "expressing a vast spectrum of nuances" (75). We are reminded, then, that what we think of as "heroic" literature is a post-Renaissance as well as a post-Romantic invention of

sorts, although we can define the Old English literary genre called "heroic" as fatalistic poems that concern "warriors endowed with often superhuman courage whose actions are motivated by a special set of values, the 'heroic ethos,'" and unlike modern heroes, their stories often end in defeat, not triumph, yet they are left with the "satisfaction of posthumous fame" (76). Bremmer then outlines this "heroic ethos" with reference to the traditions of early medieval Continental Germany that emphasized loyalty to the leader and warrior-band, generosity, fairness in military conduct, and ambition for praise and fame, and to the appearance of these heroic themes in Old English texts such as *Maxims*, *Beowulf*, *Widsith*, *Deor*, *Waldere*, *Battle of Brunanburh*, *Battle of Maldon*, and the *Finnsburgh Fragment*. Bremmer usefully notes that in so-called "factual" historical sources, "we find few traces of the heroic ideal," and this "paucity of information must alert us to a possible discrepancy between the ideal as expressed in works of literature and its practical application or modification as we find it in, for example, annalistic narratives such as the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle" (78). Bremmer also notes that in the heroic literature, especially in *Beowulf*, the "finer workings" of the warrior ethos are explored, such that "not only the ideals but also the shortcomings of the heroic ethos are critically sounded" (85).

In her Ph.D. dissertation, "Interpreting the Monstrous Word: Reading through Context and Memory in the Compilations *Junius 11* and *Lebor na hUidre*," Boston College, *DAI* 66A: 1349, Lisabeth Claire Buchelt situates her work at the "intersection of medieval theologian and mystic John Scotus Eriugena's blending of Pseudo-Dionysian and Augustinian theories about the inherently deformed nature of discursive language, negative theology, and early Christian ideas about the natures of Christ and Satan," in order to examine "the ways in which 'secular' and 'sacred' texts wrestle with the challenges of a transmission system that was both oral- and text-based." She compares Old English poetic texts from Oxford, Bodl. Lib. MS Junius 11 with the medieval Irish *Lebor na hUidre* ("Book of the Dun Cow"), utilizing the medieval reading practice of *lectio divina*: an "associative" as opposed to a "linear" monastic reading practice "in which readers allowed the text at hand to engage with other texts they had in their memories," and which allowed the reader to create ephemeral "textual moments" that often blended the sacred and the secular. Ultimately, Buchelt wants to postulate a "group" of such textual moments based upon "both the extant manuscripts known to have been part of each monastic institution's library [Christ Church, Canterbury in England and Clonmacnois in

Ireland], as well as those that were likely to have been known by an educated Anglo-Saxon or Irish religious." In addition to an Introduction, "The Books that Would be Written," and a Conclusion, "Here Be Monsters," the dissertation comprises six chapters: "Christ Church Canterbury and Clonmacnois: Contextualizing Codices, Compilers, and Audience"; "Reading the Non-Human in Scripture's Monstrous Other: *The Gospel of Nicodemus*"; "Communal Memory and Re-Collection: Old English *Genesis* and Wasting Sickness of *Cú Chulainn*"; "Taking the Representation Show on the Road: Old English *Exodus*, the Intoxication of the *Ulaid*, and *Voyage of Máel Dún*"; "Embodying Words: Old English *Daniel* and *The Two Sorrows of the Kingdom of Heaven*"; and "'Ye of Little Faith': Convincing Doubting Thomases in *Christ and Satan* and *The Phantom Chariot of Cú Chulainn*."

Some of the most interesting work in Anglo-Saxon studies has been dismantling and calling into question the supposed divide between the "Old" and the "Middle" of medieval English: see, for example, the essays collected in Mary Swan and Elaine Treharne's *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 2006). In his important essay, "Between the Old and the Middle of English," *New Medieval Literatures* 7: 203–21, more recently expanded upon in his book *The Grounds of English Literature, 1006–1330* (Oxford, 2007), Christopher Cannon wishes to trace the "funny way" in which the term "early Middle English" is "rarely taken to be the defining condition of a particular text or texts," such that "accounts that might describe a text's language as early Middle English tend, rather, to treat all attributes of that text (accidence, grammar, lexis, codicological circumstance, textual affiliation) as separate entities, each of which can then be assigned to a different period." Further, "such a dissociation is often achieved by elevating the text to the status of literature, making it possible to place it in one moment of literary history and a different moment in the history of English." And in "all of these cases, the attributes of the object which might be called 'early Middle English' are defensibly identified in terms of the 'Old' that they retain or recall, or the 'Middle' that they anticipate or begin, but, by means of disciplinary commitments to the 'Old' and 'Middle' that are virtually ideological in their self-concealment, texts are often placed in these two periods without it ever being noticed that they have been placed in both of them" (204). Cannon argues that the problem that "historical description has had in accounting for early Middle English is rooted in a misunderstanding of the 'theoretical problem of periodization,' that what often goes awry in our sense of historical period ... is not an

overly Hegelian embrace of ‘homogeneous continuity,’ but rather, a general misunderstanding of the suppleness Hegel attributed to such unities.” We need to better recognize the complex dialecticism of early Middle English—how it consists of “changes” and “rejuvenescent transitions” (205). In order to illustrate his argument, Cannon looks at Derek Pearsall’s comparison of a supposedly “Old” and a later “Middle” English version of Ælfric’s homily, “The Twelve Abuses” (in Pearsall’s *Old English and Middle English Poetry*), where Pearsall conflates linguistic and codicological circumstances, such that what Pearsall calls “Old English” may “be much closer in date to what he calls ‘transition’ than to Ælfric, with the result that what is ... described as a substantial change in language over time could just as easily be described (were these facts clear) as two different aspects of a coincident variety” (208). Cannon also addresses the “strange fate” of the critical treatment of different copies of Æthelwold’s English translation of the *Rule* of St. Benedict, where “the attention paid to the manuscript record (if not always to manuscript dates) ... allows a spatial difference (between book and book) to act like a difference in time (between historical forms of English), and it is a method corrosive enough in the case of early Middle English to decompose even a single manuscript into layers which can then be treated as successive periods of time” (210). As an example of the latter situation, Cannon reviews the treatment of the “various” forms of English in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in Oxford, Bodleian MS Laud Misc. 636, which scholars often divide into three sections representing “Old English” or “Standard Late West-Saxon,” “trending toward Middle English,” and “incontrovertibly Middle English,” which often obscures the extent to which “the Chronicle contracts the ‘Old’ and the ‘Middle’ into the smallest of spans” (211). Given the fact that a great majority of Old English writing was copied or “compiled anew” in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it has “become clear” that what we “blithely term ‘Old English’ is often a lived aspect of a scribe’s linguistic competence,” and as Roy Liuzza has written regarding the scribes of the Old English Gospels, they “did not hesitate to gloss, translate, rearrange, supplement, diminish, or modernize, their text” (qtd. in Cannon, 212). Ultimately, scholars have mainly ignored “the extent to which substantially different kinds of English coincide in the long [historical] moment” between Old and Middle English (212). Cannon next turns to an historical account of how the confusion over early Middle English is partly connected to the rise in the nineteenth century of the discipline of English literary studies, in which discipline “philological certainty”

about “the kind of English that lay in the ‘Middle’ was parlayed into a canon of literature,” and scholarly attention to “the transitional nature of the literary attributes of a particular text” often overlooked “the much more stolidly ‘Old’ attributes of its language” (214, 215). Cannon asserts that to understand early Middle English “as a period both ‘unified’ and ‘complete’ ... would be to know it as that moment in which what we are otherwise accustomed to calling the ‘Old’ and the ‘Middle’ fully coincide,” and “its beginning would therefore be the beginning of that coincidence, its end the moment that the ‘Middle’ left the ‘Old’ entirely behind” (217). Even more important, is that we recognize that the period “in which attributes otherwise found separately as ‘Old’ and ‘Middle’ English coincide” is also the exact moment at which “the distinction between ‘Old’ and ‘Middle’ is annulled” (219). The most provocative conclusion drawn from all this is that the early Middle English texts may chiefly be known “by the extent to which they are difficult or impossible to date on the basis of language” (219). Further, “a text can be known to be in early Middle English simply because it is temporally unmoored” (220). What this ultimately means for our studies is a significant expansion of the canon of early Middle English literature that would “put before us, by means of settled criteria, a long moment in time, in which the nature of English writing and its attendant and defining attributes were themselves deeply—and therefore compellingly—unsettled” (221). This is a brilliant and complex essay which (along with Cannon’s book, cited above), signals, I believe, an important paradigm shift for scholars working on both sides of the so-called “Old” and “Middle” of English literature.

In “The Armour-Bearer in Abbo’s *Passio sancti Eadmundi* and Anglo-Saxon England,” *Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 36: 46–61, Paul Cavill addresses the issue of the source of Abbo’s account of Edmund’s martyrdom, which Abbo claimed to have received from Archbishop Dunstan who had supposedly heard it when he was a young man directly from the mouth of an elderly (or “beaten-down”) former armor-bearer of Edmund, who was apparently an eyewitness to Edmund’s martyrdom. Cavill begins by reviewing the scholarly debates regarding the historical plausibility (or lack thereof) of Edmund’s armor-bearer, as well as over whether or not Abbo could have possibly known anything about Edmund’s death from any direct source. Cavill himself ascribes to the view that the story “follows the conventional style of well-known Roman martyrdoms, especially that of St Sebastian,” and in this essay he wants to follow up on Dorothy Whitelock’s view (in her essay “Fact and Fiction in the Legend of St. Edmund”) that

Abbo would not have “drastically altered” what he heard from Dunstan, nor would Dunstan have indulged in “flamboyant lying” (qtd. in Cavill, 48). Cavill finds this response “over-literal,” especially given hagiography’s propensity for “flamboyant lying,” but the question he is more interested in pursuing here is: “If he could not be invented, what in Anglo-Saxon England was an ‘armor-bearer,’ or ‘sword-bearer?’” (48). More specifically, Cavill wants to investigate two terms—Latin *armiger* and OE *swurdbora*—which are used to describe the armor-bearer in Abbo’s and Ælfric’s accounts of the legend, respectively. He first reviews *swurdbora* and its variants in the Old English corpus, where it has been used to gloss, in addition to *armiger*, the Latin terms *spatarius*, *gladiator*, and *pugil*, and has also been used to denote specific persons who function as royal bodyguards. Cavill therefore deduces that *swurdbora* in Old English texts was mainly used to refer to “a sword-fighter and bodyguard or attendant for kings, and the extant texts indicate that the term denotes a special office” (50). On the other hand, *swurdbora* is found only as a translation for Latin terms, and only in Ælfric does it gloss *armiger*. Regarding how familiar *armiger* might have been as a role in Anglo-Saxon England, Cavill finds the other predominant Old English gloss for this Latin term is *wæpnbora*, or other terms that connote arms-bearing, but again, these terms only show up as translations of Latin words, never in contexts that are exclusively Old English. Cavill suggests that Abbo’s and Ælfric’s most important source for glossing *armiger* may have been the Bible, as it is used for “armor-bearer” there twenty-three times, typically to denote young men who serve and accompany important leaders. What all of the evidence “strongly suggests,” according to Cavill, is that “the role of *armiger* or *swurdbora* was not native to Anglo-Saxon England,” and if it did exist as a military institution, you would expect to find mention of it in sources such as the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle or the heroic poetry, or in the laws and charters (52). Further, “the only example of *sweordberend* [in OE texts], in the Old English *Genesis*, indicates that bearing a sword was typical of noblemen”—in other words, they bore their own swords (53). Cavill also reviews the use of *sweordhita* in the Anglo-Saxon law codes, and concludes that “[p]ossessing, being arrayed with, and disposing of rich arms was an aspect of power; but having a special officer to carry them into battle on behalf of their owners is not something that appears in Old English texts” (54). Whereas Ælfric may have been concerned about the veracity of the old man who was supposedly Edmund’s retainer, such that he drew upon the biblical tradition of the sword-bearer to lend him more authenticity,

Abbo’s *armiger* was a role that Abbo “might conceivably have been familiar with as a Frank, either as an historical reality or a contemporary one” (55). But in the final analysis, Cavill believes that both Ælfric and Abbo saw the armor-bearer as a “literary expedient, a topos, a way of giving the story some credibility,” and this fits well with the idea that Edmund’s *Passio* is ultimately “a tissue of borrowings from hagiography and the Bible” (56).

In “The Old English Elegy: A Historicization,” his contribution to *Readings in Medieval Texts: Interpreting Old and Middle English Literature*, ed. Johnson and Treharne, 30–45, Patrick W. Conner looks primarily at the Exeter Book poems—*The Wanderer*, *The Seafarer*, *The Riming Poem*, *Deor*, *Wulf and Eadwacer*, *The Wife’s Lament*, *Resignation A and B*, *The Husband’s Message*, and *The Ruin*—within the interrelated cultural contexts of the medieval monastery and prayer-guild. Taking the micro- or New Historicist approach, Conner makes the provocative statement that the elegy may not have been a ubiquitous genre of Anglo-Saxon culture, since “its presence in a single manuscript suggests that knowledge of the form was circumscribed,” and he wants to read the poems “against culturally important documents written in the same period and to relate them to the determining issues of the day,” especially in relation to the local context of Exeter. More specifically, Conner analyzes the charter or “Guild-statutes” of the Exeter burial guild, which is preserved on folio 75 of an eighth-century gospel book (London, BL, Cotton Tiberius B.v, vol. 1), and which is a contemporary textual witness “to Exonian culture at the time the elegies were copied” in the Exeter Book (31). As Conner relates, members of the guild “contracted with the monastic community for liturgies [for the recently deceased] ... during three regular meetings per year,” and this system “was probably a consequence of the social development of lay piety that arose in the attempt to graft monastic virtue onto noble families” (33). It is Conner’s contention that “several of the elegies in the Exeter Book once functioned to perpetuate, to guarantee, and to strengthen the social relationships necessary to the production of a monastic economic hegemony,” and these “same bonds were further strengthened in the feasts that were given at each of the three annual guild meetings.” And since such meetings “would have required programs of some sort,” the “reading of appropriate vernacular poems, such as the elegies, would have been in order.” This makes even more sense if we agree with Conner that the Old English elegy “appropriates the voice of an imperiled aristocrat grappling not merely with the transient nature of glory in the world, but with the intransigent nature

of human fate" (34). I wonder if this description will work with all of the elegies—is the speaker of *The Wanderer*, for example, an aristocrat? But perhaps Conner is implying a more subtle translation of voices, as it were, with "imperiled" being the key term. Conner's argument here is that the elegies "assert the value of monastic capital in such a world by employing a rhetoric which both identifies the subject of each poem with the reader, and defers that identification, forcing the reader to admit that he or she could yet become such a subject, and thus ensuring further participation in the monastic/guild enterprise" (34). Conner exemplifies his thesis with a close reading of *The Seafarer*, which he sees as presenting us with a "paradigm" for reading some (if not all) of the elegies—a paradigm that has four components: confession, production of desire, identification (between desire and the monastic capital that alleviates that desire), and exhortation, which "asks the reader directly to reproduce the conditions of monastic capital" (39). Within this paradigm, Conner also briefly treats *The Wanderer*, *The Riming Poem*, and *Resignation A and B*. The other poems Conner classifies as "laments," which, unlike the "elegies," do not "exhort one to participate in purchasing the production of the monastery. The laments do not sell salvation, the elegies do" (43).

Holiness and Masculinity in the Middle Ages, ed. P. H. Cullum and Katherine J. Lewis (Cardiff: U of Wales P, 2004), is the result of a conference organized by Cullum and Lewis at the University of Huddersfield in 2001. With both research and teaching interests in the intersection between gender and religion, and recognizing that interdisciplinary work between women's history and religion has been "very fruitful," Cullum and Lewis felt that "the issue of holiness and masculinity was an area that had not had much attention yet paid to it." They are particularly interested "in exploring the ways in which holiness has a bearing on masculinity, and masculinity has a bearing on holiness," and in also considering "the ways in which the performance of both holiness and masculinity intersected with, and was informed by other categories such as monasticism, kingship, mysticism, sanctity, body and age" (Cullum, "Introduction," 2). While focusing mainly on northern Europe and on the high and late Middle Ages, the volume also draws on other periods, such as fifth-century Syria and Reformation England. Three of the chapters in the book might be of interest to those working in Anglo-Saxon studies. In "Holiness and Masculinity in Aldhelm's *Opus Geminatum De virginitate*" (8–23), Emma Pettit addresses Aldhelm's prose *De virginitate* and its verse counterpart *Carmen*

de virginitate within the context of seventh-century England when churchmen "had the challenging task of formulating and introducing new statuses, identities and codes of behavior that would unite mainly adult aristocratic recruits, as well as distinguish them from the nominally Christian laity." In Pettit's view, men who entered monastic life were expected to "make more of a radical break with their secular lifestyles" than were women—in particular, they had to give up their military activities, whereas for women "there appears to have been much more continuity between the types of activities associated with their religious and secular lives"—while at the same time "the church still had to teach men that the relinquishment of their secular status did not necessarily mean a concomitant loss of masculinity." Therefore, this period of "social and religious transition ... provides a fruitful context in which to examine the culturally changeable concepts of holiness and masculinity," and Aldhelm's texts are ideal for exploring these contexts since they were intended "to provide guidance on sexual and social renunciation for people entering a monastic life," and can be seen to respond to the anxieties likely occasioned by these renunciations (8, 9). More specifically, Pettit wants to "investigate Aldhelm's attitude to masculinity by examining both his passages of spiritual advice and his representation of male and female saints." Gender, in Pettit's analysis, is understood to be "a relational concept, in which masculinity and femininity pertains both to 'perceived differences' as well as to parallels 'between the sexes,'" and the fact that "individuals might be subject to 'variant notions of masculinity' also underpins" her analysis (10). Pettit notes that, in his instructions to both male and female religious for avoiding vice, Aldhelm continually emphasizes the importance of the actions of the "inner man," and also utilizes concepts typically associated with masculine militaristic traits, such as "physical strength, aggressive warrior action and weapon-bearing." In addition, he tells his audience "to act 'viriliter,' 'manfully,' in their chaste lives," and he mocks those "who would rather flee from the battlefield than face the enemy because they fear war 'muliebriter,' that is, 'in the manner of women,' something Aldhelm describes as shameful." At the same time, Aldhelm provides examples of specific male and female saints who exemplify "the virtue of iron-willed minds" (12). Nevertheless, in Pettit's estimation, Aldhelm does recognize "gendered distinctions between men's and women's external acts and demeanors." According to Pettit, a "systematic survey" of Aldhelm's saintly exempla "reveals that, in the outward act of miracle performance, only male saints are masculinized, whereas

female saints are aligned with culturally feminine characteristics" (13). Male saints perform almost twice as many miracles as female saints, and while many miracles are performed by both, only "the sanctity of male saints ... is divinely foreordained and only males perform miracles of translocation or telekinesis." Further, Aldhelm's "use of *virtus* in his male accounts ... aligns them with an active spiritual potency which is archetypally male," whereas when the same term is used in his female accounts, it typically means "good moral conduct" (14). Pettit looks most closely at exempla of both male and female saints that involve dragon-slaying and the survival of torture in order to better illustrate her point that, when it comes to external acts of spiritual heroism, the male saints are more vigorously masculine, whereas the female saints are more passive. Pettit speculates that "it is possible that Aldhelm rendered it acceptable for females to imitate masculine qualities in their minds, but did not believe it to be appropriate, or necessary, for them to imitate overtly masculine virtues or male roles" (17). Ultimately, "by providing his audience with a shared invisible spiritual identity heavily indebted to masculinity, Aldhelm perhaps sought to create unity among the disparate members of contemporary double monasteries," while on the other hand, his "differentiated treatment of men's and women's performance of miracles arguably appreciates their different gendered experiences of religious renunciation," which might have "reassured men ... that even as monks they were still masculine and that the spiritual life of the cloister presented an alternative, yet equally authoritative form of masculinity" (18).

‡Edward Christie's "Self-Mastery and Submission: Holiness and Masculinity in the Lives of Anglo-Saxon Martyr-Kings" (*Holiness and Masculinity*, 143–57) investigates whether or not the masochism inherent in the suffering and death of male Christian martyrs is true of the martyr-kings of whom Ælfric writes. As Christie points out, Ælfric's accounts of the martyrdoms of Edmund and Oswald, in addition to being indebted to well-known (and largely fabulated) Roman legends, was also connected, in terms of its tropes of masculinity, "to the models of heroic kingship depicted in poems like *Beowulf*" while at the same time we can also "see the potential for the emulation of Christ to undo their heroic identity." But in Christie's estimation, Ælfric's accounts of Edmund's and Oswald's "respective passions is at pains to bypass these negative effects." Following the thought of Kaja Silverman (in *Male Subjectivity at the Margins*) that "the compulsion to re-enact past suffering (particularly the trauma of war) is driven by a desire for mastery," Christie argues that "the life

and death of the martyred king represents submission as a new and better kind of mastery," and Ælfric's narratives of the passions of Edmund and Oswald "may be read as the cultural compulsion of a war-beset Christian nation." Further, the deaths of these martyr-kings "attempt to deny the masochistic, emasculating potential of Christian suffering and elevate it to a new position of power; to maintain, in other words, the symbolic equation of penis and phallus which sustains the ideological reality of our society, and, it has been argued, Anglo-Saxon society" (144). Both of these narratives "represent the king as a source of unity against external threats of division, and this role is symbolized by the disintegration and mystical reintegration of the king's body," and if decapitation "is a symbolically emasculating gesture, Ælfric's *Passion of St Edmund* asks, what happens when the head keeps talking?" (146). The answer, in Christie's view, "complicates the images of the warrior-aristocrat once typically taken to represent Anglo-Saxon masculinity," since the martyr-king sacrifices his "capacity to subject others to his will that is a prime factor in heroic masculinity and, instead, subjects himself entirely to the will of God," and the trick in stimulating identification between martyr-king and Anglo-Saxon warrior-aristocrat would rest on "the representation of this surrender as neither emasculating nor unheroic" (146–47). Christie wants to pursue a psychoanalytic reading of Anglo-Saxon heroism that would recognize that it does not "force a decision between success and death" (147). Following the thought of Freud (in *Totem and Taboo*) on the social anxiety produced by the "magical potency of the warrior," Christie argues that, like "the taboo of the king who may not move, the characteristic which represents the martyr-king's triumph is constraint: not the imposition of his will upon others, but the surrender of his will and the deliberate disavowal of martial power," and it is "through this self-mastery that he is seen to frustrate attempts by a pagan persecutor who is represented as his antithesis: excessive, proud and confident in his own fulfillment of the ideals of heroic exploit—the capacity to exert his will over others through violence" (149). Wanting to counter Gillian Overing's assertion (in *Language, Sign, and Gender in Beowulf*) that the binary between life and death defines the masculine economy of Anglo-Saxon heroic culture, Christie notes the ways in which both Edmund and Oswald defer the decision between the two (and also affirm both simultaneously) by submitting their wills to God, and while their desire to imitate Christ does represent a desire for death, the sacrifice is self-willed and thus still heroic (still masculine and not feminine-passive). If Edmund's decapitation and Oswald's loss of

his head and arm would seem to signify a certain emasculation, the post-mortem reassembly and preservation of these body parts “seem to assure the saint of symbolic re-emasculation.” Thus, the saint’s body “is the locus of the construction of his holiness and his masculinity” (153). And the desire for death that drives the “masculine economy” described by Overing in *Beowulf* “is not replaced in the life of the martyred king like Edmund, but is instead channeled or sublimated,” and “rather than success or death, these narratives equate success with death” (154). A smart reading, although I might note here that Christie’s interpretation follows exactly the propagandistic strategies with which Ælfric expressed the virtue of Christian self-sacrifice within the context of the war-torn and heroic-masculine culture he desired to reach with his message.

Katherine J. Lewis’s chapter in *Holiness and Masculinity*, “Edmund of East Anglia, Henry VI and Ideals of Kingly Masculinity” (158–73), addresses Anglo-Saxon England within a cross-temporal comparative context. Her essay “seeks to shed light” on the issue of gender performance and successful kingship by “exploring some of the attempts that were made to mold the kingly masculinity of a young Henry VI, and the ways in which Edmund of East Anglia was held up as a model for him” (158). Focusing specifically on John Lydgate’s Middle English life of St. Edmund, Lewis looks at “the ways in which the representation of a king-saint can be seen to intersect with the normative qualities of ideal kingship, and of kingly masculinity outlined by the *Secreta secretorum*,” a “mirror for princes” manual that was very popular in late medieval England. In Lydgate’s text, St. Edmund is presented to Henry VI “as the epitome of an ideal king, with respect to behavior, function and gender performance,” and is also “a model of the ways in which holiness and masculinity can be successfully blended in the figure of a king” (159). In Lydgate’s narrative, Edmund is portrayed as a king who “achieves the correct balance between his spiritual and secular responsibilities” (161–62). His exemplary kingship is further developed by Lydgate “presenting him as a martial hero”—a “manly knight”—and he departs from his sources by actually portraying Edmund in battle against the Danes (164). In Lewis’s view, Lydgate’s version of Edmund’s life is not just informed by ideas of the ideal king, but also by ideas about ideal kingly masculinity, which emphasize temperance over brute strength or power. Further, Lydgate does not shy away from Edmund’s virginity, but rather, “seeks to enforce an understanding of Edmund’s virginity as anything but an anomalous or problematic quality in a king,” for “it took strength of will to overcome the unruly body”

(167–68). While Henry VI “was certainly not expected to remain a virgin himself, Edmund’s virginity was a figuratively invaluable example for him nonetheless,” for the king’s virginal body (if even only a performance) could stand in for “the inviolate kingdom of England” (168, 169). And all of this would suggest “that there was something extremely significant about the performance of virginity to the ideology of kingship in later medieval England” (169).

In “Affective Spirituality: Theory and Practice in Bede and Alfred the Great,” *Essays in Medieval Studies* 22: 129–39, which is a companion piece to Allen Frantzen’s essay reviewed below, Scott DeGregorio counters the predominant view that the works of Anselm of Canterbury provide “the watershed of all later medieval spiritual writing,” which essentially “writes off” the Anglo-Saxon period. Even when certain scholarly works on medieval mysticism claim to take into account the connections between later English spiritual writing and the Latin devotional writing that preceded it, Anglo-Latin material is often completely omitted. However, “not only did the Anglo-Saxons leave behind a sizeable corpus of vernacular texts well worth exploring for its spiritual import,” but “they were also producers of Latin literature of various kinds, at least some of which must ... have affinities with what follows in the twelfth century” (129). DeGregorio’s more narrow focus here is on select texts from Bede and Alfred, and his aim “is to highlight some of the ways these writers anticipate the currents of thought and practice commonly said to mark later medieval devotional literature, and to argue thereby for a more integrated approach to the study of medieval English spirituality.” As to why Bede has not received enough attention as a spiritual author, DeGregorio points to the pervasive influence of R.W. Southern’s characterization (in his 1953 book *The Making of the Middle Ages*) of Benedictine monasticism “in terms of a pre- and post-Anselmian *mentalité*,” with a new emphasis in post-Anselmian monasticism on an ardent and effusive inner life, whereas in Bede’s time monastic life was supposedly rigid and static and, in Southern’s words, “the individual was lost in the crowd.” But it is significant, in DeGregorio’s view, that one of Bede’s longest works is a commentary on the Song of Songs, which “shows us a Bede thoroughly immersed in a scriptural text that was a favorite of many of the great spiritual writers from antiquity forward” (130). Bede’s attention in his verse-by-verse exegesis to a love that burns, the growth of love in the inner heart and soul, a movement away from a fear to a love of God, being inflamed and enkindled with love of God, and to what Bede calls “the opening of secret compunction”

which causes those who undergo it to “become warm,” “melt,” and “dissolve in tears,” should be, in DeGregorio’s mind, “all too familiar to scholars of later medieval devotion, who ... rush to make the eleventh and twelfth centuries the *terminus post quem* for the emergence of affective elements in western devotional literature” (131). To those scholars who also mark a devotion to the Passion as a theme of later affective spiritual literature, DeGregorio points out that Bede, in his commentary on the Song of Songs, revisits this theme often, and he also “assumes a direct link between the Passion and meditation.” DeGregorio admits that Bede “does not dwell on Christ’s tortured body with the intense scrutiny or heightened emotionalism found in later medieval Passion writing,” but “it is clear nonetheless ... that he had a developed sense of a meditative program with the Passion as its subject,” and therefore, Bede’s remarks on the Passion “here and elsewhere in his *oeuvre* should thus be recognized as forming an important step along the way to the flowering of affective piety in Anselm and others” (132). While Alfred may not seem as “natural” a figure as Bede for a discussion of early medieval spirituality, partly because of his lack of educational training and also because the period in which Alfred lived “was something of a low point in Anglo-Saxon literary history,” nevertheless, Asser’s Latin *Life of King Alfred* and Alfred’s own preface to his translation of Augustine’s *Soliloquies* “represent a compelling moment in the Anglo-Saxon devotional tradition, testifying at once to a change in the ‘shape’ of that tradition since Bede, but also to a further step forward in the direction of Anselm and his heirs.” We have, further, in the Alfredian corpus, “a noteworthy instance of how a pious nobleman in ninth-century Anglo-Saxon England sought to incorporate certain spiritual practices into a busy lay life,” and even more important, in Asser’s biography we can see the exemplification of Alfred’s desire “to sustain a kind of private reading-practice that ... is both devotional and meditative” (133). In his preface to Augustine’s *Soliloquies*, Alfred “employs the distinctive metaphor of woodcutting and house-building to sketch the role reading and rumination should play in the life of the individual Christian,” and in so doing also puts forward the idea that reading “is about the construction—or rather the transformation—of the individual, a process of internalizing what has been read, of making it one’s own.” In the final analysis, the “assumption that the Anglo-Saxon canon can be written out of the history of medieval devotion, and moreover that the central elements that define the so-called ‘turning point’ of that history are to be found only after the Anglo-Saxon period in the eleventh and

twelfth centuries, does not hold up with respect to the Venerable Bede or King Alfred the Great,” and by “taking stock” of developments in devotional practices in early English literature, scholars can begin to discern that Anglo-Saxon spirituality is “dynamic, not fixed and static” (135, 136).

The function of the miracle of the Pentecost in the cultural imagination and self-identity of an Anglo-Saxon England steeped in linguistic diversity, especially in the writings of Ælfric, is the subject of Kees Dekker’s essay, “Pentecost and Linguistic Self-Consciousness in Anglo-Saxon England: Bede and Ælfric,” *JEGP* 104: 345–72. According to Dekker, references to Pentecost in Old English vernacular writings are rare before the Benedictine reform; the “only substantive account from the pre-Alfredian period is the entry for 15 May in the Old English *Martyrology*.” Ælfric, on the other hand, “discusses Pentecost no fewer than thirteen times in his *Catholic Homilies*.” In Dekker’s view, a “closer look at Ælfric’s accounts of Pentecost will show that his own role as a teacher, translator, and homilist, as well as his attitude toward languages—including the vernacular—stems from a linguistic awareness that was, at least partly, informed by the miracle of the Pentecost and its traditional exegesis” (348). Before more closely analyzing Ælfric’s treatments of Pentecost, Dekker considers the “roots” of Ælfric’s use of the miracle in Bede (especially his story of Cædmon) and in the “influential” exegesis of Gregory. In Gregory, Dekker finds that a concept of “hidden language was fundamental” to his “ultimate explanation of the gift of tongues,” and with “the proper guidance by the Spirit the variety of human languages formed no impediment to God’s truth” (350). Further, for Gregory “there were no *linguae sacrae*; there was only the distinction between the language of the Spirit and the languages of humans, which inspiration might render mutually intelligible and interchangeable.” Pentecost, for Gregory, “had endowed the apostles, as founders of the universal Church, with linguistic omnicompetence,” and his conception of the miracle “involved not merely linguistic competence, but also rhetorical eloquence” (351). Dekker next turns to Bede’s *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum*, where Bede “undertook a remarkable enquiry into the nature of the apostles’ gift of ‘speaking in tongues’: did they really speak diverse languages, or was their own native language miraculously understood by listeners according to the native language of each?” (353). Bede’s answer was that “it was both a speaking miracle and hearing miracle, and therefore all the greater,” although this was obviously a subject for debate in Bede’s time (354). Following Gregory, Bede (in other writings) underscores

the view “that Pentecost had retained its significance as an example of divine inspiration and instigation to spread the word of God around the multilingual world,” and “once performed in the corporeal sense, it was now equally or more effective in the spiritual sense.” Bede’s “most effective example” of such a miracle and of the link between language and spiritual inspiration is, of course, his story of the poet Cædmon (355). The bulk of the rest of Dekker’s essay is devoted to showing how Ælfric’s “elaborations on the story of Pentecost must be seen in the light of his conscious attempt to put the miracle in the contemporaneous Anglo-Saxon perspective” (371). While Ælfric often followed Gregory’s and Bede’s leads in interpreting the miracle of Pentecost, he frequently elaborated the basic account “by adding details based on his own conception of the events narrated in Acts 2, on additional patristic sources, or on a combination of the two” (358). In Dekker’s opinion, Ælfric’s “view of the genealogy of languages was Hebrew-centered” and English “is as much related to Hebrew as Latin or Greek and was, if not directly, certainly indirectly included in the panorama of world languages spoken by the apostles at Pentecost” (360). Dekker believes that the “inspiration for Ælfric’s scholarly attitude to the vernacular may well be found in his Winchester training by Bishop Æthelwold,” and that Winchester’s “emphasis on the vernacular coincided with a unique iconographical representation of the Pentecost,” which Dekker further explains at the end of the essay. Dekker also notes that Ælfric made “repeated mention” of the Apostles’ role “in the codification of Christian wisdom, an element that does not feature in Acts 2 but that may derive from the Anglo-Saxons’ notion that the evangelists John and Matthew were among the apostles, that others such as Peter and Paul and John wrote apostolic letters, and that the apostles supposedly wrote the Creed soon after Pentecost” (361). Ælfric also emphasized the “courageous missionary zeal” of the apostles, even in the face of paganism, cruel kings, and torture, which “places his interpretation of Pentecost in the light of more recent, and even contemporary, Church history,” especially when we consider the context of “the ongoing Viking menace around the turn of the tenth century” (363). Dekker next turns to a consideration of Ælfric’s repeated emphasis on fire and flames as symbols for “the inspiring force of the Spirit, providing the apostles not only with knowledge but also with the power to spread this knowledge across the world.” Twice in his *Homilies* he even refers to spiritual inspiration as a kind of blast furnace, and Dekker finds a “striking parallel” for this “idiosyncratic” image in “two English iconographical representations of the

Pentecost from, or related to the so-called Winchester School”: in the Benedictional of St Æthelwold (London, BL, MS Add. 49598, fol. 67v), produced in Winchester in the early 970s, and in the Benedictional of Archbishop Robert of Jumièges (Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale Y.7 [396], fol. 29v), produced at Newminster, Winchester between 980 and 990 (365). Dekker provides illustrations of both of these representations of the Pentecost, in which the dove of the Holy Spirit “pours down undulating flames upon the apostles,” and a “very significant detail, and an Anglo-Saxon innovation, is that the flames do not rest on the apostles’ heads, but lead to their mouths” (366). Ultimately, for Ælfric, visible miracles “were a thing of the past,” and what remained were “spiritual miracles performed daily by the Church.” Further, the effect of Ælfric’s own spiritual inspiration “is not his speaking diverse languages but the compilation of his English homilies,” and therefore, even more so than Bede, he “reinforced the development of that distinctive attitude towards the vernacular in England that is still regarded a hallmark of Anglo-Saxon literary culture” (371, 372).

In her Ph.D. dissertation, “Intertextuality in the Lives of St Guthlac,” Univ. of Toronto, 2004, *DAI* 65A: 3796, Sarah Downey examines the stylistic and structural features of the early eighth-century *Vita Sancti Guthlaci*, “using the *Vita*’s many models, sources, translations, and adaptations to develop ideas about its role in a larger system of text-production.” Chapter One, “Iconographic Style and the *Life of Guthlac*,” reviews the “major critical issues involved in present-day study of medieval hagiographic texts, while establishing key points of structure and theme which are pursued throughout the rest of the thesis.” Chapter Two, “Biblical and Hagiographic Sources of the *Vita Sancti Guthlaci*,” addresses biblical and hagiographic sources of the *Vita*, especially the *Lives* of Antony, Paul the Hermit, Martin, Benedict, Fursey, and Cuthbert. The analysis in this chapter “emphasizes practices of ‘source-layering’ whereby the author of the *Vita* integrates verbal and narrative borrowings from multiple texts.” Chapter Three, “Style and Structure in the *Vita Sancti Guthlaci*,” argues that stylistic features, “especially those involving repetition, reinforce the careful structural patterning which the author has developed from his sources.” Chapter Four, “Style and Structure in the Old English Prose *Life*,” addresses “the ways in which the features of source-use, style, and structure articulated in earlier chapters influence the *Vita*’s most immediate translation.” Chapter Five, “Structure Reflected in the Later *Lives*,” considers “many of the later medieval Latin and English *Lives* of Guthlac, nearly all of which are drastically shortened forms

of the *Vita*,” and demonstrates “certain recurring practices of abbreviation” and that “the redactors’ selection and omission of material frequently reflects the *Vita*’s careful structural patterning” (ii). Ultimately, Downey wants to show the ways in which Felix’s *Vita* functions as kind of “central knot in a much larger web of text-production,” and how “one text generates another, both within and without the *Vita*” (1).

Why are the affective spiritual modes of the Anglo-Saxons often omitted from “the grand narratives of devotion and mysticism” in the Middle Ages? This is the question raised by Allen Frantzen at the outset of his essay, “Spirituality and Devotion in the Anglo-Saxon Penitentials,” *Essays in Medieval Studies* 22: 117–28. Frantzen argues that studies of medieval spirituality “routinely isolate later from earlier traditions” and also reinforce the idea that “affectivity is a ‘late’ medieval development” (117, 118). Frantzen finds this odd given that the scholar Eric Colledge, following the lead of Ignazio Bonetti, has already “traced the debt of Bernard to Bede, and in addition to Bede also briefly mentioned Boniface, Alcuin, and the anonymous authors of some Old English poems” (118). According to Colledge, Bede’s writings articulated “many essential teachings concerning mystical theology” (qtd. in Frantzen, 118), which then found their way into later works such as the much-deprecated Old English poem *Soul and Body*. In Frantzen’s view, Colledge’s work is still useful for his focus on the “interplay” between “what he called ‘pure contemplation’ and its reinterpretation ‘for souls not advanced in contemplation,’” and this “requires scholars of spirituality to consider a variety of texts and the social practices related to them, and to also remember that a standard of ‘pure contemplation’ is not the sole measure of a culture’s spiritual vitality” (119). Frantzen notes the work of other scholars, such as Thomas Bestul, Anne Savage, and John Hirsh, who have usefully traced the connections between poetry and prose texts associated with the spiritual life and between earlier and later medieval spiritual traditions. But whereas Hirsh, for example, argues that a “felt relationship between a divine being and a human agent” rests upon “a concept of the individual which began to gain currency only in the eleventh century” (qtd. in Frantzen, 120), Frantzen argues that earlier prayers, written in Old English “and closely associated with the practice of private confession ... achieve the goal of ‘felt prayer’” (120). If, as Hirsh has also argued, a “preoccupation” with the remission of sins was central in establishing a “sense of self,” Frantzen further notes that in Western Europe “the Christian response to sin and repentance had been explored in devotional processes since the

seventh century.” Moreover, “the penitential system as the Anglo-Saxons and their predecessors understood it was a textually directed and shaped experience that accomplished much of what Hirsh finds in the eleventh-century collections of private prayers contemporary with the Anglo-Saxon penitentials.” In Frantzen’s mind, the Anglo-Saxon penitentials have often been misread as being more concerned with “external discipline and outward conformity” than with the “nuanced regulation of the inner life,” but if we look at the Old English versions of the *ordo confessionis* or the *Old English Handbook*, “we see that they emphasize the interior disposition of the penitent” and “describe a spiritual culture that allows for a sense of ‘self’ for whom spiritual ideas are a ‘felt’ experience” (121). Frantzen makes special note of the Anglo-Saxons’ concern with the motif of the “inner heart” (*innewerdre heortan*), which shows up in various confessional prayers. If we think the Anglo-Saxon confessional prayer tradition is formulaic and therefore not truly “felt,” Frantzen suggests that this “is a modern response rather than an Anglo-Saxon one.” Further, if we recall that “Anglo-Saxon habits of prayer shaped in confession were continued in private prayer at home, we can imagine the Anglo-Saxon Christians as receptive readers and as subjects of spirituality rather than as objects of clerical instruction,” and “prayers would have been co-created by penitents as readers eager for a transformative experience.” Ultimately, Frantzen believes it is important, when integrating early evidence into the studies of late medieval mysticism and devotional practice, “to keep familiar ideas of the ‘twelfth-century Renaissance’ and the ‘discovery of the individual’ from establishing rigid divisions where gradual transitions exist” (125). Frantzen concludes his essay by noting that Anglo-Saxonists have long been studying what Nicholas Watson has termed “vernacular theology,” but they must work harder to elaborate the links between the spiritual texts of Anglo-Saxon England and later periods.

Ideas of the self from late antiquity to the Anglo-Saxon period, with a special concentration on Augustinian conceptions of individual identity, form the focus of Ronald J. Ganze’s Ph.D. dissertation, “Conceptions of the Self in Augustine, King Alfred, and Anglo-Saxon England” (Univ. of Oregon, 2004, *DAI* 65A: 4190). Chapter One, “Selves, Subjects, and Agents,” examines “conceptions of the self from ethical philosophy and cognitive neuroscience” and privileges these approaches over those that “emphasize the postmodern concept of subjectivity.” Ganze makes the argument here that these two disciplines are also efficacious “in refuting arguments against a medieval sense of self” and

in demonstrating “the constructed nature of the ‘gap’ between the medieval and early modern periods.” Chapter Two, “The Augustinian Self: Embodied Souls in the City of Man,” looks at how the “evolution of Augustine’s theological position regarding free will and predestination affects his conception of the self, and how his position on the divided will and the two Cities serves to inform individual identity” (iv). Ganze also examines here Augustine’s “narrative construction of self in *Confessions*, which bears a striking resemblance to narrative models of self in cognitive neuroscience.” Chapter Three, “A Tale of Two Cities: From *De Civitate Dei* to Alfred’s Kingdom of the Anglo-Saxons,” analyzes the “alterations made by King Alfred in his translation of Augustine’s *Soliloquia*.” Ganze asserts that the Alfredian self “differs from the Augustinian in that it is enmeshed in a web of social ties and social obligations that necessitates its active involvement in the City of Man,” and Alfred therefore adds “layers of social identity” to the “core self” described by Augustine. Ganze also sees the Alfredian self as “existential, demonstrating an anxiety about the transience of human existence” not found in Augustine and likely deriving from Alfred’s translation of Boethius. Chapter Four, “The Existential Self in Old English Literature,” looks at select Old English poems, especially *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer*, and argues that elegies “mark a movement back to the Augustinian conception of the self, a spiritual alternative to the material selves that are initially the poems’ foci.” But these poems also, in Ganze’s view, share in the existential focus of the Alfredian self, and Ganze draws “specific parallels with Kierkegaard to demonstrate this affinity.” But, as Ganze avers, the “differences between selves found in these works ... leads to the conclusion that an overarching theory of the medieval self could only be developed at the cost of the very selves the works seek to communicate” (v). I’m not sure that cognitive neuroscience is always a better way than, say, post-structuralist philosophy to get at what might be called the “truth” of human subjectivity, either medieval or more modern, but Ganze’s dissertation certainly offers a much-needed contribution to an established discipline—cognitive literary studies—that often overlooks premodern literatures. It also strikes me that we need much more work like this that concerns itself with early medieval subjectivity and mind (see also Leslie Lockett’s Ph.D. dissertation, “Corporeality in the Psychology of the Anglo-Saxons,” Univ. of Notre Dame, reviewed in *YWOES* 2003).

In “Alfred, Asser, and Boethius” (*Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O’Brien O’Keeffe and Orchard, I:326–48) Malcolm Godden wants to explore the

“tantalizing” possibility that Asser helped Alfred with his translation of Gregory’s *Regula pastoralis*. That possibility is connected to the evidence of Vatican City, BAV, lat. 3363, a manuscript originating in the Loire region that contains a copy of Boethius’s *De consolazione Philosophiae* written in the early ninth century “with glosses in numerous hands from the ninth century onwards.” Because there is a multitude of glosses “in a hand that has been identified as Welsh and dating from the late ninth century,” this “testifies to interest in Boethius in an Insular context at an important moment,” and in Godden’s mind, the “close links between the glosses and later Anglo-Saxon manuscripts of Boethius suggest that the manuscript played a key role in the development of a specifically English revision of the Remigian commentary on Boethius” (326). If this is the case, it would represent an important revision of much of the twentieth-century scholarship on the *Consolatio*, which has tended to “attribute most of the surviving sets of glosses [in about sixty surviving manuscripts] to two main traditions: an early tenth-century commentary attributed to Remigius of Auxerre and a ninth-century commentary associated with the monastery of St. Gall. Godden provides an overview of previous commentary on the glosses on the Vatican 3363 manuscript and concludes that “what we have in this manuscript is not really ‘the earliest known commentary’ on the *Consolatio* but a gradual accumulation of glosses built up over a century or more, and probably in more than one country” (329). Godden divides these glosses into the following groups: Early Continental Glosses, The Welsh Hand, and “Glastonbury” Hands (some of which have been attributed to St. Dunstan), each of which he analyzes before turning to the relation of these glosses to later English manuscripts, such as the eleventh-century CUL Kk.3.21, perhaps originating in Abingdon and “containing a much expanded version of the ‘Remigian’ commentary represented by continental manuscripts, with glosses in several different hands.” There are, apparently, “many parallels between the two manuscripts” which “cover a range of different glosses which were entered in Vatican 3363 at different times and by different hands” (337). Ultimately, the glosses in the Abingdon manuscript “match several different layers of material which gradually came together in the Vatican manuscript: ninth-century glosses in a continental hand; glosses at the end of the ninth century in a Welsh hand, otherwise unique to CUL KK.3.21; and comments otherwise unique to CUL KK.3.21 and entered by various hands in the tenth century.” Godden asserts that it is “difficult to believe that the same assemblage of material was available independently in another manuscript, or

could have come together coincidentally” in both manuscripts (339). Godden also looks at a tenth-century manuscript from Canterbury, Paris, BNF, MS 17814, which also appears to draw some of its glosses from the Vatican manuscript. Godden next turns to Alfred’s translation of Boethius and notes that, while there are aspects of Alfred’s phrasing which appear “strikingly like that of the Remigian commentary,” he cannot locate similar parallels with the Vatican 3363 glosses (341–42). Nevertheless, Godden believes that the Vatican manuscript “remains important in suggesting a context for the Old English adaptation,” and since “both the [Welsh] commentator from the end of the ninth century and those from the first half of the tenth century were actively comparing it with other copies, it is not far-fetched to suppose that another copy with a different kind of commentary was available to the Alfredian circle as well” (342). For Godden, the “key question” here might be “where the Welsh commentator was at work and how his copy of Boethius came to Glastonbury. Does he reflect a Welsh tradition of scholarship, or did he acquire the manuscript and the commentary on the Continent, or was he at work in England using materials available there?” As tempting as it might be, however, to surmise that the manuscript was actually in Wales in the ninth century “and not just in the hands of a single peripatetic Welsh scholar on the Continent or in England,” and that it was “brought to Alfred’s court by one of his learned foreign advisors, it is more than the evidence will allow” (343). We could still say, though, that it is “likely that Asser knew of it and that it was Asser who drew Alfred’s attention to the work” (344).

The elusive and changing nature of the concept of heroic virtue is the quarry of John V. Halbrooks’s “Crisis and Heroic Virtue in Four Medieval Alliterative Texts” (Ph.D. Diss., Tulane U 2004, *DAI* 65A: 2614). The ethics of heroic action in any given text are, he asserts, often problematic and ambiguous, especially so in *Beowulf*, which Halbrooks treats in Chapter One, “Beowulf’s Mournful Mind and Heroic Resolution.” Halbrooks looks closely here at Beowulf’s speech just before fighting the dragon and argues that this speech “is the ultimate revelatory moment of the poem”—one in which Beowulf “has been granted an insight into the hopelessness of his situation as well as the coming crisis of the Geatish people, a crisis which his heroic virtue cannot quail.” Chapter Two, “Byrhtnoth’s Great-Hearted Mind,” examines the longstanding debates among critics of *The Battle of Maldon* over the interpretation of *ofermod*: “Does the word condemn the hero for his pride?” Or, does it “praise the hero for his great-heartedness”? Halbrooks believes that many critics have overlooked

the fact that “these contradictory responses are encoded in the poem, that the poem pushes the reader in two directions simultaneously” (12). He argues that a “complete reading must take both of these conflicting perspectives into account and consider the possibility that the poet and the poem’s original audience may have felt both regret for Byrhtnoth’s apparent overconfidence and appreciation for his great-heartedness.” In Chapter Three, “Defining Heroic Virtue in Ælfric’s *Maccabees*,” Halbrooks further elucidates the ambiguity attendant upon representations of heroic virtue through a delineation of Ælfric’s anxieties over the possibilities of readers’ interpretation of heroic (saintly) virtue without his “careful exegesis” (13). According to Halbrooks, Ælfric would have been concerned over “the problematic ideas of heroism that are incompatible with the conservative ethics of the Anglo-Saxon church.” In his final chapter, “Heroic War and Heroic Peace in *Lazamon’s Brut*,” Halbrooks crosses over into the Middle English period to address a literary work that he believes absorbs the “problem” of heroism at *all* of the three levels addressed separately in the previous three chapters—those of hero, author, *and* reader.

In “Preaching at Winchester in the Early Twelfth Century” (*JEGP* 104: 189–218), Thomas N. Hall addresses the issue of the “paucity” of contemporary records pertaining to the lives of religious women in late Anglo-Saxon and early Anglo-Norman nunneries, and he poses, as a “rare exception” to this rule, the texts included in Oxford, Bodl. Lib., Bodley 451. This manuscript was written in England in the early twelfth century. It contains “a copy of Smaragdus’s *Diadema monachorum* (a ninth-century commentary on the *Benedictine Rule*) followed by two series of extracts from Isidore’s *Sententiarum libri tres* and eighteen sermons mainly by Caesarius of Arles,” and it is associated, by a note on one of the front flyleaves, with Edburga, a granddaughter of King Alfred and his consort Ealhswith, “who is credited with founding the Benedictine house for nuns in Winchester known as Nunnaminster sometime before her death in 902” (191, 192). Hall details several other clues that point to a Nunnaminster origin for this manuscript, including a colophon added after the last sermon “in which the main scribe identifies herself as a *scriptrix*” and also the later addition of a fragment of the now lost Latin Life of St. Edburga (194). While the manuscript has gained some notoriety through the work of other scholars (notably Laurel Braswell, Susan Ridyard, and P.R. Robinson) “as a key witness to the Nunnaminster-based cult of St. Edburga and as an extraordinary if not unparalleled example of medieval English book production by and for women,” Hall

“cannot help but detect some irony in the fact that the parts of the manuscript that have attracted the most attention are its late additions, its end leaves, and its paste-downs rather than its principal original contents” (196). Further, aside from the *Diadema monachorum*, “the manuscript’s original contents have essentially been passed over in silence.” Hall is particularly interested in a Christmas sermon at fols. 95r–96v which, as far as he can tell, is “unique and unpublished and merits attention for the light it sheds on communal preaching at Winchester to an audience that apparently included the nuns at Nunnaminster” (197). (Two appendices include a new inventory of the entire contents of the manuscript as well as an edition, with translation, of the Christmas sermon.) Hall describes the sermon as *atypical* for the genre and details its distinctive features, such as a predilection for lists and elaborate catalogs, “especially those joined by repetition of like sounds at the beginning of each word”—parachesis (198). Hall also details the features that the sermon has “in common with Old English poetry and homilies and with early Latin sermons and hymns that were written and studied in England in the tenth and eleventh centuries,” and concludes that, if this does not altogether prove that the sermon is a pre-Conquest composition, it suffices to at least “show that the sermon’s author was schooled in the rather particularized rhetoric and diction of pre-Conquest Insular literature, especially the homilies and religious verse and the hymns of the church.” What Hall finds “most revealing” about the sermon, however, is its opening address, which is directed to “a mixed audience consisting of monks, nuns, and clerics who have come together united as a single *plebs ecclesiastice discipline* for the purpose of celebrating Christmas” (202). Hall believes that mixed audience may have included the nuns at Nunnaminster, and if that is the case, then the Bodley 451 Christmas sermon “qualifies as one of the earliest surviving sermons composed in England for an audience including women” (203). Further, “the fact that it addresses these women as members of a larger group of ecclesiastical professionals including monks and secular clerics reveals an important dimension of life in Winchester at the time this sermon was composed and delivered, and this has to do with the public interaction of the male and female monastic communities,” which was strictly regulated at the time, especially via rules governing the claustration of nuns (204). Hall’s essay is an important contribution to the early medieval history of Nunnaminster—a history that, for a long while now, has been considered a “blank.”

Part One of Mary Hayes’s Ph.D. dissertation, “Still, Small Voice: Silence in Medieval English Devotion

and Literature” (Univ. of Iowa, 2005, DAI 66A: 1349) addresses “silent speaking” in Old English literature (the second part looks at “sacred silences” and “dirty secrets” in Middle English literature). Hayes is especially interested in “how silence functioned in devotional environments and how these devotional silences were represented” in medieval literary texts, and her examination of medieval silences is informed by three guiding assumptions: first, “silences designated medieval worshippers’ engagement in divine discourse and, oftentimes, signified their inability to apprehend it” (1, 2). Second, “these devotional silences draw into relief how silence does not function as the limit of discourse but rather, as Michel Foucault argues, functions within discourse alongside things explicitly said.” And third, “in providing a venue for exploring the influence of power on discourse, devotional silences offer a record of hegemonic exclusion as well as individual subversion.” Ultimately, silence “stilled the lay worshippers’ small voices yet also afforded each of them a private audience with God’s ‘still, small voice’” (2). The three chapters included in Part One “discuss texts that evince the influence of monastic silence on textual production, dissemination, and reception in Anglo-Saxon England,” and examine “two ways in which silence’s significance as devotional ideal becomes evident—somewhat ironically—when it is broken by speech” (3). In these chapters, which cover, respectively, the Anglo-Saxon riddles, *Andreas* and its sources, and homiletic and preaching literature by Ælfric and Alfred, Hayes delineates the “fraught relationship between devotional silence and the religious ‘talk’ that both evokes it and also subverts it,” and argues that silence “and the various voices that break it speak to a cultural investment in the circulation of the religious voice in Anglo-Saxon England.” Further, Hayes believes that the figure of the voice in these works carries with it a number of meanings: “it provides a way of imagining personal yet disembodied presence; it is the means and metaphor for the expression of interiority, it facilitates the dissemination of religious knowledge; it is the way for an invisible God to reveal himself to his believers” (4).

‡*Riddles, Knights, and Cross-Dressing Saints: Essays on Medieval English Language and Literature*, ed. Thomas Honegger (Variations 5. Bern: Peter Lang, 2004), a collection of essays presented at the Studenttag zum Englisches Mittelalter in 2002 and 2003, includes two chapters that might be of possible interest to Anglo-Saxonists: Dieter Bitterli’s “The Survival of the Dead Cuckoo: Exeter Book *Riddle* 9” (95–114) and Susanne Kries’s “*Fela í rúnnum eða í skáldskap*: Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian Approaches to Riddles and Poetic

Disguises" (139–64). Bitterli's essay argues that, in the "nest-parasitic" cuckoo of Exeter Book Riddle 9 (in Krapp and Dobbie's edition), the "octogenetic transformation from 'dead' embryo to living fledgling reflects a process that is emblematic of the reader's activity of riddle-solving. Just as the cuckoo survives at the expense of its fellow nestlings, so the riddle's true solution ultimately emerges as all false solutions [such as orphaned child] are eliminated" (95). Kries's essay analyzes different uses of the riddle and the kenning in Old Norse and Old English texts, with special emphasis on the riddles of the Exeter Book, in order to reveal "that the use of both poetic disguises differs markedly in the two literatures." Kries argues that, whereas the earlier Anglo-Latin *aenigmata* as well as Old Norse riddles, such as those included in *Saga Heiðreks konungs ins vitra* (her primary Scandinavian text), "are identified as riddles by their literary contexts, nothing similar appears with the short poetic texts of the Exeter Book," and she therefore questions "the validity of an *a priori* classification of this very heterogeneous groups of texts as riddles and argues instead for their individual interpretation and critical appraisal" (139).

One incident in the hagiography of Edward the Confessor—a eucharistic vision of Christ which is given to Edward and the Earl of Leofric while at mass in a church at Westminster—is the subject of Peter Jackson's essay "Osbert of Clare and the *Vision of Leofric: The Transformation of an Old English Narrative*" (*Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O'Keeffe and Orchard, II: 275–92). This is an incident, according to Jackson, that is not "among the earliest legends associated with the Confessor" and it is "not found at all in the earliest biography, the anonymous *Vita* that was written between 1065 and 1067"; nor "is it found in the account of Edward in William of Malmesbury's *Gesta regum*" (276). It first appears in the mid-twelfth-century *Vita Edwardi* by the Westminster monk Osbert of Clare. Jackson provides the Latin text, with translation, of Osbert's account of this miracle—which account traces the "circular journey" of the story: "First Leofric told it to his confessor at Worcester; the confessor committed it to writing; this writing was later rediscovered; the Worcester monk Maurice became acquainted with it and later, on migrating to Westminster, told the story to Osbert" (278–79). Jackson asks, can we believe this story? His initial answer is that there is "nothing inherently unlikely in a Worcester provenance, for Osbert had several links to the west country" (279). There is, however, Jackson points out, an earlier source for Edward's eucharistic miracle that might shed light on the alterations Osbert may have made to the story in

his version: the Old English *Vision of Leofric*, which is found uniquely in CCC 367, Part ii, "a collection of manuscript fragments bound together in or before 1575," and which can be identified with extant Worcester manuscripts. Jackson argues that the *Vision* "has an almost unique importance as the near-contemporary record of the spiritual experiences of an eleventh-century English layman," and he surmises that the Maurice of Osbert's account "had read, or perhaps heard read, at Worcester the unique copy of the *Vision* now preserved in CCC 367, Part ii" (280, 282). The differences between the miracle as it is recounted in the *Vision* and in Osbert are, in Jackson's mind, consistent with Osbert's agenda, which was to make the case for Edward's sanctification and "to collect as many miracles as possible connected with the church that Edward himself had founded and where his body now lay" (282). In the *Vision*, the miracle takes place at a church in Sandwich, not at Westminster, and Edward's role is lessened beside that of Leofric. But in Osbert's *Vita*, "Edward not only shares in Leofric's vision (a detail not found in the Old English), but warns him against disclosing it. The king, in other words, moves to the center of the narrative, and Leofric becomes a pious participant in his royal master's visions and a means by which it is made more widely known." Osbert's "greatest elaboration," however—the account of how the vision was preserved and recorded—while it *has* "in fact been 'typified' by the introduction of *topoi* from hagiography and vision literature," at the same time, "the transmission is explicitly situated in a milieu that is both literate and oral," attesting to the importance (for Osbert) of a "construction of a chain of testimony" (283). Although, as Jackson points out, there has been much recent attention to "the continued copying and reading of Old English texts throughout the twelfth century, and indeed into the thirteenth," the "use of Old English texts as sources for Latin writers has ... still not been systematically studied, and published scholarship tends to privilege better-known vernacular genres such as chronicle writing and hagiography at the expense of others" (285). Jackson admits that many of these sources are likely lost, but nevertheless "must underlie," as the *Vision of Leofric* does, "much twelfth-century Latin writing" (286).

According to Richard F. Johnson, in *Saint Michael the Archangel in Medieval English Legend* (Woodbridge: Boydell), despite "the wealth of evidence" for a "well-developed insular cult of St Michael" and numerous book-length studies of the archangel, there "has never been a detailed examination of the establishment of the cult and the proliferation of the legends of St Michael in medieval England," aside from one article in a Mont-

Saint-Michel millenary volume and one dissertation from over fifty years ago (1, 2). Johnson's book "focuses on the establishment and diffusion of the legends of St Michael, archangel of the Lord and commander of the heavenly host, in medieval England" (3). The organization of the book "is built around an analysis of the development and dissemination of the legendary motifs associated with St Michael in [what Thomas Heffernan would term] his 'sacred biography,' the 'De apparatione' text" (BHL 5948). The book is divided into two parts—"Genesis and Migration of the Legends" and "The Archangel in Medieval English Legend"—followed by a collection of appendices: Text and Translation of BHL 5948, the Waitz edition (A); The Michael Inventory, an annotated bibliographical list of textual material mentioning St. Michael in his various roles in sacred history (B); The Motif Index, which organizes the information in Appendix B according to St. Michael's various roles (C); and Saint Michael in Medieval English Iconography, a brief guide to the extant iconographic representations in medieval England (D). Chapter One, "Literary Origins of the Archangel's Legendary Roles," begins with "a historical survey of the biblical and extra-biblical texts which served as the principal quarry for the development of the medieval legends" of St. Michael, and thereby "contextualizes the ensuing discussion of the migration of the cult by grounding it in its 'literary' origins." Chapter Two, "The Archangel's Legendary History," traces the migration of the cult "from its origins in the ancient near East to the foundation of Mont-Saint-Michel," focusing especially on the three cultic centers of devotion to the saint in western Asia Minor, Monte Gargano, and Mont-Saint-Michel (4). The argument of this chapter is that "the hagiographical accounts of St Michael's legendary apparitions at the three cultic centers had a significant impact on the characterization of the archangel in the medieval English legends" analyzed in Part II of the book. Chapter Three, "Vernacular Versions of the Hagiographic Foundation-Myth," explores "the many vernacular recensions [including those in the *Old English Martrology*, Ælfric's and the Blickling homilies, and the Cotton-Corpus Legendary] of the popular account of the archangels' earthly interventions atop the steep cliffs of the Garganic peninsula in southeastern Italy." Chapter Four, "The Archangel as Guardian and Psychopomp," looks at "the vast store of early English legendary representations of St. Michael in these roles from the Venerable Bede to *Piers Plowman*." Chapter Five, "The Archangel and Judgment," investigates the English legends of St. Michael's "involvement in the individual, post-mortem judgment and Final Judgment." It is Johnson's hope that the chapters

in Part II will demonstrate that St. Michael, performing all four of his offices, "is widely represented in the prose literature of the Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Norman, and Middle English eras" (5). Indeed, "it was upon the well-established stock of legends of the archangel as warrior-angel and psychopomp that the poet John Milton relied to create his heroic figure of St Michael in *Paradise Lost*" (105). Ultimately, "no other saint offers an analogue for the *vitae* of St Michael since he cannot participate in the 'terrestrial reality' of other saints." And yet, in Johnson's view, "the Archangel possesses a rich metaphysical existence, an incorporeal individuality, that invigorates the legendary and apocryphal literature in which he appears" (107).

In "The Sign of the Cross: Poetic Performance and Liturgical Practice in the Junius 11 Manuscript," *The Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Gittos and Bedingfield, 245–65, Catherine E. Karkov explores how making the sign of the cross functions in the Old Testament context of three poems from the Junius 11 manuscript: *Genesis*, *Exodus*, and *Daniel*. She also considers "some of the ways in which the sign of the cross as it is described and depicted within this particular manuscript might have been understood within the context of liturgical practice" (245). Karkov notes that the motif of "blessing, of making the sign of the cross" is prevalent throughout these three poems, and she asserts that one reason for its prevalence might be "time and typology: the cross is there in multiple forms as a sign of Christ *Logos*, the Word present before and throughout creation, and the promise of salvation that will find its fulfillment in Christ." Further, biblical history "was conceived as being part of Anglo-Saxon history, and the sixth age of the world in which Ælfric and others located themselves was part of biblical time" (246). Time, therefore, for the Anglo-Saxons, "could be both fluid and cyclical, uniting past, present, and future in a continuous present which [in the words of Clare Lees] 'reconstructs the past, which in turn renders the present explicable,' and in which we are all located in expectation of the Last Judgment" (247). In Karkov's view, this view of time runs throughout the Junius 11 Old Testament poems, which prefigure both the New Testament and the present and future of their Anglo-Saxon readership. Images of the sign of the cross in Junius 11 are linked to this typology and also to "developments that are specific to the art and liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon church, as well as to the theological and exegetical concerns of late Anglo-Saxon culture" (248). Karkov provides examples of the use of the verbs *bletsian* and *gebletsian*, and of the noun *bletsung* ('blessing'), as well as of *(ge)segnian* ('signing'), in *Genesis*, *Daniel*, and *Christ*

and *Satan*, and she argues that the illustrations accompanying some of these examples, which display gestures of “ritual benediction,” reinforce “the interpretation of (*ge*)*bletsian* and (*ge*)*segnian* ... as involving the act of signing the cross” (255). This point is also reinforced by Ælfric’s homily on “The Exaltation of the Cross,” where he writes that, “Although a man wave wonderfully with his hand, it is not a blessing unless he make the sign of the holy cross” (qtd. in Karkov, 251). Karkov writes that this interpretation is further supported “by liturgical parallels for the phraseology of the blessings of Adam, Eve, Noah, and (more loosely) Abraham in Genesis, which God’s gesture accompanies, all of which relate to the *crecite et multiplicamini*,” a blessing “which had wide circulation in Anglo-Saxon England, appearing in charms, including the *æcerbot* charm for unfruitful land, which ... involves the making or signing of multiple crosses” (255–56). Variations of this same blessing were used in liturgical texts in the forms of Pentecostal benedictions and for marriage ceremonies. Karkov also looks at symbolic representations of the cross—the pillars of cloud and fire which also become a sail and yard-arm in *Exodus*—and compares these with images of the Harrowing of Hell in the prayers for the blessing of the paschal candle in the late tenth-century Winchcombe Sacramentary. According to Karkov, Christ’s Harrowing of Hell, “the focus of the liturgy for Holy Saturday, and a key episode in *Christ and Satan*, is also crucial to the typological unity of the poems [in Junius 11]. The journey of Noah’s ark, of Abraham, of Moses and the Israelites ... are all typologically linked to the Harrowing,” and following Nicholas Howe’s thinking in *Migration and Mythmaking in Anglo-Saxon England*, the Israelites of *Exodus* “were considered to be the ancestors of the Anglo-Saxons, and the latter could thus identify both sympathetically and historically with the biblical stories involving the former” (261). Ultimately, when “reading through the poems (and the pictures)” of the Junius 11 manuscript, “we, like the Israelites within the poems and the Anglo-Saxons for whom they were written, must recognize and follow the sign of the cross which is exemplified in the liturgy of the feasts for the Invention and Exaltation of the cross” (264).

In her contribution to *Readings in Medieval Texts* (ed. Johnson and Treharne, 15–29), “Old English Religious Poetry,” Sarah Larratt Keefer begins with *Cædmon’s Hymn* as a jumping-off point to explore the features of Old English religious poetry, which she divides into three types: the “scriptural narrative type,” as found in the Junius 11 manuscript—*Genesis A* and *B*, *Exodus*, *Daniel*, and *Christ and Satan*; “liturgical” and “hagiographical” poetry (verse inspired by the words or practice of

church ritual or by the lives of saints); and “pieces about the Christian life that present interpretation or allegorization of religious subjects for the purpose of teaching, as well as individual meditations and creative outbursts of praise to God,” such as *Cædmon’s Hymn*. Keefer is quick to point out that “these three approaches are in no way mutually exclusive,” as “some of the finest religious verse in Anglo-Saxon England incorporates elements of all three categories” (17). After running through a partial inventory of the different sorts of “mixed” religious poetry located in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, and briefly treating the issue of authorship, Keefer provides an overview of the “Germania-oriented” history of scholarship on Old English religious poetry, noting that it is “only more recently that scholarship has turned to a meticulous consideration of the entire manuscript context in which these poems are to be found,” and this “more recent exploration of context for the poems seeks to examine all the evidence that might account for their inclusion with the other texts in their codex, such as the sequence of these pieces, the marginalia and art that accompany the sections of each book, the scribal corrections made to the material within the manuscripts, and the like” (21). On the other hand, scholarship on the canon of Old English liturgical poetry has been “sparse,” according to Keefer, but would be worth pursuing in order to allow us to better “understand the ways in which Anglo-Saxon poets and their audiences apprehended the interaction of two languages, the means by which the familiar Latin liturgy could find expression in the vernacular, and the approaches that were used in moving between the two to create something in verse that was at the same time personal and universal” (22, 23). Keefer next provides a demonstration of a close reading of a “crown jewel” of Old English religious poetry, *The Dream of the Rood*, which she argues is “liturgical in nature,” while also being thoroughly “unique,” demonstrating the “phenomenon” of the “disparate terms” with which Anglo-Saxon poets of religious verse “were able to take delight in reinterpreting the stories and characters of Christian scripture through a cultural lens all their own” (24, 26, 27). Keefer also notes that, in addition to “appealing to the aesthetics of their culture,” Anglo-Saxon writers of religious poetry also “made use of their own language to create patterns of semantics in thematic development, which would also have had resonance for their audience” (27). Ultimately, these poems “readily serve as meditations upon the spiritual dimensions of life that the Anglo-Saxons found so compelling” (28).

In “The Figure of the Ethiopian in Old English Texts” (*Bull. of the John Rylands Univ. Library of Manchester*

86.2 [Summer 2004]: 69–85) Jasmine Kilburn-Small is interested in the “ambiguous characterization” of a “black devil” that appears in the Old English lives of St. Margaret: is he “a devil colored black” or “a demon in the guise of a black man”? In order to begin to answer this question, Kilburn-Small first researches the imagery of blackness “which is central to the symbolism of Christianity as well as other prominent religions” (69). While it is clear that “the tradition of using black imagery was strong within the Christian religion,” and also has “more ancient analogues,” the real question for Kilburn-Small is: “in what sense was the demon in the life of Margaret black?” Kilburn-Small next surveys the association, in Old English, Old Norse, and patristic literature, between blackness and “Ethiopian,” and between blackness/Ethiopian and “evil.” In Kilburn-Small’s view, “the overwhelming burden of evidence supports [Jean Marie] Courtès’s claim that ‘From the point of view of Christian literature ... the black was essentially “other”—the borderline case, situated in every sense at the outside limit of humanity”’ (73). Further, “the Ethiopian was used as a symbol of the unconverted, the non-Christian,” and this symbolism would have been exacerbated in places like Anglo-Saxon England that were not in close contact with the Mediterranean world and therefore might not have had knowledge of Africans as “real people” (74, 75). Although other types of demons appear in Christian literature, such as the “British” devils in Felix’s *Life of St. Guthlac*, “this type of imagery is the exception rather than the rule and it is the black or ‘Ethiopian’ demon that is encountered with greater frequency throughout Christian literature” (75). Kilburn-Small *does* note some instances of less prejudicial representations of Ethiopians in Anglo-Saxon writings and pictorial illustrations, such as is the case in the Cotton Tiberius *Marvels of the East*, yet “to an extent the Ethiopians in the manuscript are being objectified and possibly classified as monstrous,” and as *Beowulf* “bears witness, the monstrous is a short step from the demonic” (76). The remaining part of Kilburn-Small’s essay concentrates on images of demonic Ethiopians in Ælfric’s homilies based on the apocryphal acts of Matthew, Simon and Jude, and Bartholomew, where she finds that the account of Matthew, “demonstrates that the Ethiopian population are not represented as intrinsically evil because of their color and remoteness, and they convert readily to the new religion,” while at the same time, Simon and Jude’s adversaries, the magician-devils Zaroes and Arfaxath, and Bartholomew’s adversary, the demon Berith, are all figured by Ælfric as Ethiopian. For Kilburn-Small, it is “clear” that the legend of St. Margaret “draws on the tradition of

the ‘demonic Ethiopian’ or ‘demonic black man,’ and it is likely that the author of this life intended him to bring to mind a black man, rather than a black-colored devil” (85). Kilburn-Small’s essay is a welcome addendum of sorts to the recent (and important) book by the art historian Debra Higgs Strickland, *Saracens, Demons, and Jews: Making Monsters in Medieval Art* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2003), which did not treat Anglo-Saxon sources as much as I would have liked. It is a fantastic and lavishly illustrated book, however, one chapter of which specifically addresses the figure of the Ethiopian (Chapter Two, “Demons, Darkness, and Ethiopians”) and which I am surprised Kilburn-Small did not cite.

Roy Michael Liuzza’s contribution to *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O’Brien O’Keeffe and Orchard, “The Sphere of Life and Death: Time, Medicine, and the Visual Imagination” (II:28–52) argues that certain scholarly assumptions “conspire to narrow our perception of medieval medicine, so that practices which are neither effective by modern standards nor interesting relics of ‘popular’ belief are consigned to a more or less permanent obscurity” (28). This view neglects less familiar forms of medieval medical knowledge, such as “diagnostic or semiotic texts involving, for example, the examination of urine and pulses or the reading of the signs of fever, and prognostic texts used to predict the course of a disease” (28–29). One such text, which is the focus of Liuzza’s essay, is the “Sphere of Life and Death,” an “iatromathematical device” that “predicts the outcome of an illness by manipulating numbers.” Liuzza offers a “preliminary account” of its different versions and some speculations on its use and significance. The “Sphere” apparently “originated in Greek, one of many techniques of hellenistic magic which found a place in the world of medieval learning and science”; the earliest surviving example is from the fourth century. It is not known when it was translated into Latin but it survives in two versions (examples of which Liuzza provides in an Appendix) that are “textually distinct but similar in content, effect, and accompanying figure.” Liuzza notes the traditional attribution of one version to the supposed author of the *Herbarium* (Apuleius) and the other to Pythagoras (which “probably rests on the device’s manipulation of numbers”), and then provides an accounting of the copies of these versions in continental and English manuscripts, with some accompanying plate illustrations (30–34). Liuzza also mentions in passing the “Letter of Petosiris,” which “uses the same technique as the ‘Sphere’ but in a more complex fashion, with a broader application and more ostentatiously learned presentation,” and the “Tetragnonus,” a device that “uses a rectangular figure in which

numbers are arranged in three columns.” This device does not appear in English manuscripts before the twelfth century, but Liuzza includes it because “the arrangement of numbers in three columns is a common (and otherwise inexplicable) feature of most versions of the ‘Sphere’ figure” (34). While the “Sphere” appears in dozens of manuscripts, only some of these are, strictly speaking, medical collections, and most of the copies of the device “are preserved among texts devoted to timekeeping, calendars, and astronomy—most notably in collections preserving redactions of Bede’s *De temporum ratione* alongside the scientific works of Abbo of Fleury” (35). Its history, therefore, belongs more squarely within the history of computus than medicine. Also striking is the wide variety of figures accompanying “Sphere” texts—some aren’t even spherical, although “[m]ost commonly,” the “Sphere” figure is a circle, “either simple or decorated, divided horizontally and with the numbers in each half arranged in three columns separated by one or more vertical lines.” Since the division of numbers into three columns is “universal,” Liuzza surmises that this consistency, especially within the context of the diversity of other aspects of the illustrations of the “Sphere,” suggests that “the history of the ‘Sphere’ is not identical to the history of its representation, and that the information contained in the figure must be regarded independently of the figure itself, and of the text it accompanies.” Therefore, “the visual representation of the ‘Sphere’ owes something to its manuscript context”—i.e., the ninth- and tenth-century computus collections in which it mainly appears, and which collections “were particularly given to *rotae* of various kinds” (36). Liuzza concludes with several related observations: first, “while it may be tempting to conflate all texts and figures of the ‘Sphere’ into one general relic of a curious practice, as some scholars have done,” he hopes that the evidence he has collected “suggests the complexity of the history behind such an apparently simple device and drawing.” This observation reminds us “not only that every text is a transcript of an interaction between human beings, which both constructs and conceals its own history and its own secrets, but that the mental universe of a millennium ago was different from ours in countless subtle ways.” Second, because the “Sphere” is found only in Latin and primarily in monastic manuscripts, the “likely implication is that it was used primarily in monastic medical care,” and therefore was likely intimately connected to other monastic practices of the “regulation of daily life according to a minutely parsed schedule of unprecedented precision and complexity” (37). And the “lesson of illness” that the “Sphere” may have suggested

within this routine “is that the will of God is revealed in and through time,” and “in some instances disease may have been regarded as an aspect not of biological disorder but of cosmic order” (38).

In her Ph.D. dissertation, “Stories, Saints, and Dreams: The Literary Uses of Dreams in Early Medieval Hagiography” (Univ. of Michigan, 2004, *DAI* 65A: 3796–97), Margaret Wickens Lynch is chiefly interested in dreams, especially the divinely inspired dream, as a literary trope, and her concern is “not with the historical actions of saints, but with the specific literary conventions and forms which make early medieval hagiography recognizable as a distinct literary genre.” It is her contention that hagiographic dreams “represent more than merely an oneiric experience on the part of a character within a story.” Rather, “dreams recounted in early medieval Latin hagiography indicate particular theological messages and pedagogical uses for the texts which include them,” and therefore they have a “metanarrative” function within hagiographic narratives (2). Lynch offers in her dissertation a “taxonomy” of dreams which surround the birth, life, and death of saints, and in this taxonomy, “dreams are categorized according to when they occur in the narrative, who experiences them, and what they do literally in the text” (3). Ultimately, hagiographic dreams “play an integral role in the narrative structure of the texts which contain them,” and the dissertation itself is “about neither dreams, nor saints [both of which have been studied extensively], but about the literary function of dreams recounted within stories told about saints” (4, 15). The chapters of the dissertation are divided according to Lynch’s taxonomy: Birth Dreams, Life Dreams, Death Dreams, and Exceptional Dreams.

Anchorites, Wombs and Tombs: Intersections of Gender and Enclosure in the Middle Ages, edited by Liz Herbert McAvoy and Mari Hughes-Edward (Religion and Culture in the Middle Ages [Cardiff: U of Wales P]), “constitutes both a response to the one-dimensionality of the large majority of earlier studies of the anchoritic life and a furthering of the rapidly burgeoning interest amongst historians and literary scholars which is currently taking root” (“Introduction,” 7). The collection is especially interested in the issues of gender that attach to the anchoritic lifestyle and (following the thought of Judith Butler) “the extent to which gender can be regarded as a private *and* public behavioral performance,” as well as in understanding “the complex relationship between gender, power, and enclosure” (8, 9). One chapter in the first section of the book, an essay by Santha Bhattacharji titled “*Guthlac A* and *Guthlac B*: Changing Metaphors”—is reviewed in the section 4b.

In his essay “Parallel Lives: Wulfstan, William, Coleman and Christ” (*St Wulfstan and His World*, ed. Julia S. Barrow and N.P. Brooks, Studies in Early Medieval Britain 4 [Aldershot: Ashgate]), Andy Orchard investigates the little known Coleman, chaplain and then chancellor to Bishop Wulfstan, who wrote the now-lost Old English *Life* of Wulfstan close to Wulfstan’s death in 1095 (on which William of Malmesbury based his *Vita Wulfstani*). In Orchard’s view, “Coleman’s decision to compose a *Life* in Old English seems self-consciously anachronistic, given that so few English manuscripts were written or copied at Worcester after Wulfstan’s death” (39–40). Orchard surmises that Coleman, who may have had some distaste for Wulfstan’s Anglo-Norman successor, Bishop Samson (known for his immoderate habits), may have been prompted to write in the vernacular “by twin feelings of piety and nationalistic spite” (40). In order to further elucidate Coleman’s motives in writing the *Life* of Wulfstan, Orchard turns to his only other corpus of writing: a handful of marginal comments, signed and unsigned, in Worcester manuscripts—about twenty comments in all in seven manuscripts—which Orchard believes “provide an important witness to the character and interest of their putative author” (41). Orchard briefly details some of Coleman’s stylistic propensities (such as a fondness in the vernacular for using doublets and other pairing devices), and then turns to a consideration of which particular texts Coleman annotated, which then might reveal something of his interests and concerns, such as his evident “interest in the *uitae* and visions of holy men that manifests itself in Coleman’s own composition, and for which ... he was apparently censured not only by his contemporaries, but also by his translator” (44). In Orchard’s opinion, reviewing the changes that William of Malmesbury made to Coleman’s *Life* of Wulfstan is telling: for one, he apparently toned down Coleman’s often prolix, purple, and overindulgent prose. William also apparently lessened some of Coleman’s “explicit” hagiographical comparisons (between Wulfstan and other saints). William’s account still includes many miracles performed by William with “transparent” biblical and hagiographical parallels (50). But while hagiography in general is, of course, as Orchard explains, an “imitative genre,” what is “striking” about William’s *Vita* “is not so much that it closely resembles the *uitae* of other saints, but rather that such parallels have been so self-consciously exploited and sustained, and were (at least in Coleman’s version) apparently so explicitly explained.” Orchard feels there is “much to commend” the view of Antonia Gransden that Coleman may have modeled the structure of his work on the *uita* of Æthelwold of Winchester,

“thereby consciously aligning Wulfstan with one of the three great figures of the tenth-century reform of the Anglo-Saxon church.” He finds, however, a striking contrast with regard to the miracles associated with each saint: whereas the *Vita Æthelwoldi* offers only five miracles, William’s *Vita Wulfstani*, “originally composed by an author who ... was well versed in hagiography and its conventions, presents ... [at one point] an uninterrupted list of over 20 such miracles, with other wonders scattered throughout the text” (52). Moreover, one of these “miracles” is related to divine punishment against a plasterer who snubbed, not Wulfstan’s, but Coleman’s preaching, such that Orchard can say, “Wulfstan, for all his merits, was hardly blessed in his original biographer” (54). Coleman, in Orchard’s opinion, appears to have given himself too prominent of a role in Wulfstan’s *Life*; he wonders if Wulfstan himself can be glimpsed behind the hagiography, and he remarks upon Wulfstan’s unique use, five times, of the phrase *crede mihi* in William’s *Vita*, a phrase which only Jesus speaks in the entire Vulgate. Orchard also points to “the insistent stress” throughout the *Vita* on Wulfstan’s role as a peacemaker, “settling disputes and condemning those who fail to come to an agreement,” which may provide some shades of the historical person (56). In the final analysis, William’s *Vita* “is perhaps best seen as the last layer in a complicated sequence, behind which can be dimly perceived Coleman ... and Wulfstan, and a whole community of saints, from home and abroad, culminating in Christ himself” (57).

Peter Orton’s “Burning Idols, Burning Bridges: Bede, Conversion and *Beowulf*” (*Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 36: 5–46) looks again at some of the information in Bede’s *Historia* related to the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons in the late sixth and seventh centuries. Orton wants to concentrate “not on the positive promotion and reception of the Christian message, but on the related but ... distinct question of the Anglo-Saxons’ detachment from the pagan religion that they had followed for centuries before the missionaries arrived,” although “it is bound to be difficult to discover evidence of the counter-attractions of paganism in an ecclesiastical history written by a committed Christian.” Nevertheless, “the information Bede supplies shows that not all Anglo-Saxons saw the adoption of the new religion as automatically cutting off the line of retreat into paganism, or even as necessarily involving its abandonment” (5). While Orton admits that there is “no historical interest on Bede’s part in paganism as a religion,” his *Historia* nevertheless, gives us “a fair amount of information that contributes to a general idea of how paganism was envisaged by the missionaries,” especially when

compared with evidence of Germanic paganism on the continent (8). After looking closely at certain of Bede's conversion narratives, Orton turns to *Beowulf* "to illustrate some of the difficulties the Anglo-Saxons faced in revising their conception of their own pagan past in light of their newly-acquired Christian faith" (6).

Andrew S. Rabin's Ph.D. dissertation, "What Mine Eyes Have Seen and My Ears Heard': Testimony in Old English Literature and Law" (U of Chicago, 2005, DAI 66A: 988) is something to celebrate: it represents, as Rabin himself puts it, the "first extended study of the Anglo-Saxon witness" that "examines how ... discourse expresses early concepts of identity and legal subjectivity." More specifically, his project builds upon recent work in both legal history and the study of the premodern self in order to "recuperate Old English law for literary study by drawing parallels between identity construction in juridical and that in more canonical literary works, including *Beowulf* and Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*." Further, his work "aims to deepen our understanding of the psychology of selfhood in pre-Conquest England and to open up new avenues for the study of law and literature in Old English" (v). In Rabin's view, non-literary works such as the law codes "suggest that the act of bearing witness played a central role in constituting the Anglo-Saxon subject," and the usual "characterization of the witness as *written*" often re-enacted "the production of the written legal text itself" (v, vi). Ultimately, he argues, recognizing the importance of these early testimony narratives "illuminates the close relationship between Old English law and literature even as it helps us trace the link between expanding literacy and the development of a surprisingly individualized Anglo-Saxon subject" (vi). The dissertation has seven chapters in two volumes: "Introduction: The Witness and the Law in Anglo-Saxon England"; "The Witness and the Text in Old English Law Codes"; "Testimony and Authority in the 'Fonthill Letter'"; "Bede, Drythelm, and the Witness to the Other World"; "Archbishop Wulfstan and the Origins of the Law"; "The Public Witness and the Private Self in *Beowulf*"; "Conclusion: Witnessing the Past in Revolutionary America." Rabin also provides the text and translation of the "Fonthill Letter" in an Appendix. Given the complex, important, yet often unexplored connections between individual interiority, social being, and the human subject as constructed by the state in Anglo-Saxon studies, I consider this, frankly, brilliant dissertation to be a must-read.

Barbara Yorke's very short essay, "Saints' Lives in Anglo-Saxon Wessex" (*St Wulfsgige and Sherborne*, ed. Barker, Hinton, and Hunt [see sect. 7], 95–97) briefly

explains the history of writing saints' lives in Anglo-Saxon Wessex. Yorke first details the generic conventions of the well-established literary genre of early medieval hagiography, and asserts that "even the most speculative *Lives* have valuable information about contemporary beliefs and the practice of religion." She identifies three main phases in the writing of *Lives* in Anglo-Saxon Wessex: the stories, in the seventh and eighth centuries, of those West Saxons "who went to work in Germany either converting pagans or reinforcing the faith in nominally Christian areas." A "more significant" period is that of the monastic reform of the later tenth century when Winchester "was a major center for the writing of Latin *Lives*, including those of its leading saints, Swithun and Æthelwold." At the same time, Ælfric was producing his vernacular versions of these same legends. For the third, post-Conquest phase, Yorke remarks upon Goscelin, the author of the *Life* of St. Wulfsgige, "who was among those of foreign birth employed in England to produce Latin versions for the saints whose *Lives* were written in Old English, or whose reputations rested mainly on oral tradition" (96). Yorke notes that there are two main categories for saints culted at Wessex for whom written *Lives* survive: "bishops of West Saxon sees and members of the West Saxon royal house who were all, with the exception of Edward the Martyr, princesses or former queens." But Wessex "is not as well served as are some other parts of the country by local saints, usually from the conversion period, whose cults are often only cursorily recorded in later medieval sources, but may have been passed down through oral tradition"—St. Sidwell of Exeter and St. Decuman of Watchet (Somerset) are two examples here (97). As this essay was presumably intended as a sort of brief introduction to the subject of saints' *Lives* written in Anglo-Saxon Wessex for the purposes of a 1998 conference held in Sherborne to celebrate the millennium of the Benedictine abbey of St. Wulfsgige, there is no argument here, just a summary of the subject.

EAJ

Works not seen

Amodio, Mark C., ed. *New Directions in Oral Theory: Essays on Ancient and Medieval Literatures*. MRTS 287. Tempe: ACMRS. x, 341.

_____. "Res(is)ting the Singer: Towards a Non-Performative Anglo-Saxon Oral Poetics." *New Directions in Oral Theory*. Ed. Amodio. pp. 179–208.

Barnaud, Jean-François. *Le Bestiaire vieil-anglais: étude et traduction de textes animaliers dans la poésie vieil-anglais*. 2 vols. Publications de l'Association de

- médiévistes anglicistes de l'enseignement supérieur, hors série 7. Paris: AMAES, 2001. 405.
- Cahill, James. "The Marks of Many Hands: Textual Identity in Early Medieval Scribal Culture." Ph.D. Diss., Brown Univ., 2005. *DAI* 66A: 1758.
- Condie, V. "Representations of the Nativity in the Art and Vernacular Literature of the Anglo-Saxons." D.Phil. Thesis, U of Oxford, 2005. *Index to Theses* 54: 7357.
- D'Aronco, Maria A. "Il bilinguismo del medico anglosassone." *Il plurilinguismo in area germanica nel Medioevo: XXX Convegno Associazione italiana di Filologia germanica, Bari, 4-6 giugno 2003*. Ed. Lucia Sinisi. Palomar athenaeum 49. Bari: Palomar, 2005. pp. 39-57.
- _____. "Monstra nel regno vegetale: dalla mandragora alla gorgonia." *Fabelwesen, monstri e portenti nell'immaginario occidentale: Medioevo germanico e altro*. Ed. Carmela Rizzo. Bibliotheca germanica, studi e testi 15. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2004. xiv, 359 pp.
- Del Zotto, Carla. "Paradigmi agiografici nella storiografia medievale sulla conversione della Scandinavia." *Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale* 47 (2005), 361-81.
- Depreux, Philippe. "Réécrire la vie d'un saint aux XI^e et XII^e siècles: l'exemple des «Vies de saint Dunstan», archevêque de Canterbury († 988)." *Hagiographica* 12 (2005): 1-77.
- Dronke, Peter. "Latin and Vernacular Love Lyrics: Rochester and St Augustine's, Canterbury." *RB* 115: 400-10.
- Fjalldal, Magnús. *Anglo-Saxon England in Icelandic Medieval Texts*. Toronto Old Norse-Icelandic Series 2. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: U of Toronto Press. xi, 162.
- Gachelin, Jean-Marc. "Du vieux-saxon au vieil-anglais: essai de traduction d'un passage de l'*Héliand*." *Bulletin des anglicistes médiévistes* 66 (Winter 2004): 1-11.
- Harris, Joseph. "North-Sea Elegy and Para-Literary History." *Heroic Poets and Poetic Heroes in Celtic Tradition: A Festschrift for Patrick K. Ford*. Ed. Joseph Falaky Nagy and Leslie Ellen Jones. CSANA Yearbook 3-4. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 103-14.
- Hill, Thomas D. "Wise Words: Old English Sapiential Poetry." *Readings in Medieval Texts*. Ed. Johnson and Treharne, 166-82.
- Kabir, Ananya Jahanara. "Anglo-Saxon Textual Attitudes." *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism. Volume 2: The Middle Ages*. Ed. Alistair Minnis and Ian Johnson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. pp. 310-23.
- Клёмина, Е. Н. [Klyomina, E. N.] "Характеристика языка и стиля древнеанглийской поэзии" ["Kharakteristika yazyka i stilya drevneanglijskoi poezii" = "Characteristics of the Language and Style of Old English Poetry"]. *Стилистика текста: Межвузовский сборник научных трудов [Stilistika teksta: Mezhvuzovskij sbornik nauchnykh trudov = Textual Stylistics: Inter-institutional Symposium Academic Proceedings]*. Nizhnij Novgorod: NGLU. 69-72.
- Lendinara, Patrizia. "Di meraviglia in meraviglia." *Circolazione di uomini, di idee e di testi nel Medioevo germanico: XXV Convegno dell'Associazione Italiana di Filologia germanica. Cassino - San Vincenzo al Volturno - Montecassino, 27-29 Maggio 1998*. Ed. Franco De Vivo. Cassino: Edizioni dell'Università degli Studi de Cassino, 2002. pp. 177-229, ill.
- _____. "Mirabilia Indiae e le radici del discorso coloniale." *Maschere dell'impero: Percorsi coloniale della letteratura inglese*. Ed. Elio Di Piazza, Daniela Corona, and Marcello Romeo. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2005. 147-78.
- _____. "I panoti: un popolo fantastico dalla Scizia alla Sicilia." *Le parole dei giorni: Scritti per Nino Buttitta*. Ed. Maria Caterina Ruta. 2 vols. La diagonale 119. Palermo: Sellerio, 2005. Vol. II, pp. 1142-58, ill.
- _____. "Popoli fantastici nei Bestiari." *Le lingue e le letterature germaniche fra il XII et il XVI secolo: Atti del XXIX Convegno dell'Associazione Italiana di Filologia Germanica - Trento 5-7 giugno 2002*. Ed. Fulvio Ferrari and Massimiliano Bampi. Labirinti 76. Trent: Editrice Università degli Studi di Trento, Dipartimento di Scienze Filologiche e Storiche, 2004. pp. 303-33, ill.
- _____. "Rileggere e schedare i portenti." *Fabelwesen, monstri e portenti nell'immaginario occidentale*. Ed. Rizzo. pp. 237-80.
- O'Brien O'Keefe, Katherine. "Deaths and Transformations: Thinking through the 'End' of Old English Verse." *New Directions in Oral Theory*. Ed. Amodio, 149-78. [chronicle poems *Death of Alfred, Death of Edward*]
- Olivares Merino, Eugenio. "The Old English Poem 'A Vampyre of the Fens': A Bibliographical Ghost." *Miscelánea* 32: 87-101.
- Rudolf, Winfried. "Journey to the Borderland: Two Poetic Passages on Judgment Day in Old English Homilies Revisited." *Proc. of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies Postgraduate Conference* 1 (March 2005): 1-13.
- Townsend, Matthew. "Knútr and the Cult of St Óláfr: Poetry and Patronage in Eleventh-Century Norway and England." *Viking and Medieval Scandinavia* 1: 251-79.

4b. Individual Poems

Andreas

In “The *eadgip* Erasure: A Gloss on the Old English *Andreas*” (ANQ 18.1: 3–7), Mary Dockray-Miller examines the erased *eadgip* on folio 41 of the Vercelli Book, which has been “erased” a second time by Krapp and Dobbie, who fail to mention its existence in their edition of the manuscript. Because of its position in the manuscript—it appears just after Andrew is safely transported to the Mermedonian shore with Jesus at the helm of his ship—Dockray-Miller suggests that this particular *eadgip* refers to St. Edith of Wilton, who, like Jesus, was a sea-calmer. On two separate occasions she supposedly calmed storms, which allowed for the safe sea voyages of Ealdred, Archbishop of York, and King Cnut. The placement of St. Edith's name at this point in the manuscript likely represent “a gloss entered by a reader who knew the traditions and narratives of the cult of St. Edith of Wilton and made a connection between the universal male saint and the local female one” (6).

Studies of *Andreas* have often focused primarily on its potential allegorical significance. However, in “I Will Never Forsake You’: The Divine Protection Theme in *Andreas*” (In *Geardagum* 25: 47–60), Bret A. Wightman argues for the importance of examining its literal significance as well. In particular, Wightman sets out to show that the *Andreas*-poet builds on occurrences of divine protection in the likely sources of the poem, the *Praxeis* and its two OE homiletic versions, and weaves them together into a cohesive theme that pervades the text. The poet accomplishes this effect in four primary ways: by establishing God's role as a general protector and “overseeing presence”; by consistently ascribing specific words associated with protection to individuals; by using the impersonal narrator's voice to complement the presence of protection words in direct discourse; and by clustering “aid-and-protection vocabulary in relatively tight groups” (57). Together, these techniques help produce a poem that functions both typologically, where Andrew and Matthew can be seen as prefiguring New Testament characters, and literally, where Andrew and Matthew are historical figures who model the proper devotional practice that allows them to enjoy protection from God.

Cædmon's Hymn

Daniel Paul O'Donnell's *Cædmon's Hymn: A Multi-Media Study, Edition and Archive* (Cambridge: D.S.

Brewer) marks the first new examination of the textual witnesses to *Cædmon's Hymn* since Dobbie's study in 1937, and the first book-length examination of the poem since Schwab's 1972 *Cædmon*. The reach of O'Donnell's book is ambitious: it offers readers “a broad literary, historical, and textual study of *Cædmon's Hymn*, a complete archive of all known witnesses to the poem, and an edition containing critical texts of the *Hymn* at significant points in its presumed textual history, including the written archetype presumed to underlie all surviving recensions of the *Hymn*” (x). But it delivers. This accomplished study is divided into three primary sections. The first serves as a literary and historical introduction to the poem, which includes a thorough reexamination of the context of the *Hymn* in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, especially its connection to the story of the bonds of Imma, which O'Donnell recognizes as serving a similarly propagandistic function; a discussion of sources and analogues of the poem, including the expected, like the work of Aldhelm, and the more surprising, notably Ntsikana, a member of the Ciracian clan in southern Africa who, in the early nineteenth century, spontaneously began to compose Christian hymns “in the style of traditional Xhosa eulogistic verse” (41); and an examination of the *Hymn* in the context of Germanic verse. In the final chapter of this section, O'Donnell argues against the critical commonplace that the *Hymn* marks a departure from traditional Germanic poetry and opened up new avenues for the composition of vernacular religious verse. By contrast, he demonstrates how the poem reveals its indebtedness to “the same major metrical, stylistic, and formulaic conventions found in other, mostly later, verse texts in Old English and other Germanic languages” (60). The second section offers a thorough study of the textual and linguistic features of the poem. In his chapter on manuscripts, O'Donnell provides a city and library index, the entries for which include information on published descriptions of each MS, a detailed paragraph describing the manuscript itself, and a short section on relevant aspects of the text of the *Hymn*. Another section explores the filiation and transmission of the text in its various forms, which challenges Dobbie's 1937 division of the witnesses into four primary recensions (a fifth has been added more recently to this schema) divided essentially along dialectal lines, Northumbrian and West Saxon. O'Donnell proposes that there were three competitive early versions of the poem: one close to Cædmon's original, which closely resembles the West Saxon *eorðan* recension; another, “perhaps ‘learned’” version that “enjoyed limited circulation,” and which is found in “witnesses to the Northumbrian

aelda recension”; and a third that added *wue/we* and *on* in line 1a and 9a, features that appear in both West Saxon and Northumbrian witnesses (117). This section also contains chapters on the phonological and dialectal features of the various witnesses. The final section of the study includes critical editions of the West Saxon and Northumbrian recensions and their hypothetical ancestor, and also a collection of twenty-one witnesses to the poem. The CD-ROM that accompanies the book offers full-color facsimiles of manuscript folios containing the hymn and interactive versions of critical editions that allow the reader to access phonological and stylistic information about the text. A menu in the upper-left-hand corner of the screen offers the reader a variety of ways to view each edition: with critical notes, with phonological or orthographic variants, or with parallel readings from other editions. The Witness Archive really comes alive in the interactive version: readers can access a full-page MS facsimile of each available witness, a parallel facsimile/text view that focuses only on the relevant lines of the MS, and diplomatic and semi-diplomatic transcriptions. O’Donnell’s impressively thorough work fills a much-neglected critical and pedagogical gap.

Another essay discussing *Cædmon’s Hymn* is reviewed under *Phoenix*.

GD

Charms

In “Retracing the Path: Gesture, Memory, and the Exegesis of Tradition” (*History of Religions* 45: 1–28), Peter Jackson attempts “to understand how certain aspects of culture were construed before some of the terms at stake (especially *religio* and *traditio*) became associated with Christian theology and eventually implanted in the academic jargon of the West” (2). The section of the article of greatest interest to Anglo-Saxonists will be part four, “Gothic *anafilhan* and the Germanic Concept of Tradition.” Because the Gothic translator of the Bible used the verb *filhan* to render several different Greek terms (*paradidōmi*, *parádoxis*, *parathékē*), “further attention to the concepts that ensue from this verb may help us grasp the systematic analysis of cultural inheritance in pre-Christian Germanic culture” (17). Jackson argues that “the Germanic concept of tradition (**felhan*) can be seen to oscillate between the notions of handing down and of concealing. A typical object of such an operation, the **rūnō*, likewise involves the notions of secrecy and of coded knowledge to be distributed and passed down” (26). Jackson also asserts that “[i]t is the term *runa* (Greek *mustérion*, ‘mystery, secret’; *boulé*, ‘plan’; *sumboullion*, ‘counsel’), which ...

[i]n the Gothic Bible ... preserves an early sense of the term having more to do with things said, whispered, or sung in a context of confidentiality or performative markedness” rather than referring to runic script, as elsewhere (18). Moreover, Jackson emphasizes that “a mystery, in the sense of classical Greek and Koine usage, has nothing to do with magic, not even necessarily with the supernatural, but with things that have acquired a marked status, so that they may only be seen or shown, heard or said, in a special way” (20). The ensuing discussion of Óðinn leads Jackson to consider the Old Norse verb *senda* in the verbal sequence of verse 18 of the Eddic poem *Sigrdrífumál*, which he compares to “a similar formulaic sequence, which contains two cognate verbal roots” in the Old English *Nine Herbs Charm*, which “rather indiscriminately mixes Christian and pre-Christian motifs” (25), and thus “represents Christ in a context that recalls the myth of the hanging Óðinn-Woden” (26). As for the herbs, “Christ ‘created’ (*gesceop*) them, ‘set’ (*sette*) them, and ‘sent’ (*sænde*) them” into the world, through a sequence “perfectly consistent with the one in *Sigrdrífumál*,” using “the same threefold gesture: to create or shave off; to put down; to distribute” (26).

In “Reconstructing the Old English *Samhain*: An Antiphonal Arrangement of the Metrical Charm, ‘For Unfruitful Land’” (*In Geardagum* 25: 7–15), Arvilla Taylor describes the ritual she has used for celebrating Samhain “with a blend of Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, and Christian traditions that existed in the early medieval times” (7). The celebration, held “by a blazing bonfire,” opens with a recitation of *Cædmon’s Hymn*, but the body of the ritual is the antiphonal arrangement and translation of the charm for unfruitful land presented here (7). “As leader of the chorus ... both monk and druid,” Taylor “keep[s] time with a version of the Beowulf harp” (11). The Priest offers the first thirteen lines of the charm, and as he embraces the earth, the Chorus chants the thirteen lines beginning “Erce! Erce! Erce!” Then, the Priest speaks ten lines, interspersed with symbolic digging of three furrows and the sprinkling of handfuls of earth. Finally, the Priest and Chorus chant the last two lines together. “As a climax to the festivities, a rider on a galloping horse will throw the corn god into the fire,” before the celebrants conclude with *The Ballad of St. Martinmas* (7).

RN

Christ II

In “The Persecuted Church and the *Mysterium Lunae*: Cynewulf’s *Ascension*, lines 252b–272 (*Christ II*, lines 691b–711)” (in *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed.

O'Brien O'Keefe and Orchard, II:293–314), Charles D. Wright demonstrates how the poet borrows the standard Christian allegory of the sun and the moon as Christ and the church, respectively. However, the poet does not simply borrow the image from Gregory the Great's Ascension homily; he both modifies and elaborates on it, especially by "defining the church as the *gesomninga sodes ond ryhtes* [union of truth and faith]" (294). Wright finds no parallel to this definition of the church as the union of these virtues and suggests that the image reinforces the notion of the Ascension as uniting God and humankind in covenant (295). Further, the identification of the sun and moon with Christ and the church may also resonate with early medieval crucifixion iconography, wherein *sol* and *luna* veil their faces, though the bible mentions only the sun; both are also depicted in Ascension iconography, although there "they represent Christ and the church in glory, for at the Ascension the 'sun of justice' was raised up and *Ecclesia/luna* was reilluminated" (295). Like the phases of the moon, the fortunes of the church wax and wane, especially through alternating imperial patronage and persecution. Cynewulf departs from Gregory's discussion of the church's fear of preaching openly before the Ascension and focuses instead on persecutions that took place after, including the destruction of God's church and martyrdom by pagan emperors (298). Wright points out that "Cynewulf's modification coincides with a widespread patristic tradition that associated the image of the church as moon specifically with the persecutions it had endured in the apostolic and post-apostolic eras (and would again endure in the last times)" (298). The extended analogy equates the glorified church with the bright moon, the persecuted church with the darkened moon; Wright demonstrates that the fourth term, the darkened moon, is actually missing (though implicitly present), thereby causing the analogy to mimic in its structure the occlusion it suggests in its terms: "By setting up a defective analogy with the darkened moon as its implied fourth term, Cynewulf has constructed a poetic correlative of the Christian mystery of the moon and the persecuted Church, whose glory is both occulted and renewed through the *blodgyte* of persecution" (301). Depending on Cynewulf's dates, Wright argues that the church of his own time may also have been subject to persecution and martyrdom, making the significance of the moon's enduring presence despite occlusion far more resonant for the poet and his audience than either "the remote history of the early church—or to the more remote realm of allegory" (304).

MKR

Daniel

Critics have noted the importance of pride in the OE *Daniel*, a feature not extensively explored in its biblical source; Manish Sharma ("Nebuchadnezzar and the Defiance of Measure in the Old English *Daniel*" *English Studies* 86: 103–26) argues for the importance of recognizing the collocation of pride and exile in the poem. More specifically, he identifies a connection between pride, physical movement—from home to exile and back again—and spiritual movement. Such movement, which both the Israelites and King Nebuchadnezzar experience, is absent from the Baltassar episode, in which the king remains both physically and morally static. But Sharma is careful to note that the poem remains ambiguous about both movement and stasis: "Movement signifies pride and humility, expulsion and return; stasis signifies security and imprisonment, the steadfast faith of the Three Youths and the spiritual immobility of the Baltassar" (123–24). The ability to move does, however, represent potential: "capacity for movement ... implies the capacity for redemption" (124).

GD

Death of Alfred

In "English–Danish Rivalry and the Mutilation of Alfred in the Eleventh-Century Chronicle Poem *The Death of Alfred*" (*JEGP* 104: 31–53), Susanne Kries states that "[t]he varying presentation of the political crisis that the poem recalls ... invites us to investigate the different political and social realities underlying the manuscripts' respective contexts" (31). Her argument is that "[t]he narrative of the blinding of Alfred ... raises questions of legality and legitimacy that might have been motivated by a challenge to the existing political system" (32). Kries first offers a general discussion of the chronicle poems, which function both "within a larger system of discourse" and "as individual compositions" (36). Next, she considers "the political situation in England after the death of King Cnut" in order to argue that "the mutilation of Alfred as an act of punishment served as a statement of royal authority" (32). "From a particularly English perspective," Kries explains, "the mutilation and subsequent death of Alfred, allegedly at the hands of Earl Godwine, could be read as one of the most vigorous signs of a strong (Anglo-) Danish faction in the country" (43). *The Death of Alfred* thus becomes a case in which "a specifically Danish identity came to be acted out on English 'terrain'" (44), through its emphasis on a break in continuity (for example, through its absence of opening *her*) and through the

use of legalistic language, such that “the poem evokes the end of Wessex claims to the English throne” (51).

RN

Dream of the Rood

In his much anticipated *Ritual and the Rood: Liturgical Images and the Old English Poems of the Dream of the Rood Tradition* (Toronto: U of Toronto P), Éamonn Ó Carragáin undertakes the Herculean task of providing exhaustive background and persuasive interpretation for the varying strands of the tradition, including the theological, liturgical, linguistic, and artistic contexts in which it arose. The first section of the book provides excellent illustrations, including maps; photographs of the Ruthwell Cross combined with sketches to enhance clarity and runes transliterated into Roman characters; color photographs of contemporary artifacts and artwork to situate the tradition in the artistic milieu from which it came; similar illustrations are used throughout the text, providing a rich resource for scholarship and teaching. Ó Carragáin begins by providing useful background to the whole tradition, then focuses on the Ruthwell Cross for minute explication based on a wide range of potential sources and analogues, with later chapters discussing the Bewcastle Cross, the Brussels Cross and other artifacts. Throughout the book, he demonstrates that a key to understanding the iconography of the crosses and the poem is late seventh- and early eighth-century Christian liturgies for Lent and Holy Week, which in Ó Carragáin’s view provide the poem with its central theological theme: the essential unity of Incarnation and Passion. He ranges widely through liturgical texts and art to demonstrate that the combination of the text of the poem and the images, especially on the Ruthwell Cross, presents a unified message of salvation. A late chapter discusses the Vercelli Book; Ó Carragáin has promised a further book on that topic. This text is essential for understanding the broader context of the *Dream of the Rood* tradition, but it may be dangerous in its ability to present such a cogent and well-documented argument that the reader is beguiled into overlooking the problems inherent in any text that seeks to find a completely coherent explanation for a human production so far removed in time. For example, Ó Carragáin’s argument that the Ruthwell Cross is meant to be read “sunwise,” that is, following the direction of the sun, or right to left, is persuasive as stated, but glosses over the fact that some portions of the text are carved down the left side, then the right, rather than vice versa. Despite the occasional lapse, Ó Carragáin’s achievement is prodigious: insightful and, perhaps that most elusive of qualities, useful.

According to Murray McGillivray in “*Dream of the Rood* 9–12 and the Christmas Liturgy,” *N&Q* n.s. 52: 1–2, “the poet of the *Dream of the Rood* has been shown to have had a thorough familiarity with the performed liturgy” (2). Here, McGillivray demonstrates possible connections between the poem and the introit to the Christmas day mass, showing that reading “engel dryhtnes” as referring to Christ as “nuntius” does not rely on complex assumptions about the poet’s knowledge of Augustine’s interpretation of the phrase *magni consilii angelus* in Isaiah 9:6 as a prophetic reference to Christ; the poet and his audience need have gone no further than mass on Christmas to hear Christ referred to in the introit by that very phrase. Here, according to McGillivray, “the prophetic phrases from Isaiah are given what amounts to a situational exegesis by being chanted at the moment in the liturgical year when Christ symbolically enters the world” (1).

MKR

Durham

Jan Čermák offers reflections on two Old English poems about “places imbued with mystery” (7) in “The Old English *Ruin* and *Durham*: Some Reflections on Literary Topology” (*Germanistica Pragensia* 17: 7–14). In *The Ruin*, a “once perfect whole has become an irregular concatenation of its wondrous but ragged parts,” and the poem therefore oscillates between “the image of past perfection” and “the decaying present,” such that the depicted city develops a “double existence” (11). “Where the onlooker meditating on the Ruin was confronted with patterns of presence and absence, integrity and partiality in constant oscillation, the poet of *Durham* portrays a neat and stable binary spatial arrangement of the town and its natural surroundings around St. Cuthbert’s deposited body,” Čermák argues (12). The harmony of this poem is reflected in its representation of nature, which is protective rather than hostile (12). Yet through its deletion of the human presence, like *The Ruin*, Durham “becomes another city of the dead but these will mysteriously rise again; whereas for the perished of *The Ruin* ... no such hope is available” (12).

RN

Elene

In “The Failing Torch: The Old English *Elene*, 1256–1259” (*N&Q* n.s. 52: 155–60), Thomas D. Hill investigates potential sources and analogues for the simile that equates “[t]he life of a man in the world, even a warrior who is honored in the hall of a king [with] nothing more than a ‘cen drusende,’ a failing or flickering

torch that can be extinguished at any moment" (156). Hill points out that this figure is probably not original with Cynewulf since it can be found in early medieval riddles and proverbs; he cites the *Disputatio regalis et nobillissimi iuvenis Pippini cum Albino scholastico*, as well as other examples of the figure's use in riddling tradition (157). He also demonstrates that the simile occurs elsewhere besides the riddle and proverb tradition, citing a twelfth-century French poem, *Eructavit*, as an example. While the comparison is relatively common, however, Hill suggests that it is of interest because it does not occur in Cynewulf's major Latin source, because it might offer a clue in solving the enigmatic signatures of Cynewulf's poems, and because "the riddle and the poetic comparison which it embodies are ... of real aesthetic interest" (158). The lines Hill examines contain part of the runic signature of Cynewulf, with the <c> rune, usually construed as 'torch,' here taken as 'cene' or 'bold ones'; he suggests that the rune and the verb following, *cwacað* (literally 'to shake') may be read two ways: 'torches flicker or shake' as well as 'bold ones tremble' (158-59). Each reading comments upon the other, and "Cynewulf, himself, plays with the 'torch/candle of life' figure in the conclusion of *Elene*" (159). Hill also adduces here the story of Meleager, whose life is magically tied to a quenched torch, and the Old Norse-Icelandic *Norna-Gests þátr*. Although direct contact is unlikely, the similarities are striking. Hill's point is that "Cynewulf's comparison of the life of a (young) warrior to a flickering candle or torch should be understood in the context of a larger corpus of metaphor and comparison which was shared among various literary languages of the early medieval world" (159). Compared with the assurance of salvation provided by the Cross, the uncertain life of the warrior, however heroic and glorious, can never be anything but a flickering torch, in danger every moment of being extinguished forever.

Stacy S. Klein's "Centralizing Feminism in Anglo-Saxon Literary Studies: *Elene*, Motherhood, and History" (in *Readings in Medieval Texts*, ed. Johnson and Treharne, 149-65) "seeks to show how reading Old English poetry through the lens of feminist criticism sheds new light on the myriad of gender stereotypes that have accrued to motherhood, a cultural phenomenon which remains one of the most difficult debated issues in feminism" (150). Klein suggests that Cynewulf uses the Helena of the Roman past to create an image of motherhood in the Anglo-Saxon present that can transcend more restrictive cultural norms; she argues that Elene is "at once the biological mother of Constantine, the spiritual mother of the Jews, and the mother-muse who inspires [Cynewulf's] own poetry" (151). Elene's quest

to find the true cross is "undertaken in the name of maternal duty" (151), and Klein suggests that her fulfillment of this duty be construed as Christian obedience; further, she asserts that Cynewulf deliberately parallels Elene to the Virgin Mary, the only other woman named in the poem and like Elene, "a single mother carrying out her son's will in the world" (152). Such an identification would remind Cynewulf's readers of the importance of biological mothers, but would also give married women an exemplar to which they could reasonably aspire; in so doing, he re-envisioned the model of motherhood as requiring differing types of female agency (152-53). Even mothers who did not journey to Jerusalem as Elene did were "deeply imbricated in public political life" in Anglo-Saxon society and motherhood was always a public role (154). According to Klein, "Cynewulf expands the concept of motherhood itself: he neither reduces it to the act of birthgiving, nor even to the care of biological children, but depicts it as a social role bound up in the preservation of spiritual life and creative expression" (154). Elene's spiritual children in the poem are the Jews, whom she exhorts to embrace the true faith, and, by the end of the poem, her creative child is Cynewulf himself, for whom she serves as a mother-muse (154-57). The poet depicts motherhood "as a cultural phenomenon that encompasses a range of activities beyond biological reproduction" (157), significantly expanding the usual meanings assigned to motherhood in Old English heroic poetry. Klein discusses the stock role of the 'whetting woman' whose words inspire men to battle by presenting them with an either/or choice between winning and dying, largely "to prevent men from taking the third option of avoiding warfare altogether through flight" (159), and suggests that Elene adopts (and adapts) the language of the whetting woman in order to present the Jews with an either/or choice: life (conversion) or death (damnation). Elene's glory lies not in inspiring violence but in effecting conversion, so that "[t]he identity of the mother is redefined: it is no longer contingent on her warrior son's ability to kill but on her spiritual son's willingness to change" (160). Finally, Klein asserts that the Anglo-Saxon audience of *Elene* would immediately associate her name with Helen of Troy, whose name was synonymous with female disobedience in contradiction with Elene, who chastises the Jews for caring more for tales of the Trojan War than for the crucifixion of Christ. "When Elene demands that history should centre on Christ's sufferings rather than on Trojan warfare, and when Cynewulf echoes her request by urging all people to remember the story of the Cross, together, they voice an implicit demand that Woman be remembered

differently within the historical record—not as the beautiful lover who would instigate familial and political strife but as the Christian mother who would make it possible to know the giver of all peace” (161).

In his note “Inbryrdes breostefa’: Compunction in Line 841a of Cynewulf’s *Elene*,” *N&Q* 52: 160–1, Christopher Vaccaro argues that “[t]hough Cynewulf retains much of the Latin source material, he makes his authorial influence conspicuous through his descriptions of the Jews, where he repeatedly amplifies images of their hard hearts and of the grace of compunction through which they might be saved” (160). Vaccaro asserts that the problematic phrase *inbryrdes breostefa* in one of the poet’s amplifications of the Latin source “speaks specifically to Judas’s ability to feel compunction and to receive God’s grace,” as sight of the true cross opens his hardened heart, transforming it (160). He echoes Sandra McEntire’s suggestion that *onbryrdes* “often denoted an intense spiritual/emotional experience or compunction,” aligning the poet’s use of the term with translation practice; Vaccaro cites examples where Latin *compunctio* was translated by *inbryrd* (161). He concludes that “[i]n the sign of the cross, Judas is gladdened and strengthened, and moved to a *compunctio cordis* that, though not complemented with tears, still reveals the degree of the character’s new faith and love” (161).

MKR

Exodus

In “Connecting the Patriarchs: Noah and Abraham in the Old English *Exodus*” (*JEGP* 104: 171–88), Daniel Anlezark makes a convincing new argument about the sources of *Exodus*, including “Biblical precedents in the books of Wisdom [10:4, 15:16] and Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) [44:17–19] and in the epistle to the Hebrews [11:7]” (172). Anlezark further argues that “the account of the Flood in the book of Wisdom also influenced *Exodus* indirectly by way of Aldhelm’s short account of the Flood in his riddle LXIII, *Corbus* (‘Raven’), which refers to the waters of the Flood as ‘new,’ a descriptor not found in other potential scriptural or patristic sources (172). To be sure, Anlezark explains, “We need not assume that the poet had all these texts in front of him as he worked. Rather, the density of Biblical echoes is the product of long-term close study of the Bible and reflection on the relationship between scriptural passages” (177). Thus, he concludes, “The range of Biblical detail found in the Noah episode in *Exodus* points to an inspired poet ruminating on sacred history and drawing on a well-trained memory” (188).

RN

Genesis A and B

Line 457a of *Genesis B*, *freo fægroste*, is most often translated as “fairest woman” in the accusative case. To define *freo* as ‘woman,’ here, however, instead of its more usual adjectival definition, ‘free,’ requires the addition of a *hapax legomenon*, since nowhere else in the corpus does such an attestation occur. Alfred Bammesberger (“*Freo* ‘Woman’ in *Genesis*, line 457a,” *N&Q* 52: 282–84) offers an alternate explanation, one that argues against “admitting a substantive *freo* ‘woman, lady,’ to the genuine lexicon of Old English” (284). Bammesberger instead claims that it is a misanalysis of the OS genitive plural *fri(h)o*, as in the *Heliand*’s *friho scaniosta* (l. 438) and *frio sconiosta* (l. 2017): “the most beautiful of women.” According to regular phonological correspondence, OS *frio* would be OE *fria*; yet without the noun **fri* “in the required meaning” in OE, however, the Anglo-Saxon transcriber “rather mechanically and superficially substituted *freo*, because in many cases OE *eo* regularly corresponded to OS *io*” (283).

In “Legalizing the Fall of Man” (*Medium Ævum* 74: 205–20), Janet Schrunck Ericksen determines that the Old Irish legal tradition, in particular the *Senchas Már*, in which Adam’s decision to eat the apple is offered as an example of a disadvantageous contract, is a useful context in which to read “the legalism of *Genesis B*” (207). In particular, Ericksen’s essay focuses on what she identifies as contractual relationships between God, Adam, and Eve (where God directly forbids consumption of the fruit to both humans in return for their mostly unrestricted enjoyment of the garden), between the devil and Eve, and, through Eve, between the devil and Adam. According to Ericksen’s legalistic scheme, the *tacen* Adam seeks from the devil “functions as would a contractual surety” (210). And indeed, Ericksen notes a positive correlation between the four occurrences of the word *tacen* in the poem and the presence of “some contractual obligation or proposal” (211). Ericksen finds the chirograph as the most likely candidate for the *tacen* in the poem, largely because of its various connections to versions of Adam’s Fall in other texts, especially in Colossians ii.14, where Paul “refers ... to the Fall in terms of a ‘chirografum decretis,’” and also in an apocryphal “third story of Satan’s deception” that follows the couple’s expulsion from the garden.

Karin Olsen’s “Him þæs grim lean becom’: The Theme of Infertility in *Genesis A*,” in *Verbal Encounters: Anglo-Saxon and Norse Studies for Roberta Frank*, ed. Antonina Harbus and Russell Poole, Toronto Old English Series (Toronto: U of Toronto P), 127–43, argues that the opening of *Genesis A*, which depicts the joy of

the angels who follow God and the misery of those who do not, introduces an important theme about judgment and punishment that serves as a model for how the human beings introduced later in the poem are treated. In particular, Olsen illustrates "how the poet uses recurrent images of infertility in order to recall with each transgression and punishment on earth Lucifer's rebellion and fall in heaven. While the faithful are allowed to increase and multiply, and enjoy the fecund earth, God unleashes the powers of chaos so as to torture and destroy those who, like Satan, have forgotten their true Creator and shamefully commit sin" (128). Read as such, the cursing of Cain's line, the Flood, the destruction of the Tower of Babel, and the fall of Sodom and Gomorrah are meted out to those who have "transgressed against God's creative principle" (141). While the connection between "man's moral behaviour" and fertility is explored thoroughly in the poem's biblical source, Olsen identifies the connection between angelic and human behavior as "spring[ing] from the poet's own imagination" (143).

GD

Guthlac A and B

In "*Guthlac A and Guthlac B: Changing Metaphors*" (*Anchorites, Wombs and Tombs*, ed. McAvoy and Hughes-Edwards, 41–53), Santha Bhattacharji makes an important contribution to the consideration of Anglo-Saxon texts in light of the development of the affective piety movement in the later Middle Ages. She focuses her analysis on three passages describing Guthlac's failing health (lines 954–6, 1027–9, and 1141–5), arguing that the unlocked treasure hoard here described "is a striking and unusual image for death, and one which carries deeply gendered overtones. Indeed, the other principal associations of 'treasure-chest' with the idea of unlocking in Old English poetry occur ... in two obscene riddles within the *Exeter Book*, riddles 44 and 90," in which the key is masculinized and the treasure-chest feminized (42). Thus, "the passivity of the hermit confronted by death seems to cast him in a suggestively female role" (42). Bhattacharji sees this thrice-repeated image as the "one major, controlling metaphor" we should expect to find in a hagiographic text about a hermit (43); in other texts, as in *Guthlac A*, "[m]ost often, however, the controlling metaphor is that of warfare: the saint is a warrior of God" (44). Although Felix models Guthlac's death on Bede's account of Cuthbert, he "shows a striking element of independence in presenting a more joyful slant to the experience of death" (46). Taking these variables

together, Bhattacharji states that "once we have a cooperative and willing treasure-chest and an approaching key, further overtones come into play: the male saint is playing the female role in a drama resembling the sexual act" (48). This marks a development in the evolution of hermit discourse, which includes later texts by Bernard of Clairvaux, who was influenced by Anselm of Canterbury and of course the Song of Songs. But the greater significance of Bhattacharji's argument is that "perhaps Bernard's focus on the Bride was so readily received precisely because a more feminized discourse was already emerging ... *Guthlac B*, written possibly before the year 900, shows us the dim beginnings of this more feminized discourse" (51).

RN

Judith

Erin Mullally's "The Cross-Gendered Gift: Weaponry in the Old English Judith," *Exemplaria* 17: 255–84, begins with a discussion of the scholarly uneasiness caused by the shifting roles of the heroine if the poem is read strictly as an allegory. She explicitly stakes out that uncomfortable ground as her own, however, for the absence of generic markers allows her to argue that "Judith enters into a masculine system of exchange which clearly demonstrates that femininity and heroism are possible within the Anglo-Saxon warrior culture's structures of exchange. Judith's transformation in the poem is not solely from passive to aggressive nor from "feminine" to "masculine," but rather explicitly from "possessed" to "possessor" (257). She wields several types of power and functions as both sacred and secular hero "whose position is complicated by her sex but not diminished by it" (257). Mullally traces recent scholarship discussing gift-exchange and the social relationships and obligations implicit in such an economy and observes that women's position in Anglo-Saxon gift culture is vexed because women were themselves owned, passive objects of exchange (261), and that "the politics of gift giving are ultimately gendered (262). However, she proposes "that an economy of honor is applicable outside of the strictly masculine, heroic mode of Old English poetry and can be seen in hagiographic literature which contains heroic tropes" (262). Sainly women were not powerless, though female agency may have been vastly different from male. In a discussion of treasure, Mullally examines the common conflation of woman and treasure that suggests a correlation between "the material desire for goods and the social/sexual desire for women" (264). The paradox implicit in the Christian's simultaneous rejection of the temporal world and its treasures and the celebration of

it as God's gift extends to the life of the saint: how can one be both pious and ring-adorned?

When she first appears in the poem, Judith is an object, while Holofernes is presented as a giver of objects (and a would-be taker of objects as spoils, including Judith's person). Though he desires to rape Judith, he becomes incapably drunk through his own excess, allowing her to act upon him instead. Mullally argues that "because she takes on a traditionally masculine role, ... her action creates a gender crisis that informs the depiction of Holofernes as well" (270). His death at the hand of a woman disgraces him, but it also allows her to move from passive object to active warrior, who will be rewarded in kind. Here, Mullally focuses on the objects of exchange rather than the givers to avoid "traditional cultural or gendered biases" (273). Having decapitated Holofernes, Judith possesses an object of exchange with which to enter into "the archetypal masculine exchange system we see in *Beowulf* or the Icelandic Sagas" (274). She presents the head to her people, while portraying herself as the passive agent of God (276). Mullally notes that the OE poem de-emphasizes Judith's gender by removing the Vulgate's insistence that Holofernes died "by the hand of a woman" (277), while allowing her to emphasize her own agency by proclaiming, "I caused his death" (277).

In exchange for the head, the Bethulians give her Holofernes's treasure. In the Vulgate, she receives his household goods, but the OE poem gives her his treasure and arms. "Receiving weaponry links Judith with a masculine social position" (281) and allows her to transcend her gender. Victoria Wohl argues that this type of gift exchange implies both equality and hierarchy (282); critics have argued on the basis of hierarchy that Judith returns to a passive role, but Mullally contends that Judith remains an active hero at the end of the text because she is now expected to reciprocate in future gift-exchange; more specifically, although she is female, she is now expected to demonstrate martial prowess if needed, as symbolized by the armor (283–84).

Long dismissed by scholars, the possibility that *Judith* was intended as a panegyric to Æthelflæd, eldest child of Alfred the Great and queen of Mercia is reconsidered by Flora Spiegel in "The Heroic Biography of Æthelflæd of Mercia and the Old English *Judith*: A Re-examination," *Quaestio Insularis* 5 (2005 for 2004): 111–44. She begins with T.G. Foster's 1892 article, which raises the possibility based on "Æthelflæd's role as a female general, ... otherwise unheard of in an Anglo-Saxon context" (119). Because he did not offer specific evidence from the poem, Foster's argument was overshadowed by later contenders, then systematically refuted by B.J. Trimmer in 1952,

which is still cited to dismiss the connection between Æthelflæd and *Judith*. Spiegel argues that recent scholarship provides solid grounds on which to challenge Trimmer and connect the poem with the Lady of the Mercians (114). First, Spiegel divorces the question of dating the poem from that of historical identifications, as "current consensus ... is still consistent with the poem having been written during or within a generation or so of the life of Æthelflæd (d. 919)" (114), though disagreement remains. After a detailed discussion of the dating debate, she suggests that if she is correct in her association of *Judith* with Æthelflæd, the poem is best regarded as a West Saxon production, "perhaps commissioned by Edward in memory of his sister, or by Æthelstan in memory of his aunt and foster-mother" (117). Second, Spiegel addresses Trimmer's concern that the poem is strictly neither hagiography nor panegyric, but a curious blending of the two. She asserts that "the house of Wessex made a habit of cultivating literary parallels with the heroes of the Old Testament," giving specific examples from non-literary texts (118) and suggesting that Latin panegyrics were composed for Æthelflæd (121). Third, the objection that the poem is not strictly hagiographic is dismissed because Judith was not a canonized saint, but an Old Testament heroine, nor is her chastity spotlighted, as one might expect in a saint's life (125). Spiegel considers the poem as "occupying something of a middle ground between verse hagiography and the genre of Old Testament poetry with which it more logically belongs" (124). Further, she states that the Judith story began to be read as significant for the English nation, not simply as an individual biography (127), which would have linked it in the minds of those wishing to praise Æthelflæd for her service to her people (128), service elucidated in chronicles and, especially, the Irish annals, and paralleled in *Judith* (129–136). Spotting the Mercian Register, Spiegel points to the repeated emphasis on divine grace and aid in Æthelflæd's activities, which is "not characteristic of the reports of other leaders' military actions in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle," but which is characteristic of the poem's description of Judith's actions (136–37). Finally, Spiegel sees alterations from the Vulgate in the poem as reflecting Æthelflæd's career, including "the large number of royal epithets applied to Judith" in the extant portion of the text (140), a potential echo of Æðelflæd's name in an epithet applied to Judith, "seo æðele" (141), the casting of Judith as a warrior hero, especially by "the implication [absent in the Vulgate] that Judith will continue to lead Bethulia long after the curtain has dropped" (142). In the end, Spiegel admits that her argument is conjecture, but suggests that more

recent understanding of both the poem and external sources demonstrates that previous scholarly objections to reading Judith as a panegyric to Æthelflæd may no longer be valid (144).

Juliana

Jill Fredrick's "Warring with words: Cynewulf's Juliana," *Readings in Medieval Texts*, ed. Johnson and Treharne, 60–74, argues that, far from "a literary type who moves disinterestedly through a stilted and conventional allegory," Cynewulf's Juliana is "a strong, complex, and autonomous woman, functioning within a unified and artful narrative" (62). While acknowledging that Cynewulf adapts the Latin *vita* in ways likely to appeal to "an Anglo-Saxon audience accustomed to war, imaginative and actual" (65), Frederick moves beyond that scholarly commonplace to suggest further that, although Cynewulf never explicitly designates her so, Juliana can be seen as a warrior figure whose "speech enacts the conduct of a warrior: she does battle, resists conquest, with her words" (67). Indeed, the force of her words is such that, though she speaks little, her words are sufficient to compel the demon to tell the truth of his mission and transgressions. Frederick argues that in succumbing to Juliana's questioning, the demon temporarily transfers his allegiance from Satan to Juliana (68). Juliana, of course, is unswerving in her allegiance to God, true *þegn* to true *dryhten*, contrasted with the unfaithful demon and Satan. Demons "have no enthusiasm for their mission, since their bond is based on punishment rather than reward with treasure.... By contrast, Juliana's own allegiance to God, even in the face of her own punishment, remains joyfully steadfast throughout the poem" (70). Steadfastness is the centerpiece of the poem, exemplified in ll. 382–405, wherein the soul is described as a fortress under siege, a commonplace in Latin Christian texts, but absent from the version of Juliana's *vita* in the *Acta Sanctorum* (71). In the final section of the essay, Frederick discusses Cynewulf's runes briefly, but does not take a firm stand on the disagreements surrounding their interpretation; for her purposes, it is enough that Cynewulf uses them "to insert himself into the action of the poem, the middle of the battle, exhorting his audience to pray with and for him, reminding it—and us—that the struggle against sin presented in Juliana is both personal and universal" (73).

Also exploring the role of language in *Juliana*, Antonina Harbus's "Articulate Contact in *Juliana*" (*Verbal Encounters*, ed. Harbus and Poole, pp. 183–200), argues that the power of words drives the narrative

of the poem, as speech acts demonstrate sanctity, or lack thereof. "In Juliana, holiness is manifest in verbal straight-forwardness, combined with a tendency in her adversaries to use the spoken word to cajole, attack, or deceive the heroine" (183). Further, Harbus suggests that speech seems to be understood by Cynewulf as "part of the thought process itself rather than as a mere communication of preformed ideas" (183). Harbus briefly adduces semiotic theory from Augustine's *De doctrina Christiana* through C.S. Peirce and Ferdinand de Saussure, then cites Martin Heidegger, Hans-Georg Gadamer, and John Stewart as arguing for language as "an element of thought rather than a representation of it, an interpretive and communicative event rather than a system of signification" (184). She moves from the work of Marie Nelson and A.H. Olsen on language in the poem to scrutinize Cynewulf's narrative strategies, suggesting that his characters "negotiate understanding' through speech," though the negotiations often fail because neither side is willing to change (187). Harbus identifies three misinterpretations of Juliana's thought: by her father, her suitor, and the devil who visits her. Because neither side is willing to accept the opponent's position, "the specific verbal encounters in this poem are confrontational rather than conciliatory" (187). For Cynewulf, more than for his Latin source, words are weapons to be wielded against an adversary; Harbus suggests that "Juliana's own words, not her religious beliefs or her behaviour, constitute her wrongdoing," especially as they are interpreted by her father and suitor as "disobedience, blasphemy, deception, and insult" (188). Similarly, the speeches of Juliana's adversaries constitute their hostility toward her (190). Interestingly, Harbus posits that Cynewulf recasts Juliana's legend and speech acts in such a way that the poem presents more dialogue ("articulate contact") and fewer speeches, remarking that even the torture, commonplace in such narratives, "is generally less significant in the Old English poem; Cynewulf seems to be more interested in speech-based conflict" (192). She goes on to point out numerous instances of such conflict in the text, claiming for Juliana "an articulate rather than a reflective model of sanctity, whose speech can deflect evil" (194). The poet's word choice is of interest here, as Harbus argues that Cynewulf stretches the usual meanings of 'word' to also "refer to thought or intention as a binding declaration in a way that draws a conceptual if not a semantic connection between the two" (196). Here, the word is also the deed, rendering speech "morally, socially, and legally binding" (196). In Harbus's reading of the poem, the battle between good and evil is never fought in mere words, for words are the stuff of thought

and intent, not simply the purveyors thereof. “If you are what you utter, as the articulate model of speech maintains, and aspire to holiness, then enunciating saints’ lives might appear to be an ideal occupation, all the more so if the vita under consideration features an articulate, argumentative interlocutor who says what she thinks” (200). If *Juliana* were produced for a community of nuns, such verbal sparring must, Harbus opines, have “spiced up the refectory at mealtimes or invigorated personal reading in a way that sober prose or declarative speeches were unable to do” (200).

MKR

Menologium

In “The Prose *Menologium* and the Verse *Menologium*” (*Text and Language in Medieval English Prose*, ed. Oizumi *et al.*, 255–67), E.G. Stanley draws on a prose text to better understand its verse counterpart. He observes that “such turns of speech as that spring or summer or some month comes into the habitations or to town is in verse confined to *The Menologium*” (256), which “is no lyric, and has nothing lyrical about it,” although it is “often more expansive than the bare calendrical wording found in the prose” (257). Stanley lists the dates, feasts, and their line numbers in the verse text; he also notes differences between the contents of the prose and verse, and tracks where terms such as *niht* or *dæg* are used to label feasts in the prose and verse. Most helpfully, Stanley accounts for the “mild arithmetical complexities” that arise in both texts, and he most closely considers previous editions’ treatment of and commentary on lines 71 and 76 (259). In conclusion, Stanley states, “There is no dependence of the verse on the prose *Menologium*. They use the same material, major feasts only: the prose succinctly, the verse at greater length. Calendrical times are the subject of both the prose and the verse, but the terms used for saints’ days differ: *ti(i)d* in the verse, *mæsse* in the prose” (263).

Meters of Boethius

In “An Apologia for the *Meters of Boethius*” (*Naked Wordes in English*, ed. Krygier and Sikorska, 107–36), Paul E. Szarmach, with his typical wit, argues for the re-evaluation of this “key document in the cultural record and in Anglo-Saxon literary history,” which is “at the cutting edge of the interaction between the vernacular and the Latin” (107). Along the way, Szarmach considers modern impediments to work on Boethius, from the disciplinary boundary between those who work

on Latin texts and those who work on Old English, to the presentation of the *Meters* as unmoored from their prose context in Sedgefield’s edition, and the place of the *Meters* in the canon vis-à-vis their presentation as other in the *Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*. This article also lays valuable groundwork for any scholar wishing to answer Szarmach’s call for renewed attention to this important text, for example his discussion of the manuscript evidence for the *Consolation*—Latin and Old English, prose and verse—in Anglo-Saxon England. Szarmach also reviews the meager previous criticism on the *Meters*, most early studies of which focus on questions of authorship and aesthetics, to which Szarmach responds with a Foucaultian analysis of the author-function, tempered by a realist’s assessment of what Alfred’s role might actually have been. Finally, Szarmach turns his attention to “the commentary tradition that delivered to the king not the pure text but rather the text as understood” (116); the methodology and intention behind the translation project; analysis of amplification in *Meter 26*; discussion of Alfred’s “major structural addition,” *Meter 1* (122); and he concludes with a reading of *Meter 27*.

Two scholars have answered Szarmach’s call by offering metrical analysis of the *Meters of Boethius*. According to M.S. Griffith, this text “offers us a unique opportunity to watch an Anglo-Saxon poet in the act of forging his word-hoard from the base metal of the non-poetic prose source” (146). In “Verses Quite Like *cwen to gebeddan* in *The Metres of Boethius*” (*ASE* 34: 145–67), Griffith goes in search of parallels to *Beowulf*’s line 665a: *cwen to gebeddan*, which “has a preposition and prefix in its first dip but the following noun does not alliterate. There are 179 a-verses in *Beowulf* with such a preposition and double alliteration and only this verse lacks it” (145). Yet in the *Meters*, “twelve [such verses] have single alliteration, a much higher proportion than in *Beowulf* even though the extra alliteration still appears to be the norm,” and “not one of the twelve verses . . . shows any additional alliterative requirement beyond the preposition” (148). This leads Griffith to conclude that “the exceptional verses under discussion here form a large enough body to reveal the basic principles underlying one particular form of license, the appearance of single alliteration where double is to be expected. They indicate that the versifier avoided breaking more than one rule at once: verses without the alliteration also lack multiple metrical-grammatical requirements for it. They tend to be more like the prose either because they are closely modelled on it or because of the absence from them of pleonasm” (156). As for *Beowulf* 665a, which is more similar to these

exceptions in the *Meters* than it is to any other line in its own poem, “[t]he uniqueness ... is remarkable and strongly suggests rhetorical motivation,” and Griffith concludes by considering what this rhetorical motivation might have been (157).

In “Case-Forms and *mid*-Phrases in the Old English *Metres of Boethius: A Comparison with the Prose Version*” (*Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature* 17: 41–58), Kiriko Sato considers how verse and prose texts differ in the adverbial use of the dative case of nouns versus the use of a prepositional phrase, and the influence of metrical constraints on this decision. Sato states that “the prose shows a decided tendency towards an analytical language, but the verse language is less analytical” (43). The study then separately analyzes Bliss’s types of half-lines to “consider how the *Metres* poet translates case-forms and *mid*-phrases in the prose version during versification” (44). For example, to create regular verses of types A, D, and E, the poet often omits the preposition *mid*; another reason the verse tends toward case-forms is that “prepositions cannot become a filler of anacrusis” (54). Yet a preposition may be used in half-lines of types B, C, and D to obtain four metrical positions (54). Where either construction is metrically permissible, verses of type C and light verses prefer *mid*-phrases (55). Through this analysis, Sato clearly demonstrates “that metrical types are relevant for the choice between a case-form and a *mid*-phrase to denote the idea of instrumentality” (54).

RN

Phoenix

In “Old English *Gefreogum* in *The Phoenix*, Line 29b” (*Neophilologus* 89: 115–17), Alfred Bammesberger suggests that we understand the disputed word *gefreogum* not as the dative plural of the *gefrige*, “information, knowledge,” as many critics and editors have done, but as a form of *gefræge*, “information.” While Bammesberger concedes that the manuscript supports both possible readings of the noun, he finds *gefræge* is preferable for two reasons. The first is that, unlike *gefrige*, which is an unattested *hapax legomenon* reconstructed from the single occurrence of *gefreogum* in *The Phoenix*, *gefræge* is a form that is “well documented in poetry” (116). Second, Bammesberger finds phonological evidence to support his case, as well: postulating an Anglian author of the poem, he concludes that the form *gefreogum* could be the result of a West Saxon scribe incorrectly transcribing an original Anglian word, likely *gefrægum*.

In “Old English Poetic Texts and their Latin Sources: Iconicity in *Cædmon’s Hymn* and *The Phoenix*” (*The*

Motivated Sign: Iconicity in Language and Literature 2, ed. Olga Fischer and Max Nänny [Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001], 109–32), Earl Anderson hopes to demonstrate the multiple ways that Anglo-Saxon poets augmented the source material for their works by infusing them with iconic significance. Anderson’s analysis of *Cædmon’s Hymn* focuses on what he identifies as syntactic iconicity in the first four lines of the poem, whose achronology contrasts with the linear timeline represented in the final five. In those first four lines, the poet follows the same sequence of things that are to be praised (*weard, meahte, modgeþanc, weorc*) as the Latin source, but Anderson argues that in doing so, he “reinforces its iconicity by means of a chiasmatically alliterated catalogue” of those four things that is “set forth in a pattern of transverse alliteration that is independent of the poem’s regular versification pattern” (116). Anderson’s analysis of *The Phoenix* moves from syntactic to morphophonemic iconicity. His approach here is exemplified in his interpretation of the poet’s description of the phoenix itself, which Anderson labels as a “tour-de-force of synaesthesia” that departs from its Latin source by presenting the bird not as a living animal, but instead as a work of art. He notes, for example, that the variegated colors the poet uses to describe the bird are often associated with consonant clusters (e.g., *bleobrygdum fag, wrætlice wrixleð wurman geblonden, sum blacum splottum*), and that the feathers that surround the phoenix’s neck are “described using liquids, nasals and mostly rounded vowels, and voiced rather than unvoiced stops,” which emphasizes its “curvilinear-earity,” and thus furthers establishes its distance from the Latin source, which relies on mostly astrological and mythological allusions in its description (127).

GD

Riddles

Jonathan Wilcox presents a very good introduction to the Old English riddles, thorough and clear enough to be suitable for a classroom audience, in “‘Tell Me What I Am’: The Old English Riddles” (*Readings in Medieval Texts*, ed. Johnson and Treharne, 46–59). Wilcox begins his demonstration of how to approach the riddles by offering an elegant close reading of Riddle 34 (‘rake’), which “mak[es] such a humble and downturned utilitarian object briefly glorious, upright, and morally upstanding” (50). His example of the *double entendre* riddle is Riddle 45 (‘dough’), about which Wilcox cleverly comments that “*hlæfdige* ‘lady’ is a dead metaphor for the kneader of the loaf, perhaps here brought to life alongside the overtones of a bun in the oven” (53). He

discusses the importance of form, especially aural and onomatopoeic clues, in Riddle 7 ('swan'). Wilcox concludes his fourth and final close reading, an analysis of the unsolved Riddle 57, by stating that "flies might be an attractive insect solution, OE *fleoge*, where the self-naming is conceptual rather than onomatopoeic, related as the name surely is to the verb *fleogan*" (57). Through these four extended analyses, as well as briefer mentions of related riddles, Wilcox demonstrates how the riddles function as a "mixture of the serious and the lighthearted" (49), by "mak[ing] the familiar strange" (47) and "reveal[ing] the paradoxes that prove to lie almost everywhere" (51), with a particular interest in "temporary upending of status" (53).

While Wilcox begins his piece by briefly contextualizing the Old English riddles within the Latin *enigmata* tradition, this topic is central to Andy Orchard's essay "Enigma Variations: The Anglo-Saxon Riddle-Tradition" (*Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O'Brien O'Keefe and Orchard, 1:284–304). Orchard demonstrates "the benefits to be gained from seeing Old English and Anglo-Latin texts as intimately connected parts of the same literary tradition" (300) by considering not only the Old English and Latin riddles, but also "other texts and manuscripts less often considered in this light, such as the pseudo-Bede *Collectanea* and *Flores*, Alcuin's *Disputatio Pippini cum Albino, Propositiones ad acuendos iuuenes*, and occasional riddles, and the anonymous *Solomon and Saturn II*" (285). Orchard begins by dismissing many generalizations used to separate the Latin and Old English traditions, such as "[t]he notion that Latin *enigmata* always circulate with their solutions, while Old English *riddles* never do" (285), "the observation that [Anglo-Latin *enigmata*] seldom contain any challenge to the audience to solve them" (286), and the attribution of "levity and occasional crude humour" solely to the vernacular tradition (287). He also explores the formulaic nature of riddle openings in Old English, as opposed to the lack thereof in Latin verse *enigmata*, noting that "[t]he number of 'I saw' (*Vidi*) Latin riddles, however, increases dramatically when we turn to *prose* riddles with Anglo-Saxon (or at least Insular) connections" (292). Orchard then explains that this formula is rare in early Latin verse because Aldhelm explicitly associated the genre with prosopopeia, thus shifting the visual focus to one of hearing the object speak (293). Finally, Orchard offers several examples of cross-pollinating influence, such as the 'onion' riddles known in Anglo-Saxon England (Symphosius *Enigma* 45, Tatwine *Enigma* 7, and Exeter Book *Riddles* 25 and 65) and the 'bull' riddles (Aldhelm *Enigma* 83, Eusebius *Enigma* 37, *Collectanea* 194, and Exeter Book *Riddle* 38).

Whereas Orchard opens with the axiom that "Anglo-Saxons considered riddles generically distinct" (284), Susanne Kries compares the Old English and Old Norse uses of the riddle and the kenning only to conclude, "While earlier Anglo-Latin *enigmata* as well as ... Old Norse stanzas are identified as riddles by their literary contexts, nothing similar appears with the short poetic texts of the Exeter Book. The article therefore questions the validity of an *a priori* classification of this very heterogeneous group of texts as riddles and argues instead for their individual interpretation and critical appraisal" (139). In "*Fela í rúnum eða í skáldskap*: Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian Approaches to Riddles and Poetic Disguises" (*Riddles, Knights and Cross-Dressing Saints*, ed. Honegger, 139–64), Kries puts the Exeter Book riddles in dialogue with the riddles in *The Saga of King Heiðrek the Wise* and an overlooked pair of stanzas or *lausavísur* attributed to Egill Skallagrímsson. The riddles in *Heiðreks saga* are identified by their genre through the use of the Old Norse noun *gáta* 'riddle, guess, assumption' (143). In contrast, no such label exists for the Exeter Book riddles, nor is there an equivalent "performative context" (147). To demonstrate such differences, Kries compares the Old Norse 'shield' riddle with its counterpart in the Exeter Book. As for the kenning, this feature "occurs only occasionally" in Old English literature, but "it is one of the most characteristic poetic devices in the highly artistic Old Norse skaldic poetry" (150). Kries discusses how the kenning functions in Old Norse literature, and demonstrates its use in two *lausavísur* in chapter 56 of *Egils saga Skallagrímssonar*. Here, riddling verse is used as a clever substitute for love poetry (*mansöngur*), which was illegal, but Kries nonetheless focuses on its similarity to the Latin riddles of Aldhelm, Symphosius and Alcuin (157), and its difference from the heterogeneous riddles of the Exeter Book, many of which seem deliberately to play with the Latin tradition (160). Kries concludes that instead of reductively focusing on solving the Exeter Book riddles, "it might thus prove much more rewarding" to address them individually, as we have read "other texts within the same collection, where the *anhaga* has been attributed a much more prominent role" (161).

Another essay that offers a new way of reading these texts is Elizabeth Howard's "Modes of Being in Anglo-Saxon Riddles" (*In Geardagum* 25: 61–77). Rather than sorting the riddles by focusing on their solutions, a method which excludes the unanswered ones, Howard favors "examin[ing] the stance of the narrator in each riddle," following Craig Williamson's division of the texts into two types: non-projective and projective (i.e., those using prosopopeia) (62). Howard maintains

that “[t]he *lc eom/lc wæs* riddles (the projective type) provide an unmediated, literal access to the subject—both the content and the solution—of the riddle” (63), while those employing the devices *lc seah*, *lc gefrægn*, and *Wilt is* move progressively away from the “riddled object” (64). Howard’s focus is therefore the projective riddles, which “become the modes of being for the riddled objects, providing the means and opportunity for the objects to enjoy a kind of selfhood, a kind of subjectivity,” and she separately discusses examples of these “in the order of increasing ‘humanness’” (65): “the just barely achieved selfhood of the shield” in Riddle 5, “the passive self of the horn” in Riddle 14, “the active, yet obedient self of the sun” in Riddle 6, and “the emergence of a self-aggrandizing and literate persona of the bow” in Riddle 23 (75).

Likewise, Elena Afros discusses multiple riddles in her article “Linguistic Ambiguities in Some Exeter Book Riddles” (*N&Q* 52: 431–37). She begins by considering the potential conflict between grammatical gender and natural gender in Riddle 23 (‘bow’) and Riddle 38 (‘bullock’) (431). Additional points of discussion include modification of its source in Riddle 60 (‘reed’), integration of “the riddle subject’s direct speech into the narrator’s account” in Riddle 33, morphological ambiguity in Riddle 57, unexpressed verb complements and ambiguous prepositional adverbs in Riddles 30a and 30b, and reinforcement of structural ambiguity by polysemy in Riddle 31. Afros concludes that “Anglo-Saxon riddlers consciously deploy carefully crafted linguistic means to direct as well as misdirect the reader on his/her way to the solution(s)” (436). Afros focuses exclusively on two of these riddles in “Syntactic Variation in Riddles 30A and 30B” (*N&Q* 52: 2–5). This essay contributes an analysis of linguistic features to the ongoing discussion of these two texts, especially their syntactic similarity, and engages most directly with earlier articles by R.M. Liuzza and A.N. Doane. By way of conclusion, Afros offers her own translations of both riddles’ lines 5–9 to reflect her proposed analysis.

Finally, there are two articles that focus on only one riddle each. In “The Survival of the Dead Cuckoo: Exeter Book Riddle 9” (*Riddles, Knights and Cross-Dressing Saints*, ed. Honegger, 95–114), Dieter Bitterli analyzes the poet’s knowledge of the cuckoo’s nesting behavior, “drawn from classical and medieval natural history and bird lore,” as well as the Latin riddles in which Symphosius and Eusebius “explore the paradox of the ‘unborn born’” in their representation of the embryo chick (95). The main thrust of Bitterli’s argument is that “this ontogenetic transformation from ‘dead’ embryo to living fledgling reflects a process that is emblematic of the

reader’s activity of riddle-solving” (95). Along the way, he also offers interesting discussion of the context of this riddle as one of the bird riddles in the Exeter Book; description of the species’s behavior in nature; a close reading of the poet’s description of this nesting behavior; and clever analysis of the kin relationships reflected in the poem. Bitterli concludes, “Just as the other nestlings are evicted and killed, yielding their place to their rival, all false solutions are finally eliminated and the answer ‘cuckoo’ emerges as the only true one” (110).

Marijane Osborn offers a new solution to a rune-marked riddle in “‘Skep’ (*Beinenkorb*, **beoleap*) as a Culture-Specific Solution to Exeter Book Riddle 17” (*ANQ* 18.1: 7–18). Osborn states that this riddle is among those “whose solutions add pieces to our picture of the everyday Anglo-Saxon world, with the added virtue of describing an object specific to the culture.” She agrees with Peter Bierbaumer and Elke Wannagat that the riddle describes a “woven bee-basket,” specifically a “bee-skep,” the “basketwork beehive ... associated with the cultures surrounding the North Sea,” made by hand of coiled straw and brambles. Osborn compares this riddle to Aldhelm’s *Enigma* 20 (‘bee’), but “the Exeter Book riddler” focuses not on the mysterious insect but its manmade hive, “refer[ring] to the utilitarian craft of skep-making, the construction of a protective little building by fastening coiled sheaves ... with ‘wires.’” Osborn concludes, “The riddle’s very specificity is important because, behind and beyond the ‘little hut of the bees,’ the skep (or *leap beoum*), which is the riddle’s correct and culture-specific solution, extends the material reality of the Anglo-Saxon world that we, as readers, enter.”

Ruin

Eileen Joy considers *The Ruin*’s negotiation of the Other in “On the Hither Side of Time: Tony Kushner’s *Homebody/Kabul* and the Old English *Ruin*” (*Medieval Perspectives* 19: 175–205). Joy’s reading of *Homebody/Kabul*, inspired by Emmanuel Levinas, is fascinating, and the resonance of this twenty-first-century text with *The Ruin* is intriguing. What links *The Ruin* with *Homebody/Kabul* is “the admirable work of straining to hear the Other speak, to really *look* and *see*, as the Other demands, and to give a face to the Other’s suffering and destruction, and even his joy” (200). However, the focus of this review will be section two, “There’s No *There* There—The Old English *Ruin*.” Unlike the “distinct narrative persona or action” of other Exeter Book elegies, this speaker “is clearly in awe of what he is describing,” yet “he does not fail to invoke the

‘mutability topos’ (188). As a result, “the poem provides a kaleidoscope of images of power and waste, bright buildings and crumbled stone” (190). Joy states that “the monumental Roman ruins invoked by the speaker ... do not necessarily answer to the speaker’s conception of them” (187); thus, she continues, “What the poem *does* give us, however, is a past and present in tension with each other; moreover, the present only ‘appears’ in the text by reference to ‘[what has] passed away’ (*geleorene*, 7). In other words, the present of the poem comes into being, not through a figurative persona who walks and talks his way through that present, thereby inscribing it in his *being present*, but through the grammar of the poem itself, and therefore, the present is the blank space cleared by the poem’s demarcation of what is past” (190). Ultimately, Joy argues that “all this indicates, perhaps, the speaker’s desire to use the ruins as a way to connect the strange and the familiar, to enfold the ‘like-home’ into the ‘not-like-home,’ and thereby see himself, as it were, in the fabric of the ‘giant’ past, which is also heroic history” (197).

Katie Lyn Peebles reads *The Ruin* with an eye to England’s incipient nationalism in “Renovating Ruins: The Construction of Anglo-Saxon Cultural Heritage” (*Midwestern Folklore* 31: 5–13). Peebles asserts that “as [the poem] describes the ruins of ancient buildings, it is building up part of a new English heritage.” As the poem works by “linking ... people and place in the past,” it “opens the possibility of a connection between people and the same place in the present.” Moreover, because the English “need to choose, present, and explain a heritage connected to the land,” they must also consider the remains of Roman Britain, regardless of the ruins’ “past lineage.” In the poem’s cultural context, the English become “those who observe and admire the structures after their complete dissociation from their original culture and use. However, the poem also imagines the past in English terms and inserts contemplation on the ruins into a present sense of place.” Further, because the English are Christian, the poet reads his “ancestors through the lens of Christian providential history, or, conversely, in the present taking on the shape of the past, as the poet brings the ruins forward into his cultural understanding.” What the *The Ruin* finally becomes, then, is “not part of a Germanic past, but neither is it thematically or geographically totally foreign. It can be appropriated, by right of place, to an English heritage,” and, “by interpreting existing non-Germanic remains through Anglo-Saxon poetic form, the poem creates a hybrid English heritage.”

RN

Solomon and Saturn

Kathryn Powell’s “Orientalist Fantasy in the Poetic Dialogues of *Solomon and Saturn*” (*ASE* 24: 117–43) works to situate the *Solomon and Saturn* dialogues in their tenth-century contexts, particularly in the way that they construct a fantasy of the East as a place onto which serious anxieties about the precarious political situation of the late Anglo-Saxon period can be projected. Specifically, Powell argues that the *Solomon and Saturn* dialogues allow Anglo-Saxons to displace anxieties about the acquisition of wisdom (in particular, as it appears with metaphors of consumption) and the ephemerality of political geography—she notes Alfred’s preface to the *Regula Pastoralis* and the on-going threat of Viking invasion and occupation as evidence for these particular concerns—outside the boundaries of England to an Eastern region that was, importantly, both pagan and inexorably foreign. These cultural anxieties are too present in tenth-century England for the poet to write about them from an English perspective, Powell suggests; displacing them onto the East allows the concerns to be expressed in a way that will not be “difficult for readers to face” (135). By ascribing these personal and societal failures to Saturn, the representative of the East, the poetic dialogues “[perform] the cultural work of reinforcing a sense of group identity for its English readership” (129). Yet while the poems assert that it is the East that is in trouble, importantly, they maintain that those troubles are not contained there, and can be unleashed on an England that is not continuously vigilant.

Thomas Hill’s essay “The ‘Palmtwigede’ Pater Noster: Horticultural Semantics and the Old English *Solomon and Saturn I*,” *Medium Ævum* 74: 1–9, focuses on the definition of the adjective *gepalmtwigede* in *Solomon and Saturn I*, where it modifies the Pater Noster prayer: *gepalmtwigede Pater Noster*. While the literal meaning of the word is clear to the modern reader—*palm* and *twig* are its two primary elements—Anglo-Saxons would likely have faced difficulty when trying to define it, since they lacked any practical knowledge of fruit-bearing vines and viticulture. This confusion is evidenced by numerous occurrences of confusion between, for example, *palma* (palm trees) and *palmes* (shoots or green branches off of vines), or between vine shoots and tree branches; see, for example, the OE translation of Psalm 79.12. Hill identifies the polysemy of the word more generally in the OE corpus: “At any rate, the OE compound *palmtwigu* in effect meant *palmes* ‘sprouts or branches of a vine’ or more generally ‘branches’ as well as *rami palmorum* ‘branches of palms’”

(5). The question remains, of course, to determine the relevance of the word as modifying the Pater Noster. Hill begins by recognizing the poem's status as a "wisdom poem concerned with arcane lore" (5). As such, we might assume that the phrase *gepalmtwigoda Pater Noster* "is an allusive and learned phrase like other expressions in the poem" (5). Ultimately, Hill argues that the semantic flexibility of the phrase simultaneously evokes two separate mystical traditions: the Christian, where palms and vines are consistently associated with the divine, and the Germanic, where the combination of text and tree had magical significance. As evidence for the latter, Hill points to the fact that the affiliation of *palmes*, which could have been incorrectly interpreted by an Anglo-Saxon audience as "branch," and the Pater Noster prayer, whose individual letters have the power to defeat the devil, can be traced to the ancient Germanic practice of, as Hill puts it, combining "text and tree" through the use of runic inscriptions.

GD

Wanderer

In "From *anhaga* to *snottor*: The Wanderer's Kierkegaardian Epiphany" (*Neophilologus* 89: 629–40), Ronald J. Ganze turns to religious existentialists, specifically Søren Kierkegaard, "to find parallels for the existentialist despair and its religious answer that we find in *The Wanderer*" (629). Like many of the poem's readers, Ganze "argue[s] here for the essential unity of *The Wanderer*, a unity which can be found by tracing the growth of a single speaker" (630). Yet unlike previous scholars, Ganze is able to reconcile the poem's existential tone with its Christian epiphany. Kierkegaard is relevant to a reading of *The Wanderer* because he "does not see doubt and despair as incompatible with Christianity; like theologians of the medieval period, he sees despair as a sin, but a sin which everyone falls into time and again while living in this transient world, and, like all sins, ultimately forgivable, so long as one finds a way out of despair and seeks forgiveness" (637). In his conclusion, Ganze tentatively adopts an Augustinian lens to evaluate the speaker's sin of "enjoying the things that he should only be using," but while Ganze admits that he "could have turned directly to Augustine," or other patristic writers, to make his argument, instead, he is "trying to demonstrate in this essay ... the possibility of deep cross-cultural, cross-temporal communication" because "[a]s human beings, we instinctively understand the *eardstapa*'s fear of the unknown" (638).

In contrast, Lawrence Beaston reads *The Wanderer* "as an act of courage, a self-affirmation in the face of the

meaninglessness of his life" (119) in "The Wanderer's Courage" (*Neophilologus* 89: 119–37). Like Ganze, he holds that "excepting the authorial comments at lines 6–7 and 111, the poem is a unified discourse uttered by a single speaker" (119), an interpretation that Beaston at the same time considers problematic due to "several inconsistencies that, in some cases, make the discourse seem self-contradictory" (120). Although many scholars explain these away by focusing on the speaker's spiritual growth, Beaston notes that this does not account for issues with the sequence of tenses. He argues, "There is no explicit progression from the past *anhaga* stage of his life to the present *snottor* stage in the wanderer's discourse; he is, in fact, not narrating the story of how he moved from lamentation to consolation, for both are part of the present moment of contemplation represented in the poem" (123). This is because "he has not exactly renounced his former life" (124); rather, Beaston insists, "We need a way of reading the poem that will enable us to see how the wanderer retains some commitment to the heroic values of his former life and yet allows us to regard the poem as something more than a lament for 'the death of the Germanic past'" (125). Beaston accomplishes this by considering "the expression of the thoughts that had been locked in his heart, as an act of courage"; "it is what Paul Tillich calls 'the courage to be'" (125). Thus, Beaston uses Tillich's definition of courage to read the poem, arguing that "the wanderer, if he is to avoid despair, must summon up a courage that counters this particular threat ... The wanderer must assert that his life is meaningful in spite of all that seems to render his existence meaningless" (128). Finally, Beaston concludes, "The wanderer's discourse is performative rather than informative; it is an act of courage of one sitting alone in meditation. It is a self-affirmation in the face of the meaninglessness of not just the warrior way of life but a meaninglessness symbolized by the transitory nature of all things earthly" (134).

RN

Works not seen

Barnaud, Jean-Francais. "Un exemple de l'influence latine sur la poésie vieil-anglais: le Carmen de ave phoenice et let Phénix vieil-anglais." *Bulletin des anglicists et médiévalistes* 59 (Summer 2001): 1–14.

Heckman, Christina M. "Imitatio in Early Medieval Spirituality: *The Dream of the Rood*, Anselm, and Militant Christology." *Essays in Medieval Studies* 22: 141–53.

Клёмина, Е. Н. [Klyomina, E. N.] "Концептосфера 'жилище' в древнеанглийской поэме «Елена» (на

материале композитов)” [“Konseptosfera ‘zhilishche’ v drevneanglijskoi poeme *Elena* (na materiale kompositov)” = “The Conceptosphere ‘Dwelling’ in the Old English Poem *Elene* (on the Content of the Nominal Compounds)”]. *Языковое образование в России: прошлое, настоящее, будущее. Материалы межвузовской юбилейной научно-практической конференции 26–27 мая 2005 года [Yazykovoie obrazovanie v Rossii: proshloe, nastoayashchee, budushchee: Materialy mezhvuzovskoi yubilejnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii, 26–27 maya 2005 g. = Linguistic Education in Russia: Present, Past, Future. Inter-institutional Anniversary Scientific and Practical Conference, May 26–27, 2005]*. Ivanovo: n.p., 2005. pp. 56–60.

_____. “Наименования ‘жизни’ и ‘смерти’ в древнеанглийской поэме «Елена»” [“Naimenovaniya ‘zhizni’ i ‘smerti’ v drevneanglijskoi poeme *Elena*” = “The Vocabulary of ‘Life’ and ‘Death’ in the Old English Poem *Elene*”]. *Иностранные языки: теория и практика. Литературоведение. Сборник статей. Выпуск 3 [Inostrannye yazyki: teoriya i praktika. Literaturovedenie. Sbornik statei. Vyp. 3 = Foreign Languages: Theory and Practice. Literary Criticism. Collected Papers. No. 3]*. Ivanovo: n.p., 2005. pp. 62–67.

_____. “Образы святых в древнеанглийской поэме «Елена» (Лингвостилистический аспект)” [“Obrazy svyatykh v drevneanglijskoi poeme *Elena* (lingvostilisticheskij aspekt)” = “The Images of the Saints in the Old English Poem *Elene* (The Linguistico-Stylistic Aspect)”]. *Раннесредневековый Текст: Проблемы Интерпретации [Rannesrednekovyi tekst: problemy interpretatsii = The Early Medieval Text: Problems of Interpretation]*. Ed. Н. Ю. Гвоздецкая и И. В. Кривушин [N. Yu. Gvozdetckaya and I. V. Krivushin]. Ivanovo: IvGU, 2002. pp. 219–32.

_____. “Пространственная лексика древнеанглийской поэмы «Елена» (к проблеме межкультурной коммуникации в исторической семасиологии)” [“Prostranstvennaya leksika drevneanglijskoi poemu *Elena* (k probleme mezhkulturnoi kommunikatsii v istoricheskoi semasiologii)” = “The Vocabulary of ‘Space’ in the Old English Poem *Elene* (Concerning the Problem of Intercultural Communication in Historical Semasiology)”]. *Актуальные проблемы лингвистики и межкультурной коммуникации: межвузовский сборник научных трудов [Aktual’nye problemy lingvistiki i mezhkulturnoi kommunikatsii: mezhvuzovskii sbornik nauchnykh trudov = Current Problems in Linguistics and Intercultural Communication: Inter-institutional Symposium Academic Proceedings]*. Ivanovo: n.p., 2004. pp. 115–19.

Lenz, Karmen. “Images of Psychic Landscape in the Meters of King Alfred’s *Proferboc*.” Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of New Mexico, 2004. *DAI* 65A: 4555.

Sancery, Arlette. “Anges et démons dans le poème anglo-saxon *Solomon et Saturne*.” *Anges et Démons dans la littérature anglaise au Moyen Age*. Ed. Carruthers. 65–73.

Williams, David. “*Sing me frumsceaft*: le rôle de l’ange dans l’inspiration poétique.” *Anges et Démons dans la littérature anglaise au Moyen Age*. Ed. Carruthers. 57–64.

c. Beowulf

Text, Language, Meter

Ewald Standop has completely revised and expanded Lehnert’s 1967 pocket-sized edition of selected passages of the poem in *Beowulf: Eine Textauswahl mit Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar und Glossar* (Berlin: de Gruyter). Standop supplies approximately one third of the Old English text with a translation into German, as well as a substantial introduction; commentary; glossary; notes on Old English pronunciation, grammar, and meter; the textual history of the poem; and an up-to-date select bibliography.

As part of his work on a revised edition of Frederick Klaeber’s *Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg* (1950), co-edited with Robert E. Bjork and John D. Niles for Houghton Mifflin, Robert D. Fulk discusses “Some Contested Readings in the *Beowulf* Manuscript,” *RES* 56: 192–223. Fulk comments on twenty-three impaired words or letters in the sole extant copy of the poem in London, BL, Cotton Vitellius A.xv, saving his discussion of the two most seriously damaged folios until the end. (In numbering folios, Fulk explains, “the first number refers to the older foliation on the MS leaves themselves, the second to the refoliation of 1884 on the paper frames in which the MS leaves are now embedded” [193, n. 3]). Folio 198 (201), in which Fulk finds thirteen problematic readings, is the last leaf of the poem’s text and “was apparently at one time an outside cover, and, as a result, it is tattered and the verso is badly soiled” (201). The text has also been retouched, either by the second scribe himself, who took over copying the poem at the end of line 1939, or by an early modern hand. Folio 179 (182) is in the worst shape of all, having been “washed clean of its original text and rewritten, either by the second scribe or by another with considerable skill in imitating that scribe’s hand” (208–09). In this folio, the outlines of the original letters are often no longer visible, “and one must guess at letter forms from traces of ink that may or may not be where they were originally

positioned, for they may have bled in the washing the leaf received" (209). Fulk remarks on thirty-three problematic readings in this leaf alone. He rejects Kiernan's view (1996 and 1999) that the rewriting of this folio "differs substantially from the original text," having been intended to provide a better "transition between two originally discrete poems" (209), as well as Sedgefield's contention (1935) "that there was no touching up" at all (210). Fulk personally examined this manuscript twice, in October 2002 and March 2004, "with the aid of a magnifying glass and fibre-optic lighting from various angles" (193). He concludes by expressing his "belief that improved technologies will make it possible in the future to retrieve some readings in the MS that are currently in part or in whole indecipherable," particularly on the most seriously damaged folio 179 (182).

Fulk also considers "Some Lexical Problems in the Interpretation and Textual Criticism of *Beowulf* (Verses 414a, 845b, 986a, 1320a, 1375a)," *SN* 77.2: 145–55. These five half-lines each contain difficult words—*hador*, *mere*, *handsporu*, *neodlaðu[m]*, *drysmāþ*, respectively—which Fulk uses to illustrate his point that our understanding of the poem is everywhere "predicated on particular lexical assumptions, and that scholars are all too often unaware of how well- or ill-founded some of those lexical assumptions are" (145). Part of the problem is "the very informativeness" and "definiteness" of Klaeber's "magnificent glossary," which has often served merely to enshrine his speculations or to obscure "indeterminacies" and alternative readings (145). "The other chief criteria ... for determining whether the text is in need of emendation—syntax, alliteration, and meter—are all quantifiable," but lexical decisions are based upon a more subjective estimate "of relative probabilities in terms of etymology, semantics, and usage" (145).

In terms of the particular instances he cites, Fulk recommends a return from Klaeber's 1950 acceptance of MS *hador* in line 414a (which he glosses 'brightness'), to Grein's 1857 (and Klaeber's own earlier) emendation to *haðor* 'confinement,' noting the scribes' frequent confusion of *d* and *ð*. This reading would yield for lines 413b–14 something like, "after the evening light becomes hidden under the sky's constraint" (146–47). In line 845b, Fulk upholds Klaeber's understanding of *mere* as 'lake' or 'pool,' even though it usually means 'sea' in poetry (147). However, Fulk believes Klaeber's interpretation of *handsporu* 'HAND-SPUR, nail (or claw)' in line 986a as a singular weak feminine noun can be more simply explained as a plural of the neuter *-spor* 'spoor, vestige,' yielding for the whole compound 'hand-vestiges,' that is, the "claws, hand, and arm" that Grendel has left behind (148). Fulk accepts Klaeber's

emendation to dative plural *neodlaðu[m]* in line 1320a and, after considering various challenges to Klaeber's interpretation of its meaning, essentially agrees that the whole half-line *æfter neodlaðu[m]* means "according to his [that is, Hrothgar's] desire(s)" (150). Fulk concludes his list with *drysmāþ* in line 1375b (not 1375a, as in the article's title), whose spelling in the MS is clear, but for which *hapax legomenon* there are no known cognates in other languages or any related words in Old English at all. Nonetheless, once more, since scribes routinely confused *d* and *ð*, as noted in the example of *hador/haðor* in line 414a, an emendation to *ðrysmāþ* seems justified, since the word can now be taken as a third present plural of the transitive first class weak verb *ðrysmān* 'to choke, suffocate,' whose subject is the *lað gewidru* 'violent storms' of line 1375a, which *lyft ðrysmāþ* 'choke the air' (line 1375b) so that the *roderas reotað* 'heavens weep' (line 1376a).

Fulk further contributes a study of "Six Cruces in *Beowulf* (Lines 31, 83, 404, 445, 1198, and 3074–5)," to a collection honoring Michael Lapidge, *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O'Brien O'Keefe and Orchard, I:349–67. Fulk notes that Klaeber never explicitly formulated and ranked the principles upon which he made his editorial decisions to emend the text (350). Fulk considers the case of *hord mad mum* in MS line 1198a, which has been variously emended in deference to three different principles: "(1) emendations should not produce spelling anomalies, (2) emendations should not produce metrical anomalies, and (3) emendations should involve no more change than is strictly required" (350). Both Klaeber (1950) and Mitchell and Robinson (1998) prioritize the third criterion, offering in this case the "chimerical" spelling *hordmaðum* 'hoard-treasure' (accusative singular), even though the medial consonant in the second element of this compound is never spelled in Old English with a single *ð* or *þ* (350). It does sometimes appear without the epenthetic *-u-* as *maðm*, but never in the *Beowulf* MS, even when the meter requires this "etymologically correct" form (350). Fulk thus sees no reason not to offer the normal spelling of this word as *-maððum*. However, he then second-guesses himself by introducing a fourth consideration to those listed above, that is, what was "likely to have been the form in the scribe's exemplar?" (350). He suggests that *maðm* was the regular spelling of this word in the text the scribe had before him (not necessarily Scribe A of this section of the *Beowulf* MS, but possibly an earlier intermediary). This scribe normally corrected *maðm* to *maððum*, but forgot to do so in this particular instance (351). Fulk thus considers using the older spelling as an instructional opportunity and goes on

to rethink five other problematic MS readings in a way that confirms Klaeber's own choice of text, but without necessarily adopting his punctuation or editorial interpretation. The first is found in lines 28–36a, where simple re-punctuation provides the missing direct object of the third preterite singular of the transitive verb *agan* 'to own, possess' in line 31b. This is the *æpelinges fær* 'prince's vessel' of line 33b, yielding for lines 30b–33: "The friend of the Scyldings, beloved leader of the nation, for a long time had owned a prince's vessel" (p. 353). Next Fulk interprets the phrase *lenge* of line 83b as a comparative adverb used as a litotes in which *ne ... lenge* 'not longer' means "quicker, sooner, in a shorter time," so that "it was then even faster [than it took to complete Heorot] for the hostility of son-in-law and father-in-law to awaken from deadly hate" (lines 83b–85; p. 354). For line 404b, Fulk confirms Klaeber's emendation, *þæt he on heo[r]ðe gestod* 'until he stood on the hearth' (354–55). For line 445a, *mægen hreð manna*, Fulk rejects Klaeber's 1950 acceptance of Malone's conjecture (1923 and subsequently), *mægen Hreðmanna* 'the might of the Hreðmen [the Geats];' observing that some interpretations "that do not involve emendation are more conjectural than many emendations" (357). Fulk thus prefers the analysis Klaeber offered in his first two editions, *mægenhreð manna* 'glorious host of men,' "which is formally unobjectionable and requires no elaborate historical conjecture[,] ... though whether it refers to the Geats or the Danes is not clear" (358). Finally, for lines 3074–75, Fulk refines Tanke's argument (2002) by taking *goldhwæte* in line 3074a to mean "curse on the gold" (362) and *gearwor* in line 3074b to mean "rather" (362–63), yielding for the two full lines together something like, "by no means had he [Beowulf] anticipated a curse on the gold, but rather the owner's [God's?] favor," bringing to an effective conclusion the whole "point of [lines] 3051–75 that Beowulf did not even know the cause of his death, an ancient curse" (363).

Fulk also discusses "Six Cruces in the Finnsburg Fragment and Episode," *MÆ* 74.2: 191–204, including three problematic passages in the second of these two accounts of the encounter between Hnæf and Finn in lines 1063–1159a of *Beowulf*. (1) Klaeber had clarified the syntactic ambiguity of the dative plural phrase *Finnes eaferum* 'Finn's sons' in line 1068a by inserting a preposition *be* 'about, concerning' in front of it, thus forming a prepositional phrase dependent on the accusative *healgamen* 'hall-entertainment, song' of line 1066a, yielding "a song ... about Finn's sons," or by extension, his "retainers." Fulk finds this solution to be "metrically improbable, since Bliss [1967] finds that anacrusis [the presence of an initial unstressed syllable] is not to be

expected in a verse that comprises two trochaic words" (196). He suggests that *Healgamen* 'Hall-entertainment' thus be taken as the personal name or poetic epithet of Hrothgar's *scop*, on analogy with *Widsith* 'Far-Journey,' the putative speaker of the poem of that title, or with other examples of "dithematic nicknames" in *Beowulf* and elsewhere which "are almost certainly epithetic in origin," including *Healfdene* 'Half-Dane' and *Folcwalda* 'People-Ruler' (197). Fulk would thus construe *Healgamen* as the subject rather than the direct object of the verb *mænan* 'to tell of' in line 1067b and would emend the dative plural *eaferum* 'sons' to accusative singular *eaferan* on the paleographically defensible grounds that *-a* and *-u*, *-m* and *-n*, were letter pairs easily and often confused by copyists. As direct object of *mænan*, *eaferan* 'son' in the singular makes better sense of the fact that only one son of Finn and Hildeburh is placed beside his maternal uncle on Hnæf's pyre. Fulk thus translates lines 1066–70: "when Healgamen, Hrothgar's *scop*, along the mead-bench should tell of the son of Finn; when the calamity befell them, the heroes of the Half-Danes, Hnæf of the Scyldings had to die in the Frisian slaughter" (197). (2) Klaeber had emended MS *syððan scolde* in line 1106b to *seðan scolde* 'should settle it,' even though the infinitive *seðan* normally means 'to declare true, affirm, attest, prove,' paralleled by the noun *sod* 'true,' rather than 'to resolve, settle' (198). Fulk proposes an emendation not of the intelligible adverb *syððan* 'then, afterwards,' but of the preterite auxiliary *scolde* 'should,' for which he would read *scede* (or alternatively, *sceode*), the 3 singular preterite subjunctive of *scadan* 'to decide,' yielding for the whole half-line "should afterwards settle it." This form of the verb would be stylistically consistent with the *scop*'s five prior uses of the preterite subjunctive in describing the terms of the treaty in lines 1098–1106. The mistake can be explained by the scribe's misunderstanding of *sceode* in his exemplar as the common preterite auxiliary *sceolde*, which he, the first scribe of the poem, unlike the second who began copying at the end of line 1939, always renders as *scolde* rather than *sceolde*. (3) MS lines 1128b–29a read *wunode mid finnel un / hlitme*. Fulk would take the problematic single vertical stroke at the end of *finnel* not as an <l> with Klaeber, who then emended it to an adverb [*ea*]l 'all, completely' and placed it with *unhlitme* in line 1129a, but rather as the first upstroke of an *h* in the pronoun *he*, which he also would place with *unhlitme* in the next half-line, but then repunctuate the sentence to include *he unhlitme* in the following rather than the preceding clause, yielding for lines 1127b–31a: "Hengest then spent that slaughter-stained winter with Finn; all eagerly he remembered

his homeland, even though he could not sail his ring-prowed ship over the sea."

Fulk completes his remarkably full offerings for the year with "Afloat in Semantic Space: Old English *sund* and the Nature of Beowulf's Exploit with Breca," *JEGP* 104: 456–72. The noun *sund* is normally rendered as either 'swimming' or 'sea,' but Fulk suggests that these different but related meanings imply a more general sense of 'motion in water' (457) or 'natation' (471), for which there is no precise semantic equivalent in Modern English. The word is used three times in the two descriptions of the hero's contest with Breca at sea: (1) in Unferth's unfriendly characterization of Beowulf's performance in lines 506–15a: *ymb sund flite* 'competed in swimming' (line 507b) and *git on sund reon* 'you both rowed on the sea' (line 513b); and (2) in Beowulf's own "alternative construction of the event" (458) in lines 539–43: *wit on sund reon* 'we both rowed on the sea' (539b). The apparent contradiction between swimming in line 507b and rowing in lines 513b and 539b has traditionally been solved by metaphorically extending the meaning of the verb *reon* (< **rowan*) 'to row' to include 'to row (with hands), paddle,' that is, 'to swim.' Unfortunately, the question of whether the boys are supposed to have rowed or swum cannot be resolved through an analysis of *sund*, Fulk finds, since the term itself is "semantically floating among the senses 'sea, swimming, boating, floating,' and so forth" (472).

Alfred Bammesberger offers a more precise analysis of "Old English *sum* in *Beowulf*, l. 271b," *NM* 106.1: 3–6, the indefinite pronoun which our frank but tactful hero uses when reassuring the Danish coastguard that his approach is a friendly one. Germanic cognates confirm that the word normally means "one, a certain one," rather than "anything," as it is usually rendered in this one instance. Bammesberger suggests that the unspecified referent of *sum* here is a general noun like "fact, point, or issue," yielding for the two half-lines 271b–72a: *ne sceal þær dyrne sum / wesan þæs ic wene* "a special point shall not be concealed as I expect" (4). This "particular matter" is one that the proud Danes would presumably not wish to discuss with an outsider, that is, their embarrassing inability to cope on their own with the twelve years of terror that Grendel has inflicted on them. However, that is the very point the hero intends explicitly to address. In a second study, "The Coastguard's Maxim Reconsidered (*Beowulf*, Lines 287b–289)," *ANQ* 18.2: 3–6, Bammesberger shifts his focus a number of lines further on in this same scene. He takes the genitive plurals *worda ond worca* 'words and deeds' (line 289a) as dependent upon, rather than parallel to, genitive singular *Æghwæþres* 'each' (line

287b), yielding "of every one of words and deeds" or "of every word and every deed" (4). *Æghwæþres* itself is dependent upon "an idiomatic phrase in Old English" *gescad witan* 'to know fully, have complete knowledge' (line 288b), illustrated in numerous uses by Wulfstan (4–5). Bammesberger thus translates the coastguard's maxim: "A keen-witted shield-bearer, who thinks clearly, must have accurate knowledge of every word and every deed."

Bammesberger follows J. J. Anderson (1983) in identifying the general referent of "Old English *cuðe folme* in *Beowulf*, Line 1303A," *Neophilologus* 89.4: 625–27, as Hrothgar's "famous hand," that is, his well-known right-hand man Æschere, rather than as the more commonly understood "familiar hand" of Grendel, whose bloody arm and claw the monster's mother recognizes and snatches as she flees the hall. But unlike Anderson, Bammesberger takes the appendage not as a synecdoche for a competent person, a good helper, but quite literally. The sentence *heo under heolfre genam / cuðe folme* means just what it says, that "she took the renowned hand [= Æschere's actual hand] covered in blood" (lines 1302b–03a) and dragged the old man's body back to the mere by it (627). This is the *gewrixle* 'exchange' in line 1304b—Æschere for Grendel—that was not good, *þæt hie on ba healfa bicgan scolde / freonda feorum* "that they should on both sides pay for with the lives of dear ones" (lines 1305–06a). Grendel's own severed appendage, Bammesberger insists, had nothing to do with it.

Raymond P. Tripp, Jr., offers an unusual analysis of the final word of the poem in "*Beowulf* 3182B: *LOFGEORNOST*, 'Most Eager to Praise,'" *NM* 106: 425–42, suggesting that it describes a superlative desire on the part of the hero to give rather than receive praise in his role as *wilgeofa* 'giver of good things' to his people (line 2900a). Tripp discusses the eleven appearances of the adjective *lofgeorn* 'praise-eager' in Old English prose, five in Ælfric and six in the *Benedictine Rule*, where the term is indeed associated with *iactantia* 'vainglory' (428). But Tripp argues that it is only excessive eagerness for undeserved praise that is abjured in these texts, and finds instances of *lofgeorn* he believes could be construed actively, that is, to imply an eagerness to flatter others in hopes of inspiring reciprocal compliments for oneself. It is in this more active, but now non-pejorative, sense that Tripp chooses to understand the poem's last word on Beowulf's character as king, one more consistent with the constant kindness his people say he had always shown them, including a generosity "with his praise as well as with his possessions and abilities" (437).

Vittoria Dolcetti Corazza and Renato Gendre have edited a collection entitled *Lettura di 'Beowulf'* [*Reading 'Beowulf'*], Bibliotheca Germanica: Studi e testi; V Seminario avanzato in Filologia germanica (Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso), which contains two papers on the language and text of the poem. Gendre himself collects and reviews pairs of opposite terms signifying good and evil in "Coppie di opposti nel *Beowulf*, I, 'bene' e 'male,'" 29–126, while Roberto Rosselli Del Turco describes electronic versions of the poem in "L'Electronic *Beowulf* e l'evoluzione dell'edizione digitale," 347–57.

Hideki Watanabe has several chapters on *Beowulf* in his collection of revised articles entitled, *Metaphorical and Formulaic Expressions in Old English Reconsidered: with Special Reference to Poetic Compounds and their Modern English Counterparts* (Tokyo: Eihosha). Chapter 1, "Final Words on *Beowulf* 1020b: *brand Healdenes*," 11–23, was reviewed in *YWOES* 2000. Chapter 2, "The Repetition and Significance of the Verb *scriðan* in *Beowulf* Reconsidered," 25–46, first appeared as "Monsters Creep?: the Meaning of the Verb *scriðan* in *Beowulf*," *Studies in Language and Culture* [Osaka University] 14 (1988): 107–20. Chapter 3, "The Textual and Discursive Significance of the Sentences in the Form of *þæt wæs god cyning* in Old English Poems," 47–73, was reviewed under a similar title in *YWOES* 2004. Chapter 7, "Heaney's Translation of *Beowulf* with Special Reference to Poetic Compounds and the Ten Japanese Translations," 143–61, was discussed in *YWOES* 2003 under the title, "The Five Japanese Translations of *Beowulf* in the 1990s." The substance of Chapter 9, "Quotations from *Beowulf* and Other Old English Poems in the *Oxford English Dictionary* with Special Reference to its Treatments of Poetic Compounds," 187–224, earlier appeared in *Lexicographica Series Maior* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer) 103 (2000): 263–69. Watanabe's collection concludes with four appendices: (A) "Modern English Equivalents for the Four Instances of Kenning for the Sea in *Beowulf*" (B) "Modern English Equivalents for the Four Instances of Compounds Denoting Comrades in *Beowulf*"; (C) "Modern English Equivalents for the Four Instances of Compounds Denoting Phalanx in *Beowulf*"; and (D) "Liuzza's [1999/2000] Notable Poetic Compounds and Noun Phrases in Order of Appearance with Their Old English Counterparts Excluding Proper Names."

Sources and Analogues

Tom Shippey considers "The Merov(ich)ingian Again: *damnatio memoriae* and the *usus scholarum*" in *Latin*

Learning and English Lore, ed. O'Brien O'Keefe and Orchard, 1:389–406, noting that the distinctiveness of the dynastic name *Merewioingas* 'Merovingians' in line 2921a of *Beowulf*, used as a "synecdoche for 'the Franks'" (391), has been obscured by the familiar scholarly designation of this royal family. This *usus scholarum* has masked the vast array of variant and often garbled renderings in Latin of the name of this king and his family, abetted by the silence or scorn—*damnatio memoriae*—with which the earlier dynasty was treated by authors who were partisans or beneficiaries of its Carolingian successors. Shippey discovered this multitude of variant spellings by searching the new electronic database of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (2002), among other resources. He offers **Mero-wech* as the Frankish form of the name of the founder of this dynasty (397), most appropriately rendered as *Merovech* in Latin or as *Merewi(o)h* in the Northumbrian dialect of Old English, regularly yielding *Merewioingas* in the latter language with the addition of the plural patronymic suffix to signify the descendants of this king. Shippey asks, "how has it come about that the only ancient text which knows how to spell a vernacular form of 'descendent of Merovech' correctly is *Beowulf*?" (400). His answer is that "the *Beowulf* poet called the king of the Franks 'the descendent of Merovech' because at the time of writing, that is what he was" (400–01). This conclusion, Shippey believes, places the composition of the poem in the time of Eddius Stephanus, an author who knew all about the Frankish Merovingian kings and wrote his *Vita Wilfridi* at "Ripon, North Yorkshire, in the second decade of the eighth century" (392). Shippey thus reasserts the view that *Beowulf* should be dated to "the age of Bede" (ca. 673–735). He assigns the historical setting of the poem, based upon allusions to Hygelac's raid upon the Franks, to the time of the Merovingian king Theudebert I, who died in 548 (401).

Arne Soby Christensen finds these historical connections to be overconfident in "Beowulf, Hygelac og Chlochilaichus: Om beretningskronologi i *Beowulf* ["On the Dating of History in *Beowulf*]," *Historisk Tidsskrift* 105.1: 40–77. Like Shippey, Christensen credits N. F. S. Gruntvig (1815 and 1817) with the first identification of the character Hygelac in *Beowulf* with the Chlochilaichus of Gregory of Tours's *Libri Historiarum Francorum* X, book 3, whose fall in Frisia Gruntvig dated to around 515. R. W. Chambers called this identification "the most important discovery ever made in the study of *Beowulf*, and the foundation of our belief in the historic character of its episodes" (1921: p. 4, n. 1). More recently, in anticipation of his argument described above, Tom Shippey has called the

correspondence between Hygelac and Chlochilaichus the “eneste sikre faktum i forbindelse med digtet [only certain fact in connection with the poem]” (2001: 10). Christensen points out, however, that Gruntvig in particular came to the poem with a preformed assumption that, despite its fantastic monster-fights, the other episodes in *Beowulf* were based upon historical reality. Gruntvig acquired most of his information about early Danish history from the works of Peter Friderich Suhm (1728–98), whose understanding of the figure of Chlochilaichus was based as much upon his reading of Saxo Grammaticus's *Historia Danorum* and Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* as it was upon Gregory of Tours. In his *Critisk Historie af Danmark* (1779) Suhm fancifully identifies Saxo's Viglet with Geoffrey's Guitlach with Gregory's Chlochilaichus, only dropping Viglet from the correspondence in his later *Historie af Danmark* (1782). Christensen thus wonders whether the shiftily conflated personage Gruntvig seems to have imagined to be an historical figure named Chlochilaichus has any serious relevance to identifying and dating the character Hygelac in the poem, since the names are not so similar as to compel a positive identification.

Turning to other texts, Christensen notes the multiple spellings of the name in its oblique form in the anonymous *Liber Historiae Francorum* of 726–27—Chrochilaico, Chohilaico, Chochelaico, Chochilago, Hlodilago, Chodilaico, and Chlochilaicho. In addition, following Godefroid Kurth (1919), Christensen suspects that the author of the *LHF* was merely speculating without certain knowledge that the attack of this raiding king was upon the Attoarii, a people whom Gruntvig identified with the Hetware of the poem. This ethnic identification cannot be verified any more than can the names of the king. And the manuscripts of a third source, the *Liber Monstrorum* (ca. 700), also offer enough multiple spellings of the king's name—Hunclago/Huncglacus, Huiglaucus, Hyglaco/Higlacus, Glauco/Huiglacus—to undermine our confidence in its correct form and equivalency to that of Hygelac in the poem. Finally, Christensen notes that, in any case, the *Liber Monstrorum* appears in an Anglo-Saxon context and thus the identification of its Higlacus with the poem's Hygelac cannot be considered an independent witness to the historicity of this figure since the Latin text may have been influenced by the very legendary tradition recounted in the poem. Christensen concludes that Gruntvig's identification of Hygelac with Chlochilaichus cannot be accepted as a confirmed historical reference in *Beowulf* and that the presence of this character there cannot be used to date the setting of the poem

to the earlier sixth century. No event or person in the poem can be historically verified and dated, Christensen insists: “*Beowulf* er et digt fra fortiden, ikke en beretning om fortiden [*Beowulf* is a poem from the past, rather than a history of the past]” (77).

In *Æthelbald and Offa*, ed. David Hill and Margaret Worthington, BAR British series 383: 65–73, Mark Atherton reviews all “Mentions of Offa in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, *Beowulf* and *Widsith*,” as well as in the Anglian royal genealogies, the laws of Alfred, and the 1014 will of Æthelstan Ætheling, who bequeathed the sword of the eighth-century Offa II of Mercia to his brother Edmund, later called Ironside. Atherton postulates that a tradition, recorded in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* MS D *sub anno* 1016, in which Edmund Ironside “reportedly fought, or intended to fight, against Cnut in single combat ... on an island in the Severn,” presents that king “in the same legendary light” (70–71) as the ancient Offa I of Angeln, who similarly fought an enemy on an island in the Eider at Fifeldor, as alluded to in *Widsith* (lines 35–44) and described with further detail in three texts composed ca. 1200: Sven Aageson's short history of the Danish kings, Saxo Grammaticus's *Historia Danorum*, and the *Vitae Duorum Offarum* “Lives of the Two Offas.” Following others, Atherton takes lines 1931b–62 of *Beowulf* as intended to compliment Offa II and his house with a positive reference to that king's legendary namesake, a pattern of complimentary association with noble progenitors continued by the chronicler in his treatment of Edmund Ironside who had inherited the later Offa's sword.

In “From Baghdad to *Beowulf*: Eulogising ‘Imperial’ Capitals East and West in the Mid-Eighth Century,” *Proc. of the Royal Irish Academy* 105C: 151–95, Alain J. Stoclet notes several parallels between *Beowulf*, Notker of St. Gall's *Deeds of the Emperor Charles*, and an account of the Byzantine Emperor Constantine V in the *Chronicle of the Bishops of Naples*. In Notker the Frankish king Pippin demonstrates his “throne-worthiness” by battling wild beasts to save Aachen, as does Constantine in preserving Constantinople, both becoming in effect the *neos ktistes* ‘re-founder’ of those respective cities, now rivals for supremacy in the 760s with a third contender, Baghdad, which had recently been established as a capital by the Abbasid caliphate at about this time. Stoclet invokes Goffart (1981) and Lapidge (1994) to suggest that the *Beowulf* poet may have been familiar with Frankish and Byzantine texts and traditions regarding kingship in the mid-eighth-century. He thus believes that *Beowulf* represents a similar restoration of the political supremacy of a threatened capital, Heorot, by a hero who must overcome fierce monsters to do

so and thereby establishes his own worthiness for royal rule, as noted by many of the Danes in lines 856b–61 and elsewhere in the poem.

Quoting Egill Skallagrímsson (p. 419, n. 52), Roberta Frank puts her own offering on the *lofköstr* ‘praise-pile’ or *festschrift* for Michael Lapidge, *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O’Brien O’Keeffe and Orchard, with a discussion of “Three ‘Cups’ and a Funeral in *Beowulf*,” I:407–20. Frank examines three types of drinking container found in the dragon’s hoard which she believes are intended to mark a stratum in the poem’s historical narrative more archaic than the sixth-century Geatland of its setting. (1) The *bunan* ‘goblets’ of lines 2775b and 3047b appear only six other times in Old English with no known etymology or cognates. In *Judith* (line 17) the poet adds them without biblical precedent to the scene of Holofermus’s last feast: here, they are “ancient, pagan, and belong to the bad guys” (410). This heathen association is confirmed by the use of *bune* three times to gloss *carchesium*, a Latinized Greek term meaning “drinking cup, libation vessel, vessel suited for a sacrifice,” so that the presence of this kind of cup in the barrow resonates with “antique, exotic, and darkly sacral overtones” (411). (2) The *orcas* ‘vessels’ of lines 2760b and 3047b derive from the Latin and Greek *orca* ‘large earthenware vessel, amphora’ (411). The word appears eleven times in Old English and is associated either with obsolete Old Testament sacrifice or in contexts that are clearly “heathen, eastern, early, and hellbent” (411). (3) The *fæted wæge* ‘ornamented cup’ that the “last survivor” places in his people’s barrow (line 2253b) and which the runaway slave steals in line 2282a, also appears again as the *wæge* used by Satan in *Juliana* (line 487) “to serve up strife to men in the wine-hall” (412). Frank shows that in its various compounded forms this drinking-*wæge* was seen to inspire the fierce valor of ancient warriors and that its *fæted* style of ornamentation was distinctly old-school Northern Heroic Age. But why were these old-fashioned treasures re-deposited with Beowulf’s ashes in his burial mound, since he had rejoiced in winning them for his people and “asked only for a barrow on the headland, so that it might be visible to passing ships” (413)? Frank offers several thematic suggestions for the interment of these cups with the dead hero: “The reburial stands for the end of a royal line, of a civilization and an era, for the loss of a remote, substantial inheritance, of a former integrity, even of pagan wisdom (figured by the Fathers as the ‘silver and gold vessels’ carried out of Egypt). Or the reburial symbolizes the end of the dragon’s power, of enfeebling, eastern luxuriance, of a past that blocked the possibility of a new beginning” (413). In any case, the burial mound

itself, “as worthy as the finest workmanship could devise” (lines 3161b–62, Frank’s translation), becomes “an image of loss fixed in art, to be gazed upon as one would a beautifully wrought vase” (414).

Anna Maria Luisella Fadda compares “Il *Beowulf* e l’epica classica” *Lettura di ‘Beowulf’*, ed. Dolcetti Corazza and Gendre, 223–61. She understands the poem as an ordinary text derived from an oral tradition of poetry that achieves a quintessential expression of early Germanic culture, comparable to the definitive articulation of Greek and Roman tradition as expressed by Homer and Virgil, respectively, but likely developed in its surviving form by knowledge of the shape and scope of their classical epics. She compares particular types of character that appear in these works, like the “provocatore [taunter]” represented by Thersites in the *Iliad*, Euryalus in the *Odyssey*, Drances in the *Aeneid*, and Unferth in *Beowulf*. Luisella Fadda also sees influence of the stoic piety of Aeneas upon the characterization of the Anglo-Saxon hero and concludes her discussion by drawing comparisons between the death of Beowulf and the Passion of Christ as depicted in the Gospels, noting especially the presence of one beloved disciple while the others have fled.

In the same volume, Romano Lazzeroni finds a Vedic analogue to Beowulf’s struggle with Grendel’s mother in “La madre di Vritra e la lotta di Beowulf,” 263–72. The war-god Indra slew the dragon Vritra with his thunderbolt, a story that might be compared to Thor’s final battle with the Midgard-Serpent or Beowulf’s with his own dragon. But unlike Thor and Beowulf, Indra survives the contest to bring order and life to the world, killing his cosmic antagonist by first severing his limbs and then attacking Vritra’s mother amid the swelling floods thus released from her son’s body (*Rig Veda* I.32.9). Stricken, she lies down to join her slain son in death “come una vacca col vitello [like a cow with her calf],” in Lazzeroni’s rendering of the Sanskrit verse (263). He thus sees Beowulf’s destruction of both monster and mother in the mere as the reflex of this ancient Indo-European cosmogonic myth.

In *Beowulf & Grendel: The Truth Behind England’s Oldest Legend* (London: Watkins), John Grigsby seeks to uncover the mythic precursors of the hero and the monsters he encounters in Denmark. His central argument, anticipated by Craig Davis (1996), is that Grendel and his mother are permutations of old fertility gods who were worshipped in prehistoric Denmark and adjacent lands by ancestors of the Anglo-Saxons, a people whom the Roman historian Tacitus calls Ingaevones and reports as honoring an earth mother through human sacrifice in a lake. This *terra mater*

and her consort son were demonized with the arrival of an Indo-European warrior aristocracy from the east and subsequent rise of the cult of Odin. Grendel represents the son who was annually slain and supplanted by another in the older mythology. In *Beowulf*, however, the young victor does not succumb to a similar fate, but goes on to kill the ancient mother herself in her watery realm, symbolizing the violent suppression of the older cults by the new religion. Grigsby analyzes the hero's name as *Beow-wulf* 'Barley-wolf', suggesting this figure's former acquisition of an intoxicating drink of power, comparable to the *soma* of Vedic myth acquired by the war-god Indra or to the mead of poetry in Norse tradition, a further association of the hero with Odin.

Criticism

Frederick M. Biggs continues his series of contributions (2001, 2002, and two in 2003) on "The Politics of Succession in *Beowulf* and Anglo-Saxon England," *Speculum* 80.3: 709–41. Biggs describes the Christian poet as comparing the traditional Germanic system of ætheling succession, where sons and grandsons of a king are all potential candidates for the throne, with the new Christian preference for a stricter father-to-son primogeniture. In particular, the poet stresses the downside of the older system of competition among princes with his intimation that the Danish ætheling Hrothulf will kill his cousin, King Hrothgar's son Hrethric. Yet, the poet also dramatizes the difficulty of overly strict primogeniture in depicting Heardred, the Geatish king Hygelac's son, as unready to rule after his father's death, especially when compared with his older and far more competent cousin Beowulf. Biggs's new and surprising contention in this article is that Beowulf has already become a king of the Geats by the time Hygelac falls in Frisia, having exacted co-rulership from his uncle on his return from Denmark. Such a power-sharing arrangement is clearly indicated, Biggs argues, by Hygelac's gift of his father King Hrethel's sword to Beowulf in return for the Danish heirlooms offered him by the hero, a promotion in status further confirmed by a grant of 7,000 hides of land (line 2195b), a territory equivalent to the assessment of the whole kingdom of the South Saxons in the Tribal Hidage. Biggs interprets lines 2196b–99—"Together in that country they both possessed the inherited land, the ancestral domain; the wide rule was greater to the one who was there of higher rank"—to mean not just that Beowulf has been installed as senior ætheling, a position comparable to that of Hrothulf back in Denmark, but that Hygelac and Beowulf are now joint kings of the whole nation

of the Geats. The hero is simply the junior partner in that co-rulership (731). Biggs offers examples of similar joint kingship in Anglo-Saxon and Norse sources.

But rather than take over the sole rule of the Geats on the death of Hygelac, to which he would certainly have been entitled under the old system, our hero prefers unilaterally to give up his royal power completely in favor of Hygelac's son Heardred. Biggs explains this inconsistent behavior by postulating that the traditional history of the Geats, as inherited by the poet, ended not with the death of Beowulf against the dragon, but with Hygelac's death in Frisia. This assumption would mean that everything which chronologically follows the demise of Hygelac in the poem is "fiction" (735), an original invention by the *Beowulf* poet himself, recognized as such by the audience of the poem, and designed for the particular purpose of further exploring the issue of royal succession. To this end, the poet now gives his once power-hungry hero a newfound respect for filial succession, so that he can show how the hero's deference to his weaker cousin is just as unwise as the old way of allowing æthelings to contend for royal authority. The poet stresses the queen mother's misgivings about her son to show how quickly events prove her right. Beowulf's subsequent fifty-year reign, by contrast, is shown to be a magnificent success, though the hero "has no more right to the Geatish throne ... with its Christian model of succession than he [earlier had] to the Danish throne with its kin-based Germanic one," when Hrothgar offered to adopt him as a son (740). Biggs suggests that the poet deliberately leaves the old king Beowulf without an heir of his body to clinch the point about what a dreadful calamity can ensue from the Christian practice of restricting the throne too narrowly to sons. Biggs concludes that the *Beowulf* poet's analysis of the two systems of succession reveals them both to be inherently weak and unstable in their different ways, the one producing "too many" potential successors to royal power, the other "too few" (741).

Eric Stanley does not cite or seem to know Biggs's recent work on the subject, but he, too, argues that the poem is essentially about the chronic problem of political succession, especially the absence of an effective heir to the throne, as he declares in his title, "*Beowulf*: Lordlessness in Ancient Times is the Theme, as Much as the Glory of Kings, if Not More," *N&Q* n.s. 52: 267–81. Stanley believes that "*Beowulf* is certainly an Anglian poem, presumably composed in either Mercia or Northumbria," and probably "in the ninth century, at some time, not of glory, but of decline and lordlessness, or, if Northumbria, after the West Saxon subjugation of Northumbria in 829 or after the Viking conquests

in 844 or 867" (270, n. 7). In the first part of his article, Stanley adduces from the historical record the great political instability of these times and places; in the second part, he stresses the importance of a strong royal succession to the *Beowulf* poet, observing Hrothgar's hopeful anticipation of the hero's election as king of the Geats, the dangers of a weak successor like Heardred, the misery of the pre-Scylding kinglessness of the Danes, and the mercy of the Christian God in providing Scyld an heir in Beowulf the Dane, a figure whom Stanley suggests is meant to prefigure the hero of the poem, who similarly succeeds to royal authority after his people have suffered from ineffectual leadership. Stanley concludes that the poet has constructed his work as a series of vignettes, in which "times of ancient glory" are set "against inglorious times of lordlessness," with a rather "gloomy," if realistic, stress upon the latter times in order to reflect the poet's own experience of such political turmoil in own day and age (278).

Stanley appends a short "history of the concept of 'Germanic law,'" in which he quotes and translates several nineteenth-century German scholars (including Jacob Grimm, Wilhelm Eduard Wilda, and Reinhold Schmid), each of whom assumed the existence of an ancient legal tradition common to all Germanic-speaking peoples. This view influenced commentators on *Beowulf* during the first half of the twentieth century, Stanley reminds us, but is now "extinct," thanks to the work of Patrick Wormald (1999) and others who have shown a correspondence between a belief in pan-Germanic legal institutions and "the rise of German nationalism" in the nineteenth century (279). Interestingly, however, Stanley understands Wormald to make one important exception to this generalization, that is, that "the law of the blood-feud is Germanic" (280), completely alien to Roman or Christian legal thinking. How the status of the concept of "Germanic law" in legal scholarship is precisely relevant to his earlier discussion of lordlessness is not made clear, since Stanley, unlike Biggs, does not distinguish between a traditional Germanic system of ætheling competition and a newer Christian trend toward primogeniture, nor does he consider the role of institutionalized feud in the contest between branches of the royal family for the throne.

Leslie Lockett takes a different twist on "The Role of Grendel's Arm in Feud, Law, and the Narrative Strategy of *Beowulf*" (*Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O'Brien O'Keefe and Orchard, I:368–88). Rather than taking the trophy as a *tacen sweotol* 'clear sign' (line 833b) of restored peace as do the characters in the poem (379), Lockett believes that the triumphant display of Grendel's appendage would have "evoked at

least as much dread and apprehension" in the original audience of *Beowulf* (368), whose intimate experience of the dynamics of feud would have generated a kind of suspense in which multiple dire outcomes might be imagined. Lockett demonstrates the plausibility of this expectation by reviewing the evidence of various Anglo-Saxon and other Germanic laws and customs regarding vengeance, compensation, mutilation, and the use of severed body parts or bloody garments in goading reluctant kinsmen to revenge. The poet deliberately gives his characters a "false sense of security," Lockett believes, in order to heighten the audience's anxiety over the predictable but unknown retaliation to which the characters are oblivious, so that the poet generates both "the horror of suspense" and "the horror of surprise" in his development of this episode (380).

In "Costumi giuridici germanici riflessi nel *Beowulf*" (*Lettura di 'Beowulf'*, ed. Dolcetti Corazza and Gendre, 127–82), Giovanna Princi Braccini presents the older view that a number of common Germanic legal customs are reflected in the poem, including the feud, the severing and display of heads, the use of adoption formulae, the obligating gift or loan of treasure and weapons, the use of a *stapol* 'pedestal' from which to make formal pronouncements (as in line 926a), and the construction of the hero's "duels" with Grendel and his mother as judicial ordeals.

In "Hrethel's Heirloom: Kinship, Succession, and Weaponry in *Beowulf*," *Images of Matter: Essays in British Literature of the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, ed. Yvonne Bruce (Newark: Univ. of Delaware Press), 228–44, Erin Mullally examines gifts and bequests of armor and weapons in the poem, following Annette Weiner (1992) in distinguishing between "alienable" and "inalienable" possessions. The latter function as powerful symbols of group identity since they can only be given or bequeathed to relatives or other members of a special group, which is thereby signified as exclusive and elite. For instance, before confronting Grendel, Beowulf wills *Hrædlan laf* 'Hrethel's heirloom' (line 454b), his maternal grandfather's mailshirt made by Weland, to his maternal uncle King Hygelac of the Geats. In doing so, Mullally argues, Beowulf is signaling his primary identity as an ætheling of the Geatish royal family, in spite of the fact that he had first identified himself to the Danish coastguard as the son of Ecgtheow (lines 262–63), a champion of uncertain ancestry, but one sure to be recognized as a friend of the Danes. According to Mullally, royal heirlooms are not alienable from the circle of the ruling family, which explains the potent symbolism of Healfdene's sword, which Hrothgar gives to the young hero after the old king has

sworn to love him in his heart as a son. With the gift of his father's weapon Hrothgar confirms the seriousness with which he intends Beowulf's adoption as an honorary Scylding, though the king's reference to Beowulf's mother in lines 942b–46a makes it clear that he recognizes the priority of the hero's Hrethling heritage. Unferth, too, gives Beowulf the sword Hrunting, *an foran ealdgestreona* 'one of the first rank of ancient treasures' (line 1458), presumably an heirloom of his own family, in recognition of that warrior's superiority and also of Beowulf's new official status as "kinsman" of the Danish royal family. Beowulf reciprocates by willing his own sword to Unferth, an *eald laf* 'old heirloom' (line 1488b), to acknowledge their new relationship. Then, when Beowulf returns to Geatland, his uncle Hygelac gives him *Hreðles laf* 'Hrethel's heirloom' (line 2191b), this time the former king's sword, not in forced acceptance of the hero's demand for co-rulership, as Biggs argues, but proudly to claim and assert Beowulf's identity as a prince of the house of Hrethel. Mullally suggests that Hrethel's sword is the very same Nægling that fails the old king Beowulf against the dragon, reflecting the final failure of the Geatish royal line at his death. Wiglaf is no relation to this family at all, rather the contrary, so that the hero cannot pass on to his young paternal kinsman even the hilt or shards of the ancient royal sword of his mother's dynasty, offering him lesser treasures and armor instead. Wiglaf thus takes over the kingship of the Geats, in Mullally's view, without a legitimizing heirloom, a circumstance that bodes ill for his success in defending them against their enemies: "The Hrethling line is dead; the Wægmunding line is dying; Wiglaf is the last of that kin-group" (241).

Haruko Momma considers the contemporary political resonance of the poem's fictional hero in "The Education of Beowulf and the Affair of the Leisure Class" (*Verbal Encounters*, ed. Harbus and Poole, 163–82). Momma recruits the (now rather dated) theory of political evolution proposed by Thorstein Veblen in his classic study of 1899 to explain the hero's essentially pacific character, which is explicitly praised by his people in the concluding lines of the poem. Beowulf is not depicted as the kind of predatory war-lord that Veblen associated with the "barbarian" culture of the early Middle Ages, but is rather intended by the poet, according to Momma, to represent the kind of leadership appropriate to the proto-feudal society which grew out of it, one in which leisured aristocratic elites took a strong interest in maintaining at least a semblance of stability in order to preserve their class privileges through the productive ownership of agricultural land and rule over a servile peasantry.

Manish Sharma, in "Metalepsis and Monstrosity: The Boundaries of Narrative Structure in *Beowulf*," *SP* 102.3: 247–79, suggests that the ironic superiority which the Christian poet and his audience might feel toward the pagan characters in the poem is disrupted by two kinds of metalepsis or violation of narrative frame, one involving the status of bodies as human or monster, the other the transgression of boundaries set by or for divine agency. First, in fighting with Grendel and other monsters, the hero becomes so swollen with anger that he enters a dangerously "transgressive state" himself (256): "the hero must move beyond human limits in order to have the capacity to combat the monstrous forces that threaten the social order; yet this very movement is identified with pride and murderous, antisocial rage from which the monstrous corpus itself originates" (264). Sharma attributes the hero's later depression right before the dragon-fight to his realization of just this "existential dilemma" or "vicious circle," that to kill a monster he must become a monster himself (264–65). Sharma's second point is more complex. He sees a significant pun in the designation of Grendel as a *mearcstapa* 'haunter of boundaries' (line 103a), because that creature is also surely *gemearcod* 'marked,' "at least metaphorically" (266), with the sign that God set upon Grendel's murderous ancestor Cain in Genesis 4:15 (line 1264a). The meaning of the mark of Cain was variously interpreted in early Christian exegesis, but Bede combined the two main schools of thought, that of the Septuagint Greek which sees this mark as Cain's "groaning and trembling" in spiritual anguish, and that of the Vulgate Latin, which represents it as Cain's physical banishment to the waste places of earth (268). In this latter sense, the mark of Cain is the limitation of where he is condemned to live. Grendel, too, then, is a marked man, *forscrifen* 'proscribed' (line 106b) to be a *stapa* 'wanderer' beyond the boundaries of normal human habitation. He nonetheless violates this divine restraining order against his kin by trespassing in Heorot. By mutilating Grendel and repelling him from the king's hall, the pagan hero, in his own turn, steps over a kind of line, since he has just reenacted what God had done long before when he marked Cain for banishment and destroyed the wicked giants with a Flood. Just as in one sense the hero has transgressed the boundary between human and monster in his deadly rage, so in another he has assumed the role of the Christian God in proscribing monsters. Beowulf later similarly "proscribes" the dragon—*forwrat Wedra helm wyrm on middan* 'the protector of the Weather-Geats carved the worm in the middle' (line 2705)—by scoring or marking it, literally, to death (cf. *forwritan* in line 2705a).

These verbally signaled metalepses or ruptures of ontological category—good hero/enraged monster, heathen warrior/divine judge—reveal Beowulf to be appropriating identities “from which, according to the narrative logic of the poem, he should be utterly estranged” (278). Sharma explains this “metaleptic subversion” as “a symptom of the ambivalence with which the Christian Anglo-Saxons viewed their noble pagan ancestors” (278), so that the poem actively resists the conceptual protocols of its own “narrative structuration” (279).

Marie Nelson distinguishes between two categories of self-promoting speech in “Beowulf’s Boast Words,” *Neophilologus* 89.2: 299–310, one which “we commonly associate with bragging,” and that which “functions as a promise that the speaker will perform specific acts of courage” (299). The first kind is necessary to establish the hero’s past record “as a man who can be trusted to do what he says he will do,” while the second kind, described by the poet as *gylpspræc* (line 981a) or *beotword* (line 2510b), and usually offered in a formula of success-or-death, demonstrates “the degree to which he commits himself to follow through on his promises” in the present and future (299). With the dragon-fight, however, “the former either-or of the boast word as *promise* is seen to be an insufficient predictor of possible outcomes. Beowulf, with the help of Wiglaf, defeats the dragon and *dies*” (author’s emphasis, 308). The hero thus ironically fulfills both alternatives he had promised in his earlier boasting.

Susan M. Kim also explores the implications of vaunting speech in “As I Once Did with Grendel: Boasting and Nostalgia in *Beowulf*,” *MP* 103.1: 4–27. She suggests that the poet distinguishes between the individual as a body and the self as conceived through language or other signs. In particular, the hero’s verbal self-representation as an enemy of monsters is challenged, as Sharma also believes, by the fact that he becomes a kind of monster himself. Grendel’s arm, so violently ripped from his huge torso by the even more powerful and ferocious hero, is offered by Beowulf as the very “sign” of his human heroism when it actually reveals his monstrous difference from other human beings. This rupture between the hero’s subjective self-awareness and his monstrous physical being demonstrates that the young Beowulf is a very different kind of person from the one he says and thinks himself to be. Kim reminds us that such self-misunderstanding is a sad part of the human condition. Later, however, when the old king Beowulf nostalgically reflects on his youthful victory over Grendel in less confident anticipation of defeating the dragon, Kim believes that the poem moves to a more poignant investigation of the breach between

verbally constructed self-image—the hero’s express pride in his identity as a monster-slayer—and corporeal reality, the fact of his aging body. He is a monster no more, just an old man with big problems. And at the end of the poem, the appreciative language with which the hero’s people lament his absence, even while encircling the literal presence of his dead body in the mound, serves ironically to invest him with a positive wholeness, an undivided verbal identity in the story of his character and deeds, that has the potential to survive his physical body into the future.

Leo Marchetti, too, finds in “La ‘caccia’ al mostro: da *Beowulf* a Poe [Searching for the Monster: from *Beowulf* to Poe],” the first chapter of his *Anatomie dell’altro: l’immaginario teratologico nella letteratura inglese* [*Anatomy of the Other: the Monstrous Imagination in English Literature*], Domini: monografie del Dipartimento di Scienze Linguistiche e Letterarie, Univ. degli Studi “G. D’Annunzio” 6 (Naples: Liguori, 2004), 9–25, that the *Beowulf* poet uses the monster-fights as a way to imagine and externalize an individual’s struggle with the certain aspects of his own identity, a technique which would have a long legacy in subsequent English literature.

Thomas Napierkowski offers a contrasting view in “*Beowulf*: The Heroic, The Monstrous, and Anglo-Saxon Concepts of Leadership,” *International Journal of Public Administration* 28.5–6: 503–16, believing that the hero is never depicted as monstrous in any sense at all, nor does he seem to be struggling with much internal self-alienation. Instead, Beowulf is a thoroughly consistent, humane, even exemplary leader who draws much of his power by living up to the customary ideals of character and service he has deeply internalized and shares with the audience of the poem. After Napierkowski itemizes the many stark differences between Beowulf and Grendel—their parentage, associates, domicile, demeanor, sleeping habits, powers of speech, personal address, and mead-hall manners—we are pretty sure which one is the human and which the monster. Napierkowski concludes his list with a “feature so obvious that it is frequently overlooked” (510), that is, that when Beowulf dies, the Geats are truly sad. Grendel’s “fatal departure,” on the other hand, “was regretted by no one” (lines 841b–42, Heaney’s translation [2000]). *Contra* the views of Sharma and Kim, then, noted above, Napierkowski maintains that Beowulf generously fulfills, rather than transgresses or violates, his culture’s expectations of him with regard to his public or private identity as friend, thegn, kinsman, and king. This, the author notes, is an assessment shared by the hero’s own people in their comment on Beowulf’s character and

career expressed in the final lines of the poem (3180–82). Napierkowski thus reads *Beowulf* as a straightforward and still very valuable manual of leadership, one which illustrates that the best way to lead is by example, by inspiring trust in others through a deeply and consistently maintained network of positive relationships stressing shared expectations of noble behavior.

In a similar vein, Michael Alexander, in “Angels in Bede, Demons in *Beowulf*,” in *Anges et Démons dans la littérature anglaise au Moyen Âge*, ed. Leo Carruthers, *Cultures et civilisations médiévales* 26 (Paris: Presses de l’Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2002), 29–37, does not see the monsters of the poem as aspects or analogues of Beowulf’s character, but rather as straightforward personifications of negative human impulses that the hero successfully resists, amply illustrated by the historical context in which the poem was composed: wanton aggression (Grendel), thirst for revenge (Grendel’s mother), and greed for gold (the dragon). In this last case, Raymond P. Tripp, Jr., goes even further, reprising his earlier arguments of 1983, 1999, 2001, and 2002, that the dragon is, in fact, a human prince transformed into a monster by avarice in “The Dragon King of *Beowulf*,” *In Geardagum* 25: 17–45. As in his prior work on the subject, Tripp sees the last survivor, the desperate thief, and other anonymous figures mentioned in the final third of the poem as manifestations of this same character at earlier stages of his life-story.

In “Speaking of Nostalgia in *Beowulf*,” *MP* 103: 143–55, Mary Catherine Davidson follows Clare Lees (1994) in suspecting that the medieval clerics who read and copied the poem, as well as some modern scholars who study it, are nostalgically attracted to its construction of masculinity as a natural, privileged category. The poem’s “fiction of essential difference” between men and women (155) is illustrated by the gendered patterning of three speeches: (1) the Danish king’s statement after Beowulf’s return from the mere, otherwise known as “Hrothgar’s sermon” in lines 1700–84; (2) Wealhtheow’s speech in lines 1169–87 and 1216–31 in which she tries to recruit support for her sons; and (3) Beowulf’s own final words to Wiglaf in lines 2729–51 and 2794–2816. Davidson argues that Hrothgar uses “conventional heroic male speech” in an authoritative manner, one which rhetorically stresses the efficacy of masculine agency, while Wealhtheow employs a uniquely feminine idiom “in ways that also encrypt the limits of her authority” as a woman in the world of the poem (149). Interestingly, Davidson finds that in his last utterances to his young kinsman, the verbal style of the fallen Beowulf comes to resemble that of Wealhtheow rather than Hrothgar in its use of “unheroic language codes”

to imply restrictions upon human agency and an overriding concern for family relationships (152).

Martin Puhvel pursues rather the opposite view in *Cause and Effect in ‘Beowulf’: Motivation and Driving Forces behind Words and Deeds* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America) stressing an aspect of the old-fashioned hero’s character he believes has been lost in recent discussions, that is, Beowulf’s positive “thirst for and pursuit of heroic glory, that most pronounced and striking of his traits” (vi), as explicitly recognized by the king’s people in the last word in the poem used to describe him: *lofgeornost* ‘most eager for fame’ (line 3182b, cf. Tripp’s different analysis of this term described above). Puhvel notes that “the young retainer Wiglaf can think of nothing better to arouse the sorely-afflicted Beowulf to a supreme effort against the Dragon than to remind him of his youthful vow never to let his glory decline” (41). The author finds the source of this motivation in a value system promulgated by the cult of Odin in pagan times where superior achievement in battle was required for admission to an elite company of aristocratic warriors in Valhöll, the mythological concomitant of posthumous fame. Since the Germanic divinities were not omniscient, however, fame in this life was also necessary in order to achieve their notice, thus the anxiety to make sure one’s great deeds were as widely and correctly advertised as possible before death. Puhvel suggests that the depersonalized principle of *wyrd* came to supplant the anthropomorphic pagan divinities in the minds of Christian Anglo-Saxons as a superhuman power influencing their lives, one whose effect was construed as negative when compared to the blessings in this life or the next for which the Christian God could be invoked. Yet, “Beowulf does not like a good Christian commit his soul to God; instead he speaks—after requesting traditional pre-Christian funeral rites and memorials—of joining in death his kinsmen who have succumbed to a mysterious, sinister power with strong pagan connotations,” that is, *wyrd* in line 2814b, the conceptual substitute for Odin (105). The poet approves his pagan hero’s virtue, however, and does not confirm Beowulf’s expectation of soon joining the company of his fierce forebears wherever they might be imagined to reside. Instead, in lines 2819b–20, the poet “charitably and optimistically” intimates a “somewhat ambiguous,” but apparently happy Christian destination for Beowulf’s soul (105–06). Puhvel sees the reburial of the dragon’s “heathen gold” (line 2276b) in Beowulf’s barrow, a treasure which the fallen king himself had rejoiced in having won for his people, as a “rejection” of his pagan aspirations “by a new, increasingly Christianity-imbued generation

represented by Wiglaf, or at least as movement in that direction" (107). The shade of the departed hero is thus left to wander "between two worlds, one not quite dead, the other still in the process of being born" (107).

Peter Orton undertakes a related thesis in "Burning Idols, Burning Bridges: Bede, Conversion and *Beowulf*," *Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 36: 5–46, suggesting that the pre-Christian concept of divine agency as a power released through sacrificial ritual survived the elimination of such customs in Anglo-Saxon England. The *Beowulf* poet recalls this older view in his description of the Danes' "pagan sacrifice in their search for protection against Grendel's attacks" in lines 175–88 (32). Yet, the poet points out that this view was misguided, even counterproductive, and repeatedly insists that the Christian God has always ruled mankind, then as now: "The omnipotence of God is still, for the poet and his audience, a source of amazement. So is the fact that this power has always existed and been exercised even on the lives of individuals and communities who had yet to learn of his existence" (32). Orton feels that the Christian poet was "unequal to the task" of effectively representing his good characters, Hrothgar and Beowulf, as completely ignorant of God's power, believing they would lose our respect as noble and willing actors in the cause of good, becoming instead mere "puppets struggling in the dark" (32). He was thus forced to attribute to them an "anachronistic monotheism" (32), one that indeed "contains no references to God the Son, nor to doctrines connected with him" (29), but which contradicts the more consistent paganism of their peers.

Adrian Papahagi finds these theological distinctions beside the point in "The Anglo-Saxon Hero: Angel or Demon? A Reading of *Beowulf*" (*Anges et Démons dans la littérature anglaise au Moyen Âge*, ed. Carruthers, 75–100), Papahagi stresses that the *Beowulf* poet does not see a fundamental difference between some pagans in his poem and the Christians of his audience, but rather offers two alliterating categories of *hæþen* 'heathen' and *hæleþ* 'hero'. Grendel belongs to the former group, as in line 986a, while Hrothgar is placed in the latter, as in line 190b. "No Anglo-Saxon poet would have thought of calling Beowulf *hæþen* or Unferþ *hæleþ*," Papahagi insists (77). This is a moral and emotional, rather than a religious, distinction between the two types of people, he argues. Papahagi would thus "like to think" that the figure of Beowulf "is halfway between a 'pure' Germanic hero" like Sigurd Fafnir's-Bane of *Völsunga Saga* "and a warrior-saint, like St George" (77).

Eileen A. Joy, in the online Forum section of *The Heroic Age* 8 (June), n. p., reconsiders "James W. Earl's *Thinking About Beowulf* [1994]: Ten Years Later." She finds in his

"loosely connected set of motile meditations" (§ 7) a precocious model of scholarly commitment "to situating the poem not only in its own past, but also in relation to various intellectual discourses—theoretical, cultural, and otherwise—within the postmodern humanities" (§ 5). In particular, Joy believes that "Earl's commentary on the psychology of heroic poetry, as well as on epic's social function in establishing certain contested versions of the past in cultural memory, could not be more relevant to some of the questions related to whether or not Old English studies has an important role to play in . . . the contemporary university, as well as to the times in which we live" (§ 6). She calls Earl's approach to history and literature "ethnopsychological" (§ 9) in that he is most interested in the psychology of the poem's past and present audiences in seeking a heroic past for themselves in the world of the poem. Like the masks of classical tragedy, the face-guard of the Sutton Hoo helmet, or the blank expression of the modern psychoanalyst—analogs that Earl himself invokes in his book (150)—the hero of the poem and other characters provide a surface of patterned blanks onto which readers can project and play out their own imagined relationship between parts of themselves, between themselves and others, and between their perceptions of past, present, and future. Even so, on this last point, Joy regrets that Earl was not quite as prescient as he could have been: "he's too much of a structuralist and not enough of a post-structuralist thinker, for my taste," she concludes (§ 14). Joy also rejects Earl's Freudianism; she worries with Clare Lees (1994) that there is too much guy stuff in *Beowulf* that Earl does not distance himself from; and she is uncomfortable with "Earl's confessions of his very intimate dreams" (§ 14). But Joy values Earl's fundamental insight that reading the poem is a process of creating history, or a "dream" of history (as he would put it), in the reader's present (§ 14).

Roy M. Liuzza begins "*Beowulf*: Monuments, Memory, History" (*Readings in Medieval Texts*, ed. Johnson and Treharne, 91–108), by noting that "if *Beowulf* is a monument of English literature, the monument was erected in the nineteenth century" (91), almost a millennium after the forgotten poem itself was copied onto the single manuscript in which it survives around the year 1000. Liuzza notes that the hero "seeks not to be rich but to be remembered" (94), and that his exemplary figure thus provides a cultural memory and model for emulation intended to bind the past to the present, even as the poem repeatedly demonstrates that memory is a double-edged sword, which can just as easily disrupt and destroy when old enmities are recalled. Yet, "[f]or all its anxiety about unruly memory and untimely

oblivion, the conclusion of the poem seems to imply that the poetic commemoration of a heroic life can be more stable and reliable than physical monuments subject to rust, collapse, theft, or loss; his *dom* ['fame'] secured, the story of Beowulf begins to become the poem we are hearing, and the circle of memory seems complete. In the world of *Beowulf*, ... monuments may fall, but memory stands" (99–100). However, the reality of this monument of memory is merely a nostalgic "fantasy" (105). *Beowulf* was copied into Cotton Vitellius A.xv just as the Christian religion had completed its triumph over the native culture of Anglo-Saxon England, thus throwing the poem's stark old-fashioned ethics and ideals into a very ambiguous light. Rather than re-creating the past anew for its audience, as with the old oral singing in the hall, the writing of the poem served to fix its story permanently in the past, revealing "that such a world is irretrievably gone and cannot, and should not, be recovered" (105). The collective memory *Beowulf* seems to offer is thus a deception, a *trompe l'oeil*. Where we hoped it would "open a window onto the past," what we find instead is an opaque "mirror" (107), casting our own reflection back upon us in the present.

Seth Lerer, too, contemplates the *Beowulf* poet's sense of his place in time, as well as a recent response to it in "On fagne flor': The Postcolonial *Beowulf*, from Heorot to Heaney," in *Postcolonial Approaches to the European Middle Ages: Translating Cultures*, ed. Ananya Jahanara Kabir and Deanne Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), 77–102. The phrase from line 725a quoted in the title indicates that the floor of Heorot is *fah*, "decorated or patterned in some way," which Lerer takes to mean that it is "tessellated[,] a mosaic relic of an older, Roman architectural past" (77). It is thus the product "of the Anglo-Saxon postcolonial imagination," partially associating the Danish *imperium* described in the poem with the former Roman presence in Britain, and "exemplif[ying] the status of the poem's fictive world (and, perhaps, its historical readership) as living in an afterlife of Rome" (78). Even as the poet describes the construction of Heorot, he reminds us that it, too, will soon be a ruin (lines 81b–85), the relic of a mighty past in whose shadow we must now more humbly live, just as the wood- and thatch-building Anglo-Saxons dwelt among the impressive, but ruined, masonry of post-imperial Britain. In addition, Lerer sees the Danes as having colonized a land "already inhabited" and "ruled" by others (87)—in this case, Grendel and his kin—just as the Romans had wrested control of Britain from its native inhabitants. The monsters thus embody the resentment and outrage of those dispossessed and

marginalized in their own land. Lerer was brought to this political "rereading" (94) of the poem by Seamus Heaney's recent translation of *Beowulf* (2000), where the Irish poet stresses the potent impact of a past empire in the very language he must use to render the old poem into his "native" Northern Irish tongue, that is (ironically), English. To indicate his sensitivity to the complex legacy of imperialism, linguistic and otherwise, Heaney recruits obscure Gaelicisms like *bawn* to translate the Old English word for Hrothgar's hall, *reced* 'building' (line 720a); he thereby flags the foreignness of this imposing structure in a landscape of bogs and marshes, like that of Ireland as well. *Bawn* meant a fortified enclosure in Elizabethan Ireland, such as one used to protect English castles from the native occupants of the land. Later the term came simply to refer to more modest structures like cattle-folds or milking pens. In this second sense of *bawn*, Lerer believes that Heaney is trying to show how *Beowulf* domesticates the oppressive "ancient other" (94) in the poem by making Heorot "part native settlement, part foreign imposition" (96). Lerer suggests Heaney recognized that *Beowulf* is about "the idea of 'post-'" "that we live in a world that came after something else," something which has left us an obsolete but pervasive legacy to inhabit and to ponder, "whether it be in the cultural elegiacs of the Anglo-Saxon meditation on the Roman past or in the political idioms of current Northern Irish evocations of a family history or national aspiration" (98).

Bernie Harder does not find the attitude toward colonization in the poem to be bemused, regretful or elegiac, but rather aggressively and characteristically "Eurocentric," in "A Dialogic Reading of Oral Literature: Harry Robinson's *Write It On Your Heart* and *Beowulf*," *Interdisciplinary and Cross-Cultural Works in North America*, ed. Mark Cronlund Anderson and Irene Maria F. Blayer (New York: Peter Lang), 47–59. Robinson is a storyteller of the Interior Salish or Okanagan people of British Columbia whose narratives were recorded by Darwin Hanna and Mamie Henry (1995). Harder finds three similarities between Robinson's "oral history" and *Beowulf*: (1) "both mark a transition from oral to written literature"; (2) "both include a complex blending of non-Christian and Christian elements"; and (3) "both convey extraordinary events as a natural part of the ordinary world and combine legendary and historical material in their stories" (48). Harder offers a "dialogic" analysis of these two traditions, not in the sense of competing or subversive voices within the same text, as per Mikhail Bakhtin's *The Dialogic Imagination* (1981), but in the sense that both traditions can be imagined to contribute to an imaginary dialogue in which they

share and clarify their different cultural views and values. This discussion reveals some sharp differences: (1) *Beowulf* expresses a hierarchical “relationship between the Creator and creation,” and between human beings and nature, whereas as Salish tradition promotes a more egalitarian and symbiotic model of interaction between humans, animals, and divinities; and (2) the value system of *Beowulf* is “militaristic,” stressing the importance of heroic strength for human beings to secure a place for themselves in a hostile universe in which non-humans are often devalued and demonized, while Robinson’s stories suggest that power should be used to create a harmonious community of beings that includes not only humans, but also members of “the natural and spiritual world” (48).

In *Literature and Medicine* 23.2 (2004): 209–25, Arthur W. Frank stresses the importance of “Asking the Right Question about Pain: Narrative and *Phronesis*,” using the figure of Grendel to represent generally the force patients believe is causing their suffering, as opposed to the other “G,” the (Holy) Grail, which they hope “can heal and redeem” them (214). Physicians must cultivate *phronesis* in themselves and their patients, the kind of knowledge identified by Aristotle that goes beyond irrational fear and hope, or even the correct diagnosis of ills, toward an accurate assessment of those potential remedies “worth having faith in” (223). Yet, Frank notes that *Beowulf* realistically presents any remedy “as provisional. At best, the hero can keep chaos at bay, and eventually that work will kill anyone” (215).

Dissertations

Karl E. Boehler explores “Heroic Destruction: Shame and Guilt Cultures in Medieval Heroic Poetry,” Ph.D. Diss., Marquette Univ., 2005 (*DAI* 66, no. 04A: 1348). He associates both Homer’s *Iliad* and *Beowulf* with a culture of shame, in which heroes privilege their public image and status over their own lives: “Beowulf chooses to face the dragon alone because he would be diminished if others were given the opportunity to act heroically” in his place. The aging hero thus has no option but to be killed by his dire antagonist in order to avoid a worse fate: the killing of his own identity as monster-slayer. This “suicidal imperative” of a shame culture ironically destroys not only “individual heroes,” Boehler argues, but the very societies those heroes are supposed to protect, because the security of their people rests solely upon the presence of warriors like Hector or Beowulf to defend them. On the other hand, Boehler believes that the Middle English poem *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* offers a way out of this

heroic dilemma by introducing the hero to another option. The internalization of shame, the humiliating and painful acknowledgement of guilt, can replace the old avoidance of self-destructive shame. The new hero Gawain comes to realize “that he is trapped by the ideals he works to uphold,” admits his failure to do so, and accepts “a new ideal” of humility in the acknowledgement of imperfection, allowing him to live on to serve his people and king.

In “The Marks of Many Hands: Textual Identity in Early Medieval Scribal Culture (Cynewulf),” Ph.D. Diss., Brown Univ., 2005 (*DAI* 66, no. 05A: 1758), James Cahill undertakes to demonstrate how “uniquely attested works”—like *Beowulf*, the poetry of Cynewulf, or the Harley lyrics—resist efforts “to read their singularity as evidence of authorial intention and textual stability.” Just as with works for which we have two or more different manuscript versions, Cahill sees these sole surviving “texts as in flux, both materially and rhetorically, in their relations with other manuscript texts and with traditional poetic languages upon which they are built.” He rejects the notion of a “unique authorial genius,” stressing “the collaboration between producers and consumers of writing in medieval scribal culture.” For *Beowulf*, in particular, Cahill argues that the poem’s originality can be found in “the way it realizes a finite set of actual poetic lines from a larger range of [traditional formulaic] compositional possibilities ... that remain latent in its unique text.”

Translations, Adaptations, and Translation Studies

John McNamara has translated *Beowulf* for Barnes & Noble Classics (New York), supplying an introduction, a chronology from Caesar’s invasion of Britain in the first century B.C. through Tolkien’s classic essay on the monsters and critics of the poem in 1936, a new map of the world of *Beowulf*, genealogies, brief notes, commentary, and questions. He offers a lightly alliterative rendering in verse “that attempts to convey at least something of the flavor of the Old English poetry” (xxxix), making *Beowulf* “accessible to modern readers, while at the same time preserving some sense of its ‘otherness’ in diction, syntax, poetic movement, and cultural worldview” (xl). McNamara sees “the value of a translation ... in its loyalty to the original—as a faithful retainer should be to whom the lord has given a great gift” (xli). The opening eleven lines are rendered as follows:

Hail! We have heard tales sung of the Spear-Danes,
the glory of their war-kings in days gone by,

how princely nobles performed heroes' deeds!
 Oft Scyld Scefing captured the mead halls
 from many peoples, from troops of enemies,
 terrifying their chieftains. Though he was first
 a poor foundling, he lived to find comfort;
 under heavens he flourished, with honors fulfilled—
 till each neighboring nation, those over the whale-
 road,
 bowed under his rule, paid the price of tribute.
 That was a good king!

In *Beowulf* (New York: Pocket Books), Simon and Schuster have offered a prose version with succinct but useful supplementary materials by Frederic Will on the historical and literary contexts of the poem, as well as interpretive excerpts from leading critics and questions for further discussion. The translation is complete and fairly close, but the actual translator unidentified—a puzzling omission, since it is unlikely that even this distinguished American publishing firm maintains a house Anglo-Saxonist. Another mystery is that the spelling of the translation is British, so that we hope none of our Commonwealth colleagues are missing anything from their files. The first eleven lines are rendered:

Lo! We have heard the glory of the kings of the Spear-Danes in days gone by, how the chieftains wrought mighty deeds. Often Scyld-Scefing wrested the mead-benches from troops of foes, from many tribes; he made fear fall upon the earls. After he was first found in misery (he received solace for that), he grew up under the heavens, lived in high honour, until each of his neighbours over the whale-road must needs obey him and render tribute. That was a good king!

J. H. Ford has “edited” (that is, reformatted) Francis B. Gummere’s 1909 alliterative verse rendering (now out of copyright) as *Beowulf in Old English and New English: Facing Page Translation* (El Paso: El Paso Norte Press). Ford’s scholarly apparatus is minimal, omitting even identification of his bibliographical sources for text and translation. On the upside, it is gratifying to see that even small presses are eager to join in the surge of popular interest in the poem.

In *Beowulf: Das angelsächsische Heldenepos über nordische Könige—Neue Prosaübersetzung, Originaltext, versgetreue Stabreimfassung* (Wiesbaden: Marixverlag), Hans-Jürgen Hube divides the poem into thirty-five episodes, providing for each a prose retelling and discussion followed by the Old English text divided (somewhat arbitrarily) into clusters of one to five lines, each

group rendered into modern alliterative verse. For the first such cluster (lines 1-4), Hube offers:

Wahrlich, denkwürd'ge Taten von Dänen
 sind viel uns aus der Vorzeit berichtet,
 als Könige kühn ihre Kraft erprobten.
 Oft hat Garbensohn Scyld grimme Feinde, ...

Hube supplies a bibliography, genealogical charts, index of names, and simple glossary.

In “De Frisia a Fisterra, ou como facer unha tradución aliterativa á lingua galega do poema épico anglosaxón *Beowulf*,” *Viceversa: Revista Galega de Traducción* 11: 77–93, ill., Jorge Luis Bueno Alonso discusses prior translations of the poem into Castilian Spanish, those of Pérez (1959), Bravo (1981), Lerate and Lerate (1986), and Cañete (1991). He offers as a work in progress the first 114 lines of the Old English text with facing translation into alliterative Galician verse, of which the opening eleven lines are as follows:

Escoitade!
 Dos bravos daneses, nos días doutroa,
 da forza dos reis e dos feitos máis nobres
 que acadaron os heroes, escoitamos historias.
 E como dos salóns de augemel, Scyld, fillo de Scaef,
 ás tropas do inimigo, a moitas tribos, botou fóra.
 Aquel que atoparan, cando neno, esfarrapado,
 mellorou e metíalles ós guerreiros modo medo
 e creceu baixo os ceos, acadou honor e gloria
 ata que por tódalas tribos, as de máis lonxe
 e as veciñas do seu mar, vieiro da balea, fixose
 respectar e delas recibiu tributo. Aquel foi un rei bo.

Julian Glover provides an abbreviated poetic adaptation for a two-hour dramatic performance by one actor in *Beowulf*, 2nd ed. (Stroud: Sutton), illustrated by Sheila Mackie and introduced by Magnus Magnusson. Glover’s text follows, with copyright permission, the verse translations of Alexander (1973) and Morgan (1952), interspersed here and there with lines from the Old English text of the poem, but concentrating on the three monster-fights. Glover first performed his *Beowulf* at Bretforton Grange in September 1981, premiering in London at the Lyric Theatre Hammer-smith in July 1982.

Maria Vittoria Molinari reviews the practical and theoretical challenges facing translators in “Attualizzazione del testo medievale: la traduzione [Making the Medieval Text Come Alive: Translation]” (*Lettura di ‘Beowulf’*, ed. Dolcetti Corazza and Gendre, 183–203). These problems are illustrated by Giuseppe Brunetti in

the following piece of the same volume, “Ritradurre il *Beowulf* [Retranslating *Beowulf*],” 205–21, on the most recent renderings of the poem into English. Brunetti chooses lines 2179b–2180a for comparative analysis—*nealles druncne slog / heorðgeneatas* ‘not at all did he strike down his hearth-companions while drunk’—and considers the effectiveness of various efforts to reproduce the meter, alliteration, appositive variation, and poetic diction of the original verse in a contemporary idiom. In the same volume, Claudia Di Sciacca also addresses questions of accuracy and felicity in translation, with special (and somewhat ironic) stress upon renderings into Italian of the obscure verb “*Sweorcan*: una nota ai vv. 1737–1802a del *Beowulf* e alle relative traduzioni italiane,” 291–329.

In “Translation Criticism and Unknown Source Texts,” *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 13: 278–88, Cecilie Kreiner develops a methodology for evaluating translations from a language unknown to the critic, using three renderings of *Beowulf* into modern Danish as her examples, those of N.F.S. Gruntvig (1820), Adolf Hansen (1910), and Andreas Haarder (1984). She concludes that when two or more such translations reveal common features of structure, language, rhetorical form, content, or theme, “it is likely that they are following the source text closely” (286). She believes, however, that “three must be the minimum” number of translations compared and still urges caution, “since translational traditions may dictate or at least inspire specific solutions in subsequent translations” (286).

In “*Beowulf* in the House of Dickens,” *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O’Brien O’Keeffe and Orchard, I:421–39, Nicholas Howe writes on Henry Morley’s unsigned epitome of the poem, “A Primitive Old Epic,” that appeared on 1 May 1858 in *Household Words*, a reformist weekly magazine edited by Charles Dickens for a largely working-class readership of over 100,000. The staff writer Morley offers a plain prose summary of about 5,000 words that he adapted from Benjamin Thorpe’s Latinate translation of the poem, a rendering which that scholar had included in his 1855 edition of *Beowulf*. Morley spends nine-tenths of his narration on the hero’s youthful career, disposing of *Beowulf*’s reign as king and death against the dragon in about 500 words. He drops the historical episodes and “premonitions of disaster that fill the last third of the poem” (422). However, Howe finds an important virtue in this rather imbalanced and otherwise derivative version of *Beowulf* that has a claim upon the appreciation of professional Anglo-Saxonists: “A Primitive Old Epic” took the poem from an elite “preserve of scholars and antiquarians,” to introduce the story of *Beowulf* to a wide

readership for the very first time (435). This “act of popularization” was part of the progressive political agenda of *Household Words*, one in which a shared national English literature would help mitigate “social class hierarchies that rested in part on who had read what and, more crucially, on who was not allowed to read what” (434). “A Primitive Old Epic” can thus serve as a salutary caution and reassurance about our own professional devotion to study of the poem, reminding us “that the desire to read *Beowulf* need not be antithetical to the desire to improve the material conditions of those who live in the world in which we read” (435).

In “The Lords of the Ring: Tolkien, *Beowulf*, and the Memory of Song,” in *The Medieval Book and a Modern Collector: Essays in Honour of Toshiyuki Takamiya*, ed. Takami Matsuda, Richard A. Linenthal, and John Scatchell (Woodbridge and Tokyo: D. S. Brewer and Yushodo Press, 2004), 481–96, Ruth Morse argues that the popularity of Tolkien’s *Lord of the Rings* (1954–55), a work which was itself generated in part by that author’s response to *Beowulf*, made possible the later popular success of Seamus Heaney’s 1999/2000 translation of the Old English poem. Tolkien’s work not only revived formal rhetorical styles that “we might otherwise call biblical in the cadences of balance familiar from medieval literature,” but also archaic ideals of stoic heroism and a blurred distinction between high and popular narrative art. Yet, unlike Boethius, “the Christian who shed his knowledge of revelation long enough to write his prison *Consolatio* from the strong ignorance of philosophy,” or the Christian poet of *Beowulf* himself, who set his tale among pagan warriors in order to create “a space to think about where evil comes from, about the limits of heroism, about the frailty of order in a difficult world,” Tolkien “never achieved the failure to be a Christian” (486). Morse finds Frodo’s forgiveness “pathetic” in the face of such wicked enemies (490) and deplores Tolkien’s final privileging of Arthurian and Christological story-patterns: the romance quest, the suffering servant, the translation of the hero to a mystic realm for healing. “The end of *The Lord of the Rings* is sentimental to the point of failure,” she claims, in its “redemptive rejection of the pagan *Beowulf*’s end” (491–92). Morse thus believes that Tolkien finally betrayed much of “the world [of the poem] he so loved” (492), but also sparked many readers’ intelligent interest in it: “Without *Beowulf* we would not have *The Lord of the Rings* or its progeny,” she suggests, and “reading *The Lord of the Rings* makes us better readers of *Beowulf*” (496).

Eric A. Kimmel retells and Leonard Everett Fisher illustrates a children’s version of the first part of the story of *The Hero Beowulf* (New York: Farrar, Straus

and Giroux), n.p. ill. The narrative concludes with the celebration at Heorot after a livid green Grendel, bearing some family resemblance to his North American cousin, Swamp Thing, has been “dis-armed” and driven back “into the muck from which he came, never to rise again.”

Performances, Film and Musical Adaptations

In *Performing Medieval Epic*, ed. Evelyn Birge Vitz, Nancy Freeman Regalado, and Marilyn Lawrence (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer), Benjamin Bagby gives the perspective of a contemporary performer of Old English and Old Norse poetry in “*Beowulf*, the *Edda*, and the Performance of Medieval Epic: Notes from the Workshop of a Reconstructed ‘Singer of Tales,’” an allusion to Albert Lord’s classic 1960 study of the traditional bard. At <http://euterpe.bobst.nyu.edu/mednar/>, a six-minute video clip is available of Bagby’s solo performance of the poem with a lyre at the Angel Orensanz Center for the Arts in New York City in April 2003. In the clip, Bagby performs *Beowulf*’s first speech to Hrothgar and Hrothgar’s reply (lines 424b–88 of Klaeber’s 1950 edition), generously using gesture and voice to give some impression of the characters speaking and often singing the lines of verse to melodies that, as the website avers, have been “reconstructed on the basis of medieval musical evidence.” In his chapter, Bagby discusses some of the sources of information to which he turned in creating his “reconstruction of medieval epic poetry in performance,” which he notes is only “one possible” interpretation among others (181). He enters with his voice “into a world which is informed as much by the actor’s art as by the singer’s” (186), one in which narrated “events are recalled, relived, commented upon, and sometimes quite literally *inhabited* by the ‘singer of tales’” (Bagby’s stress, 187). He uses lyric or musical techniques only “for those isolated moments which call out for them, usually moments of reflection and introspection” (187). In studying the recorded performances of *Beowulf* by scholarly experts on the poem, Bagby “was struck by ... an exaggerated emphasis on the pure mechanics of metrics; the metrical patterns ... had broken the surface of the text (and the story), becoming obvious and heavy in the mouth of the reciter, and intrusive to the ear of the listener” (188). He thus sought instead “a subtler role for these delightfully vivid and supple metrical patterns,” to make them the “servants of the performance and not the master” (188). In particular, Bagby calls attention to his use of an unusual “open” tuning for his instrument in performing *Beowulf*, one which he considers “ideal for the

spontaneous outbursts needed in a six-hour performance of the complete *Beowulf*” (190).

The film *Beowulf and Grendel* was written by Andrew Rai Berzins, directed by Sturla Gunnarsson, and filmed in Iceland, premiering in both that country and Canada with a running time of 103 minutes. Gerard Butler plays a reasonably impressive and thoughtful *Beowulf*, Stellan Skarsgard a strikingly pathetic Hrothgar, and Ingvar Sigurdsson a rather presentable, scrubbed-up troll-hero, who, despite his terrible difficulty expressing himself in words, otherwise displays an attractive sense of family values. Grendel can be heard clearly to articulate Icelandic *pabbi* ‘daddy’ as he rampages through Heorot during his first attack on the Geats. He had kept the bearded skull of his father—just an ordinary troll, no relation to Cain—in a little grotto which *Beowulf*’s man Hondscioh makes the mistake of abusing and then leaving his personal odor on. Like other Neanderthals, Grendel has keen olfactory powers. He sniffs out the perpetrator and dispatches him, which is the only reason he would harm one of these strangers who, unlike the Danes, have never done him any wrong—until now. Grendel also watches over a red-haired son sired upon another introduced character, the human witch Selma, played by Sarah Polley. Selma beds *Beowulf* as well as Grendel, explaining that while she hasn’t had a *hu*-man for a quite a while, trolls are people, too—people with names. Grendel’s means “Grinder,” not in the sense that he grinds men’s bones, as *Beowulf* suggests, but rather his own teeth in rage and anguish over the many injustices done him by the Danes. A flashback reveals that Hrothgar had driven Grendel’s father off a cliff, while the terrified troll-boy looked on. The father’s offense? Stealing a fish, and being “a fucking troll,” according to Hrothgar. Grendel’s mother has a fiercely effective cameo, but the prize for least attractive character goes to a yet another figure introduced to the story, a spluttering Irish Christian priest who baptizes every demoralized pagan he can get his hands on, including a fat, sodden Unferth and a callow, drunken Hrothgar. *Beowulf* stands aloof from all this mess, sees his job through to the end, and returns home feeling bad, though one of his men composes a poem to glorify his deeds and demonize Grendel.

2005 saw a musical rendering of the poem in *Beowulf: An Opera in Two Acts* by Eduardo Perez, who offered its 430 pages of “Libretto (Old English lyrics and Modern English translation) and Music Score (composition and orchestration)” for review to the editors of *OEN*. The author stages the main plot of the poem, providing in place of its long speeches dialogue that has been freshly composed in “an Old English operatic dialect” (iii), a

kind of Anglo-Saxon pidgin or broken Old English, which our editor Daniel Donoghue, with characteristic generosity, describes as “telegraphic” in style. Perez has chosen the loosely coordinated words and compounds for their “sing-ability” and “hear-ability,” hoping to evoke “the beautiful flavor of the Anglo-Saxon language and culture” (iii). Even the monsters, wordless (if not completely quiet) in the poem, get singing parts in Perez’s opera and thus some considerably magnified self-expression. And to his credit, Perez does better than Berlioz, who once concocted nonsense lyrics in what he called an “ancien dialecte du Nord” for the first version of *Le Retour à la vie* (1831–32, with thanks to Peter Bloom for this information). Nevertheless, fastidious listeners among the readers of *OEN* might wish that the libretto could be given a grammatical scrub-down by some sympathetic Anglo-Saxonist, an operation that might even enhance the operatic force of these verses for people who understand (or want to understand) the words. One further cavil might come from the fire marshal, since the opera’s grand finale is the burning of the hero on his pyre, a technical challenge for which Perez offers several staging possibilities to accommodate local safety codes.

Calling upon the assistance of a professional and prize-winning composer ourselves, Donald Wheelock, Professor of Music at Smith College, writes that “the musical treatment of the subject is ... primitive and unsophisticated, [but t]here are, of course, great ‘primitive’ works of musical art, at least works whose subjects are primitive, or set in ancient times, where it might be appropriate to use a more immediately physical and instinctive musical language.” He comments, “The scoring is interesting: saxophones, brass and strings, with harp and timpani. I was surprised given the subject, not to find any prolonged use of insistent orchestral *tutti*, which such a subject might naturally engender. Notes are generated serially, Perez maintains [vi–vii], but my quick perusal confirms a pretty simple use of serial technique.” In his study of “ten random passages throughout the score,” Wheelock finds that in all those cases “at least some aspect of the texture, sometimes every aspect of it, was generated through chords in exact chromatic parallel (put another way, by parallel sets), a colorful technique if used sparingly, a tedious one (in my opinion) if relied on habitually. To be sure, the chords in parallel were often ‘accompanying’ simple melodic counterpoints, or offset by pedal tones, or stated against a line similar to a *cantus firmus* (no doubt another set), but the parallel-chord technique seems so ingrained in the work that one is tempted to say it may be nearly ubiquitous.” Though suggesting that he might

find this aspect of the composition “tedious in performance,” Wheelock continues, “there is something about the look of the thing that would probably tempt me to a performance, or at least to give it a listen, were a CD to come my way. A lot of work has been done here, and the production of the score, its use of ‘jazz instruments’ (saxophones, etc.), its notation, is fully professional as far as I can tell. In reading my remarks, too, one should keep in mind that one composer generalizing about another should, always, call for caution.” (Our sincere thanks to Professors Wheelock, Bloom, and Donoghue for their help in offering responses to the score and libretto of this opera).

Lee Hartman also musically characterizes the three monster-fights of the poem in a “Beowulf Triptych (Original Composition),” M.A. Thesis, Univ. of Missouri, Kansas City, 2005 (*MAI* 43: 1879). Grendel’s main movement is in G with “an off-kilter dance of death in 7/8.” Beowulf’s descent into the mere is represented by “waves of lush chords that ebb and flow,” the harmonies becoming “denser and the rhythms more active” as he nears the bottom. The sinuous volatility of the dragon is indicated by an accumulation of various inverted sequences, “an additive palindromic theme,” in which “relationships between fourths, tritones, and fifths are explored” to represent “the unpredictability of fire.”

Teaching ‘Beowulf’

Ruth Johnston Staver wrote *A Companion to Beowulf* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2005), primarily for the use of high school students and other “busy” readers who may be seeking different levels of acquaintance with the poem (xv). Her first chapter, for instance, is designed for “the student who only needs a general idea of the context of *Beowulf* and has only a half hour to read in the library” (xv). She then discusses the issues of rendering into Modern English “one of the most translated of ancient texts” (17), opting, with permission, to quote in this volume from Liuzza’s version (2000), because his “choices are moderate, combining easy readability with a good level of literal translation” (20). Subsequent chapters provide plot summary and commentary on the major episodes: “The Hero Comes to Denmark,” “Beowulf versus Grendel,” “Beowulf versus Grendel’s Mother,” and “Beowulf versus the Dragon.” A chapter on literary technique illustrates the poet’s use of contrast, irony, foreshadowing, his own narrative voice, suspense and dramatic timing, psychological development and characterization, symbolic settings, and shifting points of view. There are brief chapters on the problem of dating *Beowulf*’s original composition, the

Old English language of the poem and its poetic diction, the blend of pagan and Christian beliefs expressed therein, and various features of Anglo-Saxon culture, including work, women, food, buildings, clothing, and weapons. Staver describes several modern adaptations of *Beowulf* in books, comics, and movies. The volume concludes with a discussion of the “Beowulfian World” of J. R. R. Tolkien’s *The Hobbit* (1965) and *The Lord of the Rings* (1965). Even though these two works of modern fiction “never mention *Beowulf* and never use comprehensive parallels to its story, ... they form the most complete development of the cultural, literary, and moral world of *Beowulf*” (197) in their names, monsters, traditions and customs, sense of an even more ancient legendary world, and moral themes, in particular, “the nobility of continuing to fight against an overwhelming foe, even when all hope seems lost” (207) and the belief that some “guiding hand” or force influences the affairs of the characters, even though their world, like that of the poem, “is almost religion-free” (208–09).

Daniel F. Pigg laments the common practice of teaching *Beowulf* to high school seniors with only excerpts from the monster-fights in “Rethinking Masculinity Studies in the Curriculum: So What Do We Do about *Beowulf*?” *Jnl of Curriculum Theorizing* 21.4 (Winter): 13–20. This unbalanced focus valorizes “vigilante-like action” (14), reinforcing a sense of masculine identity as “violent, European, patriarchal, [and] heterosexual” in the minds of “male and female students at a time of their lives when violence against women, minorities, themselves, and others looms large in the lived curriculum inside and outside of schools” (13). Pigg argues that the whole poem should be taught instead, so that students can see the hero controlling his temper with Unferth, talking respectfully with Wealhtheow, accepting advice from Hrothgar. “Maleness meant more than violence” (16) to the poet of *Beowulf*, who also shows “the power of women to visualize problems resulting from the excesses of hegemonic masculinity” (17).

Jennifer M. Santos has developed a questionnaire for “Assuring the Efficacy of *Beowulf* for Undergraduate Students” (*OEN* 39.1: 37–44) in order to help instructors discover what students most enjoy in their reading of the poem and what most impedes that pleasure. Santos administered her questionnaire, a version of which she offers as the last page of her article (44), to a good sampling of students in two sections of a British literature survey at Arizona State University. She found that 78% said they enjoyed the poem, citing heroic action as its most appealing aspect. 49%, however, had trouble reading the assigned translation, finding the unfamiliarity of its poetic language the least attractive aspect

of their experience, along with difficulty they found in following the various episodic “digressions.” Santos thus compares a short passage from the Unferth episode (lines 529–32) as rendered in three different verse translations—those of Heaney (2000), Liuzza (2000), and Sullivan and Murphy (2004)—in order to estimate the response of students to a scene that combines both conflict, which they say they like, and formal rhetorical speech in a “digression,” which they say causes disengagement and confusion. In this instance, Santos believes that Heaney has found the best compromise between accurately rendering the complexity of the passage and a more accessible English idiom in terms of syntax and diction. But when she compares a later passage of direct action, the attack of the dragon in lines 2669–72a, she finds no such advantage in Heaney’s rendering. Thus, while recognizing “the difficulty of combining copyrighted texts from different publishers,” Santos suggests that instructors consider offering a hypertext version that would allow their students to read the most effective renderings of particular passages taken from various translations of the poem (41).

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

CRD/EM

d. Prose

In a brief essay of twenty-one numbered paragraphs, Bruce Mitchell supplies “Some Reflections on the Punctuation of Old English Prose” (*Text and Language in Medieval English Prose: A Festschrift for Tadao Kubouchi*, ed. Akio Oizumi, Jacek Fisiak, and John Scatchell [Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature 12. Frankfurt: Peter Lang], 151–62). He reiterates his previously published arguments concerning the distortion imposed upon Old English syntax through the use of modern punctuation: “The case against the use of modern punctuation for Old English prose and verse can be made in five words: modern punctuation produces modern sentences” (151). His earlier work in this area focused more or less on the punctuation of poetry; in this contribution he argues for the adoption of a new system of punctuation for prose texts as well. He advocates the system he developed with Susan Irvine in their publication “*Beowulf*” *Repunctuated* (*Old English Newsletter Subsidia* 29) and urges the extension of this system to prose by focusing very briefly on several syntactical conditions particularly vulnerable to the distortion of modern punctuation: the presence in prose of the paragraph as the determining unit of composition

(rather than the sentence); “the ambiguous adverb/conjunction; the ambiguous demonstrative/adverb; clause order; apposition and parataxis; and *apo koinou*” (156). Mitchell illustrates each of these very briefly by quoting relevant material he has published elsewhere.

AS

Martyrology

Michael Lapidge’s “Acca of Hexham and the Origin of the *Old English Martyrology*” (*Analecta Bollandiana* 123: 29–78) focuses on a “fundamental problem” (32): was the OE *Martyrology* a simultaneous compilation and translation of many Latin sources, or the translation of a lost Latin *Vorlage*? John of Beverley (d. 721) is the latest saint commemorated in the OE *Mart*; it lacks Boniface (d. 754) and Willibrord (d. 739), obvious candidates with well-known stories, making a Latin source with a date before the 740s likely, Lapidge argues. This *Vorlage* must have used the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, brief notices of saint’s day, place of death, and name begun in late fifth-century Northern Italy and reworked in Gaul over the next century—and then in eighth-century Lindisfarne (as indicated by Northumbrian entries that the Tallaght martyrologies adopted from it). Bede used a recension of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* to write his own *Martyrologium*, with narratives for 114 saints and many brief notices. Lapidge finds 141 entries in common among the three earliest witnesses to the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, all Continental; an additional sixteen are preserved in two, and eight solely in the third. Lapidge concludes that the writer of the *Vorlage* for the OE *Mart* could have taken 165 entries from the Northumbrian *Martyrologium*, or 73% of the *Vorlage*’s likely total. The *Vorlage* also draws on Bede’s *Martyrologium* for up to twenty-four entries, drawing 84% of the total entries from these two sources. The remaining entries include Insular saints (almost all Northumbrian), and twenty-one from literary sources, including Gregory’s *Homiliae xl in Euangelia*; about a dozen apostles’ *passiones* and a dozen confessors’ *vitae*; the *Liber pontificalis*; and as many as eighty *passiones* of martyrs. This *Vorlage* contrasts with the small scope of the few early manuscript passionaries we have. The *Vorlage*’s compiler needed a well-stocked library and good scholarly training. Acca had the training, interests, and a career with Bishop Wilfrid that took him repeatedly to the Continent. Acca became bishop of Hexham in 709 or 710 but was desposed, probably for political reasons, in 731; he did not die until 740, giving him almost ten years to write the *Vorlage*, at a time when John of Beverley would be the most recent saint.

Though the *Vorlage* and Bede’s *Martyrology* differ on when they started the year, they share much, especially the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* both as framework and as source for nearly three-quarters of the entries. As friends, Bede and Acca could lend each other texts, including even a Greek source (resembling the later *Synaxarion* of Constantinople) that both seem to have used. Acca’s Latin *Vorlage* was then translated in the ninth century before being lost. The article offers much bibliographical guidance through the complex field of early martyrologies as well as a stemma and an index of all saints it mentions. The marshalling of evidence is so impressive that by the end one could almost forget that Lapidge has taken a man from whom only one short Latin letter is extant and made him author of an impressively learned Latin text that sadly does not survive, except (perhaps) in the OE *Martyrology*.

Alfredian Literature

In “The Language of Ohthere’s Report to King Alfred: Some Problems and Some Puzzles for Historians and Linguists” (*Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Cyril Roy Hart*, ed. Simon Keynes and Alfred P. Smyth [Dublin and Portland, OR: Four Courts Press], 39–53), Janet Bately details some of the challenges of translating “The Voyages of Ohthere and Wulfstan” into Modern English, particularly where the report’s vocabulary may have been influenced by Ohthere’s Old Norse. While *hran* is not found outside this text, its use for ON *hreinn* is clear enough—but *stællhran*? Previous scholars have suggested ‘decoy reindeer’, but this sense for *stæll* is otherwise unrecorded in OE, while ON, OE, and other languages have the root *lok-* or *loc-* for ‘decoy’. *Stæll*, like *steall*, might be a place—an enclosure for the most valuable reindeer. The rare OE *fyrst* for ‘foremost’, may have been chosen rather than *fyrrest* because of ON *fyrstr*. Other words present problems because of multiple possible meanings. The *moras* along the Norwegian coast could be mountains, moors, or swamps; OE allows many meanings, but ON *mor* for ‘moor, heath’ (46) may have been intended. *Healh* conveys many kinds of landscape—here, most likely near water. *Gafol* may mean ‘tribute’, ‘tax’, or ‘rent’ (47), while *amber* could be a container or a measure, and *dyre* could mean ‘costly’ or ‘prized’ (47). *Port* presents much difficulty: ‘harbor’, ‘gate’, ‘town’, or ‘market’? Bately surveys many occurrences, noting the date and dialect of the texts she adduces, but she must conclude that we cannot know whether *port* was supplied by Ohthere or a translator, or which precise meaning was intended—a problem shared by several words in the passage.

Scott DeGregorio reads Alfred and Asser's *Life of Alfred* in "Texts, *Topoi* and the Self: A Reading of Alfredian Spirituality" (*EME* 13: 79–96). Alfred Smyth (*King Alfred the Great*, 1995), finding Asser's portrait of an ailing, ascetic king unbelievable and reliant upon other texts, declared the *Life* a later forgery. Yet medieval boundaries between text and self were fluid; Augustine, Gregory the Great, and others promoted a *lectio divina* that structures readers' lives around texts. DeGregorio argues that Asser's portrait matches the Alfred we see in the translations, especially the *Pastoral Care*. Asser describes Alfred keeping a florilegium always with him to ruminate over key passages; Alfred's Preface to the *Soliloquies* envisions patristic writings as a forest whose wood can be used to build a home in this world—preparing one for the next. Gregory described four aspects of a good ruler's life, all of which appear in Asser's account. First, the ruler must be spiritual: humble, pious, and charitable. Asser's Ch. 76 emphasizes all three aspects in Alfred's life, while Alfred's *Pastoral Care* follows Gregory in showing that a spiritual ruler guides his people well in the world. Secondly, rulers must balance active and contemplative roles; doing so requires a third point, the reading at the heart of a ruler's piety. Alfred even strengthens some of Gregory's exhortations to religious reading, and Asser thematizes Alfred's struggles with reading. Finally, Gregory emphasizes the ruler's role as judge—a role with which Asser ends his *Life*. Asser does not merely recycle *topoi*; he uses them to represent a man whose own translations reveal how he has internalized those *topoi*. Alfred built his life upon his reading. In the next world, wisdom is God; in this world, books can bring wisdom. As Alfred modeled his life on the works of Gregory, Boethius, and Augustine, so Asser offers Alfred's life as a text on which readers can model their own lives.

In "Listening to the Scenes of Reading: King Alfred's Talking Prefaces" (*Orality and Literacy in the Middle Ages: Essays on a Conjunction and Its Consequences in Honour of D.H. Green*, ed. Mark Chinca and Christopher Young, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy [Turnhout: Brepols], 17–36), Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe analyzes Asser's accounts of Alfred's literacy and Alfredian prefaces to understand Anglo-Saxon reading practices. Asser's Chapter 23 features a seven-year-old Alfred who cannot read by himself, yet who "magistrum adiit et legit" a book of poetry. *Legit* here cannot mean individual reading; instead, O'Brien O'Keeffe argues for a "corporate reading" in which lector (here, the *magister*) and auditor (Alfred) share. Asser and others read aloud to the king, and Asser copies passages into Alfred's book; lectors and scribes

enable Alfred's reading. The idea of corporate reading also makes sense of an Alfredian alteration of the *Soliloquies*: where *solitudo* enables Augustine's work in the Latin, "fæwa cuðe men and creftige" assist the OE narrator, and Augustine's imagined few readers become lectors. Three Alfredian works have "speaking" prefaces that imagine their texts' receptions. The prose and verse prefaces to the *Pastoral Care* address bishops directly, as individual readers; in the latter, the book itself speaks as an object that readers view. The verse preface to the OE *Dialogues* also imagines readers physically holding the book, but the *Dialogues*' prose preface depicts hearing audiences. The *Dialogues*' prefaces, however, seem to postdate the work and may imagine later audiences. The verse Proem of the *Boethius* uses traditional poetic words and verbs of speaking, while its rare words *ælenge* and *selflice* emphasize individual intellectual pride; "the combination folds aesthetics onto ethics to attract the self-regarding individual into a scene of corporate intellectual pleasure where 'we enjoy instructive verse' (34). The book will be read to "us," the West Saxon people. A later reader and writer, Alfred's descendant Æthelweard, describes Alfred's *Boethius* as worthy for scholars—and moving to hearers. Thus the end of the tenth century presents an audience still split between individual scholar-readers and corporate listeners to a shared text.

As director of the Boethius Project (which will publish a new edition of the OE *Boethius* in early 2009), Malcolm Godden describes challenges and new solutions in "Editing the Old English Boethius" (*Text and Language in Medieval English Prose: A Festschrift for Tadao Kubouchi*, ed. Akio Oizumi, Jacek Fisiak, and John Scahill; *Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature* 12 [Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang], 49–61). After briefly sketching manuscript and editorial histories, Godden describes three resources valuable to the current editors: digital images of the manuscripts, Moerschini's edition of *De consolatione*, and the Project's transcriptions of glosses on early Boethius manuscripts. He then studies several exemplary passages. Godden argues from the Latin and from Mitchell's *Syntax* that Sedgefield emended unnecessarily at 96.21–3 because he failed recognize the unusual *weald þone* as "whatever." Sedgefield 25.24–6 offers the shorter MS C reading where the longer B reading reflects ideas found in a Latin gloss and makes good sense; eyeskip likely caused omission in C. Next, Godden examines OE ambiguity: Sedgefield distinguishes "good" from "God" by capitalization, though both are often spelled *god*. Godden uses manuscript evidence and glosses to determine whether "good" or "God" is meant in three

passages (25.18–9, 38.20–8, and 30.22–3), twice correcting Sedgefield. Finally, Godden uses meters and prose to illuminate each other, emending prose from verse twice (34.3–6 from 161.33–8, and 7.1–7 from Meter 1). As a key early English prose text, the *Boethius* deserves an up-to-date edition.

Malcolm Godden also examines “The Latin Commentary Tradition and the Old English *Boethius*: The Present State of the Question” (given at the first annual symposium of The Alfredian *Boethius* Project, Oxford, July 2003; published online at <http://www.english.ox.ac.uk/boethius/Symposium2003.html>). Godden and project coordinator Rohini Jayatilaka are collating commentaries to the *De consolazione* from the ninth through eleventh centuries; these range from a few scholia to full, continuous commentary. The so-called Remigian tradition includes forty tenth- and eleventh-century manuscripts. Pierre Courcelle dated Remigius’s commentary too late to have aided Alfred, but some recent scholars question both the attribution and the dating, and even a later commentary might well draw on earlier ones. Manuscripts vary tremendously: “we need to think of highly fluid collections or compilations of glosses and scholia rather than ‘a commentary’” (6). A second family, the St. Gall Commentary, takes four main forms in several different manuscripts. Once believed to be ninth-century, the St. Gall family does not have strong ties to the *Boethius*, and its dating depends on the dating of hands and the assumption that Remigius used it. Some commentaries, including a few very early ones, fit neither family. Most notably, BAV Vat. Lat. 3363, an early-ninth century Continental manuscript, contains many glosses, a majority in an insular and probably Welsh hand of the late ninth or early tenth century. Some of those early glosses parallel points in Remigian commentaries, suggesting either an early date for the Remigian commentary, or that later Remigian revisers used Vat. Lat. 3363 or related (now lost) manuscripts. Godden then considers the commentaries’ relation to the OE *Boethius*. Many glosses simply explain a word or phrase in the *De consolazione*; such glosses might have helped the translator but are very difficult to trace, unless the explanation seems highly unusual. Longer, elaborating comments may prove more helpful: one gloss from CUL Kk 3.21 matches some information Alfred added in his translation of III met 6 in his Chap. 30. While editing the commentaries presents serious difficulties, the *Boethius* Project will make its work on the commentaries available in a fuller version than the *Boethius* edition itself will allow; a new multi-year grant will enable that publication. Along the way, the paper describes key manuscripts and points readers

to the scattered publications of excerpts from a number of commentaries, as well as to forthcoming work.

Susan Irvine, co-director of the *Boethius* Project, details other challenges in “Fragments of *Boethius*: The Reconstruction of the Cotton Manuscript of the Alfredian Text” (*ASE* 34: 169–81, with plates between 246 and 247). The *Boethius* exists in one late, prose-only version, Bodley 180; and one mid-tenth-century alternating prose and verse version, BL Cotton Otho A.vi, badly damaged by the Cotton fire. In the nineteenth century, Frederick Madden and others reconstructed the manuscript from burnt fragments that had to be flattened and sometimes pieced together like a jigsaw puzzle. The frames holding the fragments block small portions of text that are now readable with ultraviolet light. Frederick Madden and his colleagues did an “extraordinary” (172) job of fitting together the fragments, but their work is not perfect, as Irvine shows. Fol. 15r includes a fragment that does not produce sensible readings. Indeed, comparison with the prose and with Junius’s transcript of Otho A.vi (Oxford, Bodl. Lib. Junius 12) helps Irvine to determine that the piece belongs in fol. 14r. She demonstrates how Madden, Sedgefield, and even Krapp thought that they were reading letters that they knew must be there—but that are not. If Sedgefield thought he had read a handful of letters which cannot be seen in this small portion, how often in his edition did he mentally supply letters or words not truly visible? Even Krapp marked one letter as visible in the manuscript which he could only know from the transcript. The fragment forms part of Meter 7 (*De cons.* II met. 4), on avoiding the heights for the security of a firm foundation, an idea that the OE develops in greater detail than the Latin. Alfred himself demonstrates in his Preface to the *Pastoral Care* his awareness of the fragility of books, and in the Preface to the *Soliloquies* imagines constructing a house of wisdom from the patristic forest. Irvine concludes, “Alfred in Metre 7 muses on the stability which can be attained by building wisdom, at the very point at which the text itself is for its modern readers seen to be at its most unstable” (181).

Kevin Kiernan uses computer analysis to investigate “The Source of the Napier Fragment of Alfred’s *Boethius*” (*Digital Medievalist* 1.1, n.p., <http://www.digitalmedievalist.org/article.cfm?RecID=5>). In 1887, Napier published a transcript of a fragment of the Alfredian *Boethius* that he said he had found the year before as a flyleaf to Bodleian MS Junius 86; his dating makes it the earliest evidence for the *Boethius*. The fragment could not be found for Sedgefield’s 1899 edition of the *Boethius*, and it has never been recovered.

Other scholars have accepted Napier's transcript, his dating, and his judgment that it came from a prose-only version of the *Boethius*. Using the Edition Production Technology employed for his *Electronic Boethius* project, Kiernan reconstructs line breaks from Napier's transcript. Napier saw an astonishing sixteen subscripts for various letters in the thirty-two lines he transcribed; the contemporary Parker Chronicle and Tollemache Orosius manuscripts use occasional subscripts, so Kiernan uses their letter-forms for his reconstruction. EPT's *RamSome* function allows Kiernan to insert OE letters for all the letters in the transcript, reconstructing the fragment (shown online, the reconstruction indeed resembles a ransom note). Kiernan finds that the hand must have been extraordinarily small to fit all the letters in the space Napier reports, that line lengths show remarkable variation, and that the rate of subscript letters far exceeds any known manuscript. He finds it highly unlikely that both Wanley and Junius, who owned the manuscript that reportedly used the fragment as a flyleaf, failed to note an OE fragment. Kiernan suggests no motive for Napier to have fabricated his discovery and transcript, but he concludes, "If it leads to the recovery of such an important leaf of Old English, raising these legitimate doubts will be worthwhile. In the meantime, scholars are free to accept or reject the authenticity of the Napier fragment, but they should no longer assume that it proves the existence of an all-prose *Boethius* manuscript from the early tenth century."

John Brinegar traces "Some Sources of the Old English *Boethius*" (given at the first annual symposium of The Alfredian *Boethius* Project, Oxford, July 2003; online at <http://www.english.ox.ac.uk/boethius/Symposium2003.html>). Following Joseph Wittig ("King Alfred's *Boethius*," ASE 11), he rejects the idea that Alfred borrowed heavily from a commentary on the *De consolatione philosophiae*; instead, he finds Alfred using a small group of key texts. Bede's *De natura rerum* supplied scientific information such as that the morning and evening star are both Venus, information that Isidore's work of the same title lacks. Ambrose's *Hexameron* provided other scientific ideas, including how water prevents the earth from drying into dust. Borrowings come from more than one part of Bede and Ambrose's works, indicating that Alfred had full copies, not just extracts. Certain details in Alfred's expansion of the Hydra allusion resemble Servius's commentary on the *Aeneid* and the Vatican *Mythographus* texts. Historical details may derive from either Eutropius's *Breviarium* or Paulus Diaconus's *Historia romana*, which relies heavily on Eutropius. Christian additions prove

more difficult to trace, but in one illustrative passage, Brinegar shows a direct debt to Wisdom 8:7. Brinegar concludes that Alfred's use of Servius and Virgil suggests we should reconsider the scarcity of ninth-century knowledge of the classics. He finds Wisdom a crucial source and writes, "However broad the content of Alfred's intellectual milieu was, biblical modes and models seem to have been central to it" (14).

Rūta Šileikytė goes "In Search of the Inner Mind: Old English *gescead* and Other Lexemes for Human Cognition in King Alfred's *Boethius*" (*Kalbotyra* [Vilnius] 54 [2004]: 94–102). Otten's *König Alfreds Boethius* (1964) argued that Alfred's terminology is inconsistent; Godden's "Anglo-Saxons on the Mind" (in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England*, 1985) noted that Boethius's divine *intellegentia* pertains in Alfred to wise men and angels as well. Šileikytė's essay suggests further refinements to our understanding. Meter 20, the OE translation of "O qui perpetua" (*De cons.* III met. 9) imagines the soul ascending to God through reason—in the OE, *gescead*. Using Magee's *Boethius on Signification and Mind* (1989), Šileikytė unravels Boethius's own terminology. Boethius's *ratio* is a passive intellect in his translation and commentary on Aristotle's *Peri Hermenias*, while Alfred's *gescead* seems quite active. In the *Consolation*, Boethius further distinguishes *ratio* as a human property unavailable to lower animals, but below *intelligentia*, the immediate intuition by which God knows. Human *ratio* lacks immediate access to knowledge and must learn in a linear manner; in Alfred's usage, *gewitt* best matches this term as a human faculty above *mod*. Šileikytė finds in Alfred's distinction between *gewitt* and *gescead* an Augustinian element. Though Alfred's distinctions do not exactly match Boethius's, Šileikytė concludes, Alfred maintains consistency and communicates late antique philosophy to Anglo-Saxons.

NGD

Nicole Guenther Discenza provides a brief introduction to Alfredian literature in "The Persuasive Power of Alfredian Prose," (*Readings in Medieval Texts: Interpreting Old and Middle English Literature*, ed. David F. Johnson and Elaine Treharne [Oxford: Oxford UP], 122–35). The essay explains the salient facts behind the Alfredian "programme of translation and education" (122) and its concomitant revival of learning and letters. Discenza briefly describes the texts of the Alfredian canon and then concentrates on the Preface to the Old English translation of Gregory's *Pastoral Care* as an example of trends and tendencies in the Alfredian program as a whole: the Preface's "syntheses of varied sources with

Alfred's own words, and moral with practical elements" (123) show the way Alfredian texts typically looked to important classical and late antique texts and adapted them through translation to an Anglo-Saxon cultural context. She examines the Preface's attitude toward earlier generations of Anglo-Saxon intellectual history and then outlines what she calls a central theme of the text, its "linkage of wealth and wisdom": the recovery and promotion of literate wisdom is configured by Alfred as a pragmatic source of wealth for his kingdom. Discenza then suggestively explores some of the text's rhetorical strategies, showing the introductory student that this is a rich, complex specimen of prose. She outlines the way the Preface's voice invites or demands certain assumptions and concessions on a variety of issues, including the implied responsibilities of upper classes to promote learning, alternating modes of suasive and monitory rhetoric, and translation theory.

Nicole Guenther Discenza develops a focused source study of the Alfredian translation of Boethius in "The Unauthorized Biographies of Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius" (given at the symposium of The Alfredian Boethius Project, Oxford, July 2003; published online at <http://www.english.ox.ac.uk/boethius/Symposium2003.html>). Discenza compares the Old English text's biography of Boethius with the various brief Latin biographies of Boethius that precede select extant manuscripts of the *De consolatio philosophiae*; her analysis focuses on *vitae* I and VI (as numbered in Peiper's edition). She explains that "To see how the Latin *vitae* inform Alfred's Boethius is to see a microcosm of Alfred's whole practice: examination reveals Alfred's breadth of knowledge and careful selection of details, his skill at weaving together disparate sources, and themes very much distinct from Boethius's *De consolatione*" (1). She argues that the selection of material from these *vitae*, combined with other elements (some sourced, some unsourced) produce a composite biographical image of Boethius in the Old English distinct from the Latin sources. The Old English figure of Boethius is portrayed as a "family man": "Details carefully selected by Alfred show the audience not a man embroiled in plots, but also not a man in religious or contemplative life. . . . This Boethius emerges first as a man of politics and worldly virtue and second in the context of his family" (6). Boethius is also a "reluctant martyr" (7) and a sinner "who must learn to recognize his pride to advance spiritually" (10). She concludes: "The narrator, then, becomes more of a religious model in Alfred's hands than in Boethius's. At the same time, he also provides a model of governance—not just of the self, as Boethius's Latin text advocates, but of others"

(12). This leads to a second part of Discenza's argument: the Old English text's use of sources represents Boethius as a wise and worldly authority figure similar to Alfred himself: "This narrator is not just a philosopher, but a Christian ruler—the kind of Christian ruler Alfred's whole program aims to produce. This ruler is introspective but does not shirk his public duty" (14). This change results in a certain contradiction: "The Old English text envisions no conflict between personal spirituality and public involvement, although such tension is very much present in the *De consolatione*, forcing the rejection of public life" (15).

AS

Nicole Guenther Discenza's insightful study of *The King's English: Strategies of Translation in the Old English 'Boethius'* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press) explores how Alfred in the *Boethius* accomplishes the threefold goal of "increasing symbolic capital for [the king] and his language, granting cultural capital to his elite group of readers, and inculcating certain modes of discourse and values" (58). Her introduction sets forth the complex nature of the challenge facing Alfred: Latin, the language of learned and religious thought, was far more accessible to European and Mediterranean than Anglo-Saxon intelligentsia; Alfred had few models for rendering Latin into Old English; the contemporary vernacular offered divergent dialects rather than a standard form in which to write; and ecclesiastical figures, not kings, were the expected sources of English education. Alfred therefore had to authorize both himself as a moral and literary authority and his language—specifically, West Saxon—as a legitimate vehicle for authoritative discourse. The task of crafting the *Boethius*, moreover, was further complicated by the need to negotiate among "a Neoplatonic source text, Christian Latin traditions, and Anglo-Saxon expectations concerning language, religion, and literature" (10). The first of these Discenza examines in Chapter One, where she identifies strategies by which Alfred pursues both adequacy—the degree to which a translation reflects its source on linguistic and literary levels (6)—and acceptability—the degree to which a translation is comprehensible and attractive to the target audience (57). Adequacy Alfred maintains by preserving numerous proper nouns, that is, references to Roman mythology, history, and natural science that offered a wealth of imagery and facts—cultural capital, in other words—largely unknown to his Anglo-Saxon audience. Acceptability he promotes by making such concepts accessible, using familiar English terms rather than Latin loan-words and explaining (or, less frequently, omitting) foreign references and ideas.

Chapter Two considers Alfred's endeavor in the wider context of Western Christian traditions of translation. Alfred had precedent, Discenza notes, in the Carolingian renaissance (though its production was largely Latin), earlier English programs of education (though the focus of Theodore and Hadrian, e.g., was again not on the vernacular), and in Scripture itself (the prologue to the translation of the Hebrew book of Sirach underscoring the importance of conveying wisdom). The works Alfred chooses for his translation program, moreover, are ones compatible with patristic and biblical themes—a view of God as highest good and ultimate goal of humanity, the rejection of the world as an end in itself, assurance of final justice despite the apparent prosperity of the wicked, and so on—which Alfred is able to gloss in explicitly Christian terms. In so doing, he reflects a patristic and particularly Augustinian view that pagan material, false but potentially instructive, might be adapted to Christian use. At the same time, not all the material expounded by Alfred has roots in his Boethian original: Discenza points out themes which Alfred inserts that run counter to his source material, such as a duty to others rather than a focus on oneself. Chapter Three treats in more detail ways in which Alfred makes his work acceptable to his English audience. Linguistically, Alfred not only avoids foreign loanwords, but incorporates such familiar poetic techniques as doubling, antitheses, and alliteration. He also makes illustrations more dramatic, concrete, and rational in keeping with contemporary expectations, often uses anticipation and repetition (previewing and reviewing) to help those following the argument aurally, and presents the characters in personal terms (using the second rather than the third person) “typical of oral cultures” (71). The last in turn allows Alfred to introduce the themes of friendship and good kings, “reflecting less on friendship between equals, freely chosen, and more on hierarchical relationships based on loyalty and love ... the shift [being] from a Roman to a Germanic value system” (79). Finally, Chapter Four shows how Alfred synthesizes late-antique, Christian Latin, and Anglo-Saxon references and modes of discourse, “linking the two higher in prestige with the one most familiar to his readers” (87). He replaced Philosophy with the figure of Wisdom drawn from Scripture; he emphasized a Christian tradition of good stewardship rather than a renunciation of worldly goods; he employed images (the eye, the hunt, the forest) common to the Bible, patristic literature, and everyday experience; and he used the word *craft* not simply to convey power, physical skill or craftsmanship, and mental ability, but virtue or spiritual excellence (*virtus*), reflecting the combination of

physical and moral strength prized by all three cultural traditions. In sharing this literary wealth with his people, Discenza concludes, Alfred may have depleted his store of cultural capital, diminishing the value of his private learning to the extent that he makes it common knowledge. The investment was a worthwhile one, however, as it gained him symbolic capital—investing “both his own work as translator and the developing medium of Old English prose with prestige and authority” (3)—in the very process of educating his audience.

AK

In “Alfred's *Soliloquies* in London, BL, Cotton Tiberius A. iii (art. 9g, fols. 50v–51v)” (*Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O'Brien O'Keefe and Orchard, II:153–79), Paul E. Szarmach studies and edits the two excerpts from the *Soliloquies* in Tiberius A.iii. This miscellany contains the Rule of St. Benedict glossed in OE, the *Regularis Concordia*, homilies, prayers, and other pieces. Extracts from Alfred's *Soliloquies* (equivalent to the Latin I.2 and II.5–6) occur among other prayers and meditations without mentioning Alfred; the text has value not as his translation but as Augustine's prayer. Jost first identified the extracts in 1950, so earlier editors Hargrove and Endter had only Cotton Vitellius A. xv as witness to the text; Carnicelli unaccountably ignored Tiberius for his 1969 edition. Szarmach finds the Tiberius text more subject to eyeskip and confusion than Vitellius, but in a few cases, it corrects or clarifies a Vitellius reading. (Szarmach conveniently indicates where the two passages can be found both in Endter and in Carnicelli.) While Richard Clement (“King Alfred and the Latin Manuscripts,” *Jnl of the Rocky Mountain Med & Ren Asso* 6) established that the Latin text Alfred used for his *Pastoral Care* does not match printed editions, the tradition of *Soliloquia* in England remains unclear; the Tiberius text may offer new opportunities to identify the Latin manuscript family Alfred used. Heinrich Stirnimann (*Grund und Grunder des Alls: Augustins Gebet in des Selbstgesprächen* [Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1992]) has examined the medieval tradition of “Augustine's Prayer” (*Soliloquia* I.2–6) independent of the *Soliloquia* and argues that the text is a prose poem. Tiberius certainly shows that the Prayer had a life of its own in the Middle Ages; while Szarmach finds it does not break as neatly into prose-poetic units as the Latin, “the rhythmical features ... suggest that the prose may reflect yet another variety of vernacular prose” (163). Stirnimann finds echoes of the Prayer in Anselm of Canterbury; Szarmach concludes that Alfred's devotional piety fit into post-Conquest religiosity and wonders if Anselm himself took an interest in having

the text copied. Szarmach offers a full facsimile of the relevant portion of Tiberius, followed by his own edition, with collations from the Vitellius manuscript. He includes the Latin equivalents from Hörmann's edition and then his own translations of both OE and Latin into Modern English. In a bizarre typographical error, line 43 of the edition contains a crescent and star where "g" clearly appears in the manuscript (in "geseon"). The edition and translations, however, are valuable additions to work on the *Soliloquies*—a text that still awaits a thorough edition.

In "The Paschal Controversy in the Old English Bede" (*Bède le Vénérable entre tradition et postérité / The Venerable Bede, Tradition and Posterity. Colloque organisé à Villeneuve d'Ascq et Amiens par le CRHEN-O (Université de Lille 3) et Textes, Images et Spiritualité (Université de Picardie-Jules Verne) du 3 au 6 juillet 2002*, ed. Stéphane Lebecq, Michel Perrin, and Olivier Szerwiniack, Collection "Histoire de l'Europe du Nord-Ouest" [Lille: Ceges], 297–308), Sharon M. Rowley argues that the Easter Controversy acts as structuring symbol in both the Latin *Historia ecclesiastica* and the OE *Bede*. Far from being tedious and erroneous, as some scholars would have it, Bede's connection of the Easter Controversy with Pelagian heresy emphasizes the necessity of Christ's Resurrection in salvific history. Bede describes Pelagianism as venom or contagion and shows Germanus healing sick children of British leaders to symbolize the weakness of the heretical Britons, who in Book V suffer politically while the English, Irish, and Picts, now all in the Roman fold, experience unity and peace. That the moon and vernal equinox are both necessary to correct calculation and symbolic of grace came to Bede through Augustine, Isidore of Seville, and the Irish *De computu dialogus*; Bede and his translator saw the symbolism as central to history. After Bede's time, computus manuscripts moved away from detailing theological arguments toward stressing practical applications; the translator's revision aligns with newer interests by omitting mentions of Pelagianism and shortening accounts of the Easter Controversy. Despite the changes, the *Bede* clearly sets out the calculation of Easter in its account of the Hertford Synod (672); most surviving manuscripts lend authority with rubrics for the account of Hertford like those that mark Gregory the Great's *Libellus Responsumum*. While omitting detailed arguments from the Synod of Whitby, the translator retains key statements that Wilfrid established Roman Easter, including criticism of the Irish. A second translator renders III.16–20 and retains statements emphasizing that although Aidan miscalculated Easter, he made sure to observe it on a Sunday due to

his firm belief in the Resurrection. Theological debates could be omitted because the orthodoxy had won. The translator uses Easter dating the same way Bede used that controversy and Pelagianism: "for separating the sheep from the goats" (308).

André Crépin explores lexical choices in "La communication discursive dans la version vieil-anglais de l'*Historia ecclesiastica gentis anglorum*," (*Bède le Vénérable*, ed. Lebecq et al., 287–96). Whether deliberately or erroneously, the translator changes the Preface, compressing Bede's stages of composition and interaction with the king, inventing another source, and omitting King Ceolwulf's interest in Scripture. He renders *historia* as *spell*, which could mean any discourse, and drops the adjective *ecclesiastica* until the end of the work; he also refers to lessons learned from *this* history where Bede spoke more generally of the lessons of history. Yet this translator develops a theme of the Latin text by further emphasizing the duty of education through repetition of *læran*, *leornian*, and *lareow*. When Cædmon sang to the monks, they not only became (the Latin) *auditores* (Colgrave & Mynors 418), in OE, they *wreoton 7 leornodon* (291, Miller 346.3–5). Cædmon's hymn, written by monks to continue the educational process, survives, while Aldhelm's songs to unlettered crowds have been lost. Books matter, even as Anglo-Saxon *leorneres* replace *lectores*, because learning is collective, not just individual. The *Bede* employs multiple words for disciple: the unusual *discipul*, with its Biblical overtones, as well as the more common *leorningcniht*, which other translators favored. Crépin also notes *stæf* for *litera* and *cwæð he* for *inquit*, which needs no subject in Latin; novels in English still employ this inversion in dialogue.

Paul E. Szarmach queries "'The Poetic Turn of Mind' of the Translator of the OE Bede" (*Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Cyril Roy Hart*, ed. Keynes and Smyth, 54–68). Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* contains six poetic passages, four of them epitaphs. Bede's first poetic epitaph follows his account of Gregory the Great's life and caps off his themes—resurrection of the body, balance between active and contemplative, and the conversion of the English—so neatly that Szarmach argues Bede used the Roman epitaph to structure his own preceding chapter. Yet the epitaph does not simply perfect Bede's narrative; it leads into one more story, that of Gregory at the slave-market. Such pairing of primary narrative with extending anecdote occurs elsewhere in the *HE*, most notably with the Cædmon story as a highlight of Hild's life. The OE translator simplifies a complex Latin structure. He reduces Bede's life of Gregory to "vital statistics" (61) and then renders the

epitaph fairly literally, with minor repetition but without the distinct rhythm and alliteration of OE verse, perhaps taking Bede's caution against translating verse too literally. The translated epitaph expands these statistics. Ælfric found the translation worthy of use for his own homily on Gregory (CH II.9), which does not simply use the Latin *HE*; the OE offers a straightforward narrative in plain style where the Latin is more complex. The translator next encountered Bede's hymn to Ætheldreda, an acrostic poem in which the last three words of each couplet echo the first three. A literal translation would read badly; here "the 'poetic turn of mind' is a 'turn and run'" (66). In fact, the translator renders none of the other Latin poems and does not always acknowledge that the epitaphs even exist. Szarmach concludes that the translator did not treat the text as sacrosanct and experimented as he went; the text reveals changing intentions and methods in its differing treatment of poems.

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle

Thomas A. Bredehoft considers the roles of "History and Memory in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*" (*Readings in Medieval Texts*, ed. Johnson and Treharne, 109–21). Because the book is intended for students, Bredehoft begins with a succinct introduction to the *Chronicle*. He emphasizes vernacularity and continuity over its centuries of composition. He then focuses on "superlative" entries. Natural wonders and disasters such as cattle plague and bad weather are usually described as the greatest in memory, worthy of record because they impress human minds. Political and military events, by contrast, are the greatest in *history*, and sometimes in books. Both rhetorical strategies remain remarkably consistent throughout the long span of the *Chronicle*, one example of the many continuities between pre- and post-Conquest history that the *Chronicle* describes and creates, retaining an "Anglo-Saxon viewpoint" and specific set expressions (120) even as the last entries show the transition to early Middle English.

Scholars often distinguish between true history and propaganda in the *Chronicle*, and between a true England and an idea that developed before the English nation. In "What (and Where) Is the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* about?: Spatial History" (*Bull. of the John Rylands Univ. Library of Manchester* 86.2 [2004]: 87–104), Jacqueline Stodnick argues that such dualism misses the point: the *Chronicle's* "process of discursive mapping is dynamic ... productive of England as a geographically-imagined category," not merely "descriptive" (90). She finds useful notions of place, space, and narrative in de Certeau's

Everyday Life. For de Certeau, place is "distinct, stable, non-temporal ... associated with the objective mode and death" and "objects"; space "is dynamic and associated with directionality, speed and time," "produced through the actions of subjects" (92). He similarly distinguished map, a relational representation of a whole, from itinerary, which narrates process or action. The 892–6 annals in the *Chronicle* (MSS A, B, C, and D) offer a "spatial story" of Alfred's later Danish wars. In the Parker *Chronicle*, these annals start a new layout with year numbers in the center instead of the margin, long lines full of narrative, and a marginal initial at the head of each paragraph. These entries also begin with various linking phrases that tie them together instead of the discrete, repeated "Her." Such changes make the entries more historical (like the roughly contemporary OE *Bede* and *Orosius*) and less annalistic. Verbs of motion dominate so that descriptions of troop movements "produce a map" (96) in the entries. The sudden conglomeration of place-names in these entries produces an effect found in classical and late antique geographies (evidenced by *Orosius*, *Bede*, and their OE translations): lists create a sense of totality, an itinerary of the world. Yet here the *Chronicle* does not merely name places: it lists them with repetitive formulas to put each movement in a larger context, giving "an itinerary in the form of a list by showing how the individual stages of a journey are the same as each other" (100). Also unusually, the *Chronicle* gives directional orientation and sometimes even distances in miles (unlike any other *Chronicle* entries). The *Chronicle* generates here not just an itinerary but a map in which places exist outside of time and in relation to each other. Again in the classical and late antique tradition, the *Chronicle* uses rivers as reference points. Stodnick concludes that before England becomes a political unit we would now call a nation, the *Chronicle* uses traditional geographical techniques to create a map—and thus to write England.

Fonthill Letter

In "The Fonthill Letter: Language, Law and the Discourse of Disciplines" (*Anglia* 123: 667–86), Mechthild Gretsch answers recent studies of the Letter and reflects on disciplinary relations. Boynton and Reynolds argue ("Author of the Fonthill Letter," *ASE* 25) that Ordlaaf is *not* Helmstan's godfather and that the godfather gained Fonthill only after Helmstan's pardon. Gretsch answers that because changes from first or second person to third person are not unusual in OE, such changes do *not* indicate a change of referent, and that the absence

of pluperfect from the letter says nothing about the relative dating of events because OE has only preterite. Alfred Smyth (*King Alfred the Great*, 1995) suggests that the Æthelred whose belt Helmstan stole was Æthelred I; Gretsch replies that Alfred is always called “king” or “your father,” so Æthelred I would not be identified solely as by his name. The essay focuses primarily on three of the four cruxes that Carole Hough treated in “Cattle Tracking in the Fonthill Letter” (*EHR* 115: 864–92), sometimes following earlier lexicographers’ very tentative suggestions. Hough interprets *speremon* as “tracker,” “an otherwise unrecorded occupational term” (672, quoting Hough 891). Gretsch criticizes Hough’s use of Attenborough’s translation of II Edward ch. 4 with Liebermann’s text and Hough’s failure to cite Liebermann’s notes on the passage. Edward’s law requires an estate to provide guides for cattle owners tracking their *own* cattle; such guides provide no evidence for official trackers, Gretsch notes, and Liebermann rejected possible Continental parallels that Hough cites. Gretsch contends that a compound of the noun *man* with the verb *spyrian* is unlikely, and that *speremon* would have to be a Kentish form in an otherwise strongly West Saxon text (rejecting Hough’s argument for Kentish interference). Gretsch stands by her previous suggestion (in “Language of the Fonthill Letter,” *ASE* 23: 57–102, at 88–9) that *speremon* comes from *spere* and means “cattle driver” (she does not respond to Hough’s remark that *spere* as “goad” is unrecorded in OE and that OE used *gad*). Hough takes *sporwreclas* as the traditional “tracked animals”; Gretsch points readers to her suggestions in “Language” and merely notes here that most words with the suffix *-il/-el* are tools. Hough argues her interpretation of *speremon* and *sporwreclas* make sense in context, but Gretsch rejects such reasoning as “not a philological argument” (681). Finally, Hough links *unlæde* both to *lædan* (“to guide”) and the attested sense of *unlæde* as “wretched” to derive a sense of “stray” (unguided and therefore wretched). Yet Holthausen’s dictionary shows *lædan* and *unlæde* to be unrelated etymologically; Gretsch suggests these oxen are simply “wretched,” an epithet arising from Ordlaaf’s frustration. Gretsch concludes that scholars must realize what they cannot know—including definitive meanings of some terms. She then writes that scholars must be able to rely on each other: historians, paleographers, and philologists must all master their own disciplines thoroughly so that they can rely on each other’s results without being misled, in this case, when one invents an unattested group of professional trackers. Though Hough’s work could have benefited from more engagement with Liebermann and Holthausen, here Gretsch

mainly reiterates her original interpretation without answering Hough’s strongest points. Quite rightly, neither scholar claims to have a definitive interpretation.

West Saxon Gospels

Maria Laura Esteban Segura’s “Punctuation System of the West-Saxon Version of the Gospel According to Saint John” (*Linguistica e filologia* 21: 29–44) analyzes the punctuation of the OE Gospel of John in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 140. She classified each instance of *punctus*, *punctus versus*, and *punctus elevatus* in the manuscript for this study and here offers the statistics, explanations, and examples of each kind through the body of the article. In her conclusion, Esteban Segura provides a useful chart identifying the several possible uses of each mark and its modern equivalent. She also advocates critical editions that note original punctuation in the apparatus. While she observes that some uses of punctuation overlap (all three can mark the end of a sentence, for instance), she finds the punctuation consistent and primarily grammatical in function. Oddly, she begins the piece with a lament about the paucity of work on punctuation in Old English texts, but her References show her to have missed more works than she cites, including key studies by Mitchell and O’Brien O’Keefe.

See *YWOES* 2002 for Yoshitaka Kozuka’s “Syntactic Uniqueness of the Gospel of John in the *West Saxon Gospels* and Their Authorship: Additional Evidence for the Divided Theory” (*Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature* [Japan Society for the Study of Medieval English] 17 [2002]: 59–74).

NGD

Mary of Egypt

2005 saw the publication of a small volume of four essays on *The Old English Life of Mary of Egypt* (ed. Donald Scragg, *Old English Newsletter Subsidia* 33 [Medieval Institute, Western Michigan Univ.]). In the first essay of the volume, Catherine Brown Tkacz argues for the presence of “Byzantine Theology in the Old English *De Transitu Mariae Aegyptiace*” (9–29). She begins by addressing Mary of Egypt’s prominence in the liturgy and devotion of the Eastern Church and explains that certain elements in this originally Eastern hagiographical account “such as the symbolic use of numbers and the dynamic role of icons are simply lost without reference to the Byzantine calendar and theological concepts” (11). She notes the likelihood of Byzantine theological concepts traveling widely in the early medieval world and argues that the translator “adds or elaborates

repetitions of Byzantine theological terms" (13); in particular he "elaborated the presentation of Mary of Egypt as icon in a manner entirely consonant with Byzantine theology" (13). She also argues that the Byzantine calculation of Lent and the Byzantine concept of *theosis* inform the structure of the narrative in the Old English text: e.g., Mary spends a total of forty-nine years in the desert before her body is found and buried; there are forty-nine days in the Byzantine season of Lent. In general, Tkacz finds a Byzantine "Lenten patterning in the lives of Zosimos and Mary" (21). She argues that the Old English text translates key Latin terms with an awareness of their originally Byzantine import, particularly *Theotokos* and *icon* ('*godes cennester*' and '*anlicnyssse*', respectively). She points to the importance of the Byzantine doctrine of icons in the Old English text; she sees the translator as focusing on the power of an icon in his word choices, echoic repetitions and in coining words such as *wuldorfæstlicnyssse*.

Andy Orchard delivers a typically thorough stylistic analysis in "Rhetoric and Style in the Old English Life of Mary of Egypt" (*The OE Life of Mary of Egypt*, ed. Scragg, 31–55). The critical tradition behind Mary of Egypt has generally seen the Old English translation as "stylistically challenged," if not outright clumsy. Orchard seeks to rescue the work from such denigration. He argues that the translator recognized "a level of rhetorical sophistication" in the source and embellished the text with further stylistic adornment: "in the Old English Life we find an Anglo-Saxon author deliberately creating a Latinate and aureate vernacular prose, based on a notion of translation far removed from that of Ælfric" (32). He notes that the scribe of Julius E.vii deserves some of the blame for translation problems that have been ascribed to the author: "The idiosyncrasies of the source-text and the idiocies of the copyist, then, certainly combine to absolve the author of a good deal of the critical blame that has accrued" (34). Rather than judge the translation as excessively repetitive, for example, he sees artful echoic repetition. Orchard shows that the Latin source engages in artful repetition and the Old English translator picks up on the technique and develops it further; in fact, this technique goes back to the Greek source. Thus successive translations of Mary of Egypt in Latin and Old English have further embellished the rhetorical techniques found (or suggested) in the original Greek. Rather than seeing echo-words as a characteristic of vernacular verse (a typical explanation), Orchard demonstrates their use in Anglo-Latin literature. Therefore, rather than a slavish and clumsy translator, we instead have a perceptive reader of the Latin text, one attuned

to its rhetorical texture, who attempts to translate and augment his source based on this sophisticated understanding. Orchard also briefly covers other stylistic features used by the translator in a similar way: anaphora, alliteration, polyptoton, paronomasia, doublets.

Clare A. Lees focuses on the text's engagement with the tradition of visionary knowledge in "Vision and Place in the Old English Life of Mary of Egypt" (*The OE Life of Mary of Egypt*, ed. Scragg, 57–78). She argues that the text "subtly amplifies the relation of seeing to knowing, the visual to the visionary beyond that of its Anglo-Latin source" (57); the *vita* places a pervasive emphasis on sights, seeing, revelation, and knowledge. The narrative is shaped by a "thematic trajectory of secrets and insights, miracles and spiritual knowledge, writing and revelation" (67). Lees views the narrative as an exploration of the notion that "seeing and knowing are ultimately unified through the work of belief" (57–8). Different types of knowledge are at play in the text: sexual knowledge, spiritual knowledge, figural knowing, the comprehension of reading, and so forth. The interplay of knowledge informs the dialectic between Zosimus and Mary: one is afflicted by pride, the other by sins of the flesh; both proceed through parallel narratives of revelation through visionary knowledge. Lees begins by tracing the figural connotations of Mary as "*Ecclesia*—the 'prostituted' Church, liberated by the exodus, exiled and tested in the wilderness, and ultimately redeemed by Christ" (60–61); ultimately irreducible to one meaning, she is also "the Virgin and Christ." The figural dimensions of the narrative's places, people, and events are important in the text's visionary capacity because "To read figurally is ... to learn how to see" (62). Seeing Mary (or not seeing her, or seeing her incorrectly and then correctly) are all part of the text's complex engagement with the modes of visionary knowledge: hence the many instances of secret knowledge and striking iconic visual representations in the text, and the "secret world resonant with scriptural allegory" (63). In turn, the reader ultimately gains a visionary insight by being led through the dynamics of revelation embedded in the narrative. Thus in many ways, Zosimus is a proxy for the reader as the monk is led through a process of education and taught how to see and how to understand; he must see the truth of the figural world about him in the narrative. To reach true belief, Mary must proceed through a parallel process of sight and revelation in advance of Zosimus. Ultimately, Mary figures belief itself, and the text insists on her veracity as well as the labor needed to apprehend her figural dimensions; this veracity is the "insistent reality of the figural mode within spiritual

discourse” and it “turns out to be the *Life’s* main lesson for Zosimus and for all subsequent readers. To read this text figurally is to learn how sight and knowledge are clarified by the insights of belief” (78).

In the final essay of the volume, Robin Norris concludes that an excess of turbulent emotion is the defining characteristic of the *vita* in “*Vitas Matrum: Mary of Egypt as Female Confessor*” (*The Old English Life of Mary of Egypt*, ed. Scragg, 79–109). She places Mary of Egypt in the context of the other non-Ælfrician texts in BL Cotton Julius E.vii—Euphrosyne, Eustace, and the Seven Sleepers. All these texts are united in their “melodramatic display[s] of sorrow” (80). Their displays of “effusive emotion,” typically rendered as dramatic sighing and weeping, would have rendered them suspect to the more orthodox mind of Ælfric; the texts would come too close to the sin of *tristitia* (‘sorrow’). Norris is interested in the dialectic between Zosimus and Mary, particularly in terms of the excessively emotional dialectic between the two; their mutually dependent compunction is an educational process in the narrative that will lead the two protagonists to salvation. She analyzes the occurrences of weeping in the text in comparison to the Latin source and finds the weeping and emotion of compunction developed to a greater degree in the Old English, with a variety of stylistic and narrative strategies. For Norris, weeping is an index to the characters’ suitability for salvation; the ebb and flow of emotional turmoil provides a window on their striving toward salvation. The more Zosimus is able to rein in his excessive emotions, the closer he comes to understanding the true nature of salvation: “Although he remains somewhat histrionic to the end, Zosimus’ development could be read as growth away from *tristitia*” (108).

Alexander’s Letter to Aristotle

Kathryn Powell continues her work on the Anglo-Saxon understanding of the Orient by delivering an astute analysis of the narrator in “Laying down the Law: First-Person Narration and Moral Judgement in the Old English *Letter of Alexander to Aristotle*” (*Bull. of the John Rylands Univ. Library of Manchester* 86.2 [2004]: 55–68). Arguing against what she sees as an overly simplistic assumption that Alexander would be understood as a symbol of pride in the *Letter*, she adopts a more complex view based on the fact that the text presents its narrative information only through the first-person perspective of Alexander himself; there are no contrary voices in the text qualifying his exploits in a moral light or castigating him for his pride (she draws a contrast with *Beowulf* to make the case). Without

such a qualifying internal gloss, the ethical imperatives of the text are rendered more complex: “the narrative is constructed in such a way that the reader cannot help identifying with Alexander; this identification is then exploited so that the reader suffers for it, is horrified by it, and eventually gives it up, having learned not to behave as Alexander does” (56). In other words, she is interested in “the affective responses that the work might elicit during a reading” (56). She explores this affective dynamic through the use of Lacanian psychoanalytic categories: thus the lack of a qualifying moral voice in the text, a supplement to point out the traditional moral opposition to Alexander as a figure of pride, means that the “text lacks a voice with which to articulate what Lacan calls the Law” (56), opening the possibility for “the reader to pursue foreign desires ... [and to allow] him to experience horror as a result of that pursuit” (57). The reader is permitted to identify with Alexander and to experience the vicarious thrill (both pleasurable and horrible) of the text’s vision of the East. Powell argues that the Lacanian Law is not explicitly articulated in the narrative, but of course outside the narrative world of the text, Alexander’s actions and character transgress the moral precepts of the Christian Anglo-Saxon tradition; moreover, Powell suggests that within the narrative, traces of the moral Law can be found: “I would suggest that, if the Law does not find direct expression in the language of the narrative, it does return in the form of numerous physical sufferings endured by Alexander and his men” (63). The trials and horrors that confront Alexander’s army allow the reader to form a moral judgment about the undertaking as the reader vicariously experiences them. In Lacanian terms, “in the absence of any voice to give expression to the symbolic Law, the natural world of the East takes on the function of a superego that attacks the reader from without and leads him toward a rejection of the East that is as much visceral as symbolic” (64). Thus in the end she qualifies her argument, stating that “For the reader of the *Letter* ... the Law is not absent but weakened” (65), and so the narrative structure of the *Letter* leads to a “certain fluidity in the moral dimension of [the] text” making it “potentially adaptable to a variety of historical and manuscript contexts” (66). Powell concludes by briefly exploring potential late tenth-century historical contexts for the horror of the foreign (e.g., Viking invasions).

Apollonius of Tyre

In the first of two articles this year on the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*, Javier Calle Martín and Antonio

Miranda García examine “Aspects of the Punctuation of the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*” (*Folia Linguistica Historica* 26: 95–113). They argue for the presence of meaningful, systematic authorial punctuation in the extant manuscript. Distinguishing between grammatical and rhetorical punctuation, they maintain that medieval writers used both depending on the local needs of a particular text. They first describe the punctuation and physical makeup of Cambridge, Corpus Christi 201; then they survey the punctuation of the two main editions of the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*: Thorpe (1834) and Goolden (1958). They proceed next to a statistical analysis of the use of the *punctus* in the manuscript, using data gathered by the software program *Old English Concordancer* (99); they also explain the procedure they used to organize the data in a spreadsheet program. The body of the article lays out an organized discussion of the different uses of the *punctus*, including relevant statistics: for example, there are 179 instances of the *punctus* used to mark the end of a sentence, 15.32% of all the occurrences (101). They give similar data for the following categories (here using their order and terminology): at the sentence level, introducing coordinate clauses, subordinate clauses, adjectival clauses, and nominal clauses; introducing direct and indirect speech; initiating adverbial clauses, and marking off non-finite forms of the verb. They also record data for the use of the *punctus* at the clause level: to separate clause constituents, to signal the coordination of phrases, to introduce appositional phrases, to mark off a vocative phrase. And they end with data on the sporadic use of the mark at the phrase level: to link phrase constituents and to introduce numerals. They conclude that the punctuation of the text is “far from whimsical”; they believe that “the writer is actually showing such a level of expertise in his use of punctuation marks that we can think that there was an art of pointing at the time, performed with the utmost virtuosity and, more importantly, plausibly transmitted under the shelter of monastic tradition” (110). They come to the conclusion, thus, that 70.6% of the punctuation marks are rhetorical in nature while 29.4% are grammatical. They conclude by offering a system of punctuation to be used in modern editions to better represent medieval punctuation practices (110–111).

Carla Morini draws a connection between “The Old English *Apollonius* and Wulfstan of York” (*Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 36: 63–104). Building upon her previous article (“The First English Love Romance without ‘Love’! The Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*” [*SELIM* 12 (2003–04): 109–25], reviewed in *YWOES* 2004), Morini argues for authorship of the text by Wulfstan or his

“entourage”: “Both the substance and style of the translation seem closely related to Wulfstan’s writings and ideology” (63). She first examines the manuscript context of the romance and argues (as she did in her *SELIM* article) that the romance (*contra* received opinion) is not an odd fit in its manuscript context, but that the legal themes of the romance are highlighted by the Old English translator and thus make a good fit with the legal material found in the extant manuscript: “it is reasonable to argue that there could ... be a relationship between some of the juridical and religious statements to be found in Corpus Christi College MS 201B and the content of the fragments of the romance, which touches on issues of rape, incest, marriage, free consent, and widowhood” (67); she contends that “behind the translation there lay an exemplary intent, moral and (in particular) juridical, which related to Wulfstan’s ‘propaganda’ on the subject of incest and marriage” (80). She compares the text to its Latin source, arguing for the adaptation of the text to an Anglo-Saxon audience interested in legal matters; she pays particular attention to the subjects of rape and incest and draws connections to the corpus of Wulfstan’s writings on sin, incest, rape, and free consent in marriage. In the second half of the article she engages in an analysis of the rhetoric and style of the work, looking at devices such as alliteration, polyptoton, parallelism, rhetorical quotations, and so forth; she links these stylistic devices to similar uses in the Wulfstanian corpus. Hence her conclusion: “We may therefore consider two possibilities: the first, that the author was a monk belonging to Wulfstan’s circle, to whom Wulfstan assigned the task of translation, and who imitated the archbishop’s style; the second, that the translator was Wulfstan himself” (91).

Pseudo-Wulfstan

Hiroshi Ogawa analyzes “Napier XL and Napier LVIII: Two ‘Pseudo-Wulfstan’ Homilies and Their Places in the Old English Vernacular Prose Tradition” in *Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature* 17 (2002): 1–21. The article is in Japanese with an English summary, which states that the two homilies are both composite homilies drawn from Wulfstan’s works,

[b]ut they differ not only in the precise extent of indebtedness to different specific works but also in attitudes towards these sources as they rewrite them.... [T]he compilers of Napier XL and Napier LVIII revised the earlier materials in quite different ways, producing stylistically distinct prose. The ‘pedantic adapter’ of Napier

XL writes in terse, controlled prose with precise syntax and poetic rhythm, whereas the prose of Napier LVIII is above all an outcome of fussy additions and prolix expansions. The one looks rather backward to the old style in the vernacular prose tradition; the other comes close to natural, if not literally colloquial, speech of everyday life with all its diffuseness.... The available evidence seems to show that Napier XL is a traditional homily on a very important theme and as such is a 'standard piece' of the genre, while Napier LVIII is perhaps a later accretion to it, at least in matters of syntax and style, a typical example of composite homilies as (in Malcolm Godden's words) 'preaching', rather than 'quasi-literary', homilies of the period.

Wulfstan

The 2004 dissertation of S. M. Pons-Sanz, "The Norsified Vocabulary in the Works of Archbishop Wulfstan II of York." Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Cambridge, 2004 [*Index to Theses* 54 (2005), 172] will see publication in 2007 as a book: *Norse-Derived Vocabulary in Late Old English Texts: Wulfstan's Works. A Case Study* (Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2007). It will be reviewed in the *YWOES* for 2007.

See also Morini's article, under *Apollonius of Tyre*; and the items by Joyce Hill and Mary Clayton, under *Ælfric*.

Other Religious Prose

Anke Bernau studies transvestites in "The Translation of Purity in the Old English *Lives* of St Eugenia and St Euphrosyne" (*Bull. of the John Rylands Univ. Library of Manchester* 86.2 [Summer 2004]: 11–37). Building upon the work of Clare Lees and Gillian Overing (this twenty-six page article has sixteen substantial references to their 2001 book *Double Agents: Women and Clerical Culture in Anglo-Saxon England* and an additional six references to Lees's 1999 *Tradition and Belief: Religious Writing in Late Anglo-Saxon England*), Bernau begins with a survey of background material concerning the lives of the transvestite saints in the Middle Ages, particularly the two under focus here, Eugenia and Euphrosyne. Throughout the article she highlights the unstable and destabilizing nature of the transvestite saints. She notes the medieval anxiety over cross-dressing, particularly with regards to women: while it was an "unnatural" practice, it was also an attempt to move from a flawed

female state to a higher manly realm. It was also a narrative tactic for preserving virginity: as Bernau states in summary, cross-dressing was a "thorny issue" (13). She is particularly interested in the moments of transition in these cross-dressing narratives, the way the "religious identity [the saints] assume radically reshapes those notions of family and kinship which construct individual and social identity" (16); in these *vitae* "the familiar categories and markers which determine identity—and public legibility—are continually erased and redrawn" (17). Bernau sees the themes of knowledge, interpretation, revelation, sight, and desire as important to these lives (not unlike the analysis by Clare Lees of *Mary of Egypt*; see above). She also connects the dynamics of knowledge and (mis)interpretation found in these narratives to the act of translation from Latin into the vernacular. She notes that "translation ... is a complex and unstable process" (21) and concludes that the uncertainty and anxiety over translation is present in the figure of the transvestite saint (22). In yet another connection, she then relates this ambiguity of the transvestite saint, veiled and disguised in the narratives, to medieval sign theory, where the animating spirit of allegory or potential meaning is hidden or veiled beneath the inanimate literal sense. Essentially, Bernau argues for the exceptionally ambiguous nature of the transvestite (and the attendant anxiety over that ambiguity) and then draws analogies to other cultural processes that encode ambiguity or anxiety. In an article generally solid in its research on the limited secondary sources on these two saints, she omits Andrew Scheil, "Somatic Ambiguity and Masculine Desire in the Old English *Life of Euphrosyne*" *Exemplaria* 11.2 (1999): 345–361, a study which does overlap on some points, particularly in the discussion of eunuchs and the resonance of the phrase "wif-hades man" discussed by Bernau on pp. 27–28 and 32–33, respectively.

In her contribution to a *festschrift* for Roberta Frank, Dorothy Haines examines "Courtroom Drama and the Homiletic Monologues of *The Vercelli Book*" (*Verbal Encounters: Anglo-Saxon and Old Norse Studies for Roberta Frank*, ed. Harbus and Poole, 105–23). To show the aesthetic skill in selected Vercelli homilies, she looks at monologues designed to elicit an emotional response from the audience through a variety of stylistic/rhetorical effects; she sees these speeches as "early forms of the dramatic monologue" (106). Haines concentrates on three Judgment Day texts: Vercelli Homilies IV, VIII, and X. She does not base her argument on a concept of literal performance, but rather on the internal dramatic quality of the texts and their monologues. In each homily there is a careful delineation of

setting, followed by character development, and then the delivery of a monologue, all of which generates a certain sense of theatricality and drama. The homilists “deliberately selected dramatic speeches from Latin sources, then prepared the audience with all the elements of setting that would be needed to fully imagine the dramatic moment, and finally often reworked their sources to heighten the rhetoric, at times by elevating the language through the use of rhetorical patterning, or by taking full advantage of the emotional effect of the persona’s position” (106). She examines three personas and their monologues. The first is the address of the Soul to the Body in Vercelli IV; the soul’s address to the body underscores the consequences of how life was lived on earth and invites an affective response on the part of the audience. The second is Christ’s address to a sinner in Vercelli VIII: the audience is invited to imagine themselves in the place of the sinner; the emphasis on the “personal pathos ... perhaps prefigur[es] the affective piety of the later Middle Ages” (117). The third is Satan’s speech in Vercelli X, where the emphasis is on “the foolishness of those who do not recognize their true benefactor” (121). In each of these cases, the monologues are embellished with uncommon words found mostly in poetry, rhyming doublets, alliteration and other stylistic effects. The result is an intimate emotional bond with the audience through the rhetorically powerful monologue, an affective connection that will help produce a desired change in behavior. She argues that “The process of conjuring up a dramatic persona in these sermons ... is never really about the character as such, but about the audience’s response to what these figures have to say” (121–122). Haines concludes by noting that these homilies were re-copied and reused into the twelfth century, evidence for their popularity and hence effectiveness.

Thomas N. Hall contributes an essay on “Old English Religious Prose: Rhetorics of Salvation and Damnation” to *Readings in Medieval Texts* (ed. Johnson and Treharne, 136–48). He begins by briefly describing the Anglo-Saxon sources for “the fate of the soul after death” (136) in biblical and apocryphal models, particularly the *Vision of St. Paul* and the *Apocalypse of Thomas*. The essay then proceeds through three sub-sections. In the first, “Visions of Death,” Hall draws on a variety of prose texts (Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History*, the *Old English Martyrology*, Ælfric’s homilies, the prose life of Guthlac) to illustrate the varied Anglo-Saxon approaches to the moment of death as experienced by both the righteous and the damned. He explains that the moment of death “reveals the individual’s true spiritual state, implicitly aligning the soul with either the blessed or the damned

even before judgement has taken place” (141). In the second section, “Visions of Judgement,” he illustrates the various Anglo-Saxon theories on when the soul receives its final judgment (at the moment of death, or at Doomsday); he draws examples from Ælfric, Vercelli IV, and Pseudo-Wulfstan XLII. In the final section, “Visions of Heaven and Hell,” he briefly describes the “nuanced range of ideas about the nature and physical make-up of the otherworld” (144) to be found in Old English prose, this time drawing examples from Vercelli IX and XXI and Blickling XVI. In conclusion he notes that “the Old English sermon corpus is unparalleled for its synthesis and embellishment of competing eschatological traditions drawn from numerous quarters” (147).

Brian McFadden explores the authorial shaping of the extant *vitae* of Saint Margaret in response to their varied audiences in “The Books of Life: Theotimus as Narrator of Identity in the Old English Lives of St. Margaret” (*ES* 86: 473–92). Noting that the *vita* had a long history of transmission but was always somewhat controversial given Margaret’s encounter with a dragon and a demon, he argues that “each version reveals its author’s strategy for dealing with the controversial material while preserving the elements judged most important for the textual communities using the legend, and Theotimus (or his absence) reflects the attitude of the author toward the role of the demonic episode in forming a narrative identity for that community” (473). In the version found in the *Old English Martyrology* (Saint Marina), which omits both Theotimus and Margaret’s encounter with the demon, “the author is suspicious of the legend but preserves Margaret’s request for devotional practices suitable for a monastic community” (474); in his truncated version, the martyrologist emphasizes Marina’s virginity: “Marina’s refusal of marriage and wealth preserves not only her virginity but also her faith, and it suggests that the text is meant to encourage celibate monks and lay members of a monastic community” (475). The author changes his text in order to suit the needs of both a monastic audience and a lay audience: “Identification with the subject of Marina’s prayer allows the non-clerical members of the community to share in her sacrifice by supporting the clerical community; the clerical community, who identify with Marina’s formal renunciation of the physical world, in turn support the laity by their ministry” (477). McFadden also argues that the later versions of the life of Saint Margaret (in the eleventh-century MS London, BL, Cotton Tiberius A.iii, and the twelfth-century Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 303) “are designed for popular preaching and highlight the

transmission of narrative itself as a tool for conversion" (474). The authors of the later versions use the entertaining, sensational elements (rather than suppress them) in order to speak to a broader audience. Through the figure of Theotimus, the authors make sure the sensational elements are properly contextualized in an orthodox fashion: "Theotimus is a necessary character; he is learned and literate, so he can direct Margaret to learning, and he is also capable of recording her actions and deeds so that they can be passed on as she requests" (488). He is a proxy for the audience, interacting with the more sensational elements: "The character Theotimus personally strives for correct belief and practice, witnesses the seemingly unbelievable events, and allegedly creates the text with which the requests of Margaret and the needs of the audience may be fulfilled" (488).

Tracey-Anne Cooper engages in a close reading of one manuscript's contents in "The Homilies of a Pragmatic Archbishop's Handbook in Context: Cotton Tiberius A.iii" (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 28: 47–64). She describes the manuscript of her title as "a bilingual compilation manuscript of some ninety-four texts and two full-page illustrations ... produced at Christ Church, Canterbury, sometime between 1012 and 1023" (47). Cooper argues that this miscellany's contents are not random and without purpose; rather, she argues that it is "an archbishop's commonplace book or pragmatic handbook" (47). She asserts that the emphasis is on texts necessary for pastoral care, including texts that would be useful in educating a lay audience as well as a monastic one. She concludes that the manuscript "assisted the archbishop in addressing the needs of four audiences, the monastic inmates of Christ Church, his bishops to whom he provided guidance in their duties, the secular clergy who operated in Canterbury and its hinterland delivering pastoral care, and the lay Christians of Kent who received this provision" (49). She states that the compiler of the manuscript creatively selected and adapted a series of texts to fit an early eleventh-century historical/theological context. In her discussion she focuses on the homilies of the collection, and argues that the miscellany of material from Ælfric, Wulfstan and anonymous homilists combine to produce a book of basic theology that would be employed in pastoral care, particularly for lay instruction. To make this case, she also compares the versions of the homilies here with their originals, arguing that redactor adapted the homilies to the requirements of an archbishop's handbook. She sees these homilies as breaking down into clustered sub-groups that speak to particular concerns: basic theology, the internal nature of piety, external acts

of devotion. She concludes: "The first thirteen homilies comprise a comprehensive, if simple, catechism for the layman" and the final two homilies "address the *masspreost* directly, ensuring priestly propriety and the effectiveness of the sacraments, particularly penance and extreme unction" (60). She argues that the collection was designed to be passed on to bishops operating under the archbishop, who would have need of a handbook of "lay and clerical instruction" (61). Thus the homilies and their manuscript context speak to an interest in an outward-reaching pastoral care and an interest in lay piety. The essay concludes with a useful appendix of the manuscript's contents.

Robert Faerber provides translations and commentary for selected St. Andrew material in "Les Acta apocrypha apostolorum dans le corpus littéraire vieil-anglais: Acta Andreae" (*Apocrypha* 16: 199–227). He begins by translating and paraphrasing (into French) *The Fates of the Apostles*; from there he briefly surveys other occurrences of Andrew in Anglo-Saxon texts, including Bede, the *Old English Martyrology*, Ælfric's homily on the saint in the *First Series of Catholic Homilies*, the poem *Andreas*, and the prose versions of Andrew's exploits in the Blickling manuscript and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198. Faerber then translates the complete version in CCC 198, including brief commentary notes. This is followed by a short discussion of several topics: the linguistic features of both Blickling and CCC198, the putative sources of these prose versions and their handling of Latin, a brief introduction to *Andreas* and the relationship of the prose texts to the poem. Faerber then translates the *passio* of Andrew composed by Ælfric in *CH* I.38, lines 170–351, and includes a brief following discussion of some basic themes and images (e.g., the cross) and some comments on Ælfric's skillful translation of Latin. He concludes by stressing the interdependent Latin and Old English linguistic cultures of Anglo-Saxon England and the complex transactions between the two languages. Throughout the article Faerber's intent is to provide a translation and summary of received scholarly views rather than advance new research.

Janna Riedinger provides a conspectus of her dissertation project at the University of Göttingen under the direction of Mechthild Gretsch in "Die altenglische Interlinearversion der Benediktinerregel: Edition und Kommentar" (*Englische Sprachwissenschaft und Mediävistik: Standpunkte—Perspektiven—Neue Wege / English Linguistics and Medieval Studies: Positions—Perspectives—New Approaches; Proceedings of the Conference in Bamberg, May 21–22, 2004*, ed. Gabriele Knappe, *Bamberger Beiträge zur Englischen Sprachwissenschaft*

48 [Peter Lang], 287–93). Her project is a new edition of the Old English interlinear version of the *Benedictine Rule* found in BL Cotton Tiberius A.iii. She briefly describes the manuscript and the cultural significance of the interlinear version of the *Rule* and discusses the importance of interdisciplinary research by Helmut Gneuss and Mechtild Gretsch on Standard Old English and the Benedictine reform. The needs and methods of such interdisciplinary research and the advent of tools such as the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus* in electronic form make the need for a new edition plain. New research methods and tools justify a new edition using modern editorial practices to replace Henri Logeman's 1888 EETS edition. Riedinger's edition will re-examine the dating of the text, and her philological commentary will examine the translation practice of the glossator: the consistency of his Old English glossing of Latin words; how the diction of the text relates to the "Winchester Vocabulary"; how consistent the morphology and phonology of the language used in the manuscript is with Standard Old English. Her intent with the edition is to provide important evidence for the knowledge of Latin in late Anglo-Saxon England, stimulate more scholarship on the interlinear version of the *Rule* and on glossing in Anglo-Saxon England generally.

Winfried Rudolf provides a brief record of a computer demonstration at a 2004 conference in Bamberg of an electronic edition of Old English sermons in "Altenglische Themapredigten als unfeste Texte—ein elektronisches Textkorpus" (*Englische Sprachwissenschaft und Mediävistik*, ed. Knappe, 295–301). He begins by noting that the goal of a previous generation of editors of Wulfstan and anonymous homilists (e.g., Bethurum and Napier) was to present an ideal, stable, authorial version of a sermon text. However, this textual editing assumption cannot adequately do justice to the complex textual variants, fluid nature, and instability of sermon texts: homiletic themes, motifs, phrases, and terms seem to move between homilies in such a way that the limitations of traditional print editions are obvious. The intertextuality is result of the methods of sermon composition in which homilists and scribes continually reformatted and reworked common homiletic materials. The ongoing electronic edition will be designed to better represent the fluid, eclectic nature of these sermons by incorporating parallel versions, hyperlinks and other technical elements so as to better represent each manuscript version of the homilies and compare their relative states, without conflating manuscript versions into "standard" editions. Rudolf notes that such an edition will allow the complex shared themes, vocabulary, and motifs of these homilies to

be better studied. The edition will allow users to track variants quickly and easily in order to understand this compositional process; thus each homily can be studied in its "unstable" manuscript form more easily. The in-progress edition, which derives from his doctoral work under the supervision of Hildegard L.C. Tristram, will include eventually a commentary, bibliography and hyperlinks, integration of facsimile images, and discussion of palaeography; the edition can be continually expanded. The article provides three screenshots of the electronic edition; Rudolf explains that the layout was inspired by Joyce Lionarons's edition of Wulfstan's eschatological homilies (<http://webpages.ursinus.edu/jlionarons/wulfstan/wulfstan.html>). The final sentence notes that a trial version of the edition will be mounted on the homepage of the Institut für Anglistik/Amerikanistik at the Friedrich-Schiller Universität Jena beginning in Fall 2005, but it does not seem to be on the site at this time.

AS

In "(Ge)wyrð: Emendations to Three Anonymous Old English Homilies and Saints' Lives" (*Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 106: 311–14), Adrian Papahagi discusses three instances in which *wyrð* or *gewyrð* carry meanings other than 'fate', 'event', or 'condition'. In an anonymous homily on the wise and foolish virgins (Matt. 25:1–13), to begin with, found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 303, *wyrð* occurs within a depiction of the Last Judgment. Where its source, Gregory the Great's *Homiliae in Euangelia* XII, speaks of sins being laid bare in *conuentu omnium angelorum* ("in the assembly of all the angels"), the Old English homily underscores the obedience of angels, archangels, and all the heavenly *wyrð*. Papahagi suggests that correcting *wyrð* to *weor(o)d* ('[the heavenly] host'), better fits both the context and the Gregorian source. A similar situation, he suggests, is found in the vernacular *Life of St. Giles*, where upon the saint's death St. Michael and his *ængla wyrð* lead Giles's soul up to heaven: emendation to *ængla weor(o)d* ("host of angels), would better seem to reflect the situation. Finally, the anonymous *Life of Mary of Egypt* in London, BL, Julius E.vii follows the Latin original in showing Mary subsisting on three grains of lentils—*tria grana*, which in the Old English becomes *þreora corna gewyrðe*. Changing *gewyrðe* to *gewyrðe* ('amount'), Papahagi posits, would be an appropriate modification. Papahagi does not insist that such instances of (ge)wyrð constitute mistakes: while dictionaries do not record *wyrð* as a graphical variant of *weorod*, for example, *weord* does appear in Alfred's version of *De consolatio Philosophiae* as a variant of

wyrd, leaving open the possibility that these alternative uses of (ge)wyrd might be more than scribal error. Either way, he notes, modern translations of these passages have intuitively rendered the word as “host” and “amount,” confirming that regardless of spelling, such are the word’s connotations.

In her 2004 doctoral dissertation from Penn State, “The Rhetoric of the End Times in Old English Preaching” (*DAI* 65A [2005], 4555), Jennifer Elise Merriman seeks to redress the scant attention paid by rhetoricians to medieval preaching between Augustine and the *ars praedicandi* of the eleventh century. While Old English scholars have provided insightful studies of the historical context, sources, and dissemination of vernacular sermons, she affirms, students of rhetoric have largely ignored this valuable area of English practice. Where a rhetorical lens is applied to the Middle Ages, moreover, scholars often search for classical tropes or focus on medieval manuals and works of theory rather than the sermons themselves. The former approach, Merriman suggests, overlooks the rhetorical principle of decorum—that is, that the utterance must match its context: one cannot assume that Latinate practices at all times would have made for effective religious discourse. The latter focus, moreover, all too often overlooks the homilies themselves—works that, inasmuch as they seek to persuade, are rhetorical by definition. Working empirically from the inside out—that is, from texts to principles rather than the opposite—Merriman seeks to analyze ways in which homilists shape their utterances to achieve decorum or effectiveness for particular contexts. Specifically, her concern is eschatology, a genre that fulfills a variety of rhetorical functions, providing a pool of commonplaces for homiletic address, a motivational pressure for the audience whether implicit or expressed, and “the culmination and fullest expression of the cosmology that underlies and validates the genre of Christian preaching” (5). Examining selections from the Vercelli Book, Ælfric’s *De die iudicii* (*SH* II.18), Wulfstan’s *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, and *The Dream of the Rood*, Merriman offers insight into the structure of eschatology, “the engine driving Old English homiletics” (2).

Donald Scragg re-examines the relationship of “A Late Old English Harrowing of Hell Homily from Worcester and Blickling Homily VII” (*Latin Learning and English Lore*, II: 197–211). The Harrowing homily, which appears as an addition to Oxford, Bodl. Lib., Junius 121, is unusual in that three scribes were involved in copying the short piece. According to Ker, the main scribe is Hemming, a copyist whose work appears in a number of Worcester manuscripts; he begins and

ends the homily, and he alternates five times with two other “junior” scribes whose brief stints (as little as fifteen lines) are marked by confused vowels and non-standard spellings. Scragg suggests that the piece may have served as practice for the junior scribes, to whom the busy Hemming delegated portions while turning to more pressing projects elsewhere. Turning to the content of the homily proper, Scragg reviews two competing theories for its relationship to Blickling VII: that of Pope, who views the piece as an adaptation of Blickling, and that of Luiselli Fadda, who sees both as analogues descended from a common source. The first two passages compared by Scragg contain numerous portions unique to each, apparently belying a close connection between the homilies. Closer examination, however, reveals stylistic traits of the Junius homilist that account for many of the differences: a penchant for introducing parallel words, phrases, and syntax; a fondness for repeating particular words; and a tendency to substitute one common word or phrase for another (203–04). Despite variation and re-ordering, moreover, not only is the sense largely the same in both homilies, but often the actual language itself: *herehuðe* (‘plunder’), for example, has the sense of ‘plunder recovered’ (referring to the souls Christ leads from hell) only in these two texts, an unlikely occurrence were both translating independently from a Latin original. Scragg concludes, therefore, that Pope’s view of Junius as an adaptation is correct: “the whole homily was freely composed by a preacher who was steeped in Blickling homily VII, but who had his own view about how the ideas of B should be presented to his audience” (206).

AK

Ælfric

Carla Morini seeks “Bilinguismo nelle Omelie di Ælfric di Eynsham” (*Il Plurilinguismo in area germanica nel Medioevo: Atti del XXX Convegno Associazione Italiana di Filologia germanica, Bari, 4–6 giugno 2003*, ed. Lucia Sinisi [Bari: Palomar], 191–210). Charlemagne commissioned Paul the Deacon to produce an authoritative, unified homiliary. Ælfric composed his homilies later but with similar goals: to replace less literate treatments with theologically and stylistically correct homilies for the entire church year. Ælfric uses *sermo*, *sententia*, and *tractatus*, and in English *cwide*, more or less interchangeably; the Anglo-Saxon homilists did not closely observe the Carolingian distinction between homilies (systematic treatments of specific pericopes) and sermons (less formal treatments of readings, holy days, or church seasons). In his two series of *Catholic Homilies*, his *Lives of Saints*, and his *Supplementary*

Homilies, Ælfric often quotes Scripture, exegesis, or liturgical sources. He carefully cites his authorities before offering an English rendering. Ælfric revised and augmented his own homilies, so manuscripts vary. Morini compiles a list of passages in specific manuscripts where Latin quotations appear as well as English translations (portions that editions sometimes relegate to footnotes because the quotations appear in a minority of manuscripts). Latin quotations seem to increase as Ælfric revises. Adding Latin increases the authority of a homily, but the changes may also serve different audiences. Ælfric knows his audience consists of three groups: educated, bilingual clergy; mostly uneducated, monolingual laity; and less educated clergy, often older (hence pre-Reform), whose Latin may be quite limited. Some homilies even offer Greek and Latin etymologies via Old English. Ælfric's revisions always serve his didactic intent; adding Latin where he already has English quotations may help instruct less literate clergy in Latin.

NGD

In "Ælfric's Comments about the *Passio Thomae*" (*N&Q* n.s. 52: 5–8), Frederick M. Biggs sheds valuable insight into the conservative monk's relationship to the apocryphal Passion of the apostle Thomas. Ælfric initially demurs from relating the account in a note known as the "Excusatio dictantis" in his Second Series of *Catholic Homilies*, saying not just that the Passion had been translated to English long before, but that—far more importantly for Ælfric—Augustine had cast doubt on an episode therein in which Thomas brought about the death of an individual who had slapped him. The note is problematic not for Ælfric's concern to provide authoritative teaching, for which he is well known, but for his decision later to translate the work in *Lives of Saints* II.36. The problem would seem mitigated by the fact that Ælfric affirms the credibility of the Passion overall in the *Excusatio*, and omits the suspect episode in his *Lives of Saints*; Biggs points out, however, that in actuality Augustine objects to the Passion as a whole, not simply to Thomas's vengeance, and that Ælfric demonstrates his knowledge of this objection by quoting from it verbatim. Biggs's solution to the conundrum is twofold. First, he examines the context of Augustine's remarks in the latter's commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. Here, Augustine's target is the Manichees, for whom the Passion had apparently been reworked after its translation into Greek from the Syriac. Speaking of Christ's exhortation to turn the other cheek (Matt. 5:39–42), Augustine avers that the Manichees could not welcome Thomas's alleged action

in the Passion while condemning the Old Testament for its use of corporal punishment. Echoing Malcolm Godden's assessment that Ælfric in the *Excusatio* may have been working from memory, Biggs suggests that Ælfric had associated approval of the Thomas episode with failure to distinguish between the dispensations of the Old Testament (when violence was at times licit) and the New (when revenge was no longer permitted): both thus were to be condemned. Second, Biggs posits that Ælfric's continued misunderstanding of his Augustinian source, after he had re-examined it more carefully in the *Lives of Saints*, may have stemmed from a difference between classical and Anglo-Latin. Quoting Augustine's assertion that the writing (*scriptura*) may be discounted since it is not in the biblical canon (*canon*), Ælfric understands *canon* in its common Anglo-Saxon sense of "canon law" or ecclesiastical rules. Where Augustine would condemn the apocryphal text outright, therefore, Ælfric, focusing on the issue of revenge, condemns the episode for modeling behavior inappropriate to the Christian life.

Frederick M. Biggs returns to the subject of Ælfric's sources in "Ælfric's Andrew and the Apocrypha" (*JEGP* 104: 473–94). Investigating the seeming tension between Ælfric's condemnation of apocrypha on the one hand and his use of extra-biblical accounts of biblical persons on the other, Biggs offers an important reassessment of Ælfric's understanding of canonical versus unorthodox works. Ælfric views apocrypha, Biggs suggests, not as historically distant but as an ongoing threat, not as works from before the fourth-century closing of the canon but as any corruption of orthodox thought right through the present day. Similarly, the authoritative canon encompassed not simply the Bible but God's teaching as revealed through Christ's immediate followers and "all who follow their example, by the Holy Ghost" (494). Ælfric's enumeration of Old and New Testament books in his *Letter to Sigeward*, Biggs points out, recognizes various sources of authority even within the Bible: face-to-face revelation to Moses in the case of the Pentateuch, inspiration by the Spirit in the case of the Psalms and prophets, and (God-given) human wisdom in the case of books associated with Solomon, being examples. The fact that Ælfric says in his Latin preface to the First Series, moreover, that he translates *ex libris latinorum. Scilicet sancta scripture* 'from Latin books, certainly from Holy Scripture', suggests that he views "scriptural" authority as extending beyond the Bible itself to include, for example, the example and teaching of the apostles. Biggs's case in point is Ælfric's sermon on the apostle Andrew (*Catholic Homilies* I.38). Where Malcolm Godden, echoing the work of Patrick

Zettel, concludes that Ælfric drew on a copy of the Cotton-Corpus Legendary for the sermon, Biggs follows Gordon Whatley in suggesting that the Legendary's exemplar did not incorporate apostolic passions and that such accounts as do appear in the Legendary are later additions. Not only might Ælfric have drawn his apostolic material from elsewhere, therefore, but Biggs opens the possibility that Ælfric's example could have influenced later compilers of the Legendary to begin incorporating apostolic passions (478). Regardless, to say that Ælfric had respect for the "scriptural" authority of apostolic accounts is not to suggest that Ælfric approached such works uncritically. Warned by such texts as the *Gelasian Decree* about heretical teaching in various "gospels" ascribed to apostles, Ælfric shows himself sensitive to and selective about the material he reproduces. In Ælfric's account of Andrew's passion in *Catholic Homilies* I.38, for example, Biggs shows how in the very act of repeating his source's claim to be a first-hand witness of Andrew's passion, Ælfric omits a statement that the Spirit proceeds from the Father rather than the Father and the Son—the *filioque* controversy addressed by the Nicene Creed—claimed by his source to have been conveyed by Andrew himself. The apostles' teaching may be authoritative inasmuch as their source was Christ himself, therefore, but for Ælfric those who continue the work of conveying Christ's truth are likewise "apostolic" and their works "canonical." It is for this reason that Ælfric insists that his writings be copied correctly: should they not, they may introduce *gedwylde*, a perversion of truth, becoming in consequence new apocrypha (488–89).

Ælfric is also the focus of Rachel S. Anderson's 2004 doctoral dissertation from Indiana University, in which she examines "Ælfric's Kings: Political Hagiography in Anglo-Saxon England" (*DAI* 65A [2005]: 2594). Anderson notes that the years in which Ælfric was educated, commenced writing, and rose to the position of abbot saw four major crises of Anglo-Saxon kingship: Edgar's death, the disputed succession and ultimate murder of Edward, Æthelred's period of "youthful indiscretions," and the Viking attacks that led to the St. Brice's Day massacre (4–5). As a protégé of Bishop Æthelwold, moreover, Ælfric was closely associated with the Benedictine Reform sponsored by Edgar but subsequently embroiled in the succession controversy, with Archbishop Dunstan supporting Edward and Æthelwold backing Æthelred. Furthermore, in writing for his patrons, Æthelmær and his father Æthelweard, head counselor to Æthelred after ca. 993, Ælfric was addressing a noble audience in close proximity to the king. Indeed, Ælfric's most prolific period corresponds neatly

to Æthelweard's ascendancy before the latter's death in 1002. It would be remarkable, in short, for this charged political environment not to have affected Ælfric's writings, particularly in his numerous portraits of virtuous and villainous leaders and kings. Setting Ælfric's work in the context of political writing from the third to the tenth century, Anderson offers a detailed examination of these portraits in Ælfric's hagiography and biblical translations. Her analysis demonstrates that by exhibiting anxiety about royal shortcomings and failure, setting forth role models (as might be instructive to Æthelweard) of counselors to kings, and revealing deep concern over the role of women as political advisers or agents, these writings offer important contemporary perspective on the political and social world of late Anglo-Saxon England.

Robert E. Bjork offers sophisticated insight into "The Symbolic Use of Job in Ælfric's Homily on Job, *Christ II*, and the *Phoenix*" (*Latin Learning and English Lore* II:315–30). As a base of comparison for his analysis of the poems, he turns to "the only relatively comprehensive treatment" of the book of Job in Old English, Ælfric's Second Series homily for the first Sunday in September (*CHom* II.30; Bjork 315). Bjork draws attention to three aspects of the work. First, while Ælfric intersperses his paraphrases and translations of Job with commentary deriving from Gregory's *Moralia in Job*, he refrains from discussing the spiritual (as opposed to literal) meaning of Job in depth. Second, when apologizing thrice for this lack of explanation, he first identifies (in a modesty topos) with his audience's limited capacity for comprehension and then distances himself from it, implying that he offers not the fullness of his understanding but only what the unlearned require. Third, the lesson underscored repeatedly in the homily is that Job stands as an example for all believers, particularly as regards his patience in adversity. Far less straightforward, Bjork suggests, is the symbolic use of Job in *Christ II* and the *Phoenix*. The former augments a Gregorian interpretation in *Homiliae in Euangelia* XXIX, where a bird whose way is unknown (*cf.* Job 28:7) is equated with Christ, whose ascension unbelievers fail to comprehend. Though Job himself is ancillary to the passage in question, the Job-derived image is not only germane to a poem treating Christ's descent from and return to heaven, but literally central to it, carefully highlighted by verbal repetition and placed strategically precisely in the middle. In the *Phoenix*, the imagery is more complex still. While the basic identification of the phoenix with Job with the believer, all of whom have a sure hope of resurrection, Bjork notes that the *Moralia* consistently speaks of Job as a type of Christ:

just as Job repeatedly offers sacrifices on behalf of his children, for example, so Christ perpetually offers himself on behalf of those who believe; just as Job sits on a dunghheap rather than in a position of honor, so Christ rests not with the proud but in the hearts of the humble afflicted. Noting that Job appears at the end of the seventh of the *Phoenix's* eight fitts, moreover, Bjork draws on Pythagoras, Macrobius, and Augustine to consider the medieval symbolism surrounding these numbers. Associating seven with absolute isolation, virginity, and the combination of spiritual and temporal (three plus four), and eight with resurrection, salvation, and eternity, Bjork posits Job as a particularly fitting figure for the *Phoenix*: isolated from men but prefiguring the virgin Church, representing both Christ and human believers, he stands firm in faith before the dawning of the Eighth Age—the salvation of resurrected souls that will have no end. Were this not enough, Bjork points to a collocation of ideas associated with Job in both poems as well as Scripture: the fire of Judgment, flight (e.g., through resurrection), and worms. The last, like Job, is a multifaceted symbol, connoting not only the grave but—according to various Church Fathers, who saw the winged insect that developed from the silkworm as a kind of bird—resurrection, the phoenix, and Christ. Such images cogently illustrate the kind of spiritual depth which Ælfric, constant to his pedagogical purpose, lamentably chooses not to address.

A key reassessment of part of Ælfric's corpus comes from Mary Clayton's "Ælfric's *De auguriis* and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 178" (*Latin Learning and English Lore* II:376–94). Ælfric's *De auguriis* is preserved in two forms, one printed as Skeat's *Lives of Saints* I.17, the other—augmented by stories of Macarius and of Saul and the witch of Endor—as Pope's *Supplemental Homilies* II.29. The augmented version appears in Oxford, Bodl. Lib. Hatton 116, and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 178, the latter of which also contains a note in Old English acknowledging the expansion both of this homily and another called *De octo uitiis et de duodecim abusiuis*. Pope argued that the anonymous author of the note likely compiled the collection and expanded the two homilies as follows: on the one hand, adding an introduction to *De octo uitiis* (essentially an extract from Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* I.16) and joining it to Ælfric's *De duodecim abusiuis*; on the other, taking the stories of Macarius and Saul from a late version (now lost) of Ælfric's Life of Swithun (*LS* I.21) and composing a three-line introduction to join them to *De auguriis*. (The Macarius account does appear after *LS* I.21 in Skeat's base text, London, BL Cotton Julius E.viii.) Clayton agrees with Pope that the Macarius and

Saul stories are Ælfrician and go together, but notes that their ending, which warns against magic, witchcraft, and auguries, seems as fitting for *De auguriis* as it seems inappropriate for the Life of Swithun (as indeed Pope had originally thought). Both here and in *De octo uitiis et de duodecim abusiuis*, moreover, Clayton is disinclined to see either compilation or content as the work of an anonymous author. To uphold such a position, she states, "we would have to postulate a compiler who was able to produce a flawless imitation of Ælfric's rhythmical style [...], able to write sentences in ordinary prose very like Ælfric's which contain views identical to Ælfric's documented opinions, and who had access to an authentically Ælfrician undocumented version of *Lives of Saints* [I.21]—an Ælfric clone, in short. It would seem simpler to attribute all of these activities to Ælfric himself" (382). Since the author of the Old English note seems to take responsibility for both the augmentations and the organization of the CCCC 178 collection, moreover, Clayton views note and organization as Ælfric's doing. As the homilies in CCCC 178 are divided into two groups of twelve, the first comprising works not tied to the liturgical year, one implication of Clayton's argument is that in addition to the *Catholic Homilies* and two collections of *Temporale Homilies*, he also in CCCC 178 compiled a *quando uolueris* collection—pieces to be spoken when needed or appropriate. The second group of homilies are likewise "unlike any collection known to have been authorized by Ælfric," in that they begin with Annunciation (25 March) rather than Christmas. Clayton suggests a different organizing rationale, however, inasmuch as the set covers the main events of Christ's life in the order in which they occur (387). Finally, Clayton considers the role of Wulfstan, who for his version of *De falsis diis* used a version of Ælfric's text (*SH* II.21) much like that found in CCCC 178 and Hatton 116. She concludes that Wulfstan's copy, which he must have used between 1006 and 1023, derived from an ancestor of CCCC 178 which came between CCCC 178 and its common source with Hatton 116 (388–89). The effect of Clayton's study is to redefine the boundaries of Ælfric's corpus, shed new light on the complex relationship of Ælfric and Wulfstan's work, and offer new possibilities of understanding the late career of this prolific monk.

In "‘Thousand is a Perfect Number ...’ Quoth Ælfric of Cerne" (*St. Wulfsgige and Sherborne: Essays to Celebrate the Millennium of the Benedictine Abbey, 998–1998*, ed. Katherine Barker, David A. Hinton, and Alan Hunt [Oxford: Oxbow Books], 33–39), Nicholas Campion considers whether St. Wulfsgige's replacement of secular canons with Benedictine monks at Sherborne Abbey

in 998 may have been motivated by millennial concerns. Quickly reviewing the biblical passages which motivated patristic millennial thought, Campion then distinguishes between millenarianism (“appealing to revolutionary armies and religious enthusiasts, culminating in the Reformation”) and eschatology (“a more scholarly appreciation of the approaching End” [35]), before assessing to what extent apocalyptic concern actually surrounded the year 1000. His conclusion: “the evidence is slight and there is considerable skepticism that anyone in the year 1000 believed that anything of supernatural significance was about to take place” (36). He does question one argument put forward in this regard, namely that ecclesiastical endowments or reforms made near the millennium—as at Sherborne—seem antithetical to belief in an imminent Second Coming. Campion points out on the one hand that the prospect of Christ’s return might well motivate such pious actions, and suggests on the other that “it is foolish to look for logic in areas of activity driven by fear, faith and blind hope” (37). Finally, having affirmed that the general populace was “entirely uninfluenced by millenarian fever,” he posits that “it is fair to assume that a church reformer such as Wulfsgige would have been” (38). Setting forth the examples of the Peace of God movement, that from the 990s attempted to limit violence, and of Otto III, who saw himself as the secular ruler charged with preparing for Christ’s arrival (39), Campion asks whether the English reformers may have been influenced by the former and how, if the latter “could be moved to such lengths by the ticking of the calendar, why not Wulfsgige?” (39). Combining as it were the determination of the Bolshevik revolutionaries with the optimism of San Francisco’s summer of love, Campion says, Wulfsgige’s probable millenarianism made him a dissenter seeking in Sherborne Abbey an alternative to existing earthly political orders (39).

Edward Christie explores how accounts of martyrdom re-define masculine success in his “Self-Mastery and Submission: Holiness and Masculinity in the Lives of Anglo-Saxon Martyr-Kings” (*Holiness and Masculinity in the Middle Ages*, ed. P.H. Cullum and Katherine J. Lewis [Cardiff: U of Wales P, 2004], 143–57). Drawing on the work of Thorstein Veblen, he discusses the notion of “societies of exploit,” which measure aristocratic masculine success by military achievement—prowess in dominating other people groups through violence. Where Gillian Overing argues that societal pressure for such exploit forces binary choice on heroic figures—Beowulf publicly asserting that he will accomplish X or die, for example—Christie suggests that Anglo-Saxon literature at times associates success with death. Indeed,

he says (echoing Freud and Frazer), such societies may ultimately want the hero to self-destruct, since the hero’s unusual power poses a threat to his own society as well as others. Such perspectives inform Christie’s understanding of the sacrificial triumph found in accounts of martyrdom. On the one hand, he notes, military defeat might appear far more as feminizing than as consonant with masculine triumph. In the case of St. Edmund, we find him throwing away his weapon and being penetrated with arrows, while Edmund and St. Oswald alike, before being beheaded, are made the passive objects of the tormenter’s gaze—“with all its gendered connotations” (154). In these passions, however, this feminizing potential is reversed. In Ælfric’s accounts, for example, the desire for “exploit” is firmly associated with paganism; the protagonists show confidence in their martial ability despite the odds; physically subdued—and in Edward’s case, having renounced his capacity to subject others to his will—their spirits cannot be broken; their sacrifice parallels that of Christ in being for their people; after death even their decapitation is negated by the miraculous preservation and (in Edmund’s case) reattachment of their heads; and their reward is both eternal victory over their adversaries and everlasting fame—the very goals of “exploitative” pagan masculinity. “In this way,” concludes Christie, “the martyr’s death is depicted as the ultimate heroic exploit” (154).

Mechthild Gretsich’s second contribution to the Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England series, *Ælfric and the Cult of Saints in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), focuses on five saints who feature prominently in the Benedictional of Æthelwold and Ælfric’s *sanctorale*, reconstructing the historical, liturgical, and literary state of the cults, assessing Ælfric’s knowledge thereof, and exploring in what ways his perception of the cults shaped his hagiography. A number of factors, she asserts, appear to have guided his choice of saints to be treated in the *Catholic Homilies and Lives of Saints*: a penchant for models of heroic resistance (as with the Forty Soldiers); a response to direct requests from his patrons (as with St. Thomas); a deference to the importance of certain cults at Winchester and other reformed monastic circles (perhaps with the Nativity of the Virgin or St. Vincent); and a faithfulness to idiosyncrasies of his sources, such as his version of the Cotton-Corpus Legendary (as with St. Eugenia). In addition, however, Gretsich argues that Ælfric was influenced by the contents and iconography of the Benedictional of Æthelwold, the most lavish book produced during Ælfric’s time at Winchester. For thirty-six of the thirty-eight *sanctorale* feasts provided with blessings in the Benedictional, Ælfric composes

homilies. Where for Epiphany the Benedictional features facing full-page miniatures and two sets of blessings of the Adoration of the Magi and (unusually for this period) the Baptism of Christ, Ælfric similarly treats the two events in separate homilies for the occasion. Where the Benedictional includes a miniature of Gregory, Cuthbert, and Benedict side by side, Ælfric selects the lesser of Benedict's feasts in order to treat these saints in liturgical sequence (March 12, 20, and 21; *CHom* II.9–11). The importance of the Benedictional for Ælfric's hagiographic works, in short, offers a compelling basis for examining saints prominent in both. First, Gretsich turns to Gregory the Great, assessing the possible institution of Gregory's cult by Theodore of Tarsus, Gregory's place in the reform programs of Alfred and the 747 Council of Clofesho, Gregory's influence on Ælfric's mentor Æthelwold, the availability of Gregory's works in Anglo-Saxon England, Ælfric's knowledge of all the above, and the sources and aims of Ælfric's own life of Gregory. Second, Gretsich considers Cuthbert: the development of his cult in Northumbria, the Continent, and Wessex; Ælfric's sources for his *Life*; and their potential impact on his style and vocabulary. Third, she comes to Benedict, examining the impact of his *Regula* on pre-Reform England, the Life of Benedict in Gregory's *Dialogi* and Anglo-Saxon knowledge of the work, the unusual iconography of Benedict in Æthelwold's Benedictional, and the influence of the above on Ælfric's portrait of his monastic forebear. Finally, Gretsich addresses two saints found in Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, Swithun and Æthelthryth. For the former, she details the commemoration of these figures in Anglo-Saxon calendars, mass books, litanies, and hymns, as well as in the Benedictional of Æthelwold; compares the structure and content of Ælfric's Life of Swithun with its putative sources; and discusses Ælfric's ambivalent attitude towards the cult. For the latter, she examines the Life of Æthelthryth in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* on which Ælfric drew; evidence for the cult of Æthelthryth at the double monastery of Ely, founded around 672 by Æthelthryth and refounded around 970 by Æthelwold; and Ælfric's reworking of Bede. Gretsich reveals Ælfric adapting patristic and Anglo-Saxon understandings to convey his own portraits of these saints: Gregory the apostle to the English and preacher of contemporary relevance; Cuthbert the solitary saint and combater of demons; Benedict the founder of western monasticism and the English Church, steeped in learning and marked by miracles; and Swithun and Æthelthryth, relative newcomers to veneration whose lives Ælfric used to attest to God's continuing presence among the English people (233).

A variety of Ælfric studies are to be found in *Text and Language in Medieval English Prose*, ed. Oizumi, Fisiak, and Scahill (see section 2). First, Joyce Hill discusses "Authorial Adaptation: Ælfric, Wulfstan and the Pastoral Letters" (63–75). Surveying the extant evidence for the Letters—namely, Ælfric's private Latin response to (now-lost) questions from Wulfstan; Ælfric's two Latin letters and two Old English redraftings of these letters, all commissioned by Wulfstan and addressing clergy in the archbishop's voice; and Wulfstan's extensive reworking of Ælfric's first Old English letter—she shows that the issue of adaptation on multiple levels is fundamental to these texts. To begin with, save for the private letter, the copies survive in manuscripts associated with Wulfstan, allowing for the possibility that even the "Ælfrician" works contain Wulfstanian interpolations. The text of the letters, furthermore, clearly attests to the process of revision. Hill illustrates ways in which Wulfstan adapts Ælfric's works, taking slightly more pragmatic positions (regarding, for example, which kinswomen might live in a priest's home), omitting what may have seemed mere literary embellishments (such as a sustained comparison by Ælfric between priestly and worldly vocations), and introducing a less monastic and more episcopal focus (excising details of regular liturgical practice but delineating the distinctive functions of bishops). Even more significant, she identifies aspects of Ælfric's Latin letters which undergo successive changes, first by Ælfric in the Old English and then by Wulfstan in his own version. On the one hand, there are increasing omissions. On the subject of chastity, for example, in the Latin, Ælfric reinforces his admonition to clergy with a learned and metaphorical discussion of those who "make themselves eunuchs" for the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 19:12); in the Old English, Ælfric makes little use of these comments, and Wulfstan in his version omits them altogether—though both writers underscore the fundamental importance of priestly celibacy. On the other hand, there are progressive expansions. Where in the Latin Ælfric enjoins clergy straightforwardly to give communion, anointing, and (if desired) confession to the sick, in the vernacular he spells out the basic fact that confession should precede the anointing, and Wulfstan clarifies further that shriving should precede anointing too. Such changes offer insight not simply into the writers' standards of clerical conduct, but into their assessment of clerical capacity—markedly low in regard to the presumed audience of the vernacular, even in basic practical matters—as well as their concern to exercise conscientious pastoral care.

Second, William Schipper examines "W.W. Skeat's Edition of Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*" (*Text and Language*

in *Medieval English Prose*, 229–36)—both the circumstances surrounding its production and the vital need for a new edition of the *Lives*. Schipper traces the origin of the edition to years of work by Oswald Cockayne, Skeat’s teacher at King’s College School. Skeat took up the project on Cockayne’s death, having acquired some of the latter’s papers, but apparently had been involved some time before: Schipper points to an early transcript in Skeat’s hand of part of the base manuscript for the edition, BL Cotton Julius E.vii. That Skeat should have had an interest in medieval English works is not surprising, as he also produced a seven-volume edition of Chaucer and a three-volume edition of Langland. While the quality of those is such that “even today they are worth consulting” (229), his work on the *Lives* is less definitive. His notes are sporadic and inconsistently presented. He claims to have collated all witnesses but omits the evidence of numerous manuscripts; he fails to note scribal corrections of various kinds present in Julius E.vii itself. Schipper treats this last point in detail, noting that the corrections offer key evidence for resolving problems of meter or sense in the copy. He also shows, however, that Skeat’s approach to these corrections is alarmingly inconsistent. Skeat silently incorporates many grammatical or lexical corrections and silently accepts, “corrects,” misreads, or ignores over thirty scribal additions of one or more words. At other points, he is “very free with silent emendations” or “simply ignores the manuscript reading” altogether (232). To illustrate his point, Schipper includes as an appendix a list of forty-six scribal corrections to one *Life* (*LS* I.21) in Julius E.vii, noting how Skeat’s reading compares to that of the manuscript itself. Taken as a whole, his analysis provides welcome support for the argument that a new edition of these texts is badly needed.

Third, Jun Terasawa re-examines the tension between Ælfric’s paraphrase of the apocryphal story of Judith and his interpretations of this figure in “Ælfric’s *Judith*: Is the Heroine a Model of Chastity or Patriotism?” (*Text and Language in Medieval English Prose*, 269–77). Terasawa offers alternatives to arguments by Mary Clayton and Hugh Magennis that find tension between Ælfric’s paraphrase and subsequent commentary on the one hand and consonance between his paraphrase and *Letter to Sigeward* on the other. Ælfric’s *Letter to Sigeward*, to begin, offers Judith as a precedent for armed resistance to foreign invasion—as indeed her decapitation of the Assyrian commander might appear to suggest. Terasawa, however, notes that Achior’s long patriotic speech (which Ælfric keeps) emphasizes trust in God rather than military action; that both the Latin original and Ælfric’s paraphrase depict the Assyrians’

flight as the result of their commander’s death rather than Jewish defense; and that where the anonymous poetic *Judith* presents her as aggressive and courageous, Ælfric’s paraphrase describes her as *lytel and unstrang* (“little and weak”). By contrast, in his commentary to nuns following his paraphrase, Ælfric offers Judith as a model of chastity—an explanation seemingly at odds with Judith’s sexual manipulation of Holofernes. Terasawa points to six factors which may narrow the interpretive gap. First, Ælfric’s paraphrase considerably abbreviates the Vulgate’s description of Judith’s adornments, underscoring that sensuality was not the reason for her raiment. Second, while the paraphrase at times makes note of Judith’s beauty, Ælfric uses terms associated with holy brightness rather than physical allure. Third, where in the Vulgate Judith thanks God for his protection, Ælfric’s paraphrase adds that she returned *unwemme* (“unstained”) by Holofernes. Fourth, the paraphrase emphasizes the lust not only of Holofernes but of his servants, who after getting drunk hasten not to their lodgings as in the Vulgate but to their sin (*mane*). Fifth, the paraphrase disassociates Judith from things related to the lustful general: unlike the Vulgate, Ælfric makes no mention of Judith eating or drinking with Holofernes and omits various references to Holofernes’s bedchamber. Finally, the paraphrase largely excludes a long prayer by Judith which recalls the story of the rape of Dinah, an image with which Ælfric may not have wanted his heroine associated. Given such adaptations, Terasawa suggests, the Judith of Ælfric’s paraphrase may be less a precedent for resistance and more a model of chastity than hitherto has been thought.

In her Sir Israel Gollancz Memorial Lecture for 2004, “Authority and Intertextuality in the Works of Ælfric” (*Proc. of the British Academy* 131: 157–81), Joyce Hill challenges modern source study’s tendency to privilege ultimate sources and calls for more careful consideration of intermediaries such as (in Ælfric’s case) the homiliary of Smaragdus. Like the Carolingian homilists on whom he draws, Hill notes, Ælfric’s approach to “translation”—i.e., the transmission of authoritative teaching—is inherently intertextual. Where Paul the Deacon, Smaragdus, and Haymo are explicitly derivative, offering an anthology of discrete patristic sermons, sermons comprised of clearly-attributed patristic extracts, and sermons blending unattributed patristic quotations, respectively, so Ælfric proudly presents teaching derived from weighty ecclesiastical forebears. At least two factors, however, complicate our understanding of Ælfric’s composition or conveyance of ideas. First, the very line between ultimate and immediate sources is blurred (a) by Ælfric’s tendency to cite

the former (e.g., Augustine) rather than the latter (e.g., an Augustinian sermon in Paul the Deacon) and (b) by the intertextual nature of these “ultimate” sources—Bede, for example, being often as dependent on earlier authorities as Ælfric or the Carolingian homilists. Second, the tendency of intermediate sources to value derivation over originality often results in similarities that makes it difficult to determine which was used—Ælfric quoting a passage from Gregory, for example, that appears in a work by Alcuin in turn copied by Pseudo-Bede, rewritten by Haymo and Hericus, and excerpted by Smaragdus, the works by Hericus and Gregory also appearing in Paul the Deacon. Which source in fact did Ælfric have before him? Hill offers four cogent principles for identifying immediate sources: first, practical accessibility (could Ælfric have found all his material for his sermon in this source?); second, contiguity (do details present in Ælfric appear consecutively or nearly consecutively in this source?); third, abridgement (are abridgements by Ælfric similarly abridged in this source?); and fourth, the indicative detail (do unusual details present in Ælfric appear likewise in this source?). The presence of one or more of these factors, suggests Hill, constitutes evidence that can assist scholars in reconstructing not simply the “origin” of a homilist’s exegesis but the actual process of Anglo-Saxon intertextual creation—insight into which is as valuable as it has been neglected.

A study of Ælfric’s teaching on angels comes from Marthe Mensah’s “Angeles et démons dans les homélies d’Ælfric” (*Angeles et Démons dans la littérature anglaise au Moyen Âge*, ed. Leo M. Carruthers [Presses de l’Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2002], 39–56). She first sets this teaching in its tenth-century context, briefly describing the Benedictine Reform, the need for Christian education in the face of Danish attack, and the potential use of Ælfric’s homilies in public preaching, private devotions, and the monastic office. She next surveys Ælfric’s remarks regarding the angelic nature, particularly as distinct from that of God and humans: they are created, not eternal; spirit, not corporal; more knowledgeable about God than men, but not comprehending him wholly, and so on. Considering Ælfric’s treatment of the angelic orders, Mensah places Ælfric in a tradition extending back through Gregory the Great to the fifth-century angelology of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, itself informed by neoplatonic notions of a celestial hierarchy increasingly removed from the perfection of God. Where Gregory and Pseudo-Dionysius speak of nine orders of angels, however, Ælfric envisions a tenth: the fallen host of demons. Regarding this fall, Ælfric states firmly that God created all things

good and predestined none to evil; rather, he gave free will to the angelic host which Satan abused in his proud desire to equal the Creator. Once made, however, their decision to follow or reject God was irrevocable: thereafter, God confirmed the righteous angels so they would always obey and never sin, while the demons he left to their evil, unable to be redeemed. Their heavenly place, Ælfric affirms, will ultimately be given to believing humans, who rather than forming an independent host will be integrated into the nine angelic orders in keeping with their human merits. Such a destiny only increases the importance of understanding angelic duties, Mensah implies. Ælfric offers various examples from Scripture depicting angels as messengers revealing mysteries (such as Gabriel to Daniel), guardians of nations (such as Michael for Israel), and instruments of wrath (such as the angel of death in Egypt), for example. Mensah also suggests that for Ælfric angelic duties change after the Incarnation: since Christ offers human beings direct access to God, angels move from being intermediaries between God and humans to being witnesses to God’s truth (24). Just as they continue to serve Christ, however (such as after his temptation in the desert), so angels continue to aid believers in their fight against the devil’s wiles. By pursuing godliness, moreover, saints become angel-like even before death: interceding for sinners with their prayers, intervening in fallen creation with their miracles, they reveal God on earth by the purity of their lives.

Marthe Mensah and Fabienne Toupin offer a French translation of and linguistic commentary on the first grammar of Latin in the English vernacular in *La ‘Grammaire’ d’Ælfric* (Paris: Publications de l’Association des médiévistes anglicistes de l’enseignement supérieur [AMAES]). In their introduction, the authors note the challenge of offering precise equivalents for polysemic Latin and Old English terms; observe that unexpected readings in Ælfric’s own translations may offer insight into differences between medieval and classical Latin; and defend their choice to reproduce Ælfrician categories (leaving adjectives as a subset of nouns, for example, rather than treating them separately as in modern usage) and language (rendering words designated *tobrocen* or *corruptus*, for example, using the more literal “partie adultérée” rather than the modern “bound morpheme,” as does David Porter in his translation of the *Excerptiones de Prisciano*, the putative source for Ælfric’s *Grammar*). Their translation of Ælfric’s work follows, conveying his analysis of parts of speech, numbers, grammatical divisions, and so on. Three glossaries appear thereafter, the first listing Old English terminology from the *Grammar*, organized by category

(case, declension, mood, etc.), with its Latin and French equivalents; the second listing and defining Old English terminology that lacks a Latin equivalent; and the third listing all terms contained in the preceding glossaries in Old English alphabetic order. A detailed commentary by Toupin then addresses such subjects as semiotic metalanguage from a general linguistic perspective, the metalanguage or terminology used by Ælfric, and autonymic versus metalinguistic words—that is, quoted words (such as *armatus* [‘having been armed’], which Ælfric adduces as an example of a participle) as opposed to language describing those words. Finally, Mensah concludes the work with a two-part study: first, she sets Ælfric’s work briefly in its historical context, describing the need for Latin instruction in English following ninth-century Viking invasion and the Latin grammatical traditions on which Ælfric draws; last, she gives sketches of English grammatical “successors” to Ælfric from the fifteenth to nineteenth century, comparing Ælfric particularly with the philologist William Barnes (1801–1886).

Robert K. Upchurch addresses the seeming paradox of “Virgin Spouses as Model Christians: The Legend of Julian and Basilissa in Ælfric’s *Lives of Saints*” (*ASE* 34: 197–217). In treating this legend, largely unfamiliar to his Anglo-Saxon audience, Ælfric appears to have drawn on a Latin account such as that found in London, BL, Cotton Nero E.i, pt. i, a witness to the so-called Cotton-Corpus Legendary. The manuscript contains an abridgement of the most common version of the legend, combining a *vita* chronicling the saints’ trials in life with a *passio* depicting the events surrounding Julian’s martyrdom. In both parts, Upchurch notes, the measure by which believers are judged is “undeviating fidelity” to God (201). Where the Latin stresses the need to place Christ’s call above family ties, however, Ælfric downplays the tension between ascetic impulse and societal responsibility, depicting Julian (for example) not as resisting his parents’ injunction to produce heirs but as acceding to their desire for him to marry—even as he remains resolute in his commitment to chastity. The resulting text “subtly broadens the applicability of this model union to his contemporary audience,” pointing out the value of chaste marriage while underscoring the necessity and attainability for all of spiritual purity (203). Verbal and structural changes to his original likewise help Ælfric convey this message. Ælfric speaks not simply of virginity, but of *clænnys*, “the word for chastity and purity that in Ælfric’s lexicon has the widest possible range of connotations”—faithfulness in marriage, for example—“and, hence, the greatest applicability to his audience” (206). His use of

verbs such as *gebigan* (‘to bend, convert, turn’) warn not simply of the danger of turning to false gods but yielding to sin in general. By omitting details and accelerating the narrative, he ironically juxtaposes oppressors’ attempts to bend believers to false belief with pagan conversions and believers’ refusal to turn from Christ. Even as he seeks to promote greater asceticism among English Christians, therefore, Ælfric uses this account of virgin spouses as a broader model of steadfast faith. In the process, Upchurch states, Ælfric transforms a programmatic account of saintliness and martyrdom into “a spirited exhortation to constancy” (214).

Jonathan Wilcox offers a seminal reassessment of the context and reach of Ælfric’s *Catholic Homilies* in “Ælfric in Dorset and the Landscape of Pastoral Care” (*Pastoral Care in Late Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Francesca Tinti [see section 7], 52–62). Reviewing the evidence within the homilies for their expected audience, Wilcox notes that as explanations of the gospel reading from the mass, they could be read to a church congregation on a Sunday or major saint’s day; that the homilies include injunctions to laity, secular clergy, and monks; and that they could provide private devotional reading as well as aural instruction. Such versatility sets Ælfric’s work apart from Carolingian homiliaries, which were clearly marked either for preaching or for devotional reading or for the monastic night office, not a combination of lay and clerical hearers. Wilcox, however, offers three settings near Ælfric’s monastery at Cerne where such a complex audience would have been found. First, there were the secular minsters. Sherborne, for example, twelve miles from Cerne and the seat of the local bishop Wulfsgige, was a cathedral community of secular clerics (replaced in 998 by Benedictine monks) in which Wulfsgige would have preached to clergy and lay townsfolk on Sundays and major festivals. Closer yet were a number of minster churches where, though lacking a bishop, priests still lived corporately and provided pastoral care to the surrounding region. (Ælfric’s daunting list in his *Letter to Wulfsgige* of books necessary for every priest, Wilcox observes, is more understandable if minster rather than personal libraries are in view.) Second, there were the reformed monasteries such as Cerne itself, nearby Milton, or later Abbotsbury. Here, laity would have joined monks in the congregation at major points in the liturgical year. Third, there were locally owned proprietary churches—small chapels acquired by estates and villages that were becoming increasingly important and that would ultimately constitute the basis for the modern parish system. Lacking the library resources of a minster and all too often extensive training, priests in such settings would have

been ideal recipients for Ælfric's homiletic collections. Given that thousands of such churches were in existence by the time of the Domesday Book, the potential circulation for Ælfric's homilies was, as Wilcox says, "massive." The evidence for the dissemination of the *Catholic Homilies*, moreover—present in over a tenth of extant Old English manuscripts—suggests that considerable pains were taken to use them to meet the preaching need. Noting that most of the survivors appear to be relatively high-status copies such as exemplars from major scriptoria, however, and that copies used in the field (as in the small chapels) were the most likely to suffer loss, Wilcox posits that the reach of the *Catholic Homilies* may have been far greater than hitherto thought. Addressed to Archbishop Sigeric in their prefaces and disseminated largely through Canterbury, they may have been an institutionally-adopted instrument for instruction on a national scale—one responding specifically to "the pastoral needs which arose from an increasingly decentralised system of local churches and the multiple providers of pastoral care" during this period (61). If so, says Wilcox, week upon week thousands of copies would have been simultaneously recited "in virtually every church, minster, and monastery throughout England, [to] people of both sexes and all classes"—a revolutionary accomplishment not just for homiletics but also for defining English identity at the turn of the millennium (62).

Dicts of Cato

Building on Max Förster's work of over a century ago, Adrian Papahagi offers "Another Source for the Old English *Dict of Cato* 73" (*N&Q* n.s. 52: 8–10)—or rather, another instance of borrowing from a source previously identified by Förster: Alfred's version of Boethius's *De consolatio Philosophiae*. Where the Latin *Disticha Catonis* exhorts individuals not to care overmuch "about the future state of fate" (*uenturi tempora fati*), *Dict* 73 renders the phrase "how fate varies" (*hu sio wyrd wandrige*). Papahagi notes that *wandrian* itself is fairly rare, with half its occurrences appearing in texts associated with Alfred. The collocation of *wyrd* with *wandrian*, however, is found only here in *Dict* 73 and in Alfred's *Boethius*, where it appears twice. Even if this notion of "varying" or "wandering" *wyrd*—echoing the vicissitudes of Fortune, perhaps?—is merely recalled rather than quoted directly, Papahagi concludes that the origin of the echo is likely Alfredian.

AK

Byrhtferth

In "Costituzione e impiego del lessico tecnico nell'«Enchiridion» di Byrhtferth: l'ambito dell'astronomia" (*Testi Cosmografici, Geografici ed Odeporici del Medioevo Germanico: Atti del XXXI Convegno dell'Associazione Italiana di Filologia Germanica* [A. I. F. G.], Lecce, 26–28 Maggio 2004, ed. Dagmar Gottschall, Fédération des Instituts d'Études Médiévales, Textes et Études du Moyen Âge 33 [Turnhout: Brepols], 1–39), Francesca Chiusaroli examines Byrhtferth's technical and particularly astronomical vocabulary. In his bilingual *Enchiridion*, Byrhtferth expands the English lexicon while drawing upon Latin authorities from classical times through Bede and Ælfric. Byrhtferth's didactic intent helps structure his work: often he addresses the implied (young, ignorant, even lazy) clerical reader conversationally, as in a colloquy; he repeats himself frequently, not only rendering Latin content in English, but rephrasing the same idea more than once in English. Byrhtferth often pairs Latin and English words to build a new lexicon. Many key items (day, star) already have English words. As his discussion becomes more technical, Byrhtferth increasingly brings Latin words into otherwise English passages, either offering a Latin-termed paired with its English synonym or relying on the specialized vocabulary of Latin. Sometimes he glosses terms, especially difficult ones or ones for which there is no native English word (*embolismus, concurrentes*) with periphrastic English explanations or multiple synonyms, and then uses the Latin in his English passages as well, usually as an undeclined noun. At times he even gives Greek equivalents and etymologies. He offers the Germanic pagan names of days, but classical names for months and planets, and Latin names with translations for symbols of the zodiac. Byrhtferth makes connections between some terms and daily life clear, as when he ties terms for parts of the night to the monastic hours and cockcrow. He does not always offer a consistent equivalent for a Latin technical term: *saltus lunae* appears both as *monan hlyp* and *monan oferhlyp*. Chiusaroli concludes that Byrhtferth helps to develop a varied and flexible technical language despite the difficulties he explicitly recognizes of rendering scientific concepts in English. In the course of her article, Chiusaroli provides a wealth of examples and examines many specific terms.

NGD

5. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works

General

Several volumes of essays ranging throughout the Anglo-Saxon period were published in 2005. Most extensive of course are the two volumes dedicated to Michael Lapidge, *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O'Brien O'Keefe and Orchard. Among the numerous articles on Anglo-Latin literature, most of which will be covered below, is a thorough survey of "Anglo-Latin Women Poets," by Jane Stevenson (II. 86–107). Stevenson begins with the evidence of nuns at Barking reading and presumably writing in Latin and proceeds to women like Lioba who corresponded with Boniface and other missionaries. She shows how there is evidence that women benefited as did men from the revival of learning and education in the tenth century. The most attention is given to Willettrudis, perhaps identical with Abbess Wiltrud of Wilton, who wrote a fascinating poem on Susanna in leonine hexameters. Unfortunately, the tradition of Latin learning in convents seems to have disappeared by the fourteenth century, by which time French and English had taken over.

Britannia Latina: Latin in the Culture of Great Britain from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century, ed. Charles Burnett and Nicholas Mann, Warburg Institute Colloquia 8 (London and Turin: The Warburg Institute and Nina Aragno Editore) includes articles by Michael Lapidge and Peter Dronke that will be considered below. In the same volume, Maria Amalia D'Aronco has provided a survey on medical knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England. In "How 'English' is Anglo-Saxon Medicine?" (27–41), D'Aronco not only presents a detailed discussion of the sources of medical knowledge known throughout the Anglo-Saxon period, but also draws several important conclusions from the scant material that has survived. She posits that there must have been an extensive and learned medical community who "had at its disposal written works which fused both the classical medical tradition and the new knowledge from contemporary practice." That this community was not solely monastic is suggested by the large number of medical works written in Old English.

The first volume of *La trasmissione dei testi latini del medioevo*, ed. Paolo Chiesa and Lucia Castaldi (Florence: SISMEL, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2004) provides synopses of current scholarship on the textual transmission of a number of medieval Latin authors, including Adomnán, Alcuin, Frithegod, Virgilius Maro *grammaticus*, and Wulfstan. The entries by different scholars,

which will be discussed individually below, vary in length and detail but all include a basic bibliography of printed editions and a brief discussion of the important surviving manuscripts and their relationships.

Proceedings of a conference on medieval Latin poetry was published by Manuel C. Díaz y Díaz and José M. Díaz de Bustamante, *Poesía Latina Medieval (Siglos V–XV): Actas del IV Congreso del "Internationales Mittellateinerkomitee" Santiago de Compostela, 12–15 de septiembre de 2002* (Florence: SISMEL, Edizioni del Galluzzo). This large volume includes articles on Hiberno-Latin, Bede, Alcuin, and others.

In *Mary in the Middle Ages: The Blessed Virgin Mary in the Thought of Medieval Latin Theologians* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press), Luigi Gambero gives brief synopses of the theology of Mary according to famous doctors of the Church. From Anglo-Saxon England he includes Bede and Alcuin. Bede affirms Mary's role as a prefiguration of the Church, for example, while Alcuin stresses Mary's role as *Theotokos*, in response to the adoptionism then threatening the Church. Included are very short extracts of writings on Mary by each author discussed.

Latin Language

Patrizia Lendinara introduces the concept of "Contextualized Lexicography" in *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O'Brien O'Keefe and Orchard, II.108–31. By "contextualized lexicography," Lendinara means the general tendency found in Hiberno- and Anglo-Latin literature of clustering together lexical items from the same semantic field, not necessarily obscure or recondite vocabulary, as found frequently in colloquies such as those by Ælfric or the *Hisperica famina*. Her survey ranges from Celtic works such as the *Lorica* of Laidcenn and the *De raris fabulis* to Anglo-Latin authors like Aldhelm, and continental works, such as Book III of Abbo of Fleury's *Bella Parisiaca urbis*.

Though the volume concentrates largely on the Classical period, several articles on Medieval Latin appear in *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, ed. Tobias Reinhardt, Michael Lapidge and J. N. Adams (Oxford: Oxford UP). Studies of Gregory of Tours and William of Malmesbury appear, as well as one on Bede by Richard Sharpe, which will be reviewed below. In "Poeticism in Pre-Conquest Anglo-Latin Prose," 321–37, Michael Lapidge asks "how and if the Anglo-Saxon authors could have been fully, or even partially, responsive

to stylistic nuance in the Latin which they composed, and whether they could have sensed (say) the distinction between poetic and prosaic registers." Lapidge provides a list of seven criteria for considering a word poetic (adjectives ending in *-eus*, nouns ending in *-men*, etc.) to serve as a test for whether authors were aware of the difference between prose and poetic diction. As one might expect, Bede shows himself truly sensitive to the different nuances of words, eschewing most poetic vocabulary in his prose reworking of his *Life of Cuthbert*. Aldhelm, on the other hand, in spite of his dazzling displays of vocabulary and complex syntactic patterns, seems deaf to at least the difference of diction, using almost none of the poetic criteria even in his poetry. Many of Lapidge's criteria show up in abundance in later Anglo-Latin prose, even in the charters—hardly the most poetic medium—suggesting at the least that such "poetic" words were recognized as imparting a higher stylistic register.

One of the most difficult tasks in Anglo-Latin studies was undertaken by Carin Ruff—finding humor in Medieval Latin grammatical treatises! In "*Desipere in loco*: Style, Memory, and the Teachable Moment," in *Verbal Encounters: Anglo-Saxon and Old Norse Studies for Roberta Frank*, ed. Harbus and Poole, 91–103, Ruff presents a witty and learned study of medieval grammars worthy of the volume's honorand. Though soon abandoning the search for humor, Ruff concentrates on the use of puns and etymologies as mnemonic techniques used by grammarians such as Aldhelm and Byrhtferth to make their often dry technical terms more comprehensible to students.

The teaching of Latin grammar was not done solely through grammatical treatises, however, but could be achieved through treatises on metrics as well. In "The Place of Metrics in Anglo-Saxon Latin Education: Aldhelm and Bede," *JEGP* 104: 149–70, Ruff examines two contrasting approaches to the teaching of Latin metrics by Aldhelm and Bede. It should come as no surprise that Aldhelm presents the composition of the hexameter as a complicated and difficult mathematical patterning of various possibilities of dactyls and spondees. Little attention is given to the relationship of the resulting structure to the actual sense of the lines. That relationship is more the focus of Bede's metrical treatise, which emphasizes the connection between metrical and syntactic or semantic units.

Michael Lapidge asks "How 'English' is Pre-Conquest Anglo-Latin?" (*Britannia Latina*, ed. Burnett and Mann, 1–13). Lapidge searches for linguistic and stylistic features that will allow one to distinguish Latin composed in England from Latin composed elsewhere.

Unfortunately, the features he finds, such as use of the letter <f> for Latin u/v, or the lack of elision with *h* in poetry, are either found elsewhere or occur too sporadically to be of much help. In fact, he finds that Latin composed in Anglo-Saxon England is generally more "correct" than we would expect, no doubt due to its status there as a learned second language, and perhaps for this reason it is difficult to find any such idiosyncratic features.

William Sayers investigates the origins of two sea terms in "The Etymology of Late Latin *malina* 'spring tide' and *ledo* 'neap tide,'" *Mittelateinisches Jahrbuch* 40: 35–43. These terms are found in Bede and in several seventh-century Hiberno-Latin texts, but their earliest attestation is in Marcellus Empiricus's *Liber de medicamentis* (ca. 395–410). As early as Du Cange a Gaulish origin was proposed for the two words, a suggestion which accords well with the prevalent Gaulish element in Marcellus's Latin. Given the contacts between traders in western Gaul and Ireland, Sayers sees a plausible context for such local Aquitanian sea terms to be spread elsewhere.

Another fascicle of the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources: Fascicle IX, Pa-Pel*, ed. D. R. Howlett, with the assistance of T. Christchev, T. V. Evans, P. O. Piper and C. White (Oxford: Oxford UP), has been published.

Celtic Latin

Michael Herren undertakes the task of distinguishing characteristics of Hiberno-Latin from Anglo-Latin and Continental rhythmical poetry in "Identifying Features of Hiberno-Latin Rhythmical Poetry," in *Poesía latina medieval*, ed. Díaz y Díaz and Díaz de Bustamente, 651–64. Herren limits his focus to structure, word-division, alliteration and rhyme, mostly in octosyllabic verse. For example, while Hiberno-Latin and Continental poems are frequently stanzaic in structure and are often abecedarial, Anglo-Latin octosyllabic poems, from Aldhelm to those he influenced such as Æthilwald and Boniface, are not divided into stanzas until Alcuin borrows the structure from Continental sources. Anglo-Latin poems can also be distinguished by a systematic and regular use of alliteration, unlike Hiberno-Latin examples which use it frequently but irregularly. Hiberno-Latin and Anglo-Latin verse can be set apart from Continental in the regular use of rhymes based on grammatical analogy, whereas Continental rhymes are affected not only by Vulgar Latin pronunciation which perceives words ending in *-um* rhyming with words in *-o*, but also seem satisfied with general assonance of the

concluding syllable. As Herren notes, his conclusions are limited and provisional, and there is much more to be studied, particularly in the use of rhyme and influence of vernacular models.

Adomnàn receives a very brief treatment in *La trasmissione dei testi latini del medioevo*, ed. Chiesa and Castaldi, 3–5. Michaela Zelzer notes the printed editions and major manuscripts of *De locis sanctis* and the *Vita Columbae*, and gives an overview of the relationships of the major manuscripts preserving each text.

Loredana De Falco gives a brief discussion of Virgilius Maro *grammaticus* in the same volume (419–23). De Falco notes the uncertainties concerning Virgilius's Irish or Frankish origins, the confusing relationships between the major manuscripts and fragments, and Vivien Law's possible identification of lost Virgilius material in the *Collectaneum* of Sedulius Scotus.

Andrew Breeze discusses two cruces in "Celtic Symptoms in *De abbatibus* and *Altercatio magistri et discipuli*," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 15: 148–52. The first is the origin of the phrase *pia castra beorum* in *De abbatibus*. Breeze supports Campbell's suggestion that *beorum* here is an Irish word, representing heaven as "the land of the living," as found in other pagan and Christian Irish texts. Breeze, however, would add that the word *castra* reflects a British view of heaven as a fortress as seen in texts such as *Armes Prydein* and others. The next crux concerns the word *tenaces* used to describe the English in the *Altercatio*. Breeze suggests that the word should be taken as "stingy, over-fond of money," as a reference to the extensive yearly tribute first established by Æthelstan for the Welsh to pay.

Scott Gwara unravels the complicated layers in the transmission of the *De raris fabulis* in his *Education in Wales and Cornwall in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries: Understanding De raris fabulis*, Kathleen Hughes Memorial Lectures on Mediaeval Welsh History 4 (Cambridge: Dept of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic, 2003). After an introduction to the colloquies, which provided a source for Ælfric Bata, Gwara turns to the difficult question of their origin, which seems to depend on the numerous glosses in Cornish and Welsh, though many are ambiguous enough to be referred to simply as Brittonic. Gwara plausibly divides the colloquies into two sections, one apparently glossed in Cornwall and the other in Wales. After these were joined, more glosses were added, some Welsh and some Cornish. Most interesting, however, is that many of the Cornish glosses in this stage gloss exceedingly rare words, which Gwara suggests "explicitly document a Celtic Latinity" (38). These texts and glosses were also known and studied at Canterbury, not only by Ælfric Bata, but by

the compilers of several Canterbury glossaries who had access to the same glossaries (yet with Old English definitions replacing the Cornish). Gwara also provides a text and translation of the work: '*De raris fabulis*,' 'On Uncommon Tales': A Glossed Latin Colloquy-Text from a Tenth-Century Cornish Manuscript, Basic Texts for Brittonic History 4 (Cambridge: Dept of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic, 2004).

Peter Dronke, "Arbor eterna: A Ninth-Century Welsh Latin Sequence," in *Britannia Latina*, ed. Burnett and Mann, 14–26, sees the image of the "eternal tree" as representing Ecclesia, not Mary as others have suggested. In the article, which includes an edition and translation of the sequence, Dronke proceeds through the poem, explaining the images, figures and allusions, to solve textual cruces and build his case for the interpretation as *ecclesia*. In the end, he is left with a fascinating "experiment" in the sequence, as was common in the ninth century, but one that he finds "not a fully realized lyric" in that it has not achieved "the perfection of outer and inner form together." By way of contrast he prints the little studied Winchester sequence *Gloria resonante*, which presents a single image tightly controlled through the entire text.

PGR

Jason R. Gildow ("Origin and Adaptation of the Medieval Theban Narrative from Gildas to Shakespeare," unpubl. PhD diss., Univ. of Nebraska [2004]) traces the transmission of the narrative of Thebes from its sources through to Shakespeare, but devotes his first chapter to the origin of the Trojan-British narrative in the personal history of Gildas's *De excidio et conquestu Britanniae*. Gildow argues that Gildas models his work after Eusebius, who demonstrated how to interpret the happenings of one's own age "through the exegesis of historical texts," including, of course, scripture and classical history. Gildas's view of history was that it is cyclical, or related (in terms of, for example, the Israelites and the Britons). Gildow's main point in terms of Theban narrative concerns its lines of transmission: it enters medieval literature via Latin accounts of the Greek history, as everyone knows, but also via Eusebius and Gildas, what Gildow calls the scribal tradition of Eusebius, who linked Christianity with the Egyptian theological tradition from Thebes.

MF

Aldhelm and Early Anglo-Latin

Michael Herren, "Aldhelm the Theologian," in *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O'Brien O'Keefe and

Orchard, I:68–89, examines the corpus of Aldhelm's writings to shed light on his "theology, spirituality and formation as a churchman." He considers seven topics—the Roman Church, scriptural exegesis, use of apocryphal writings, paganism, Judaism, Orthodoxy and Heresy, and Salvation—most of which lead to the conclusion that Aldhelm saw himself as a staunch defender of the primacy and authority of Rome, both in the Easter controversy and in matters of scriptural interpretation. The only place where Herren finds Aldhelm deviating even slightly from strict orthodoxy, at least as represented by Augustine's views, is in his apparent emphasis on the power of the will to bring about salvation, perhaps a sign of Cassian's influence on his thought.

Michael Winterbottom has brought forth a new edition and study of the Life of Aldhelm by Faricius, based on a newly discovered manuscript of the text. Gloucester Cathedral, MS 1 preserves a longer version of the Life than previously known, and serves as the basis for Winterbottom's "An Edition of Faricius, *Vita S. Aldhelmi*," *Journal of Medieval Latin*, 15: 93–147. The major features of this text, especially its differences from the shorter version, are laid out in his "Faricius of Arezzo's Life of St Aldhelm," in *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O'Brien O'Keefe and Orchard, I:109–31. Winterbottom investigates the sources and new items that appear, allowing him to reassign the text to 1093–99. Although there is no conclusive evidence, Winterbottom suggests that the Gloucester version is in fact closer to the original and that the shorter text known previously is a revised version, with some of the Latin idiosyncrasies of Faricius edited out and the signs of a Malmesbury authorship removed.

Catherine Franc studies the wide array of sources of the life of St. Thecla, from Greek and Latin *passiones* to Ambrose's *De uirginibus*, in "The Cult of Saint Thecla in Anglo-Saxon England: the Problem of Aldhelm's Sources," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 86.2 (2004): 39–53. One major problem in determining Aldhelm's source is that he recounts Thecla being killed by wild beasts in an amphitheater, whereas in the Latin *passiones* the beasts refuse to attack her, and she dies of old age after many years of teaching the Gospel (and perhaps even baptizing the faithful). Though Aldhelm certainly seems to have known a Latin *passio*, he apparently ignored this ending in favor of presenting her death, as found in several of the Greek versions and in numerous patristic retellings of the Life. Franc sees in Aldhelm's preference for the patristic version against the *passiones* a sign of his steadfast support of Roman authority and avoidance of suspect apocryphal stories.

Emma Pettit turns away from the more common examinations of female saints to question the representation of men and masculinity in "Holiness and Masculinity in Aldhelm's *Opus geminatum de uirginitate*," in *Holiness and Masculinity in the Middle Ages*, ed. Cullum and Lewis (see section 4.a), 8–23. A primary problem for Aldhelm is that while monastic women can occupy many of the same roles as secular women, monastic men must eschew the standard warlike roles played by men in secular society. Thus, she explains the frequent military metaphors Aldhelm employs in depicting the battles against the vices. Aldhelm also seems to endow his male saints with more holy power to enact miracles than he does the women, who tend to achieve sanctity through avoidance of marriage and subsequent martyrdom.

Rather than assuming the Church had one overall theory of dreams, Jesse Keskiaho examines the practical realities of dealing with dream interpretation in "The Handling and Interpretation of Dreams and Visions in Late Sixth- to Early Eighth-Century Gallic and Anglo-Latin Hagiographies and Histories," *EME* 13: 227–48. For example, texts intended for a wider, lay audience, stress the importance of identifying when the devil is in a dream attempting to deceive the dreamer. Determining the validity is crucial considering the necessity to obey dreams that come from God, and many texts, such as Bede's description of Cædmon's dream, describe the dreamer seeking out an authority figure for proper interpretation.

Brian McFadden discusses the skepticism of the author of the *Liber monstrorum* towards his subject. In "Authority and Discourse in the *Liber monstrorum*," *Neophilologus* 89: 473–93, McFadden shows how the author walks a fine line between acceptance and dismissal of the stories of fabulous creatures he recounts, preferring instead to let his audience determine the truth of his sources. McFadden suggests a possible historical context for this anxiety about the trustworthiness of his sources in the threats of pagan kings and the dissension in the English church during the late seventh and early eighth centuries.

Bede

In "Bilingual Philology in Bede's Exegesis," *Medieval Cultures in Contact*, ed. Richard F. Gyug, Fordham Series in Medieval Studies (New York: Fordham UP, 2003), 3–17, Carmela Viricillo Franklin looks at Bede's commentary *In Genesim* to reveal the importance of philological work in his interpretation of scripture. Franklin shows how Bede systematically compared reading from

the *Vetus Latina* with the Vulgate to explore nuances in the text, sometimes leading him to depart far from his sources such as Augustine or Jerome. For example, when God places a new seed into Adam after the death of Abel, the Vulgate has *posuit* where the *Vetus Latina* uses the word *suscitavit*, leading Bede to see Seth as a figure of Christ after the resurrection.

Marianna Malo Chenard finds the image of “hands” central to Bede’s efforts to connect Church and monarchy in his *Historia ecclesiastica*. In “King Oswald’s Holy Hands: Metonymy and the Making of a Saint in Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History*,” *Exemplaria* 17: 33–56, Malo Chenard examines Bede’s portrayal of Oswald as both a Christian and a warlike king, in which the symbols of his hands play an important part, whether praying or carrying the cross into battle. Thus, when Oswald’s hand is discovered to be uncorrupted after death, it becomes an object of veneration and evidence of his sanctity, as well as a sign of his victory over the pagan Penda.

In an attempt to redeem Bede’s reputation from a “competent but uninspired” poet, Michael Lapidge examines his use of certain features he may well have learned from a close study of an excellent poet such as Vergil in “Bede and the Poetic Diction of Vergil,” in *Poesía Latina Medieval*, ed. Díaz y Díaz and Díaz de Bustamente, 739–48. For example, Bede tends to prefer the same types of variations of dactyl and spondee in the first four feet of his hexameters as Vergil did. Bede also imitates Vergil and other Latin poets in his use of the so-called “*accusativus graecus*,” a Grecism borrowed by Latin poets to “impart a tone of Greek epic seriousness to their verse.” Bede shows a sensitive use of euphony and cacophony and etymological wordplay, features which he would have found plentiful in Vergil, but that he would not have learned from simply studying metrical treatises.

PGR

In “The Metrical Art(s) of Bede,” *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O’Brien O’Keeffe and Orchard, 1:150–70, Neil Wright builds on work by Arthur Holder which places the dating of Bede’s *De arte metrica* in doubt and attempts to juxtapose Bede’s own verse with the guidelines of the metrical handbook. Wright looks first at the two versions of the *Vita S. Cuthberti*, composed perhaps twenty years apart. Close analysis demonstrates that Bede did become a more proficient metrician: he corrected errors, increased elision, and eliminated *productio ob caesuram*, though these changes tell us nothing concrete about the date of *De arte metrica*. Wright goes on to consider Bede on the “golden line” or “golden symmetry” (“any lines with two

interlaced adjective/noun units and a verb”) and how he uses it within his own verse against the example of Caelius Sedulius. Bede has the maturity to resist the metrical usage of Sedulius, and his handbook is both practical and original. In the end, the analysis does not help to date *De arte metrica*, but it does show that there is no reason that it could not have been written at its traditional early date (ca. 701–2), as Wright demonstrates convincingly that Bede was a highly accomplished metrician early in his career.

Richard Sharpe (“The Varieties of Bede’s Prose,” in *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, ed. Reinhardt *et al.*, pp. 339–55) notes that Bede, as a prolific writer held in high esteem, has often been praised for his Latin. However, there are voices which point out that Bede’s Latin is not always a model of “simplicity.” Overall, Bede seems not to have his own “personal style,” but rather seems to show a “deliberate neutrality” as he models his prose after different authors for different purposes. Sharpe confines his analysis to Bede’s exegetical works, and carefully enumerates the difficulties which inhere in such an endeavor (such as Bede’s own tendency to copy his sources, modern editorial deficiencies, sense pauses, *capitula lectionum* and problems with distinction between lemmata and comment). Average “sentence” length in Bede’s longer works tends to suggest that his Latin grew ever more complex as his career progressed, and it may be that Bede was, in his later works, imitating Jerome’s “most leisurely later exegesis.” Comparison with sentence length in some works of Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine and Gregory, shows that a late work like Bede’s *De tabernaculo* rivals Jerome’s commentary on Ezekiel. Bede’s style, concludes Sharpe, “is that of a chameleon”: “Style appears to have been for Bede a matter of imitating what he judged to be the appropriate models” (354). Interestingly, Sharpe’s finding that Bede’s *In Ezram* has the longest average sentence length seems not to accord well with Paul Meyvaert’s conclusions (discussed below) on the date of the commentary.

Faith Wallis’s 1999 translation of (and commentary on) Bede’s *De temporum ratione* has been reprinted with corrections: *Bede: The Reckoning of Time*, Liverpool Translated Texts for Historians (Liverpool: U of Liverpool P, 2004).

Ildar H. Garipzanov (“The Carolingian Abbreviation of Bede’s World Chronicle and Carolingian Imperial ‘Genealogy,’” *Hortus Artium Medievalium* 1: 291–8) traces the development of royal genealogies in the Carolingian period, looking particularly at the abbreviation of that part of Bede’s *De temporum ratione* which qualifies as a “world chronicle.” Effectively, the abbreviations

of Bede made in 807 and 809 were a composite document, based in the first instance upon Isidore, who was Bede's main source, and then upon Bede, whose continuation and development of Isidore was subsequently abbreviated and updated, at least partly in an attempt to demonstrate the Roman heritage of Carolingian rulers. Garipzanov compares the efforts of 807 and 809, and some of their manuscript contexts, and concludes the article with an imperial list from Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Guelf. 532 Helmst.

Noting that *De temporum ratione* is the most widely circulated of Bede's scientific works, Andrew Rabin ("Historical Re-Collections: Rewriting the World Chronicle in Bede's *De temporum ratione*," *Viator* 36: 23–39) considers a new possible reason for its popularity, "the various rhetorical strategies by which Bede develops a peculiarly English notion of time measurement and historical narrative" (24). While the Eusebius-Jerome *Chronicon* is Bede's main source for the *Chronica maiora*, its Rome-centered view is perhaps less influential in terms of method than Augustine's notions of *historia*, post-lapsarian communication and the model of the text-as-collection. Rabin notes that Bede uses the categories of nature (*natura*), usage (*consuetudo*) and authority (*auctoritas*) to define ways of measuring time, thus aligning computus with Augustinian language theory. Further, this demonstrates the "relationship between the practice of computus and the narration of Christian history" (31). Another major and obvious difference between Eusebius-Jerome and Bede is the format of the chronicle: Rabin argues that Bede's changes alter the underlying narrative to emphasize the "ordered progression" of universal Christian history rather than the "fiction of Roman triumphalism." At the same time, though, *DTR* demonstrates how history can also become a regional narrative.

Beginning from the premise that Bede's experience of the monastic life must have had some influence on how and what he wrote, Scott DeGregorio ("Bede, the Monk, as Exegete: Evidence from the Commentary on Ezra-Nehemiah," *RB* 115: 343–69) sets out to discover what that influence might have been. Faced with a dearth of evidence for early eighth-century monastic practice, DeGregorio nevertheless points out that Bede's autobiographical comments at the end of the *HE* make explicit that Bede writes *meae meorum necessitate*, and then proceeds to search Bede's *In Ezram et Neemiam* for monastic influence. DeGregorio first points out a few verbal parallels with the Benedictine Rule itself, most from the prologue, and a potential point at which monastic experience or the Rule might have guided Bede's exegesis of a particular passage. He

then considers several passages which suggest that Bede was mindful of monastic instruction as well as basic exegesis, places where "monastic concerns could surface" in his commentary. The article concludes with a suggestion that even the style of the commentary—the way Bede sometimes seems to progress haphazardly, by association more than logic—may demonstrate the monastic "meditative impulse," and, more, perhaps Bede's desire to initiate a "distinctively Anglo-Saxon 'monastic' form of exegesis."

In part motivated by a recent article by Scott DeGregorio, Paul Meyvaert ("The Date of Bede's *In Ezram* and His Image of Ezra in the Codex Amiatinus," *Speculum* 80: 1087–1133) returns to comments he had made in a 1996 article about the date of Bede's commentary on Ezra and makes new arguments about Bede's involvement in the construction of the Codex Amiatinus. The details are impossible to summarize briefly, but Meyvaert demonstrates convincingly that *In Ezram* was written between 711 and 715. What that means for the Codex Amiatinus occupies the remainder of the article. Noting first of all a verbal parallel between the commentary on Ezra and the couplet above the image of Ezra in the Codex Amiatinus, Meyvaert (with assistance from Paul Dutton) shows that the commentary must have come before the image and couplet. Detailed study of the Codex itself helps to show different stages in the evolution of the plan for the opening folios, and Meyvaert considers the possibilities and influences exhaustively (for example, what is the relationship to Cassiodorus's Codex Grandior?). The portrait itself occupies much of his interest, again particularly with reference to how Bede would have altered the image for its new context. Meyvaert now accepts that Alcuin's *Carmen* 69, which seems a direct echo of the couplet, is most likely the result of Alcuin looking on the Codex Amiatinus itself. Finally, with a new date for *In Ezram*, we must be aware that "ideas about the need for church reform animated Bede from a quite early period of his career." [Also reviewed in section 6.]

After noting that apples appear only infrequently in the Bible, George Brown ("Patristic Pomegranates, from Ambrose and Apponius to Bede," in *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O'Brien O'Keefe and Orchard, I:132–49) surveys the appearance and importance of the pomegranate in the Bible and in patristic exegesis. The pomegranate is most associated with the Song of Songs, and Brown therefore explores its symbolic associations mainly in that context, particularly in the commentaries of Apponius and Bede.

A new edition of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* began to appear in 2005 (*Bède le Vénérable*,

Histoire ecclésiastique du peuple anglais [Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum] 2 vols. Source Chrétiennes 489–90 [Paris: Cerf]). The Latin text is edited by Michael Lapidge, notes are provided by André Crépin, and a facing-page translation into French by Pierre Monat and Philippe Robin is included. SC 489 contains Books I–II; SC 490 contains Books III–IV; and SC 491, as yet unpublished, will complete the edition.

M.J. Ferrar (“The Venerable Bede and the *Tabula Peutingeriana*,” *Cartographic Jnl* 42: 157–67) examines the history of early geographical knowledge of England, and suggests that the description of the island which Bede offers in the *HE* may derive from or have been influenced by the *Itinerarium Antonini* or, perhaps, from the now missing section of the *Tabula Peutingeriana* depicting the British Isles, some of France and the Iberian peninsula. Ferrar offers a conjectural version of how that missing portion of the *Tabula* may have appeared.

Walter Goffart considers anew how exactly we ought to understand Bede’s well-known phrase *uera lex historiae* (“Bede’s *uera lex historiae* Explained,” *ASE* 34: 111–16). Goffart notes that the phrase is borrowed from Jerome, originally in Bede’s commentary on Luke, and suggests that the key to understanding the phrase in the *HE* may actually lie in the seemingly insignificant adverb *simpliciter*, which he argues may best be translated as “untheologically.” The contrast then, in the passage as a whole, is not between truth and falsehood, but rather between “theological truth” and “common perception.” *Vera lex historiae* might best be translated as “inherent limitation of historical discourse.” Bede’s point, then, is to give “notice of the inherent superficiality of history.”

The jumping off point for Nicholas Howe’s wide-ranging contribution on Bede (“From Bede’s World to Bede’s World” in *Reading Medieval Culture*, ed. Stein and Prior [see section 2], pp. 21–44) is the notion that Bede’s historiography is concerned very much with “senses of place, whether conceived of as geography or topography.” Howe discusses Bede’s idea of the importance of the *stabilitas loci*, the differing vantage points of the *HE* (looking north to England; looking south to Rome) and how they relate to Bede’s sources in Pliny, Gildas and Isidore, the nature of Bede’s *De locis sanctis* and what it, in juxtaposition with the *HE*, tells us about “how the demands of genre affect the ways in which Bede writes a sense of place” (34). Finally, Howe relates all this to the recreated “Bede’s World,” and suggests that if “the north” is seen as a “historically distinct place,” “it owes more than a little to the example set by Bede.”

J. M. Pizarro (“Poetry as Rumination: The Model for Bede’s Cædmon,” *Neophilologus* 89: 469–72) finds in Rufinus’s addition to his Latin translation of Eusebius’s world history a fascinating correspondence to Bede’s description of Cædmon and the process by which he turns what he hears into verse. In Book XI, Rufinus describes Didymus the Blind, who was accustomed to listen in an attempt to quench his thirst for learning. When his readers nodded off to sleep, Didymus would *tamquam mundum animal ruminans cibum quem ceperat ex integro reuocabat*, as if to copy what he had heard “on the pages of his mind.” The Latin here, of course, is quite similar to Bede’s *quasi mundum animal ruminando*. Pizarro cautions that although there are obviously major differences between the two accounts, the intellectual process is the same, and some kind of disability (either blindness or illiteracy) underlies each.

Richard Sharpe (“King Ceadwalla’s Roman Epitaph,” in *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O’Brien O’Keeffe and Orchard, 1:171–93) observes that neither editors of Bede nor editors of Paul the Deacon’s *Historia Langobardorum* have explored the textual history of Ceadwalla’s epitaph. The verses also survive in epigraphical collections, and so there are three related “routes of transmission” for the epitaph. Sharpe explores these in detail, especially with relation to the collections of epigraphs, and offers a new text with variant readings. In the end, we still do not have any clear evidence how Bede learned of the epitaph, though his version is the “most exact text.”

Anselme Davril (“Bède et le Saint-Benoît du 21 mars,” *RB* 115: 27–32) points out that the first mention of a saint’s day for St. Benedict on March 21 appears in Bede’s martyrology, and thus the oldest evidence for a cult of St. Benedict is, in fact, Northumbrian. Davril observes that Bede’s notice was adopted in the martyrology of Echternach and then spread across the Carolingian empire. But why did Bede fix upon a date of March 21, the date of the vernal equinox and of the *salutis lunae*? Naturally, this is rolled into Bede’s concerns with the dating of Easter (many considered March 25 to be the equinox, which was problematic) and his sense of the “inextricable interlace” of all the movements of time. The question remains whether this is a tradition derived ultimately from calendars of Monte Cassino, or from Bede, though insular calendars may have influenced the Cassinian ones.

In 2002, the Université de Lille 3 and the Université de Picardie—Jules Verne organized a colloquium on Bede which was held at Villeneuve d’Ascq and Amiens. The papers from that colloquium have been edited by Stéphane Lebecq, Michel Perrin, and Olivier

Szerwiniack in *Bède le Vénérable entre tradition et postérité / The Venerable Bede, Tradition and Posterity; Colloque organisé à Villeneuve d'Ascq et Amiens par le CRHEN-O (Université de Lille 3) et Textes, Images et Spiritualité (Université de Picardie-Jules Verne) du 3 au 6 juillet 2002*, Histoire de l'Europe du Nord-Ouest (Lille: Ceges). The volume contains twenty-five papers, and a two-part epilogue, though only twenty-three of the papers are properly dealt with in this section of the YWOES. The papers are divided into five sections: sources, Bede as exegete, the historian and his milieu, *Nachleben*, and the translations.

In a section on sources, Louis Holtz ("Bède et la tradition grammaticale latine," 9–18), noting the shortcomings of previous editions of *De orthographia*, *De arte metrica* and *De schematibus et tropis* with respect to Bede's sources, studies anew how Bede situates his grammatical works within the long tradition of Latin grammatical study, both in his direct sources and in his use of Christian Latin poetry. Holtz notes that *De arte metrica*, in particular, was the key learning text of the Carolingian period. Jean-Marc Vercruyse ("Bède lecteur de Tyconius dans l'*Expositio Apocalypseos*," 19–30) explores exactly how Bede uses Tyconius in his *Expositio Apocalypseos*. Vercruyse examines Bede's use of Tyconius in the prefatory letter to Eusebius (Hwætberht), explicit references in the commentary itself, why Bede might have chosen Apocalypse for his first work of exegesis, and concludes with a table of those passages in which Tyconius is mentioned by name. Diarmuid Scully ("Bede, Orosius and Gildas on the Early History of Britain," 31–42) turns to Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* and looks carefully at Bede's use of Orosius and Gildas, not only where they appear as sources, but also how those sources are interpreted and edited or omitted. Jean-Michel Picard ("Bède et ses sources irlandaises," 43–61) returns to Bede and the Irish, this time ignoring the question of Bede's attitude toward the Irish and concentrating on which Irish texts Bede quoted in his own works. Picard includes tables, illustrating precisely how Bede borrowed from such works as the *Vita Fursei*, Adomnán's *De locis sanctis* (both illustrations and text), *De ordine creaturarum*, Virgilius Maro Grammaticus, and Pseudo-Hilary. Finally, Jacques Elfassi ("L'occultation du paganisme dans la *Chronique mineure* de Bède le Vénérable," 63–69) considers Bede's *Chronica minora (De temporibus XVII–XXII)* as "almost a cento" of Isidore's chronicle, but also influenced by Isidore's abbreviation of his own work in *Etymologiae* V.39. As Bede alternates between these two works of Isidore, he is obviously concerned to eliminate or abbreviate references to pagan gods.

Bede's exegesis forms the subject of the second section of the book. Georges Tugène ("Le thème des deux peuples dans le *De Tabernaculo* de Bède," 73–85) studies Bede's use of the phrase *uterque populus* in his *De tabernaculo*, where it refers to both Jews and Christians in a way that minimizes their differences over the broad scope of salvation history. George Brown ("Le commentaire problématique de Bède sur le Premier Livre de Samuel," 87–96) examines four issues to do with the commentary on the first book of Samuel. Brown considers the textual history of the work, including its limited circulation and highly corrupt text, and its content and purpose, including why Bede chose to write on I Samuel in the first place, and why he did not take the opportunity offered by I Samuel VIII to evaluate Anglo-Saxon kings. Scott DeGregorio ("Bede's *In Ezram et Neemiam*: A Document in Church Reform?" 97–107) has more to say about *In Ezram et Neemiam*, this time about its possible role as a document of church reform. As in the case of the commentary on I Samuel, one must look for reasons why Bede wrote on such an otherwise neglected pair of biblical books, and DeGregorio finds that in the focus of Ezra-Nehemiah on "reform and restoration" and suggests that Bede uses the commentary to focus attention on, for example, teaching and preaching, and the need for more bishops. Instead of focusing on a particular work, Arthur Holder ("The Feminine Christ in Bede's Biblical Commentaries," 109–18) examines the role of Bede in transmitting the idea of the "feminine Christ" (as Wisdom) in Western theology. Holder traces the idea in the *Expositio Apocalypseos*, *In Lucam*, the *Homiliae*, and the commentaries on I Samuel, Song of Songs and Proverbs. In an interesting companion piece to Nicholas Howe's contribution (see above), Jennifer O'Reilly ("Islands and Idols at the Ends of the Earth: Exegesis and Conversion in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*," 119–45) explores how Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* exploits the commonplace description of the British Isles as islands "at the ends of the earth" in relation to the central place of Jerusalem and Rome. O'Reilly traces the development of such ideas in patristic thought and in papal writings before looking more specifically at Bede and his portrayal of "a multitude of isles."

Walter Goffart ("L'*Histoire ecclésiastique* et l'engagement politique de Bède," 149–58) opens a section on Bede the historian and his milieu. Goffart demonstrates via the *Epistola ad Egbertum episcopum* that Bede was, as Scott DeGregorio would put it, deeply interested in "reform and restoration." If we understand this concern of Bede's, we may better understand certain aspects of the *Historia ecclesiastica*: the focus on Northumbria, the

glorification of the early Northumbrian church, the presentation of Bishop Wilfrid and the Irish, and the cursory coverage of 705–731, which Bede saw as a period of decline. Olivier Szerwiniack (“L’Histoire ecclésiastique ou le rêve d’un retour au temps de l’innocence,” 159–76) suggests that the lasting relevance and success of Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica* is due to the fact that it contains both a particular history and a universal message about “the dream of a return to time of innocence,” and that universal message is particularly in evidence in the presentation of corruptibility and incorruptibility. Masako Ohashi (“Theory and History: An Interpretation of the Paschal Controversy in Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica*,” 177–85) returns to the question of calculating the date of Easter in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, noting that the information Bede gives there is not always enough to follow events in sufficient detail. Ohashi compares the *HE* with Bede’s computistical writings and demonstrates how Bede’s approach varies across his different writings, and particularly how Bede opposed the Easter table of Victorius of Aquitaine. Barbara Beall (“Entry Point to the *Scriptorium* Bede Knew at Wearmouth and Jarrow: The Canon Tables of the *Codex Amiatinus*,” 187–97) describes and analyzes the canon tables of the *Codex Amiatinus* and their place within the manuscript, within their Northumbrian and Mediterranean context, and suggests possible sources, all with an eye to what they might tell us about the scriptorium at Wearmouth-Jarrow. The model for the *Codex Amiatinus* seems unusual for an insular manuscript, and Beall suggests that “it is tempting to conclude that the pandect at Wearmouth and Jarrow [that served as the model for *Amiatinus*] was from the scriptorium of Cassiodorus at Vivarium,” even, perhaps, the lost Old Latin pandect, the *Codex Grandior*. Bede’s conception of and attitude toward Rome is the subject of Michael E. Hoenicke Moore’s contribution (“Bede’s Devotion to Rome: The Periphery Defining the Center,” 199–208), and Alban Gautier (“La table de Bède,” 209–20) concludes the section with an exploration of all the scenes in Bede’s historical and hagiographical writings which mention eating and drinking, suggesting that Bede had specific ideas about the “ideal” and the “social” at the meal.

Bede’s *Nachleben* is the subject of the penultimate section of the book. Christiane Veyrard-Cosme (“Bède dans les *Lettres* d’Alcuin: de la source à l’*Exemplum*,” 223–30) returns to a favorite subject, the letters of Alcuin, and shows that Alcuin refers explicitly to Bede several times in his letters, and uses Bede both as a historical persona and as a source, an author, in his own letters. Michael Perrin (“Bède le Vénérable: une source

invisible de l’*In honorem Sanctae Crucis* de Raban Maur (810),” 231–45) observes that Bede is a major source for Hrabanus Maurus’s *In honorem sanctae crucis*, and the range of works from which Hrabanus drew allows us to imagine what works may have been available at Fulda and Tours, and that the poem may have been an introduction to his exegetical work. John Contreni (“Bede’s Scientific Works in the Carolingian Age,” 247–59) maintains the focus on the Carolingian period, in which Bede was known first and foremost as an expert in the reckoning of time. Contreni examines the tradition of the glossing of *De temporum ratione* in the Carolingian period, and later by Byrhtferth, and what these glosses can tell us about the study of the text. Paul Gerhard Schmidt (“Bède et la tradition des récits visionnaires,” 261–66) compares two versions of a visionary text of Haemgils or Plecgils, one of which, in prose, appears in manuscripts which excerpt Book V of Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica* (Haemgils) and the other, in verse, which appears in the *Miracula Nynie episcopi*. Schmidt edits the prose text from Paris, BN, lat. 2464 and shows its close relationship to the verse version. To close the section, Agnès and Alessandro Arbo (“*Multa anima agit, illa ipsa nesciente*: Notes sur le *musica theorica* attribué à Bède le Vénérable,” 267–80) show that the *Musica theorica*, which Herwagen had published among the authentic works of Bede, is in fact certainly not Bede’s, and that is clear from the content of the treatise, which points more to the twelfth century than the eighth.

The final section of the book addresses the translations of Bede, and, as such, contributions by André Crépin and Sharon Rowley will be found elsewhere [section 4c]. Próinséas Ní Chatháin (“Aspects of Irish Treatment in Some Works of Bede,” 283–87) comments on Irish versions of Bede, including Books I and II of the *Historia ecclesiastica*, and *De locis sanctis*, and includes a diplomatic text of the *Fursa* vision from Dublin, King’s Inns, MS 10, 32C.1. Lastly, Pierre-Yves Lambert (“Les gloses en vieux-breton aux écrits scientifiques de Bède, dans le manuscrit Angers 477,” 309–19) explains how Léon Fleuriot’s edition of the Old Breton glosses to Bede (*DNR, DT, DTR*) in Angers, BM 477 (AD897) tended, through alphabetical arrangement, to obscure the method of the glossators. Lambert is at work on new edition of all the glosses in the manuscript (not just the Old Breton ones) which will present the glosses in order of appearance, and gives here some examples of just what such a presentation can uncover. The volume ends with an “Épilogue” by François Dolbeau (321–9) on recent developments in the study of Bede and their possibilities for new growth, and a “Conclusion” by Stéphane Lebecq (331–4).

Alcuin and the Carolingian Period

Sandra Bruni revisits some of the basic details of Alcuin's *De orthographia* (the first redaction of which she edited in 1997) in her entry on the work in the first volume (2004) of the SISMEL series *La trasmissione dei testi latini del medioevo / Mediaeval Latin Texts and Their Transmission* ("Alcuinus Eboracensis ep.," in *La trasmissione (Te.Tra. 1)*, ed. Chiesa and Castaldi, 14–23), offering a list of editions, a brief discussion of the two redactions and their manuscript witnesses, and an untangling of some of the difficulties that the two versions have occasioned.

In the second volume of the series (2005), Francesca Sara D'Imperio and Rossana Guglielmetti join forces to offer a further entry on Alcuin, this time covering many of his biblical commentaries and several spurious works ("Alcuinus Eboracensis ep.," *La trasmissione (Te.Tra. 2)*, ed. Chiesa and Castaldi: 22–70). D'Imperio and Guglielmetti offer useful information on Alcuin's *Enchiridion* on the Psalms, the *Expositio in Ecclesiasten*, the *Compendium in Canticum Canticorum*, the *Expositio in Iohannis euangelium*, the commentaries on the Pauline epistles, the two dubious works on Apocalypse, and the spurious *Expositio in LXXV Psalmos*, two commentaries on Matthew, and *De septem sigillis*.

M. T. Connaughton ("Alcuin's Computus: A Case for Alcuin's Authorship of *Ratio de luna XV* and *De cursu lunae*," *Quaestio Insularis* 5 [2005 for 2004]: 62–97) rehearses the history of the six short computistical works printed in Migne among the works of Alcuin (*PL* 101.979–1002), and examines the arguments that have been made about their authenticity. When Charles Jones suggested that *De saltu lunae* and *De bissexto* preceded Bede, the other four works, by association, were also thought not to be by Alcuin, though the grouping of the six works together was an invention of the second editor of the collected works of Alcuin (Froben Forster, 1777). Connaughton examines the recent revival of the question, and suggests, on the basis of the manuscripts (one of which was compiled shortly after Alcuin's death in the abbey of his former student Fridugis) and on the basis of the use of computistical terminology—particularly *punctus*, *ostentum*, *bisse* and *trine*—that Alcuin was in fact the author of at least *Ratio de luna XV* and *De cursu lunae*. The article concludes with a critical edition of the two works which collates not only the two surviving manuscripts, but also the early editions of Duchesne, Forster and Migne.

Mary Garrison returns thrice to her favorite subject: Alcuin. Her first effort ("Alcuin and Tibullus," *Poesía latina medieval*, ed. Díaz y Díaz and Díaz de

Bustamente: 749–59) seeks to overturn the notion that there is no evidence for the knowledge of the verse of Tibullus in eighth-century Carolingian poetry. Though Tibullus is twice mentioned by name (by Paul the Deacon and Peter of Pisa) and appears in a booklist of the late eighth century, the earliest manuscripts of his work date from the eleventh century, and no evidence has yet been adduced to support the citation in the booklist. Garrison approaches the question from the point of view of content, arguing that the appearance of the name Delia as a nickname in three of Alcuin's poems (*Carm.* 12, 39 and 40), especially in the context of the *exclusus amator*, suggests familiarity with Tibullus and his poetry (though the situation is of course quite different). Unusually for Alcuin, there are no convincing verbal parallels between the two poets, but Garrison suggests that this is in fact necessary in such an evocation of poetic setting. If the reader is not yet convinced, Garrison offers the further example of Theodulf of Orleans, who seems in his *Carm.* 27 to be reacting to both Alcuin's poem and his "poetic reminiscence of Tibullus."

Garrison's second article ("Quid Hinieldus cum Christo?" in *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O'Brien O'Keefe and Orchard, I:237–59) returns to Alcuin's *Ep.* 124, of particular interest to Anglo-Saxonists for the famous question which she takes as her title. Garrison first cautions that the interpretation of Alcuin's letters, in particular, is not a simple task, as the history of the question from *Ep.* 124 shows. Building on Donald Bullough's dramatic revision of the circumstance of the letter, Garrison considers exactly why a bishop in Mercia in 797 should receive such an admonition as the letter contains. She first demonstrates how 796 marked a turning point in Alcuin's worldview, then analyzes the passage which contains the question in great detail; Garrison rejects the common reading (that the referents in each clause are identical, making the passage tautological) and suggests instead that the passage contains *amplificatio* without *tautologia*, meaning that each successive clause refers "to various different vernacular entertainments emanating from the *scop's* role as royal propagandist, including the recitation of genealogies, king-lists or royal praise poems." Overall, this letter is a "proscription against certain kinds of performance" and "a castigation of an over-cosy alliance between a Mercian bishop and king" (252). [For Garrison's third article, see *Works not Seen*, below.]

Of the two different commentaries on the Song of Songs now attributed to Alcuin, the *recensio longior* [*PL* 100.641–64] and the *recensio breuior* [*PL* 83.1119–32], Rossana Guglielmetti (*Alcuino, Commento al Canticum dei Cantici con i commenti anonimi Vox ecclesie, Vox*

antique ecclesie, *Millennio medievale* 53, testi 13 [Florence: SISMELE Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2004]) edits the shorter, which she argues is the earlier, as well as two related texts, the *Vox ecclesie* and the later *Vox antiquae ecclesie* (the latter derived from the *Vox ecclesie* and from Alcuin).

Fee-Alexandra Haase (“Rhetoric between Praise of the Emperor and Education; The Contributions of Alcuin of York and Rhabanus Maurus for the Early History of Rhetoric in Europe during the *Renovatio* of Charlemagne and the Manuscript *Alcuinus ad Regem*,” *Troianalexandrina* 5: 99–124) writes generally about the works of Alcuin and Hrabanus Maurus, looking particularly at those texts which have to do with the liberal arts and, particularly, rhetoric.

Guido Milanese’s article appears both in Italian and English (the English version is co-authored with Hung Ward-Perkins) in the same journal: “Alcuino, I grammatici e la trasmissione del repertorio gregoriano”/“Alcuin, the Latin Grammars, and the Transmission of the Gregorian Repertoire,” *Polifonie: Storia e teoria della coralità* 1 (2001): 219–35 (Italian) and 237–50 (English). Milanese, building on Kenneth Levy’s arguments about the origins of the “Frankish-Gregorian proper” and its impact on liturgy and music in the Carolingian period, discusses neumatic scripts and particularly the issue of liquescent neumes with <g> for what they can tell us about the development liturgical chant, and possibilities for the influence of Alcuin and his *De orthographia*.

Noting that the “content and inspiration” of the otherworld vision recounted in St. Boniface’s letter to Eadburg have been discussed in detail, Patrick Sims-Williams (“A Recension of Boniface’s Letter to Eadburg about the Monk of Wenlock’s Vision,” in *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O’Brien O’Keeffe and Orchard, I:194–214) turns to the transmission of the text. Sims-Williams dates and contextualizes the letter within Boniface’s correspondence, and considers the possible relationships between the letter and Bede’s account of Drythelm’s vision in the *HE*. After explaining the manuscript situation in detail, Sims-Williams offers the text of the letter from Oxford, Bodleian Library, Fairfax 17 (a recension of the text that has not been printed before) with variants from London, BL, Harley 4719.

MF

Michael Fox provides a review of Alcuin’s career in education and pedagogy in “Alcuin as Exile and Educator: ‘uir undecumque doctissimus,’” in *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O’Brien O’Keeffe and Orchard,

I:215–36. Fox examines Alcuin’s writings to show how he emphasized education, especially grammar and rhetoric, all leading to the ultimate goal—the study of scripture as the word of God. According to Alcuin, God “consented to introduce himself to us after the manner of our speech,” and thus knowledge of scripture is knowledge of God. Yet, as Fox shows, alongside Alcuin’s insistence on education was the imperative to teach, seen by him as a necessary extension of his learning. Thus, many of his writings were composed in response to direct requests, and the number of surviving manuscripts testifies to the popularity and success he had.

Paolo Zanna examines the influence of Aldhelm and Alcuin on the poetic style of Dúngal in “Il carme *Quisquis es hunc cernens: Dúngal, Aldelmo, Alcuino*,” in *Poesía Latina Medieval (Siglos V–XV)*, ed. Díaz y Díaz and Díaz de Bustamente, 863–79. Zanna examines elements such as alliteration and syntax and verbal borrowings before printing the poem and tables comparing the three poets.

As part of an ongoing review of texts attributed Candidus Wizo, a pupil of Alcuin, Christopher A. Jones considers four anonymous and unedited sermons in “The Sermons Attributed to Candidus Wizo,” in *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O’Brien O’Keeffe and Orchard, I:260–83. After a brief review of Wizo’s career, Jones lays out the evidence for a common authorship of three of the sermons, though the case for the fourth is less certain. Though many of the reasons that led Germain Morin to tie these works to Wizo are shown by Jones to have little merit, Jones is nevertheless able to make a plausible case for his authorship, based on doctrinal concerns shared with other works known to have been written by Wizo, and on a connection with the church of St. Servatius at Maastricht, which was under Alcuin’s control.

PGR

Ninth Century

N.J. Higham (“Guthlac’s *Vita*, Mercia and East Anglia in the First Half of the Eighth Century,” in *Æthelbald and Offa*, ed. Hill and Worthington, pp. 85–90; see section 7) looks at Felix’s *Vita Guthlaci* as a source of “evidence for the political perceptions of the East Anglian royal family concerning Æthelbald of Mercia.” Higham notes that Felix was, as perhaps Asser after him, well positioned for the task: Felix was close to the East Anglian court, dependent upon it for patronage, and perhaps also an immigrant from the continent. The first question is why an East Anglian king should order a work on a Mercian saint, when the East Angles would certainly

have had enough candidates of their own. Higham suggests that the *Vita* consistently undermines the stature of Æthelbald, while reserving his praise for his patron, Ælfwald: "dynastic ambitions" might lie behind the commissioning of the text. Higham concludes the article with a look at Felix's treatment of the Britons and how Felix perceived the East Angles within an "English" nation. Overall, Felix's attempt to "secure Guthlac's cult in support of East Anglian kingship did not ultimately prove a success" (89).

Audrey L. Meaney's "Felix's *Life of Guthlac*: History or Hagiography?" (in *Æthelbald and Offa*, ed. Hill and Worthington: 75–84) is, as she puts it, a "brief epitome" of an earlier paper ("Felix's *Life of St Guthlac*: Hagiography and/or Truth," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 90 [2001]: 29–48). Meaney's main purpose is to consider just how much of Felix's account is historical, and to what extent is Felix reshaping and inventing incidents in the life of Guthlac.

Tenth Century

Philip Rusche ("Isidore's *Etymologiae* and the Canterbury Aldhelm Scholia," *JEGP* 104: 437–55) reminds us that if we are looking at any Anglo-Saxon glosses of any kind, be they in Latin or Old English, then their most likely source is Isidore's *Etymologiae*. The *Etymologiae* were not only used as a source for information on Latin lexicography (i.e., in glossaries), but also for "glosses and scholia in the margins of literary texts," including the Bible and classical literature. Certainly, the *Etymologiae* had a "dominant influence" on the glossing of Aldhelm's *Enigmata* and *De uirginitate*. Rusche notes that there were often many stages in the transmission of these "glosses"; as texts were recopied, the glosses were often incorporated into the main text, abbreviated, altered, or translated, and thus it can take some effort to work backward to the original source, or to understand how the later glosses could even have been helpful at all. Here, Rusche is particularly concerned with Canterbury glosses to Aldhelm, mainly in late Anglo-Saxon manuscripts of *De uirginitate* and in glosses in the Third Cleopatra Glossary, and he considers some of these in detail. It may be that it was standard, as early as the late seventh century, for the *Etymologiae* to circulate in epitome form, as Rusche argues for further evidence of an Isidorean epitome embedded in the First Cleopatra Glossary and the Antwerp-London Glossary. All of this evidence "should confirm that Isidore of Seville was one of the most dominant figures in Anglo-Saxon literary criticism" (455).

MF

Shannon Ambrose examines "The *Collectio Canonis Hibernensis* and the Literature of the Anglo-Saxon Benedictine Reform," *Viator* 36: 107–18. Like Amalarius's *Liber officialis*, the *Hibernensis* is one of the texts transmitted to England from Brittany during the early years of the tenth century, whereupon it played an important role to the Benedictine reformers who were intent on reestablishing ecclesiastical standards and canonical law. Ambrose shows how the collection of canons was plumbed by Oda of Canterbury for his *Constitutiones*, perhaps by Dunstan at Glastonbury (but certainly when he got to Canterbury), and at Worcester. Wulfstan and Ælfric too both looked to the *Hibernensis* in their attempts to regulate Christian discipline. Ambrose finds echoes of the work in Wulfstan's *Institutes of Polity* and perhaps in Ælfric's *Letter to Brother Edward* among other works. It is worth noting that in none of these places is there recognition of the text's Irishness; rather, it is its position as a continental import that lends it the authority to function as a repository of canon law for the reformers.

Paul Cavill revisits the question of the historical accuracy of Abbo's account of the death of King Edmund in "Fun and Games: Viking Atrocity in the *Passio Sancti Eadmundi*," *N&Q* n.s. 52: 284–86. Dorothy Whitelock and Ian McDougall, though accepting the influence of earlier hagiography, have suggested that Abbo's account is "basically historical and reliable," both because of the existence of an eye-witness, the *armiger*, and because Vikings are elsewhere described as taking pleasure in such "playful sadism." Cavill instead sees a resemblance to the death of Saul and his *armiger* at the hands of the Philistines, and Saul's request that his weapon bearer kill him so that he will not be mocked by his enemies, as the more probable source. Thus, according to Cavill, "The details of the torture of Edmund borrow from hagiographical martyrdoms, but the *idea* that such torture might be 'monstrous sport' is from the Bible (286). In other words, Abbo was making no attempt to achieve historical verisimilitude.

Michael Lapidge provides a thorough entry on the Frithegod in *La trasmissione dei testi latini del Medioevo*, ed. Chiesa and Castaldi, 134–45. Lapidge begins with the *Breuiiloquium uitae Wilfridi*, the most well-known of the six works by Frithegod listed by Bale in the seventeenth century. Lapidge suggests that the corrections in BL Cotton Claudius A.i are by Frithegod himself and should form the basis of any new edition of the text. Though some of the works listed by Bale are either lost or remain unidentified, several others have been transmitted anonymously both in England and on the continent. Lapidge notes the production of

many of the manuscripts containing these works in or near Aquitaine, suggesting that after the death of Oda of Canterbury, Frithegod returned to Francia, perhaps as a canon at Brioude.

One of the poems ascribed to Frithegod is edited and translated by Rosalind Love in “Frithegod of Canterbury’s Maundy Thursday Hymn,” *ASE* 34: 219–36. The evidence to ascribe “Dum pietas multimoda” to Frithegod rests upon Patrick Young’s description of some now-lost verses in a Salisbury manuscript (now Dublin, Trinity College 174) and Bale’s catalogue. Since Bale misquoted the opening line, however, the poem has gone unascribed until now, in spite of being edited three times. Love notes that there is little evidence to ascribe the poem to Frithegod besides the testimony of Bale and Young, and in fact the poem shows a clear departure from Frithegod’s other poems by not displaying the same exuberant usage of grecisms and hermeneutic vocabulary. While this may suggest that Frithegod was not in fact the author of the poem, Love makes the intriguing suggestion that Frithegod may have been “skilled enough to be able to modulate his tone so as to produce poetry that is very much more restrained than the extreme hermeneutic posturing of the *Breuilquium*.”

Wojtek Jezierski reexamines the narrative and genealogical style of Æthelweard’s *Chronicle* in an attempt to rescue it from those who find its Latin less than appealing in “Æthelweardus Redivivus,” *EME* 13: 159–78. Jezierski concentrates on Æthelweard’s retelling of the *Adventus saxonum*, mixing elements from Bede, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and his own knowledge to create a more epic story of the founding of England, complete with allusions to Vergil’s *Aeneid*. Other features of the chronicle, such as the book divisions, concentration on genealogy, and use of dates, also show Æthelweard’s efforts to transform the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* into a literary narrative, and should inspire students to view the work as more than just a supplement to the ASC.

In “An Undiscovered Riddle in Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale MS 1828–1830,” *ELN* 43.2: 8–14, Tony Perrello prints a previously unpublished Latin riddle that includes an Old English word, *hus*. Like many Anglo-Latin riddles, this one delights in phonetic word-play, revolving around the words *thus*, *rus*, *mus*, and the OE *hus*, and Perrello makes the plausible suggestion, especially given the manuscript context, that its main source was a passage in Ælfric’s *Grammar* that lists words ending in *-us*.

Helmut Gneuss provides a lengthy and very thorough review of David Porter’s *Excerptiones de Prisciano*

(Cambridge: Brewer, 2002) in “The First Edition of the Source of Ælfric’s *Grammar*,” *Anglia* 123: 246–59. Gneuss notes a few errors of citation and errors in the edition and translation, but does not take issue with Porter’s claims in the introduction, such as his tentative suggestion that Ælfric himself may have compiled the *Excerptiones*.

One of the manuscripts of the *Excerptiones*, now split between Antwerp and London, contains a Latin text of Ælfric’s *Colloquy*, which Joyce Hill edits for the first time in “Ælfric’s *Colloquy*: The Antwerp/London Version,” in *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O’Brien O’Keefe and Orchard, II:331–48. Hill suggests that this version, like the other two known copies of the text, also displays various editorial changes by Ælfric Bata. Hill prints the text using bold type to signify the differences from the Tiberius version of the *Colloquy*, which she says contains fewer signs of Ælfric Bata’s modifications.

Patrizia Lendinara in “Un ritmo dei Carmina Cantabrigensia,” in *Poetry of the Early Medieval Europe: Manuscripts, Language and Music of the Rhythmical Latin Texts*, ed. Edoardo D’Angelo and Francesco Stella (Florence: SISMEL Edizione del Galluzzo, 2003), 63–73, studies a poem found in the Cambridge Songs manuscript as well as in Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, LXXXVIII, a ninth-century manuscript written perhaps at St. Denis. She considers the poem, *Vestiunt silve tenera ramorum*, a religious poem in praise of Mary.

Michael Lapidge gives a synopsis of the transmission history of Wulfstan’s *Breuilquium de omnibus sanctis*, the *Narratio metrica de sancto Swithuno*, and the *Vita sancti Æthelwoldi* in *La trasmissione dei testi latini del Medioevo*, ed. Chiesa and Castaldi, 439–47. Also included among Wulfstan’s works are five hymns on Winchester saints, including two on St. Swithun and one on Æthelwold. Finally, given his position as precentor at Old Minster, Winchester, Wulfstan may well have been the author of a number of tropes and sequences found in the two Winchester troper.

The Latin homilies in Bodley 343 are studied by Aidan Conti, *Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha: A Previously Unidentified Homiliary in an Old English Manuscript*, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 343 (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 2004). Conti identifies the collection of sermons as the Homiliary of Angers, though presented in different order than found in other manuscripts of the homiliary. Conti discusses the sermons and their relationship to the other manuscripts of the homiliary, as well as several sermons unique to Bodley 343, including a previously unknown translation of Pseudo-Eusebius Alexandrinus’s *De Christi passione*.

Conti's suggestion that the Homiliary was available in England before the Conquest is supported by the identification of the Taunton fragments as another copy of the Homiliary of Angers in Helmut Gneuss's "The Homiliary of the Taunton Fragments," *N&Q* n.s. 52: 440–42. The fragments, published in 2004 by Mechthild Gretsch, contain portions of four sermons written in the eleventh century and are in both Latin and Old English, representing a bilingual expansion of the homiliary.

Elizabeth Tyler studies the complex interplay of notions of fiction and history as presented in the *Encomium Emma Reginae*. In "Fictions of Family: The *Encomium Emma Reginae* and Virgil's *Aeneid*," *Viator* 36: 149–79, Tyler explores the difficulty the encomiast would have experienced in praising Emma to a contemporary audience who would be well aware of the places in which his history departed from a "factual" account of the events. Thus, in the prologue and through the text, the author makes references to ideas of fiction and poetry as new models in which to present narrative, one that is not necessarily less "true" than an historical account. He turns in particular to the *Aeneid*, written in order to praise Octavian, not by recounting events of Octavian's life but through fictional and poetic narrative of Aeneas's journey to Italy. (Also reviewed in section 7.)

Liturgical Studies

Christopher A. Jones presents a detailed discussion of the little-studied Chrism mass in late Anglo-Saxon and early Anglo-Norman England in two articles. In the first, "The Chrism Mass in Late Anglo-Saxon England," in *The Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Helen Gittos and M. Bradford Bedingfield, HBS Subsidia V (London: Boydell), 105–42, Jones provides an overview of the Maundy Thursday mass for the Holy Oils as it developed on the continent in the Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries and the *Ordines Romani*, before turning to the variation on these forms found in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. Not only do the Anglo-Saxons preserve the Romano-Frankish traditions and the somewhat newer traditions found in the Romano-German pontificals, but new types appear such as the so-called *breviculum* type, which survives today only in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, and the Canterbury type, first found in Christ Church manuscripts of the eleventh century. It is the development of the Canterbury type that is the focus of his second article, "The Origins of the 'Sarum' Chrism Mass at Eleventh-Century Christ Church, Canterbury," *MS* 67: 219–315. Here Jones

identifies three stages of revisions the mass underwent from the eleventh to the twelfth centuries, each involving extensive reworking of the rituals by the liturgical experts at Canterbury. The liturgy is also provided with a commentary that discusses the typological associations of the liturgical elements, which, as Jones points out, seems independent of Amalarius or other major commentaries on the liturgy. Jones prints a working text of each of the three stages of the mass in the Appendix, allowing one to see the growth of the ritual over the years.

In "A Palm Sunday Sermon from Eleventh-Century Salisbury," in *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O'Brien O'Keeffe and Orchard, II:180–96, Thomas N. Hall examines four unpublished Latin sermons preserved in London, BL, Cotton Tiberius C.i, an eleventh-century copy of the Romano-German Pontifical that was first copied in Germany and then supplemented by other liturgical material, including Latin and Old English sermons, at Sherborne and then later at Salisbury. One of the unpublished sermons, that for Palm Sunday, exists in a manuscript known to have been copied at Salisbury, strongly implying that the four unpublished Latin sermons in Tiberius C.i also were written there. The Palm Sunday sermon, which Hall edits and translates, is also noteworthy in that it reveals knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England of John the Deacon's *Vita Gregorii Magni*, and is apparently the earliest text to illustrate such knowledge.

In "Rending the Garment and Reading by the Rood: *Regularis concordia* Rituals for Men and Women," in *The Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Gittos and Bedingfield, 53–64, Joyce Hill examines an Old English translation of the *Regularis Concordia* in CCC 201 that seems to have been altered to apply to female religious. The first section Hill examines describes a dramatic performance of the rending of Christ's garment to be reenacted in the church. Both the Latin and Old English versions mention the previous placing of a cloth on the altar, but the Old English translation notes that the cloth should be previously "sewn-together," presumably making it easier for the deacons to rip it apart at the dramatic moment. The occurrence of such reenactments must have presented problems for women in Anglo-Saxon England, whose ability to perform in liturgical roles was far more limited than that of males. Nevertheless, the Old English translation specifies the reading by a lectrix during the Maundy Thursday ceremonies, though in the refectory and not in the church.

The literacy of women is also the subject of Mary Jane Morrow's essay "Sharing Texts: Anselmian Prayers, a

Nunnery's Psalter and the Role of Friendship," in *Voices in Dialogue: Reading Women in the Middle Ages*, ed. Linda Olson and Kathryn Kerby-Fulton (Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P), 97–113. Morrow begins by noting the presence of two prayers by Anselm in the twelfth-century Shaftesbury Psalter. From surviving letters it is possible that Anselm had the same type of close, supportive relationship with Abbess Eulalia that he is known to have had with other prominent women, and that he may even have sent copies of his prayer compositions to her as he did to Matilda of Tuscany. Such sharing of texts between male and female religious seems to have been quite common in the eleventh and twelfth centuries and lends more support to the existence of a large community of literate women throughout England.

Post-Conquest Anglo-Latin

Rosalind Love continues her studies on Goscelin with a translation of "The Life of St Wulfsgie of Sherborne by Goscelin of Saint-Bertin," in *St Wulfsgie and Sherborne: Essays to Celebrate the Millennium of the Benedictine Abbey 998–1998*, ed. Katherine Barker, David A. Hinton and Alan Hunt (Oxford: Oxbow Books), 98–123. She also contributes a study on another of his Saint's Lives to the Lapidage *Festschrift*. In "Et quis me tanto oneri parem faciet?": Goscelin of Saint-Bertin and the Life of St Amelberga," *Latin Learning and English Lore*, ed. O'Brien O'Keefe and Orchard, II:232–52, Love strengthens the case that Goscelin was the author of the *Vita S. Amelberge*. Attribution of the work to Goscelin is slightly circular, in that it largely depends on also attributing to him the *Vita S. Werburge*—both saints are presented controlling flocks of unruly geese. As Love examines the prose style and diction of the Life she makes a convincing argument that it is indeed by Goscelin, making it his earliest attempt at hagiography, written presumably before he came to England in the 1060s.

Goscelin is also the subject of O'Brien O'Keefe's essay in the same volume, "Edith's Choice," II.253–74. O'Brien O'Keefe looks at Goscelin's portrayal of the baby Edith choosing the veil rather than the golden crowns and ornaments that had been laid before her, signifying her own decision to enter the convent even though only a baby at the time. One of the reasons for Goscelin's inclusion of this story and his emphasis on the significance of accepting the veil is probably the contemporary anxiety over the decisions of noble women to live as nuns to escape the threat of marriage to those of the growing Norman seignorial class looking for heiresses.

Goscelin's most famous work is studied by Rebecca Hayward in "Representations of the Anchoritic Life in Goscelin of Saint-Bertin's *Liber confortatorius*," in *Anchorites, Wombs and Tombs: Intersections of Gender and Enclosure in the Middle Ages*, ed. Liz Herbert McAvoy and Mari Hughes-Edwards (Cardiff: U of Wales P), 54–64. Goscelin recounts the stories of famous hermits such as Paul, Anthony, Mary and others to give not only spiritual guidance but also a sense of scope and history to Eve after her departure to live as an anchorite in France. More startling perhaps is his use of otherwise unknown stories, like the "hairy anchorite" Alexander. He had sex with a girl he had raised and then killed her to avoid the shame of his crime. As the uncorrupted body of the girl implies forgiveness for Alexander, Hayward suggests, Goscelin, suffering perhaps from a bit of male guilt, is recasting the Adam and Eve story to remove blame from the female as is so commonly found in other works.

Medieval letter collections have been a growing area of scholarly interest lately, and Lena Wahlgren-Smith examines how such a collection was put together in "On the Composition of Herbert Losinga's Letter Collection," *Classica et Medievalia* 55 (2004): 229–46. Wahlgren-Smith examines the letters for signs that they were dictated rather than physically written by Herbert himself. Like many of the other authors of letter collections, Herbert seems to have directed that the letters be gathered together but does not seem to have revised them as extensively as some authors do. Nevertheless, in spite of their rather pedestrian nature, he appears to have considered the collection a literary and edifying work.

Two translations of twelfth-century historical works were published in 2005. Janet Fairweather has translated the massive *Liber Eliensis: A History of the Isle of Ely from the Seventh Century to the Twelfth Compiled by a Monk of Ely* (Woodbridge: Boydell). Several smaller works by Aelred of Rievaulx were translated by Jane Patricia Freeland: *Aelred of Rievaulx: The Historical Works* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications). Two of the works included, "The Genealogy of the Kings of the English" and "The Life of Saint Edward, King and Confessor," concern pre-Conquest history. These works, addressed to King Henry II, provide examples to him of his ancestors as guides to being a moral, Christian ruler, and reveal ways in which the twelfth-century historians reworked their sources for their own ends.

Stephen Matthews discusses the thirteenth-century Life of Harold in "The Content and Construction of the *Vita Haroldi*," in *King Harold II and the Bayeux Tapestry*, ed. Gale Owen-Crocker, Publ. of the Manchester Center

for Anglo-Saxon Studies (Woodbridge: Boydell), 65–73. Like most of the historical works written in this period, the *Life* reveals more of the concerns of the time in which it was composed than an effort to portray what we would consider the factual details of the historical period. The *Vita Haroldi* actually suggests that Harold lived through the Battle of Hastings, eventually ending up as a hermit near Waltham Abbey. Matthews shows how the compiler wove together, somewhat clumsily, various accounts from Chester and Waltham, to produce a history of the saint that downplayed or even contradicted current Waltham claims that Harold was buried there in favor of Chester's own claims to be the saint's resting place.

The boom in history writing in the eleventh and twelfth century presented some problems for historians of "nostra modernitas," as Walter Map put it, when considering time in a linear progression from past to present to future. Although the future seems to hold a symmetrical relation to the past from the viewpoint of the historian, its inability to be known and narrated creates for the historian "an uneasiness about one's own limited and precarious epistemological position" (46). In "Prolixitas Temporum: Futurity in Medieval Historical Narratives," in *Reading Medieval Culture: Essays in Honor of Robert W. Hanning*, ed. Robert M. Stein and Sandra Pierson Prior (Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P), 45–67, Monika Otter examines three narratives "that use futurity to sketch a way around the dead stop of the present" (47): Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum*

Britanniae, the anonymous *Life of King Edward Who Rests at Westminster*, and Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*. Otter shows how the first two use prophecies to extend their narratives into the future—both a future that is contained in the reader's past and one that is future to the reader as well. In this way the author avoids the uneasy closure that the end of his narrative in the present would otherwise entail. Henry of Huntingdon delays the closure of his text not through prophecy or narrative but by addressing readers a thousand years in the future, turning an *ubi sunt* passage into *ubi fuerimus* questions.

PGR

Works not seen

Bovendeert, Jasmijn. "Beda's deugdenkwartet." *Madoc: Tijdschrift over de Middeleeuwen* 19: 36–46, ill.

Garrison, Mary. "Getting Acquainted with a Medieval Man: Alcuin of York and His Letters." *Zmanim: A Historical Quarterly* (Tel Aviv) 89: 72–77, ill. [in Hebrew]

Meens, Rob. "Troubles in Tours: The Conflict between Alcuin and Theodulf of Orléans over a Sinful Cleric." *Zmanim: A Historical Quarterly* (Tel Aviv) 89: 84–89, ill. [in Hebrew; cf. his development of the same argument, "Sanctuary, Penance, and Dispute Settlement under Charlemagne: The Conflict between Alcuin and Theodulf of Orleans over a Sinful Cleric." *Speculum* 82.2 (2007): 277–300]

6. Manuscripts, Illuminations, Charters

Jane Roberts, *Guide to Scripts Used in English Writings up to 1500* (London: British Library), is an exceptionally beautiful volume as well as an extremely useful one. Tailored to the needs of programmes in medieval English literature, its seventy black-and-white and twelve colour plates focus on the manuscripts of significant literary texts; it ranges from "Cædmon's Hymn" in the St Petersburg Bede to the sixteenth-century manuscript of the "Digby Play of Mary Magdalene," by way of such literary milestones as the Exeter Book, the *Pearl* manuscript, and the Winchester Malory. The book is divided by script type arranged chronologically (covered are the 'Insular background'; Anglo-Saxon minuscule; English Caroline minuscule; Protogothic; and three forms of Gothic: *textualis*, *anglicana*, and Secretary). Each of the more than sixty examples comprises a full-page plate and a transcript (usually facing); the discussion of each hand is moderately but not

impenetrably technical; palaeographical terms are defined in the introduction to each section or in the text accompanying the plates; and elements such as punctuation, lineation, and pointing are all discussed. Included are also several images of illumination and illustrations. The book would, in short, be ideal as a base-text for graduate or even advanced undergraduate classes in medieval literature and the history of the book (and is reasonably priced enough for this to be feasible); it is also quite helpful for anyone wishing to develop competence in reading a variety of medieval English book-hands.

Michelle Brown, "Fifty Years of Insular Palaeography, 1953–2003: an Outline of Some Landmarks and Issues," *Archiv für Diplomatik* 50 (2004): 277–325, provides an accessible overview of the personalities, publications, and debates which shaped the study of the palaeography and codicology of Britain and Ireland ca.

500–900 during the last half of the twentieth century. Brown focuses particularly on E. A. Lowe's *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, the work of Julian Brown, and the fluctuating controversies surrounding the date and place of origin of the Lindisfarne Gospels (a subject on which she is peculiarly qualified to speak: and indeed the facsimiles of the Lindisfarne Gospels are discussed in detail at 290–6). This would be an extremely useful reading assignment for a graduate seminar—and indeed anyone wishing for an entry into the study of palaeography—as it provides a wide-ranging bibliography together with its survey of scholarship (297–325). Also of note in the same volume is David Ganz, “The Study of Caroline Minuscule 1953–2004” (387–98), which focuses on the Continent, but is of obvious relevance to the study of Anglo-Saxon palaeography, and also includes a substantial (if not quite as monumental) bibliography on its topic.

Another historical survey, William O'Sullivan, “Manuscripts and Palaeography,” in *A New History of Ireland: I. Prehistoric and Early Ireland*, ed. Dáibhí Ó Cróinín (Oxford: Oxford UP), 511–48, is a dense, magisterial, and occasionally personal overview of the development of Irish script from its earliest beginnings to the twelfth century. The discussion, which follows the tangled threads of Irish scribal presences in Britain and on the Continent, as well as in Ireland, contains detailed descriptions of individual hands as well as encapsulated summaries of relevant historical developments: this means the article can be read in isolation from the rest of the volume, and indeed from the plates, although there are fortunately many of the latter (occasionally with muddled reference-numbers). Though providing a broad outline of the formation of Insular majuscule and minuscule scripts, O'Sullivan is particularly concerned to stress the complexity of this period, and the dangers of trying to force the evidence into too rigid a scheme of development (e.g., “Such a variety of scripts, all more or less contemporary, must alert us again to the dangers and difficulties of trying to use insular script for dating...” 525). As the editor notes in the preface, O'Sullivan died in 2000, and the bibliography (which is substantial, but not exhaustive) seems to contain no works more recent than 1998. Despite this, “Manuscripts and Palaeography” provides a level of scope and detail that should ensure it remains useful to scholars for some years.

Richard Gameson, “La Normandie et l'Angleterre au XI^e siècle: le témoignage des manuscrits,” in *La Normandie et l'Angleterre au Moyen Âge*, ed. Pierre Bouet and Véronique Gazeau (Caen: CRAHM, 2003), 129–59, provides an overview of Norman influence on the contents

of eleventh-century English libraries and the style of post-Conquest English book production (146–51), but focuses primarily on the reverse context: Anglo-Saxon influence in Normandy. As Gameson demonstrates, English books were by no means merely known as spoils of war, for a number of high-grade, often beautifully written and illuminated manuscripts crossed the Channel well before 1066, most likely as part of an established book trade (139). The influence of their script on Norman book-hands was minimal (141–2), but the effect of Anglo-Saxon styles of illumination was felt into the twelfth century, and indeed re-imported to England along with Norman ecclesiastics (150). Gameson provides a detailed outline of the ways in which English initials, frames, and miniatures affected Norman styles (142–6): this is very helpfully illustrated with fifteen full-color plates in addition to the eight black-and-white figures. He concludes that “considering the eleventh century as a whole and with the advantage of hindsight, the two countries were considerably enriched by their contact” (151). Gameson also appends an annotated list of the twenty-two Anglo-Saxon manuscripts which reached Normandy during the tenth and eleventh centuries (152–9).

Partly an addendum to the author's 1999 ASE article (“The Earliest Texts with English and French”) and 2002 edition of the *Excerptiones de Prisciano*, David W. Porter, “Another French Word from an Anglo-Saxon Manuscript,” *NM* 106: 23–5, is also a veiled plea for better lighting in the manuscripts room at the Bibliothèque nationale. As the author relates, a second look at the manuscript of the *Excerptiones* (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, nouv. acq. lat. 586) during summer revealed some dry-point glosses illegible during an overcast week in January (23), and—in addition to a better reading of an inked gloss on *peripatasma* (‘paratura’, it seems, not ‘paruure’: 25) and two new dry-point Latin glosses unconnected to the text (24)—the Old French gloss *i. gravirs* to *serpere repere* has turned up. This provides the earliest known attestation of this word, as well as a slightly different meaning for it, but the author argues that *gravirs* was most likely added at the same time as the other Old French glosses in this manuscript, about the middle of the eleventh century (24).

Joshua A. Westgard, “Manuscripts of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich,” in *Angelsächsisches Erbe in München: Angelsächsische Handschriften, Schreiber und Autoren aus den Beständen der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek in München / Anglo-Saxon Heritage in Munich: Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts, Scribes and Authors from the Collections of the Bavarian State Library in Munich*,

edited by Hans Sauer with Birgit Ebersperger, Carolin Schreiber and Angelika Schröcker (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang), 89–100, provides a look at two Humanist manuscripts of the *Historia ecclesiastica*, one (Clm 1207) produced at the reformed monastery at Tegernsee in the late fifteenth century, and the other (Clm 118) written in Italy in 1549 and owned by Johann Fugger (images and detailed descriptions of both these books are given 94–7, 99–100). Both, interestingly, contain annotations calling special attention to miraculous visions; and the variants shown in their text “would seem to support the conclusion that the German and Italian textual provinces [of the *HE*] are closely related” (93). Westgard also discusses excerpts from the *HE*, and gives a list of manuscripts in which these occur (94, 97).

In “The Oldest Lists of Latin Books,” *Scriptorium* 58 (2004): 48–63 + plates, Michael M. Gorman begins with an interesting sketch of the many forms that early lists of books could take, and the many purposes which they might serve: he distinguishes catalogues, in which books are regarded as repositories of knowledge, from inventories, in which they appear merely as property (48–9), and in the course of the article also notes the separate genres of author-lists (which say nothing about the composition of physical volumes) and lending-lists. In pursuit of the genesis of the true catalogue—which he defines as a list which “aimed to achieve completeness in describing a collection of books, even though it might not have succeeded,” and in which “the holdings are presented in a useful order” (48), Gorman examines the three oldest surviving book lists, all of them in Anglo-Saxon scripts: one from the cathedral in Würzburg ca. 800 (Oxford, Laud. misc. 126, fol. 1); that from the monastery at Fulda, slightly before 800 (Basel F.III.15a, fols. 17v–18); and, most importantly, that in an eighth- or ninth-century Anglo-Saxon hand in an Italian collection of Augustine’s homilies, written c. 600: Vatican Pal. lat. 210, fol. 1. This last list, Gorman argues, may well have been written in Canterbury Christ Church, and if so, Pal. lat. 210 may have been brought to England by Theodore and Hadrian, before returning to the Continent sometime in the ninth century (56–62). He further offers the hypothesis that the compiling of book-lists may have originated in Anglo-Saxon England, and indeed suggests a mode of testing this: “It would be useful to pursue the investigation into the ninth century in order to verify whether library catalogues turn up more frequently at Anglo-Saxon foundations on the continent than elsewhere” (61, n. 49).

This year’s bibliography also saw a number of studies of individual manuscripts. Francisco Jose Alvarez Lopez, “The Palaeography of Oxford, Corpus Christi

College, 197,” *Proceedings of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies Postgraduate Conference* (1: 1–8, online), gives an overview of the palaeographical and codicological features of the oldest manuscript of the bilingual version of the Benedictine rule. As the author has noted (2), the manuscript has often been studied before, and the description given does not venture beyond the details found in Ker’s *Catalogue* and Dumville’s *English Caroline Script*. As this is such an important book for the Benedictine Reform period, though, it may well be handy for students to have a précis of this information on the web (though it should be noted that some change of format seems to have disarranged the author’s cross-references).

Aidan Conti, “Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha: A Previously Unidentified Homiliary in an Old English Manuscript, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 343” (PhD diss., Univ. of Toronto, 2004), *DAI* 65A (2005), 3796, is testimony to the discoveries that can still be made even in relatively well-studied manuscripts. Conti demonstrates that the Latin homilies on fols. xi–xxxix of Bodley 343—a book well known for its late Old English sermon collection, including versions of Ælfrician texts—are largely derived from the Carolingian “Homiliary of Angers,” and represent the first known English copy of this text, which seems to have been relatively popular across the Continent in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. This was not previously recognized in part because the text of the homiliary has been studied in detail only relatively recently, and partly because the Bodley 343 version represents a deliberate rearrangement of its contents. In his second chapter, Conti’s close study of the gathering structure and contents of Bodley 343 allows him to conclude that “the Homiliary of Angers was an integral part of the Bodley manuscript at the time of initial composition,” and that “it seems reasonable to present a working hypothesis that posits that the Homiliary of Angers, like other items in Bodley 343, was available in England before the Conquest” (111). Moreover, among the Latin sermons in the book which were not derived from the Homiliary of Angers, Conti has discovered the first known independently circulating Latin version of pseudo-Eusebius Alexandrinus’s *De Christi passione*, which includes an account of the Harrowing of Hell (it was actually the *only* known independent Latin version, until Conti found that Cambridge, St. John’s College MS C.12 also contains the text: 211–12). In his chapter 4, Conti provides a study of the text and a close comparison of the Bodley version with the Greek. There are also four appendices, containing a semi-diplomatic text of the Bodley sermons; a collation of the text with

the reconstructed homiliary of Angers; a comparison of the order of texts in different witnesses to the homiliary; and a study of item xviii, a note on the genealogy of James the son of Alpheus. This dissertation is a massive contribution, not only to our knowledge of a manuscript witness to a major transitional phase in English culture, but to medieval sermon studies generally.

Tracey-Anne Cooper, "The Homilies of a Pragmatic Archbishop's Handbook in Context: Cotton Tiberius A.iii," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 28: 47–64, deals with the rationale behind the selection of homilies in the eleventh-century miscellany of the title. Arguing from the inclusion of a form for the *examinatio* of an incumbent bishop that Tiberius A.iii was compiled as a commonplace book for an archbishop of Canterbury (she suggests Lyfing or Æthelnoth as the instigator of the collection), Cooper examines the collection of homilies in the manuscript for signs of the texts' intended role. As a whole, she writes, the group of homilies "provides not only a fascinating insight into pastoral care and lay piety in the early eleventh century, but also demonstrates the ways in which older texts were used as malleable resources in this period" (49). The homilies in Tiberius A.iii seem to be all attested elsewhere (the chart in the appendix is somewhat difficult to read); Cooper believes that the textual modifications and overall arrangement demonstrate a collection intended for the basic instruction of a catechumen (or the generally ignorant), and suggests that the "collection would be an ideal pastoral package for an archbishop to pass on to his new bishops" (60). If I understand this correctly, Cooper is here suggesting that Tiberius A.iii was, in part, intended as an exemplar for the dissemination of these texts: if so, the eccentric orthography of this book may well have left a traceable mark on any descendants. It is not always clear in this article, though, whether the oddities in Old English were due to scribal or typographical errors (e.g. "nanunum lof," n. 21), and the translations are sometimes inexact. "The Homilies" is derived from the author's doctoral thesis, "Reconstructing a Deconstructed Manuscript, Community and Culture: London, BL MS Cotton Tiberius A. III" (Ph.D. Diss., Boston College: DAI 66A (2005), 1911), which I have not been able to examine in full; the dissertation also examines the manuscript's non-homiletic texts, as well as its overall structure, and the historical and cultural circumstances of its compilation.

Also working with a Cotton manuscript is Guillaume Schiltz, "Der Canterburypruch oder 'Wie finden dänische Runen und englische Komputistik zusammen?' Ein Beitrag zur historischen Textlinguistik," in *Riddles, Knights, and Cross-Dressing Saints*, ed. Thomas

Honegger (Bern: Peter Lang, 2004), 115–38. This is an interesting attempt to use text-linguistics to deduce the origins and connections of a rather peculiar text. The 'Canterbury Charm' is written in Danish runes along the bottom margin of fols. 123v–124r in BL, Cotton Caligula A.xv, a composite manuscript; the part in question contains mostly computistical texts and dates to the later eleventh century (122–5). Schiltz's goal is to study this text using the methodological apparatus devised by de Beaugrande and Dressler, by way of Gaberell (this is outlined in detail, 115–19). Essentially, this consists of assessing the text against three sets of criteria: its internal form (cohesion and coherence); its external form and significance (informativity, intertextuality, and situationality); and pragmatic criteria (intentionality and acceptability). In the course of this analysis, Schiltz compares the runic charm to other Old English charms in the manuscript, and concludes that it *can* function as a text, which makes it more likely that it arrived in England during the first half of the eleventh century (134–5). Although Schiltz acknowledges that the question of whether a runic inscription is really a text, functioning according to the proposed criteria, is somewhat difficult (126), it seems to me that the principles he outlines could have more to say on the question of "secret writing" than is provided here.

Rebecca Rushforth, "The Bury Psalter and the Descendants of Edward the Exile" (*ASE* 34: 255–61), deals with two hexametrical obits in the calendar of the Bury Psalter (Rome, BAV, Reg. lat. 12), one for "King Edgar" and one for "Christina." After a brief description of the manuscript itself (255), Rushforth identifies these figures with Edgar, king of Scotland (1097–1107) and Christina, his aunt, sister of Queen Margaret of Scotland and also a descendant of Edward the Exile, nephew of Edward the Confessor. In condensed form, Rushforth gives a sketch of relations between the remnants of the royal house of Wessex and the Scottish royalty (256–8, interesting also to readers of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*) and outlines the strong ties the East Anglian foundations—including Bury—had to their Anglo-Saxon roots well after the Conquest (259–60). She concludes that

[t]hese obits in the Bury Psalter may perhaps attest to some connection between that house, or some individual who had retired there, and David Count of Huntingdon; or they may simply show continuing interest in that part of the world in the fates of the descendants of the house of Wessex. Their survival in this context, far from Edgar's Scottish kingdom and

Christina's monastic home in Wessex, demonstrates the complicated dynastic relationships of Anglo-Norman England. (261)

The Bury Psalter also makes a guest appearance in Rebecca Rushforth and Nicholas Orchard, "A Lost Eleventh-Century Missal from Bury St Edmunds Abbey," *Bodleian Library Record* 18: 565–76. As the authors state,

The back board of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 356 (*Summary Catalogue* 2716) carries an offset impression of a lost pastedown. This is the only remaining trace of a large and ostentatious Missal produced at Bury St Edmunds Abbey in the second half of the eleventh century. (565)

Bodley 356 still bears the medieval Bury classmark on the spine of its fourteenth-century binding (566), and though the bifolium formerly covering the back board has been lost, the script of the impression it left is still moderately legible (a photograph is printed at 565). The large, round display script is similar to several high-grade books produced at Bury in the third quarter of the eleventh century: the authors compare the sacramentary fragment Cambridge, Pembroke College, MS 313/20, and the St Edmund cult-book BL, Cotton Tiberius B.ii (567), but the book whose script most closely resembles that of the offset is the Bury Psalter (568–9). The text of the Bodley 356 offset (the first and fourth pages on a sheet which formed the middle of a quire) is printed 572–3, and an analysis of its liturgical function is provided. The text represents parts of two Masses, one for the Commons of a confessor, and one from the Commons of two or more confessors (569), the latter with a rather rare set of prayers which stems ultimately from Saint-Denis: perhaps, it is suggested, via the activities of St. Oswald (571). The authors conclude with the hopeful sentiment that more traces of this lost missal may eventually resurface (573).

Englische Sprachwissenschaft und Mediävistik: Standpunkte—Perspektiven—Neue Wege, ed. Gabriele Knappe, Bamberger Beiträge zur Englischen Sprachwissenschaft 48 (Frankfurt: Peter Lang), presents the results of a two-day conference held at Bamberg in 2004. "Cotton Tiberius C.i and the Question of (Public) Penance in Late Anglo-Saxon England," 337–50, is derived from a poster presentation by Angelika Schröcker, and focuses on one aspect of the author's doctoral project, a collected edition and study of all the shorter Old English penitential texts (potentially a very useful contribution). After

an overview of the debate concerning confession and the practice of public penance in Anglo-Saxon England (339–42), Schröcker makes the point that "episcopal prerogative can therefore be taken as a prerequisite for distinguishing the rite of public penance from all other forms of penance" (342). So, in pursuit of public penance, she turns to a pontifical, London, BL, Cotton Tiberius C.i, an eleventh-century book formed of English accretions to a German core-text, which probably belonged to Herman, bishop of Sherborne from 1058 to 1078, and was taken with him to Salisbury (343–6). Schröcker focuses on one short form of confession (a prose text with the DOE short title Conf 9.1), and finds that the text's direct address to a bishop, and switch from the first person singular to first person plural, might indeed indicate its use in a ritual of public penance (347–8). Also the result of a poster presentation, Dominik Kuhn, "Die altenglischen Glossen der Gebete in London, British Library, Arundel 155 in ihrem sprachlichen und kulturhistorischen Kontext," 277–86, deals with the text of prayers in the eleventh-century Canterbury psalter of the title. Kuhn shows that the contents of the manuscript (including the illustration of the scribe, Eadwig Basan, giving the psalter to St. Benedict) locate it firmly in a reformed Benedictine context, and connect it to Winchester as well as Canterbury (278–9); this article, connected to his dissertation, is an investigation of the extent to which this Benedictine milieu is reflected in the text of the interlinear glosses and their interaction with that of the Latin prayers. These prayers, Kuhn suggests by comparison to Ælfwine's prayerbook (BL, Cotton Titus D.xxvi + xxvii), might well have been intended for private devotion: whether they were for *Eadwig Basan's* devotion is a question he raises but does not answer (280). Kuhn presents the results of his survey of adjective endings (part of the linguistic commentary to be included in his planned edition of the glosses), and finds they largely conform to established standard prose usage, with some peculiarities in the use of the vocative, and some collapse of gender inflections in the strong forms (282–4). He concludes with the hope that such studies will eventually lead to a clearer picture of the actual use of Standard Late West Saxon (284–5).

Many of the articles in *The Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Helen Gittos and M. Bradford Bedingfield, Henry Bradshaw Society Subsidia 5 (London: Henry Bradshaw Society) contain substantial discussions of manuscript evidence, though the only article specifically within this section is Susan Rankin, "Making the Liturgy: Winchester Scribes and their Books," 29–52. Rankin's study focuses on the evidence of three

important Winchester books: London, BL, Royal 15.C.vii, a book of texts related to the cult of St. Swithun and marked up with readings for his feast days; and the “Winchester Tropers,” Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 473 and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 775. First, she examines the lection-markings in the Royal manuscript—a book possibly written by Wulfstan, cantor at Winchester toward the end of the tenth century—and the original hexametrical tropes for the first Sunday in Advent shared by the Corpus and Bodley manuscripts, concluding that “[h]ere, as with the Swithun readings in Royal C.vii, creativity and aesthetic decisions are revealed as fundamental elements in shaping the liturgy” (35). The bulk of Rankin’s analysis is devoted to the development and interrelation of the “Winchester Tropers.” Accepting the recent arguments that Corpus 473 is from the second quarter of the eleventh century, rather than ca. 1000 (37–8; this would obviously preclude it belonging to Wulfstan Cantor, but would still mean it was copied before Bodley 775), she then examines the question of the relative chronology of the two books’ contents. Rankin’s detailed examination essentially demolishes the earlier notion that Bodley 775 was a relatively faithful copy of an exemplar predating Corpus 473; it must, as she demonstrates (44–51), have involved the synthesis of several different exemplars of various types, and its material for the Swithun feasts is clearly an updating of that in Corpus 473 (42–3). Rankin concludes by reaffirming the necessity of recognizing that liturgical books existed within a matrix of continually shifting usage, and by noting Wulfstan Cantor’s lasting influence in Winchester (51–2).

In “Shoots and Vines: Some Models for the Ascenders and Descenders of English Vernacular Minuscule,” *Quaestio Insularis* 5 (2004): 98–110, Peter A. Stokes searches for parallels to the vertically lengthened proportions seen in the variety of Vernacular Minuscule associated by Stokes with Winchester and Worcester (100). While making no claims for direct influence, he examines the convention of writing sung passages in Latin liturgical manuscripts in reduced, elongated script (illustrations are given at 110). He argues that grade had nothing to do with this script style, and that planned musical notation cannot be assumed (102–5). A need for legibility, on the other hand, might be behind the change in proportion for chanted liturgical texts (107). Stokes is rather sparing of absolute pronouncements in his conclusion, but presumably this need for quick recognition of word-shapes would apply also to glosses, which, he implies, may well be the proximate source of the proportions of Vernacular Minuscule (109).

As is meet and right, the colossal festschrift *Latin Learning and English Lore: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature for Michael Lapidge*, ed. Katherine O’Brien O’Keeffe and Andy Orchard, 2 vols. (Toronto: Toronto UP), has much to delight scholars of manuscripts; most of the articles at least touch upon the subject, and each volume contains a handy Index of Manuscripts. Six of the articles fall within this section’s scope. Simon Keynes, “Between Bede and the *Chronicle*: London, BL, Cotton Vespasian B. vi, fols. 104–9,” 1:47–67, investigates an early ninth-century miscellany, arguing that it “is simply a matter of principle that all of the texts in this collection should be understood, first and foremost, in relation to each other, and each item thus regarded as part of a composite whole” (47). Accordingly, Keynes provides a detailed analysis of the booklet’s contents (47–8, 51–9), finding that the lists and chronological notes in Vespasian B. vi fols. 104–9 are not haphazard jottings, but the result of an intelligent attempt to organize often-messy historical data into a clear and comprehensible form. The nature and bias of much of the information, Keynes argues, suggests an origin in Kent, rather than in Mercia (as had been traditionally assumed); he concludes that “if pressed to give the collection a home, and a date, the most obvious response would be Canterbury, in the early ninth century; and if pressed to name the guiding spirit, who better than Archbishop Wulfred (805–32)?” (60–1). Evidence for ninth-century intellectual activity—particularly in Canterbury—is also provided by David N. Dumville, “English Script in the Second Half of the Ninth Century,” 1:305–25, although he concludes that “the evidence speaks for the collapse of high-quality and high-volume manuscript production in England after about 850” (320). Dumville’s survey of the available evidence includes useful lists of the relevant books (310) and documents, particularly single-sheet charters stemming mostly from Canterbury and Rochester (312–13); from this he is able to deduce a few diagnostic features: “What all the documentary specimens plausibly attributable to the period from about 850 to the first decade of the tenth century have in common is their scribes’ abandonment of the defining feature of early Insular script, namely the triangular wedge at the top of ascenders and of minim-strokes” (314); also he notes the use of tall ascenders and clear separation of letters (315). In considering regional scripts, Dumville concludes that some evidence might imply a “much less severe decline in educational and scriptorial standards in western Mercia in the late ninth century, although it is difficult to know what happened in this respect in the deeply troubled years of the 870s” (318). Although there is no reliable evidence for scribal

practices in Northumbria and East Anglia, Dumville is able to provide a summary description of tendencies in Kent and west Mercia (318–19), which should be useful to palaeographers interested in this obscure period.

The second volume of the festschrift emerges into the comparative clarity of the tenth and eleventh centuries. O. J. Padel, "The Charter of Lanlawren (Cornwall)," II:74–85, revisits the text of a tenth-century grant of land to the Cornish church of St. Hyldren in Lansallos, in light of the rediscovery of the original cartulary of Athelney Abbey. After a detailed analysis of the various probabilities surrounding the likely historical circumstances of the charter's production, Padel argues that the grant "provides a unique glimpse of the Cornish response to Athelstan's incorporation of the region into his newly expanded kingdom" (80), showing as it does a Cornish financial and ecclesiastical transaction taking place within the English administrative system. The charter's existence implies that the Anglo-Saxon stance toward the Cornish church could not have been one of unmitigated hostility during this period: "Even if we suppose that such a permissive attitude was atypical of the Anglo-Saxon period, or did not last long, the charter serves to remind us that matters on the ground during this period of transition must have been more complex, and less clear-cut, than our modern surveys, necessarily made on scanty evidence, tend to assume" (82). Meanwhile, Richard Marsden, "Latin in the Ascendant: The Interlinear Gloss of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 509," II:132–52, examines a Latin gloss of about 1100 on the text of a late-eleventh century copy of the Old English Hexateuch. In an English, rather than a Norman hand (133–4), the gloss seems to have been reliant upon a heavily-abbreviated copy of the Vulgate (134), from which the scribe frequently supplied verses missing in the Old English. The glossator's knowledge of Old English frequently seems imperfect, though; Marsden examines evidence for his engagement with the vernacular text (139–44), as well as the peculiar Old English gloss *bæcelinge* (145–7), and the scattered glosses to Ælfric's *Libellus de ueteri testamento et nouo* (147). Marsden concludes that the glossator's "response to the Old English text is assured but uneven, a sort of awkward dialogue in which the desire to engage with the vernacular text often becomes half-hearted and the Vulgate voice is more firmly asserted. Thus, although he often negotiates the Old English text extremely well ... frequently the glossator falls back into syntactical glossing and imposes the Vulgate phrasing" (148). The identity and purpose of the glossator remain puzzling, however, although Marsden offers a few possible explanations (148).

In "Ælfric's *De auguriis* and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 178," II:376–94, Mary Clayton uncovers new ramifications of the Ælfrician textual tradition. Starting from an Old English note midway through CCCC 178 (a two-volume collection of Ælfrician homilies and other texts), Clayton challenges Pope's contention that the note—and, thus, the augmented versions of *De auguriis* (Skeat's XVII in his *Lives of Saints*) and *De octo vitiis* (Skeat's XVI)—are the work of a later editor. Demonstrating that the method of integrating the (authentic) additional material is distinctively Ælfrician (378–82) and that the compilation as a whole must date to the very early eleventh century (388–9), Clayton concludes that "the composite *De octo vitiis* and the augmented *De auguriis* are the work of Ælfric, not an anonymous compiler, and that he produced the augmented texts as part of a revision of some of his works associated with his issuing a *quando uolueris* collection" (390). This would make CCCC 178, and the associated compilation Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 116, important witnesses to yet another stage in Ælfric's continual reshaping of his material, often in response to specific personal requests.

Fred C. Robinson, "Mise en page in Old English Manuscripts and Printed Texts," II:363–75, is a plea to editors to show greater respect for the sectional divisions and other modes of textual organization present in the Old English manuscripts, but often silently suppressed in modern publications. Robinson examines in detail some instances from *Genesis A*, in which the ASPR system of paragraphing distorts clearly-marked sectional breaks in the manuscript (363–6), and adds that fitt divisions in particular have been absolutely ignored (366). Arguing, however, that sectional divisions clearly had significance for medieval authors and copyists, Robinson makes a case for greater attention to this mode of textual sign in all editions of *all* types of Old English literature, not just verse; even modern editions of Ælfric's homilies, he demonstrates, have frequently ignored section-breaks that are probably authorial (369–72). It is the *silence* of these changes that seem to annoy Robinson most, for his concluding comment is:

If an editor feels an irresistible compulsion to break his text up into sections of his own devising rather than follow the sectional divisions of his manuscript(s), then can't that editor at least report to his readers in textual notes the presence of an alternative system of sectional divisions in the manuscript(s)? [...] For what makes no sense to the editor might very well make perfect sense to an informed

and thoughtful reader—but only if that reader is allowed to know that the break is there in the manuscript (373).

The collection *St Wulfsgie and Sherborne: Essays to Celebrate the Millennium of the Benedictine Abbey, 998–1998*, ed. Katherine Barker, David A. Hinton, and Alan Hunt, Bournemouth University School of Conservation Sciences Occasional Papers 8 (Oxford: Oxbow Books), contains a wealth of documentary evidence connected to Sherborne, as well as analysis to place it in context. Simon Keynes, “King Æthelred’s Charter for Sherborne Abbey, 998,” 10–14, provides an edition and parallel translation of the abbey’s foundation charter, which should be read not only in conjunction with the partial facsimile of the twelfth-century copy (BL, Additional MS 46487, fols. 3r–4r: the facsimile, which forms the book’s frontispiece, is of 3r), but with Keynes’s discussion in “Wulfsgie, Monk of Glastonbury, Abbot of Westminster (c. 990–3), and Bishop of Sherborne (c. 993–1002),” 53–94. There he notes unusual aspects such as the provision for appeal to the archbishop in case of disputes between the community and the bishop (clause 3), and the exemption from the construction of beacons (clause 6); despite its late attestation, Keynes argues that most evidence points to the charter’s authenticity (69–71).

Also of special interest to manuscript scholars in this volume is Rachel Stockdale, “Benedictine Books, Writers, and Libraries: Some Surviving Manuscripts from Sherborne and South-West England,” 164–76. Stockdale presents an overview of the sort of books that Sherborne must have possessed during the Middle Ages—missal, psalter, pontifical, and so on—and gives brief descriptions of those Sherborne books which have survived (such as the beautiful ca. 1400 Sherborne Missal; the Sherborne Pontifical of St. Dunstan (Paris, BN, MS lat. 943; the cartulary), and descriptions of the works of nearby foundations for those sorts which have not, such as psalters (Stockdale describes examples from the nearby convent of Shaftesbury). There are plates of pages from the Sherborne Missal and the accounts-book, or *comptus* (BL, Cotton Faustina A.ii). The extremely patchy evidence for Sherborne illustrates, as Stockdale notes, the chancy nature of manuscript survival in the Middle Ages, and as such might make useful reading for a seminar on medieval books. This is also true of “Bishop Wulfsgie’s Name,” 15–19, a note by Rebecca Rushforth and Katherine Barker. This provides an enlargement of Wulfsgie’s name in the Pontifical of St. Dunstan, with a detailed description of each letter, and definitions of the palaeographical

terms used, and as such might be very helpful in introducing Insular script to classes of undergraduates or non-specialists.

S. E. Kelly, ed., *Charters of St Paul’s, London*, Anglo-Saxon Charters X (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004), was reviewed last year. Kelly’s next edition in the series, *Charters of Malmesbury Abbey*, Anglo-Saxon Charters XI (Oxford: Oxford UP) presents the charters and several associated documents relating to this important early foundation, and the volume is likely to be of interest to students of Aldhelm and William of Malmesbury, as well as to historians. Kelly’s introduction includes a history of the abbey from its foundation (possibly by ‘Maildubh’; Kelly presents evidence regarding this shadowy figure 2–5) through the early Norman period (1–33), together with a separate history of its archives to the present, including short discussions of the working methods of Faricius of Arezzo and William of Malmesbury; also that the man into whose possession the abbey’s books fell after the Dissolution “was in the habit of using their leaves to stop the bung-holes of his ale-casks” (34–42, at 41). All but possibly one of Malmesbury’s charters are preserved in problematic later medieval copies, and Kelly provides a detailed analysis of the manuscripts and the charters’ authenticity (42–64; also following the text of individual charters). Kelly also discusses the “decimation” charters of King Æthelwulf of Wessex, most of which relate to his supposed gift of a tenth of his lands before his pilgrimage to Rome in 855; she analyzes the evidence for the authenticity of each group of charters, and provides an edition of the common text of the 854 charters, and a re-evaluation of Malmesbury’s 844 “decimation charters,” which, she argues, represented a tax concession rather than a land-grant, and are likely to be largely authentic (65–91). The boundary clauses are also examined in detail, along with an overview of the abbey’s landholdings (together with a helpful map).

Of the subject presented in her title, “Lyminge Minster and its Early Charters,” in *Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Cyril Roy Hart*, ed. Simon Keynes and Alfred P. Smyth (Dublin: Four Courts Press), 98–113, Susan Kelly writes that Lyminge’s “charters provide information about aspects of the minster’s early economy, and the development of the pre-Viking community (or communities) on the site; they also teach us some important and often disconcerting lessons about the nature of early Anglo-Saxon diplomatic” (98). One of those lessons is that moments of clarity in early documents very often merely heap complication and uncertainty on the historical situation. For instance, one of the things most firmly known about Lyminge Minster

was that it was a very early double house, connected to the Kentish royal line (though how it was connected had been unclear at least since the eleventh century, when there were unseemly squabbles over the house's relics: 101–3). Yet, as Kelly shows (109–12), S 23, datable to 732, appears to show a priest-abbot in charge of the community, when one would expect an abbess: had it then become an all-male house? Or was the *Liminiaee* of this charter and its successor actually Lympne, not Lyminge? Kelly's analysis of this and other early charters shows the sometimes-insoluble complexity of early written evidence, but her preference for questions over assumptions is admirable, and the précis she provides of very early diplomatic (107) will be useful to anyone trying to make sense of England's early written records.

EVT

For the study of manuscripts and illumination, 2005 is the year of the catalogue and collection. Taking pride of place for its beautiful production is *The Cambridge Illuminations: Ten Centuries of Book Production in the Medieval West* (London: Harvey Miller) a handsomely illustrated catalogue of selected manuscripts from Cambridge Collections. Edited by Paul Binski and Stella Panayotova, the catalogue documents an exhibition held in 2005 at the Cambridge University Library and Fitzwilliam Museum. The first half of the publication consists of a "Foreword" by Peter Fox and Duncan Robinson, an "Introduction" by Binski, and two essays: "Collectors and Collecting" by Christopher de Hamel and Stella Panayotova, and Teresa Webber's "Making an Illuminated Manuscript." De Hamel surveys the men and motivations behind the preservation of books in Cambridge's various College libraries. At Cambridge several colleges enjoy rich and extensive collections thanks to the bequests of generations of collectors beginning, quite famously with Archbishop Mathew Parker's bequest of his manuscripts to Corpus Christi College in 1574. While Parker was motivated by political and religious concerns, seventeenth-century collectors sought manuscripts for their antiquity, exhibiting "a desire for books which a college might expect to display as symbols of luxury and patriotic adherence to English antiquity" (19). The University Library received its first large bequest of manuscripts in 1714, with the gift of the collection John Moore by King George I. In the late eighteenth and nineteenth century the aesthetic value of the manuscript as a work of art prompted Lord Richard Fitzwilliam's foundation of the University Museum. Stella Panayotova and Teresa Webber's "Making an Illuminated Manuscript" is a particularly useful

survey of the process of creating hand-made books because it is so concise and so well illustrated with color images of quire structures, binding, writing materials, and unfinished manuscripts. The second part of the publication, the catalogue proper, consists of eight different sections devoted to different types of manuscripts and/or their uses. Each section displays a similar structure: an introductory essay directed at a general audience, followed by short discussions of particular manuscripts. Anglo-Saxonists will wish to pay particular attention to Rosamond McKitterick's "The Coming of Christianity: Pagans and Missionaries" (39–73) with its splendid full-color illustrations. Represented here are some well-known manuscripts, such as the Gospels of St. Augustine and the Book of Cerne, as well as some not-so-well-known, the Pembroke Gospels and the Trinity Arator, for example. Anglo-Saxon manuscripts play a smaller role in other sections of the catalogue. Teresa Webber's "The Bible and Its Study: From the Cloisters to the University" (75–117) briefly alludes to studies of biblical manuscripts in Anglo-Saxon England, though the catalogue that follows concentrates on later material (Anglo-Saxon Gospel Books and Psalters are instead taken up by McKitterick). Nigel Morgan's contribution ("The Liturgy and the Offices" 119–161) does illustrate a Gospel Lectionary (Pembroke College, MS 302) and a liturgical compendium (Corpus Christi College, MS 422, Part II). It is especially useful that so many of the illustrations in this catalogue depict openings and not simply single folios so that the viewer can get a better sense of page layout and the visual structure of the manuscripts.

A second catalogue appearing this is *Angelsächsisches Erbe in München: Angelsächsische Handschriften, Schreiber und Autoren aus den Beständen der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek in München / Anglo-Saxon Heritage in Munich: Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts, Scribes and Authors from the Collections of the Bavarian State Library in Munich*, edited by Hans Sauer. This publication documents the exhibition of early medieval manuscripts from the Bavarian State Library that was organized around the theme of ISAS 2005, "England and the Continent." The exhibition consisted of Latin manuscripts (though some have Old English Glosses) that have connections to England ca. 450–1066. The catalogue proper, by Birgit Ebersperger and Angelika Schröcker, documents (in German and English) and illustrates (in black-and-white) the manuscripts included in the exhibition (33–87). According to Sauer ("Preface," 1–12), the manuscripts fall into four groups: those written in England (preserved as single sheets); manuscripts written on the continent by Anglo-Saxon

scribes or scribes trained by Anglo-Saxons; manuscripts with Old English glosses (really just one example); and continental manuscripts that transmit texts written by Alcuin, Aldhelm, Bede, and Boniface. Caroline Schreiber's "Introduction: Anglo-Saxon Heritage in the Bavarian State Library" (13–31) places these survivals in context, by outlining briefly Bavaria's early ecclesiastical history. She also reviews the history of Anglo-Saxon script on the continent and describes the history of the collections of the Bavarian State Library. Joshua A. Westgard contributes a short but useful overview of later medieval copies of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, a group of manuscripts that have not received much attention. Two of them contain complete versions of the text dating to after 1400 (MS Clm 1207 is from the monastery of Tegernsee; Clm 118 was once in the collection of Johann Jakob Fugger). Others survivals contain excerpts, although, as Westgard shows, these excerpts demonstrate the particular interest for German readers in texts such as the Life of St. Oswald, *Libellus responsorium* (the correspondence of Gregory the Great and St. Augustine) and Bede's autobiographical sketch (92).

The Language of Forms: Lectures on Insular Manuscript Art (New York: Pierpont Morgan Library) collects six lectures read by Meyer Schapiro in March 1968 for the Franklin Jasper Walls Lecture Series held at the Morgan Library. The lectures are preceded by a "Foreword" by Charles E. Pierce, Jr., and an introduction by Jane E. Rosenthal. Rosenthal has painstakingly reconstructed the lectures, editing them from a transcript of the recording, checking and recording Schapiro's own revisions, updating the text (it was Rosenthal's idea to substitute "Insular" for Schapiro's term "Hiberno-Saxon," for example), and adding references to Schapiro's uncompleted footnotes and captions for the images. The six chapters of the book follow the structure of the lectures: first three deal with step-by-step analysis of formal relationships (Chapter 1: "Frame, Field and Figure"; Chapter 2: "Carpet Page and the Giant Initial"; and Chapter 3: "Image and Ornament.") Two chapters (Chapter 4: "Models and Their Transformation: Single Figures and Motifs"; Chapter 5 "Models and Their Transformation: Composition of Field and Frame") are detailed case studies that trace changes across centuries. The book ends with an overview ("The Religious and Secular Grounds of Insular Art") of the social and cultural context of Insular art. Rosenthal has done us all a great service since these lectures condense and distill perspectives and methods that Schapiro expresses elsewhere in his diverse writings, perspectives that mark an important shift in the study of Insular

manuscripts. Schapiro presents a complete and coherent argument against those who would see the insular art as crude, stylized, deficient due to a lack of naturalism. He rejects the methodologies of iconological interpretation of images that privilege prototypes, generalized economic social explanations, and ethnic and racial approaches that were dominant in the field at the time when the lectures were first performed. Instead, Schapiro encourages us to view the images as part of a new, complex challenging paradigm in which artists break away from the classical "professional" model of scribes to a personal and artistic relationship with the text. He argues that the carpet pages from the Lindisfarne Gospels, for example, are best seen in terms of relationships of a series of complementary or dualistic formal aspects: "field-frame and figure-ground relationships and coordinate-discoordinate systems of order" (2). Until the publication of this volume, art historian relied on Schapiro's earlier publications on particular objects, to witness his ability to develop a deep understanding of meaning of a work through close scrutiny the formal relationship and structural functions of components of a work.

Two essays from a collection of another sort, *St Wulfstan and His World* (ed. Barrow and Brooks [see sect. 7]) concern manuscripts. Richard Gameson's "St Wulfstan, the Library of Worcester and the Spirituality of the Medieval Book," (59–104) compiles all surviving evidence for the library at Worcester and examines how Wulfstan's personal interests may have shaped the collection and manufacture of books. Surviving manuscripts indicate that book production increased at Worcester during Wulfstan's tenure, following a lull in the late tenth and early eleventh century. The pattern at Worcester is the mirror image of book production elsewhere; in England as a whole there is a drop-off in production in the years following the Conquest and an upsurge later in the eleventh-century; at Worcester, production levels after the Conquest remain high only to fall between 1090–1110. In Gameson's view there is "an interesting correspondence between the pattern that has just been outlined and the life of St Wulfstan, and it is possible that the saint was a contributory factor" in that "Wulfstan gave Worcester invaluable continuity through the period of the Conquest and for a generation afterward." (62). The types of books that have survived demonstrate rather conservative patterns of reading; the texts copied during Wulfstan's pontificate reflect Wulfstan's own interests in preaching, liturgy, and hagiography and are predominantly in Old English. In the early twelfth century, following Wulfstan's death, a marked change occurs with a demonstrable

preference for Latin homilies and patristics. Attention to the visual appearance or style of the surviving evidence uncovers a similar story, as Gameson observes, “book production began a gentle transformation from Anglo-Saxon modes to Romanesque ones in Wulfstan’s lifetime; but the watershed—in terms of script, choice of texts and general effort—seems to have occurred around the time of his death” (80). To understand attitudes and uses of books Gameson turns to the biography of Wulfstan, composed by Coleman and preserved by William of Malmesbury. Gameson finds that the interaction with books plays an important role in the saint’s Life. Coleman, for example, invites the reader to dwell on Wulfstan’s spiritual interaction with books, compared to the more materialistic and worldly concerns of his master Earnwine (who, in a well-known story gave a splendidly decorated sacramentary to King Cnut). Wulfstan is also shown traveling with a book of the *vitae sanctorum* and donating books to churches in his diocese. For Coleman’s Wulfstan, “books and reading were ... central to his striving for spiritual perfection and correspondingly to his renunciation of material concerns” (86). Gameson provides not one but two appendices, one cataloguing manuscripts and texts associated with Worcester, the other listing scribal connections between them. *St Wulfstan and His World* contains a second important contribution, Julia Barrow’s “The Chronology of Forgery Production at Worcester from c. 1000 to the Early Twelfth Century” (105–122). Barrow takes a fresh approach to forgeries, arguing that much can be gleaned from these documents once we move past “credulousness and indifference” (105). As she notes, “the body of documents surviving from Worcester Cathedral is particularly rich. It includes a few original charters, a larger group that were only copied in the seventeenth century before being lost, and three collections of eleventh century cartularies (including the *Liber Wigornensis* and Hemming’s cartulary, now bound together in BL Cotton Tiberius A.xiii) and a thirteenth century Worcester cartulary (MS A 4 in the cathedral library, dated to ca. 1240). Her main focus is on the eleventh and thirteenth century collections and her method is comparative, focusing on the features that forgeries in each collection have in common and how those features change over time. In her analysis, the *Liber Wigornensis* “was compiled when the monks of St. Marys were expressing a newly found confidence and sense of purpose” (121) and this confidence is manifested in an interest in liturgical innovations and a high-flown literary style influenced by the texts of Brythferth of Ramsey. The language of documents in Hemming’s cartulary, comparatively,

demonstrates influence from Domesday, which “forced all churches to reevaluate their views of property holding” (121). The thirteenth-century cartulary is “a triumphant marriage of hermeneutic research and historical fiction” (122), a potential witness to the contributions of Worcester monks to the studies of the contemporary historians, William of Malmesbury and Eadmer.

Katherine Barker surveys royal patronage of sumptuous arts on the continent and reviews the importance of the Book of Revelation and its illustrations in late Anglo-Saxon England in her “Picturing the Beginning of the Age of Saints: The Iconography of Last Things” (in *St Wulfsgige and Sherborne* ed. Barker *et al.* [see sect. 7] 177–87). From Barker’s perspective, the tenth century witnessed “a renewed sense for the need to prepare for the beginning of the end of history which would see the final battle with the Devil and the ultimate victory of Christ for all men” (177). Barker surveys the appearance of mandorlae, which she describes as a “celestial time capsule” (180), in the Æthelstan Psalter (BL Cotton Galba A. xviii), Benedictional of Æthelwold (BL Add. MS 49598), New Minster Liber Vitae (BL Stowe MS 944), and Sacramentary of Robert of Jumièges (Rouen, Mun. Lib. MS Y.6 8). She places the use of this visual structure in context of continental practices, particularly the illustration of Otto III seated in Majesty from the Aachen Gospels (Gospels of Otto III).

Student of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts will find a very valuable resource in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile: Interim Index (Volumes 1–10)*, MRTS 309 (Tempe: ACMRS), edited by A.N. Doane and Matthew T. Hussey with the assistance of Roger Ladd, Patrick Murphy, and Judith Nysenholc. The index consists of a General Index, an Index of Illustrations, and separate indices for incipits in Latin, Old English, French, macaronic, and “other”.

“What does it mean to be faithful to the text?” asks Maria Amalia D’Aronco in her “The Traditional Facsimile: Reproduction or Edition? The Case of MS London, B.L., Cotton Vitellius C iii,” (in *Care and Conservation of Manuscripts* 6 [2000]: 76–84). Should a facsimile seek to reproduce the conditions of manuscript as they exist today or to make that manuscript more readable and perhaps more understandable? D’Aronco reflects on a difficulty she encountered as editor of the facsimile edition of the Old English Pharmacopeia (BL Cotton Vitellius C.iii) for Early English Manuscripts in facsimile series (EEMF 27). Tradition and economic realities dictated that the EEMF volume would reproduce the manuscript in a series of black and white photographs, supplemented with color plates. She describes the difficulties involved in the creation of the

facsimile of the manuscript, which was damaged during the famous fire in the Cotton Library and disfigured by the chemical reaction of some pigments with the parchment. An apparently inexperienced photographer neglected to separate the damaged leaves of the manuscript with paper before capturing images for publication, resulting in many unacceptable reproductions. As D'Aronco explains, "the images on the folios underneath appeared through the damaged parts of the plant, falsifying or blurring the original shape of the herb" (80) making the images of the plants unreadable. "The loss is not merely aesthetic, for understanding is also jeopardized" (78). She observes, "what is the use of a facsimile if we need to make recourse to the methods of the critical edition and the user is therefore obliged to 'see/read' the manuscript through the eyes of the editor?" (77). D'Aronco's preferred remedy, to digitally retouch the photographic images, was not accepted by EEMF's Scientific Committee who defended "the stated aim of the EEMF series to present 'the manuscript in its integrity'" (83). This dissatisfies D'Aronco, who argues that "a facsimile reproduction remains essentially a reproduction, that is an interpretation of the original document and one that is dependant upon the technology available at the time." (83). As such, she contends, editors should make best use of the technologies available to them in order to make the manuscript as readable and "understandable" as possible. She views the emergence of digital technologies optimistically: "they are perhaps the only tools that can enable us to scrutinise a manuscript as if it were lying on the desk in front of us" (83). (Another publication listed in the Bibliography for 2005, D'Aronco's "Il ms. Londra, British Library, Cotton Vitellius C. iii dell'erbario anglosassone e la tradizione medica di Montecassino," in *Incontri di popoli e culture tra V e IX secolo, Atti delle V giornate di studio sull'età romanobarbarica* (Benevento, 9–11 giugno 1997, ed. Marcello Rotili (Naples: Arte Tipografica, 1998), was reviewed in *YWOES* for 1998.)

In his "The Date of Bede's *In Ezram* and His Image of Ezra in the Codex Amiatinus," (*Speculum* 80: 1087–1133) Paul Meyvaert re-evaluates the circumstances and date of composition of Bede's commentary on the book of Ezra and postulates his direct role in the creation of the well-known portrait of Ezra in the Codex Amiatinus. Meyvaert retracts his earlier views, put forward in a 1995 article in *Speculum*, that that "books 1 and 2 of the Ezra commentary represented the earlier version, while book 3, on Nehemiah, as part of a revised version" (1091). This in turn was built on the generally accepted view that *In Ezram* was composed between 725 and 731, because Bede refers the reader to a fuller discussion of

the topic of seventy prophetic weeks in his "book on time" (*De temporibus ratione*). Meyvaert now argues that Bede "at quite an early stage in his career he had familiarized himself considerably with the contents of Ezra" (1095). Meyvaert argues that Ezra was written between Bede's two forays of commenting on Genesis, between ca. 711 and 720; he contends that the reference to *De temporibus* is the result of a later comment written by Bede in the margins of Ezra that has been incorporated into the main text by later copyists. Based on this redating, Meyvaert attributes to Bede the creation of the portrait of Ezra and changes to the structure of the first quire of the Codex Amiatinus. He points to close verbal similarities of passages from the Ezra commentary and the Latin couplet above Ezra in Amiatinus, arguing that the couplet derives directly from and depends on Bede's engagement with *In Ezram*. This observation leads him to re-examine the question of the original construction of the first quire of Amiatinus and Bede's role in the Amiatinus project. Meyvaert reviews what we know about the construction of the first quire, its dependence on Cassiodorus's Codex Grandior, and evidence for change in direction in its make-up. "If in the early stage of preparation, the sequence of divisions of Scripture in the first quire of Amiatinus closely mirrored that of the Codex Grandior, there was something in this sequence that bothered Bede" (1107). That something was the prominence given in the postulated first plan to the sequence of the pre-Hieroniam biblical text (the *antiqua translatio*), a prominence out of place in Amiatinus whose text derives from Jerome's translation. With time short before the scheduled departure of Ceolfrith, there was not enough time to start fresh, so (Meyvaert argues) the folios were re-arranged, permitting "Jerome's division of Scripture to acquire first place, following immediately on the image of Ezra" (1107). Meyvaert argues that "the 'Ezra' we see in the Codex Amiatinus, that is, the seated figure garbed the way he is, is totally Bede's creation, explained basically by his misinterpretation of the image in Cassiodorus's Codex Grandior, coupled with the belief he held during a limited period of his life—the years when he was composing *In Ezram* and making the image—that Ezra had been a Jewish high priest" (1113). And Meyvaert means "totally Bede's creation": noting the presence of drypoint lines revealed in recent investigations, he contends that Bede himself copied the outlines of what would become the Ezra portrait directly from the Codex Grandior. The copyist did not trace every line of the bookcase or on the figure. For Meyvaert this reveals Bede's confident hand (he could complete the bookcase freehand) and his intention to link the figure to his study *In Ezram*—

the untraced spaces of the figure permitted Bede to add the drapery and accoutrements of the figure that would clearly identify him as a high priest. An appendix examines the relationship of the Ezra portrait in the Codex Amiatinus and the image of the Evangelist Matthew in the Lindisfarne Gospels.

BW

Works not seen

- Nancy Bishop, "The Barberini Gospels," Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Iowa, 2004. *DAI* 65An: 2403.
- V. Condie, "Representations of the Nativity in the Art and Vernacular Literature of the Anglo-Saxons." D.Phil. Thesis, Uof Oxford, 2005. *Index to Theses* 54: 7357.
- Rumble, Alexander R. "Palaeography, Scribal Identification and the Study of Manuscript Characteristics." *Care and Conservation of Manuscripts* 8: 217–28.

7. History and Culture

a. General Sources and Reference Works

Hans-Werner Goetz's *Europa im frühen Mittelalter 500–1500* (Stuttgart: Eugen Ulmer, 2003) covers an amazing amount of material in a relatively brief space: the early Middle Ages as an epoch; the political development of the Germanic tribes; the political, social, religious, and cultural structures of the early Middle Ages; research controversies, methods, perspectives, and problems; and an extensive bibliography. The section on the British Isles (700–1066) falls into the second of the above topics and is divided into two sections. "The Anglo-Saxon kingdoms" opens with a list of kings from Egbert to Harold Godwinson and runs quickly through the Heptarchy, the Anglo-Saxon Church and the Synod of Whitby, the rise of Mercia, the arrival of the Vikings, the reigns of Alfred and his successors, and the Norman Conquest. "The Celtic Areas" summarizes the political development of Brittany, Wales, Ireland, and Scotland in a paragraph each, as well as touching on the achievements of the Irish Church.

Ananya Jahanara Kabir and Deanne Williams's *Postcolonial Approaches to the European Middle Ages: Translating Cultures* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP) itself approaches postcolonialism through the conceit of translation being not only a mechanism of and metaphor for cultures in contact, confrontation, and competition, but also a means of rehabilitating wonder. That is, the sense of wonder engendered by modern encounters with the medieval is often lost when the processes of orientalism and medievalization are demystified. Among the essays that deal with Anglo-Saxon England, Seth Lerer's essay on the postcolonial *Beowulf* is reviewed in section 4.c, above, and Nicholas Howe's essay on Bede's historiography is reviewed in subsection 7.c, below. Kabir's own contribution, "Analogy in

Translation: Imperial Rome, Medieval England, and British India" (183–204), deals with post-medieval ideas about Anglo-Saxon England, rather than with Anglo-Saxon history *per se* or its reception later in the Middle Ages. Specifically, she explores late-eighteenth-century English comparisons between subjugated India and early medieval England. For example, the idea of England relinquishing its rule of India was likened to Rome's withdrawal of troops from Britain; just as the "groans of the Britons" accompanied their entreaties that the Romans stay, so the Indians were argued to be desirous of continued English rule. In another case, the Muslim move into India was compared to the Norman Conquest. Such thinking arose after the seventeenth-century myth of the Norman Yoke was revived by the anonymous *Historical Essay on the English Constitution* of 1771. Kabir then shows how comparisons between India and medieval England changed over time, and she concludes by examining the tensions inherent in a discourse in which Britons are both colonizer and—when groaning—the colonized.

In *Anglo-Saxons* (Dublin: Four Courts Press), their *festschrift* to Cyril Hart, Simon Keynes and Alfred P. Smyth compile a series of useful and provocative essays, several of which have a bearing on this section and which are reviewed in the appropriate subsection below.

Richard Rudgley's *Barbarians: Secrets of the Dark Ages* (London: Channel 4 Books, 2002) is the companion volume to the Granada Media television series *Secrets of the Dark Ages*. Accordingly, it is structured around "on location" visits to museums and archeological sites and interviews with curators, re-enactors, and craftsmen who replicate medieval artifacts. Part Two ("Shadows on the Land," 99–192) deals with the early Anglo-Saxon world and features visits to Saxon sites in

northern Germany as well as to Lakenheath and West Stow in Suffolk and West Heslerton in Yorkshire. Rudgley foregrounds the evidence showing the peaceful integration of the Anglo-Saxons with the native Britons, and his emphasis on the sophistication of Anglo-Saxon craftsmanship is continued through the chapters on the treasures of Sutton Hoo that end Part Two.

b. Religion and the Church

Given that 2004 was the 1,250th anniversary of the death of Boniface, it is not surprising that 2004 and 2005 produced a bumper crop of scholarship about that saint. In “Bonifatius: een Angelsaksische priester-monnik en het Franische hof” (*Millenium* 19: 5–23), Mayke de Jong examines the concept of *scandalum* in Boniface’s letters, where this biblical expression refers primarily to flagrant sin committed by political and religious leaders. Such sin undermined religious order, creating a dangerous “pollution” or “contamination” that called for public penance. De Jong argues that Boniface’s monastic upbringing may have contributed to this outlook, but most likely he was not the only religious reformer to adopt such a perspective. For Pippin and Carloman, the mayors of the palace, religious reform was a crucial way to assert their legitimate authority, for such initiatives had been an integral part of Merovingian kingship. Just as Merovingian rulers had welcomed holy men such as Columbanus to their court, the mayors of the palace valued Boniface’s contribution to their religious revival. His fierce altercation with Adelbert of Soissons suggests that the court had become the focus of reform, even to the point where competing reformers—all engaging in the same discourse of purification and renewal—would try to destroy each other’s reputation through accusations of impurity.

Hubertus Lutterbach’s *Bonifatius—mit Axt und Evangelium: Eine Biographie in Briefen* (Breisgau: Herder, 2004) is indeed an epistolary biography. Lutterbach has selected items from the extant letters to and from Boniface and has filled in the gaps in the correspondence with text of his own invention. In some cases he adds—quite extensively—to the medieval material, and in other cases he composes entirely new letters. (The two kinds of text are printed in different fonts.) As Lutterbach controls both the selection and very often the content, the letters are able to progress through a series of themes (the support of the pope, the establishment of new sees, the westward expansion of the Roman Church, pastoral care, etc.) as well as through time (from 718 to 754). This must have seemed a brilliant conceit at the outset, but there is much to be said for the

standard formula of objective biographical narrative supported by citation from authentic medieval sources. With Lutterbach’s “creative” (9) treatment of the subject, the reader is constantly dealing with an awkward combination of supposedly medieval voices and obviously modern content, as when Lutterbach has Boniface telling Pope Gregory II *Geboren bin ich kurz vor 675, I was born shortly before 675* (15). Serious scholarship underpins this work, but *Mit Axt und Evangelium* is essentially historical fiction.

In “Het Christendom van Bonifatius” (*Millenium* 19: 45–60), Rob Meens analyzes three types of sources in order to determine the characteristics of the religion that Boniface preached. He first considers the sermons attributed to Boniface. Although we cannot be certain that Boniface preached these himself, they give some idea of the topics of concern to eighth-century Anglo-Saxon missionaries. Meens then turns to the *Excarpus Cummeani*, a penitential handbook composed in the first half of the eighth century. This provides information about the sins and remedies that were being discussed during the process of hearing confession. Boniface’s letters—the third kind of source that Meens examines—show that many of the topics dealt with in the *Excarpus* were of particular concern to him. Meens concludes that Christians were supposed to have a basic knowledge of the main outlines of Christian history as well as an awareness of the principal Christian virtues and sins. Special attention was given to the moral conduct of the clergy, sexual matters, forms of violence, the existence of non-Christian ritual practices, and dietary rules. These sources reveal that many aspects of social life were increasingly coming under the supervision of the Church, but as Meens points out, ecclesiastical control of these behaviors was far from complete in Boniface’s time.

In “Kerstening en kerkstichting in Friesland” (*Millenium* 19: 61–72), Paul N. Noomen debunks the myth of St. Boniface as the missionary who brought Christianity to Frisia. His reconstruction of the oldest system of parishes in the central regions of this country shows that the work of Boniface’s predecessor Willibrord and his successors Willehad and Liudger in christianization and the founding of churches had much more effect than did Boniface’s own efforts.

Lutz von Padberg’s *Bonifatius: Missionar und Reformier* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2003) offers a compact overview of the life and works of “the apostle of the Germans,” who was born in southwest England in the early 670s, rose to become archbishop of Mainz, and was martyred in 754. Four short chapters introduce Boniface’s native land, his life at the monasteries of Exeter and

Nursling, his careers as teacher, diplomat, and abbot, and the events that led to his new career as a missionary. Substantial chapters cover the trials of bringing the heathen to Christ, Boniface's efforts to reform the Frankish church, the politics of the western Church at this time, and the people who helped and hindered Boniface's work. The saint's death, the fate of his relics, and an evaluation of his character are covered in three closing short chapters. Three maps, a table of dates, and an annotated bibliography round out the volume. Although this paperback is small, slender, and in German, there is nothing to compare to it for a lively, up-to-date treatment of Boniface's life. Padberg is particularly good on the *Strudel der Machtpolitik* 'vortex of power-politics' (114) that swirled around the work of conversion in Frisia and Germany.

Nikola Proksch ("Monastic Observance in the Early Monastic Foundations of St. Boniface," *Regula Benedicti Studia* 20 [2001]: 129–39) considers whether it can be assumed (as has long been customary according to the author) that the monastic communities founded by St. Boniface followed the Rule of St. Benedict. On the basis of a letter by Boniface to the monastery at Fritzlar, Proksch sees evidence of divergences from the Rule. For example, rather than the organization of "kitchen service ... on a weekly basis so that the brothers may serve one another in turn" as prescribed in the Rule, Boniface's letter assigns this duty to one of the brethren, something which would seem contrary to one of the basic principles of St. Benedict's monastic legislation (131). Duties assigned to the *presbiter* and *diaconus* in Boniface's letter are likewise those "that in *RB* would be strictly part of the abbot's office"; these and other details indicate "a parallel terminology being used to designate different realities" (131). Ultimately Proksch concludes that Boniface's debt was primarily to the "mixed" monastic rules that seem to have prevailed in early England (where it likewise cannot be assumed even that Gregory, in spite of his admiration for St. Benedict, imposed the Rule on the monasteries established by Augustine). In particular, Proksch sees evidence that Boniface's views on oblation seem not to have approached the severity of the Rule, and these, if Proksch's reading of their correspondence is indeed correct, may have brought Boniface into brief conflict with Pope Gregory II. Proksch's essay is composed with remarkable clarity, and so it is all the more disappointing that much of the text suffers from poor copyediting: the author's name is misspelled on the title page, titles are italicized inconsistently, and while some quotations from Latin texts appear only in translation, others are left untranslated.

In "Aan het graf van Bonifatius. De verering van de heilige martelaar in het klooster Fulda in de achste en negende eeuw" (*Millenium* 19: 73–90), Janneke Raaijmakers describes the difficulties presented by the presence of St. Boniface's body at the monastery of Fulda. Although the number of monks and the abbey's property had expanded considerably since Boniface was laid to rest there, the many visitors to the saint's shrine also disrupted the monastic routine. In the 810s, internal conflict over the management of the lands and pilgrims became so bitter that it was resolved only by the intervention of the emperor. The solution included limiting access to the monastery's church and distributing some of Boniface's relics to dependent churches, which were easily accessible to lay visitors. Raaijmakers concludes by noting another change relating to Boniface: as the Rule of Benedict became the main focus of monastic life in Fulda, Boniface ceased to be remembered as the spiritual father of the monks and the initiator of their monastic traditions and instead became transformed into Fulda's patron saint, interceding with God on behalf of its community.

Bonifatius: vom angelsächsischen Missionar zum Apostel der Deutschen (Petersberg: Imhof, 2004), edited by Gregor K. Stasch, is the catalog of a 2004 exhibit held at Vonderau Museum, Fulda, commemorating the 1,250th anniversary of the death of this saint. Apart from sections on post-medieval German monuments to Bonifatius and the uses made of his life and thought in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Germany, much of this amply illustrated volume will be of interest to Anglo-Saxonists. Lutz von Padberg's "Wynefreth-Bonifacius—Leben und Werk" focuses on the saint's monastic career, his life's work as a missionary, the challenge of reforming the Frankish church, and his death at the hands of Frisian brigands. Stasch's "Die Ratger-Basilika—ein Ort der Memoria" briefly reviews the churches at Fulda; his "Bonifatius—Kult und Reliquien" surveys the saint's cult, relics, and iconography from the Middle Ages through the eighteenth century; and his "Das Grab des hl. Bonifatius" illustrates the saint's resting place. Thomas Heiler's "Bonifatius—Lebenszeugnisse und Forschungsstreit" describes Bonifatius's correspondence and the medieval works written about him, as well as his treatment at the hands of historians from 1500 to 1954. Burkhard Preusler's "Bonifatius und das Kloster Fulda" presents early medieval objects from the monastery and Fulda's images of Bonifatius across time. The closing section, Werner Kathrein's "Die Codices Bonifatiani," covers the sixth-century Victor Codex, the Codex Ragyndrudis (ca. 700), and the eighth-century Cadmug Gospels.

In “Bonifatius onthuld: de geschiedenis van zijn relieken te Dokkum” (*Millenium* 19: 91–111), Marieke van Vlierden offers a redating of a cope and chasuble (now at the Archiepiscopal Museum in Utrecht) that were traditionally associated with St. Boniface. These vestments were long honored at the Church of St. Martin in Dokkum as relics of the saint, yet their form and material suggests a date of around 1200. Van Vlierden suggests that they were donated to the church by Frisian crusaders who took part in the pillaging of Damietta in 1219. Their status as relics is probably due to the fact that they were preserved near the relics of Boniface in the church’s treasury.

Among more general scholarship, it is hard to overstate the importance of John Blair’s *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford: Oxford UP), or, given its scope (the period prior to the conversion of Kent until the twelfth century), to summarize adequately the many conclusions advanced therein. Blair purports to confine himself to the “externals of Christian culture rather than its spirituality; [to] churches as social and economic centers rather than as sites of scholarship or the religious life; [to] the topographical and tangible rather than the intellectual and conceptual” (1). This focus on “externals” is, however, a way of getting at “internals”—specifically, the reconstruction of “Anglo-Saxons’ perceptions of themselves and the world around them,” along with those aspects of pre-Conquest pastoral care that were peculiarly English, such as the forms of ecclesiastical organization preceding the parish and the nature of the ambiguous communities known as “minsters,” which Blair maintains in spite of some criticisms should be regarded as “the basis of the first English parochial system” (5). In general, Blair’s study aims to counter the older view that the religious organization of early England took shape amid struggles between static entities such as the “Celtic Church” and the “Roman Church,” both of which were conceived of by earlier scholarship as “two self-contained and contrasting ‘packages’” in a manner Blair finds “unrealistic and unhelpful” (5). Accordingly, Blair draws on recent work urging that “the familiar image of the British Church as eccentric, introverted, and feeble ... be rejected” (11). Though Blair suggests on the basis of archaeological studies that “the debt of the institutionalized English Church to the British still seems limited” (33), the influences for which Blair argues are greater than had been routinely supposed decades ago. The largely monastic orientation of the Church in England in the middle of the seventh century, and the remarkable “lack of purely local churches serving villages and homesteads,” is seen by Blair as

evidence for the occasionally overlooked importance of local economic and cultural factors—in this case, the vanity of recently-converted kings anxious to find new means of monumentalizing themselves and their families—as “the main determinants” of forms assumed by “ecclesiastical structures” (76). Blair ranges as far as early medieval Tibet for analogues to English developments, a move which he acknowledges some may find jarring, but which seems, in light of the heavy use of anthropological research that is increasingly typical of legal-historical studies, entirely appropriate. Major discussions of subjects such as burial practices are to be found throughout Blair’s study, and these consistently offer both superb summaries of recent scholarship and suggestions that will no doubt stimulate much further research. Indeed, Blair argues plausibly on a number of occasions that the development of what would become “Christian burial” played a central role in shaping the “sacred geography” of pre-Conquest England. The development of saints’ cults is, naturally, also explored at some length, and here Blair suggests that the emphasis on the saving power of saintly effects offers evidence of “an interplay between educated Christianity and folk-belief” that shows minster-priests “play[ing] the game by rules which their lay flocks would have understood” (476). The bulk of the study, however, is devoted to tracing the fortunes of the minsters and the rise of local churches and parishes. Evidence for the latter is, Blair acknowledges, “disappointingly” sparse, but literary and homiletic evidence shows by at least the tenth century “a new prescriptiveness, an insistence on the religious duty of all layfolk to belong to collectivities defined by worshipping in the same churches, venerating the same relics, and processing through the same landscapes: that is, to be ‘parishioners’” (489). Though the “centrality of minsters to Anglo-Saxon Christianity” remains for Blair “the main message of this book” (505), the interest of Blair’s study extends well beyond the history of ecclesiastical organization given its virtuoso response to the established imperatives that historians consider their subjects in local terms and from the perspectives of those unable to leave written records of themselves.

The Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church (London: Boydell), a collection of essays edited by Helen Gittos and M. Bradford Bedingfield, is drawn from a 2000 Oxford conference and published with the aim of “rais[ing] the profile of the liturgy as a source for evidence of Anglo-Saxon history” (ix). Work on liturgical evidence is, of course, fraught with many of the same hazards posed by more popular sources of evidence, such as “the antiquarian tendencies of those who

produced them”; often, the authors concede, it is difficult “when dealing with liturgical sources to talk about anything other than ideals” (2). Further difficulties are encountered when scholars attempt to “[d]efin[e] what is and what is not liturgical” (8). It is, perhaps, because of these constraints that most of the studies appearing within this volume focus on the minutiae of textual interpretation to an extent that is uncommon in historical scholarship. In “Cross-Referencing Anglo-Saxon Liturgy and Remedies: The Sign of the Cross as Ritual Protection” (213–244), Karen Louise Jolly returns to territory earlier covered in her *Popular Religion in Late Anglo-Saxon England: Elf Charms in Context* (Chapel Hill, 1996) and numerous other studies. Here, as elsewhere, Jolly suggests that “the line between formal and popular religion” in Anglo-Saxon England “needs to be redrawn,” this time adducing in support of this claim the uses to which the sign of the cross is put in homiletic literature as well as books of remedies such as *Lacnunga*, *Bald's Leechbook* and *Leechbook III* (213). In these texts, Jolly finds the sign of the cross surfacing in ways that suggest “the popularization of sacramental and allegorical understandings of the cross in Anglo-Saxon devotional life” (214). “[T]o call these medicinal and protective uses of the cross ‘magic,’” Jolly argues, “limits our appreciation of how Anglo-Saxon religious practice functioned;” no easy distinction can be made between the two as both uses appear upon closer consideration to be “interdependent” (215). Jolly observes an awareness of the tension between the devotional and medicinal uses of the cross (and a “grudging” acceptance of the latter) in Ælfric’s *Sermo de Sacrificio de Die Pascae* and in his sermon on the Exaltation of the Holy Cross: Ælfric tolerates the protective use of the sign, but urges that it be understood allegorically while assenting reluctantly to the more popular view that “the actual physical cross or the gesture ... contains and distributes power derived from its devotional meaning” (217). An unreserved acceptance of the latter view is found, somewhat predictably, in hagiography, where the sign of the cross serves “as a powerful tool ... for dispelling demonic illusions and other afflictions”; Blickling Homily IV also offers a fulsome endorsement of the use of the cross as a spiritual weapon by which one might “annoy the devil day and night” (218–19). After a thorough overview of the role of the cross in medical literature, Jolly concludes that in the “cultural context” of “late Anglo-Saxon Christianity ... the cross is both symbol and sign, the allegorical bridge mediating between the spiritual and the physical” (236). Sarah Larratt Keefer’s “The Veneration of the Cross in Anglo-Saxon England” (143–184) offers an “historical introduction to a

hitherto unedited Anglo-Saxon text of the Good Friday Veneration of the Cross service, a late eleventh-century addition to the liturgical miscellany forming Part II of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 422” (144). The text edited and discussed by Keefer is one of three witnesses to the Veneration service that survive from Anglo-Saxon England, the other two being found in the *Regularis concordia* and in “a binding leaf in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 120, from what may be a fragmentary triduum of the later years of the eleventh century” (144). Keefer offers a careful reconstruction of the Veneration ritual based upon both English and continental evidence and including an exhaustive survey of the relevant materials. That no Anglo-Saxon version of the ritual predates the *Regularis concordia* is, for Keefer, no obstacle to supposing that it was a feature of the English liturgy much earlier: its ample attestation in continental sources such as “ninth and tenth-century post-Carolingian reform books, ordines and customaries” requires us to “consider the implications of such a dearth in England where there is a wealth in France and Germany” (162). Keefer concludes that “a rudimentary design for the Veneration service” may have circulated in England “prior to the ninth century ... for which we have no surviving evidence” as the version found in the *Regularis concordia* seems either to have resulted from “the necessary material having been added onto what was already in England” or from “the expanded service being reimported anew as a whole” (163). An accretion of materials in England is not beyond the realm of possibility, as Augustine and other missionaries may well have borne with them to Kent “a basic Veneration practice for Good Friday as they had experienced it in Italy or on their way to England” (162), and there was an abundance of subsequent opportunities for the ritual to have found its way across the Channel. Sarah Hamilton begins her “Rites for Public Penance in Late Anglo-Saxon England” (65–104) by acknowledging that her conclusions somewhat resemble those of Brad Bedingfield’s roughly concurrent “Public Penance in Anglo-Saxon England” (*ASE* 31: 223–55). Yet each brings a sufficiently unique perspective to the evidence to be valuable in its own right. The question considered is an important one. Public penance must have played a significant role in Anglo-Saxon pastoral care given its establishment on the Continent in the form of the well-known “Carolingian dichotomy”: public penance, so the argument went, should be undertaken for manifest sins, and secret penance (a practice popularized by Irish missionaries in Francia and England) for private offenses. This formula “was repeated by Wulfstan’s contemporary Ælfric” (65) and

seems likely to have played some role in the affairs of the Anglo-Saxon church, and yet most scholarship, as Hamilton notes, has been inclined to accept at face value Wulfstan's remark that public penance (though not mentioned by name in the text in question—a sermon on Ash Wednesday) was neglected in England. A consequence of this tendency, Hamilton notes, is the almost exclusive focus of historians on secret penance. While it is true that secret penance is more amply documented and hence a more inviting area of inquiry, Hamilton points out that the reluctance to explore public penance may be owing to the polemical origins of the field itself. Much of the scholarship on confession published in the early twentieth century was part of a (largely justified) "Catholic backlash" to remarks made in 1898 by the Protestant historian Henry Charles Lea, who disparaged the practice of confession by arguing that it was a "thirteenth-century papal construct" (67). That this "backlash" coincided with new editions and translations of the penitentials led scholars to concentrate on secret penance to the exclusion of public penance, which at the time was considered by many to be "an archaic early church practice, unsuccessfully revived by the Carolingian bishops in the early ninth century" (68). Hamilton concurs with the suggestion of Mayke de Jong "that the dichotomy between public and secret penance was not as straightforward as the legislation suggests, and that in practice penance could and did mix elements from both public and secret rites" (68). Wulfstan's complaint about the neglect into which public penance had fallen does not, Hamilton argues, agree with evidence suggesting that the practice remained relatively vital into the tenth century. Given that English rites for public penance seem not to have resembled their counterparts on the Continent, Hamilton plausibly suggests that Wulfstan's complaint has more to do with the ambitions of "reformist bishops" to assert themselves over both the laity and secular clergy in ways that closer adherence to the continental models of public penance would have made possible (87).

In "St Aldhelm and the Chapel at Worth Matravers: Sea-Mark, Lighthouse or Bell Tower?" (*Proc. of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Soc.* 126 [2004]: 148–57), Katherine Barker and Gordon Le Pard investigate whether the *farus editissima* (very tall lighthouse) that is the subject of one of Aldhelm's riddles could have been a real lighthouse—not a literary invention—that stood on the southernmost headland at Renscombe in Worth Matravers. A twelfth-century chapel dedicated to St. Aldhelm stands there now. The chapel has a curious central pier that extends through the roof, but Le Pard thinks it unlikely that this pier ever bore a

light. Possibly the pier terminated in a massive cross that would have served as a sea-mark. Such crosses were built in eleventh-century Norway, but no British parallels are known. Barker suggests that the abbot of Cerne, at least from 987, had responsibility for maintaining beacons on St. Aldhelm's Head, so possibly there could have been a beacon-related site there in the seventh century. Equally speculative is the connection she makes to the report by William of Malmesbury that Aldhelm built a church in Dorset two miles from the sea. There are Roman lighthouses at Dover that might have remained visible into the seventh century, and Aldhelm might have seen them on this occasion.

In "L'autel dans les grands édifices religieux d'Angleterre et de Normandie du X^e au milieu du XII^e siècle; Quelques réflexions," (*Hortus Artium Medievalium* 11: 165–76), Maylis Baylé studies the changing placement of altars in the great churches of England and Normandy in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. She uses Deerhurst church and Winchester cathedral as examples of the pre-Conquest practice in England, which was governed by the liturgy delineated by *Regularis Concordia*. The post-Conquest *Decreta Lanfranci* established a new liturgy, reflected in the different organization of the choir and apse in Canterbury cathedral and Durham cathedrals. Baylé notes that this change soon changed again; from the end of the eleventh century, the great English churches display an amalgamation of old and new liturgical traditions. In particular, the Anglo-Saxon saints displaced by the Normans made a return in—for example—the Canterbury apse, whose radiating chapels provided space for a large number of altars. A converging development was the elevation of relics in shrines, such as that of Aldhelm at Malmesbury, Augustine at Canterbury, and Edmund at Bury St. Edmunds, to name a few eleventh-century examples. In most cases, these precious relics are situated behind the altar placed at the entrance to the apse.

In "Les recherches récentes sur la formation des paroisses en Angleterre: similitudes et différences avec la France" (*Médiévales* 49: 33–44), John Blair compares parish formation in England and France. With respect to Anglo-Saxon England, the model of a system put into place by the authority of the bishops is less appropriate to England and certain regions of northern France than to regions south of the Loire. With its primarily monastic ecclesiastical culture, England between around 650 and 850 resembled northern, "monastic" Gaul rather than southern, "conciliar" Gaul. The first English parishes developed around regional monastic centers and reflected patterns of land-lordship, taxation, and community identity. Only after 900, with the fragmentation

of large domains, were these “mother-parishes” themselves subdivided in turn into new, local parishes of manorial churches, a process that is only now recognized as close to that operating in northern France. One sign of this new parish identity was a more controlled burial practice, with the rise of consecrated and delimited cemeteries at both minsters and local churches.

In “The Common Steeple? Church, Liturgy, and Settlement in Early Medieval Lincolnshire” (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 28: 103–23), Paul Everson and David Stocker investigate the ecclesiastical structures they designate as “Lincolnshire towers.” The classic examples are from the late eleventh century, and their main purpose was to house bells. Windows overlooking as much of the graveyard as possible suggest that the towers were built in order to synchronize the ringing of bells with burial activities. The authors find that a substantial number of these towers were probably built at the direct instigation of resident, second-rank lords (i.e., not the tenants-in-chief but their subtenants, reeves, and bailiffs). In a sizable minority of cases, the towers seem to have been built at the wish of the sokemen. In any case, the towers were probably erected to cater for new developments within the burial rite arising from Lanfranc’s reforms of the Anglo-Norman church. Support for these reforms was therefore evidently found among the sokeman class as well as among the minor aristocracy.

In “Share and Share Alike? Bishops and Their Cathedral Chapters: The Domesday Evidence” (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 28: 138–52), Vanessa King looks at the tenurial relationships between bishops and their *familiae* in the aftermath of the Norman Conquest. The Domesday Book contains evidence of a few changes in this area, but on the whole, some form of separate endowment was already in place for most cathedral chapters before the Conquest, so it would be inaccurate to assert that a great tenurial revolution had taken place between 1066 and 1086.

In “St Cuthbert and the Border, c. 1080—c. 1300” (*North-East England in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. Christian D. Liddy and Richard H. Britnell, *Regions and Regionalism in History* [Woodbridge: Boydell], 13–28), Richard Lomas investigates the evolution of the landed and spiritual interest of St. Cuthbert in the border region up to 1300. St. Cuthbert was represented by his trustees, but as a result of the foundation of the Benedictine chapter of Durham Cathedral in 1083, the trusteeship was divided into two institutions, one headed by the bishop of Durham and the other headed by the cathedral priory of Durham. The bishops had to endure a number of losses: Hexhamshire became a member of the diocese of York, and Durham’s jurisdiction north of the border

in Teviotdale was terminated during Ranulf Flambard’s exile (1100–1101). At the same time, south of the border, the townships of Lowick, Barmoor, Bowsden, and Holburn came under the control of the barony of Wooler. The cathedral priory also suffered losses: a Cuthbertian presence could not be re-established at Melrose in 1074 because that would have meant swearing fealty to the king of Scots, Hexham was lost in 1080 by an act of betrayal on the part of its priest, and Tynemouth was lost in the 1080s as a result of Bishop William of St. Calais’s quarrel with the earl of Northumberland. The priory’s real gains were in Scotland, but they turned out not to be as large as was promised by Duncan II and Edgar, who in the 1090s were pretenders to the throne of Scotland and who issued charters granting properties to the monks of Durham in an attempt to secure St. Cuthbert’s backing. Duncan’s grant was temporary at best, and Edgar reduced the size of his grant once he was securely on the throne.

The *Wilton Chronicle* is a fifteenth-century rhymed account of the history of St. Mary’s nunnery in Wilton from its foundation around 800 up to the reign of Edgar, followed by an appendix in Latin in which the author lists his sources and quotes from one of them. W.F. Nijenhuis argues that “The Wilton Chronicle as a Historical Source” (*RB* 115: 370–99) is reliable, at least with regard to the abbey and its benefactors. The *Chronicle*’s data can sometimes be verified from other sources, and when this is not the case, the author may well have had access to oral tradition or documentation that is no longer extant. The consecration of Wilton Abbey was still celebrated every year in the fifteenth century, and during the service the details of its founding and parts of its history may well have been recited.

In his Brixworth lecture on *Lost Chancies and Chapels of Medieval Northamptonshire* (Brixworth: Friends of All Saints’ Church, 2003), David Parsons sets out a preliminary argument that a large rectangular structure in the churchyard of All Saints’ in Brixworth is the chapel of St. Mary referred to in church documents. The structure was discovered by dowsing and is yet unexcavated, but its proportions and dimensions resemble those of Anglo-Saxon churches or chapels. Parsons suggests that it may have been part of the early monastic complex and was perhaps the original church of the community, later replaced by the present building, which appears to be not earlier than the late eighth century.

In “Dunstan and Monastic Reform: Tenth-Century Fact or Twelfth-Century Fiction?” (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 28: 153–67), Nicola Robertson questions whether Dunstan really was the guiding hand behind the monastic revival of tenth-century England. She

suggests instead that this view of Dunstan occurs from the reinterpretation and reconstruction of this period of ecclesiastical history by twelfth-century authors who placed Dunstan at the center of an organized reform movement. The contemporary *Vita Dunstani* should not be understood as meaning that Dunstan was literally the first abbot of Glastonbury; rather, *primus* is adjectival, not temporal, as William of Malmesbury points out. It also cannot be proven from the contemporary sources that Dunstan instituted the Rule of St. Benedict at Glastonbury. Indeed, Æthelwold wanted to leave Glastonbury because monastic discipline there was not very strict. The account of King Edgar's establishment of monasteries is argued to be biased, and the words *monachos*, *muneca*, *monasterium*, and *minster* can refer to secular clerics following a rule such as the *Regula Canonicorum* as well as to professed monks. Contemporary texts are equally vague as to the nature of Dunstan's reforms as archbishop. But in his twelfth-century chronicle, John of Worcester changes the emphasis of his source to make Dunstan the one who influenced Edgar and stimulated his promotion of reformed Benedictine monasticism. The many references in William of Malmesbury's works that have been taken as evidence of Dunstan's reforms are argued to be inconsistent, unspecific, and in places positioning Æthelwold rather than Dunstan as the foremost monastic reformer. Robertson concludes that Dunstan cannot definitively be excluded as the instigator of monastic reform in England, but this depiction of him would appear to be a twelfth-century fiction, at least in part.

Richard Sermon and Bruce Watson's "A History of Mitton Chapel and Its Environs" (*Glevensis* 37 [2004]: 29–37) focuses on the search for the chapel's location and twelfth-century remains, but the introduction provides information of interest to Anglo-Saxonists. The place-name Mitton (*Mitune* in 1086) is Old English in origin and derives from *mythe* "confluence" and *tun* "settlement," the confluence being that of the Carrant and the Avon. Sermon and Watson also list the three Anglo-Saxon charters that are the earliest documentary evidence for Mitton. These show that an Anglo-Saxon estate existed at Mitton by at least the tenth century. This is confirmed in the Domesday Survey of 1086, where Mitton is listed along with Teddington as subunits administered by Bredon manor.

c. Ecclesiastical Culture

St Wulfsgie and Sherborne: Essays to Celebrate the Millennium of the Benedictine Abbey 998–1998 (Oxford: Oxbow Books), edited by Katherine Barker, David A. Hinton,

and Alan Hunt, contains the expanded proceedings of a one-day conference. It combines many short, introductory essays with several substantial pieces of new work. The following items will be of the greatest interest to Anglo-Saxonists. Timothy Reuter's "Introduction: Sherborne and the millenium" (1–9) sets out the ways in which the passing of time was experienced a thousand years ago and the various strands of thought that could have allowed belief in the idea that the world as people knew it would end. Reuter emphasizes that we have no real means of assessing whether the reference to the end of the world in Wulfsgie's foundation charter was merely conventional or deeply felt. Simon Keynes provides an edition and translation of "King Æthelred's charter for Sherborne Abbey, 998" (10–14). For those unfamiliar with Old English, Rebecca Rushforth and Katherine Barker explain "Bishop Wulfsgie's name: the writing and the spelling" (15–19). In the same vein, Simon Keynes offers "A note on Anglo-Saxon personal names" (20–23; see section 8). Eric Woods briefly discusses apocalypticism and the apocalyptic in "The Revelation of St John: the last book of the Bible" (30–32). Nicholas Champion's "'Thousand is a perfect number...' quoth Ælfric of Cerne" (33–39) considers the question of medieval millenarianism. Katherine Barker's "*Anno Domini Computati* or Counting the Years of the Lord 998–1998: The Sherborne Benedictine Millennium" (40–52) explores the effect of the introduction of computation with Arabic numerals on the Western medieval understanding of numbers. Simon Keynes's "Wulfsgie, monk of Glastonbury, abbot of Westminster (c. 900–3), and bishop of Sherborne (c. 993–1002)" (53–94) is one of the cornerstones of the collection, a detailed and contextualized assessment of the saint's career that draws on evidence from charters, letters, Wulfsgie's pontifical, Goscelin's *Life* of the saint, and William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*. A consideration of the church of Sherborne in the eleventh century and the development of the cult of St. Wulfsgie rounds out the essay. Barbara Yorke offers a short introduction to "Saints' Lives in Anglo-Saxon Wessex" (95–97). Another valuable contribution is Rosalind Love's much-needed new translation of "The Life of St Wulfsgie of Sherborne by Goscelin of Saint-Bertin" (98–123) with an introduction, an appendix of emendations to the standard edition, and notes. Katherine Barker provide a brief overview of "Bishop Wulfsgie's Lifetime: Viking Campaigns Recorded in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for Southern England" (124–32). In "Sherborne: Saxon Christianity *be Westanwuda*" (133–48), Teresa Hall discusses Sherborne's transition from a British monastery to a Saxon bishopric. In "Sherborne in AD 998: The

Benedictine Abbey and Its Estate" (149–63), Katherine Barker gathers the scanty evidence concerning Sherborne's home estate, its eleven outlying estates, and the three hundreds that were held by Bishop Wulfsgie. In "Benedictine books, writers and libraries, some surviving manuscripts from Sherborne and south-west England" (164–76), Rachel Stockdale describes the Sherborne Missal, two psalters (Lansdowne 383 and BL Cotton Nero C iv), the Sherborne Pontifical, the Sherborne Cartulary, the Sherborne *compotus*, and the Cotton Tiberius A.v copy of the *Chronicle* of John of Glastonbury, as well as medieval manuscripts from neighboring Benedictine houses whose contents cover everything from the instruments of the Crucifixion to chess problems. Katherine Barker's "Picturing the beginning of the Age of Saints: the iconography of last things" (177–87) surveys tenth-century *mandorla* illuminations, Joseph Bettey describes "The dissolution of the abbey and after at Sherborne" (188–98), and Katherine Barker examines the charter evidence for "The Sherborne Estate at Lyme" (199–204).

John Crook's "The physical setting of the cult of St. Wulfstan" (in *St Wulfstan and His World*, ed. Julia S. Barrow and N. P. Brooks, *Studies in Early Medieval Britain* 4 [Aldershot: Ashgate], 189–217) begins with the most recent evidence, accounts dating from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries of the destruction of some English saints' shrines. The worth of these accounts for Crook's inquiry "lies not in their often erroneous, sometimes quirky, interpretations, but in their description of the cathedral fabric at the time of writing, and also in their occasional reporting of local traditions, some of which provide insight into earlier periods" (190). In spite of their suggestiveness, Post-Reformation statements concerning the location of Wulfstan's shrine demonstrate above all that "Henry VIII's Commissioners for the Destruction of Shrines were so successful in obliterating the cults of Oswald and Wulfstan that within a hundred years the very position of their final shrines within the cathedral had been forgotten" (196). That Wulfstan's shrine was moved often prior to King Henry's activities further complicates the situation. Accordingly, it is on the basis of textual evidence that Crook relies, and the author finds this evidence still capable of yielding new insights, among them: that in the decades following his death St. Wulfstan's remains occupied "an elaborate sepulchral monument, certainly not the type of structure which in the context of the later Middle Ages we might call a shrine" (205); that "[b]urial beneath the floor ... would not have been possible because the crown of the crypt vault was only a short depth below the pavement", and that "there was apparently no altar

attached to the tomb itself (as became the custom with later medieval shrines)" (206). These and other conclusions issue from a careful rereading of William of Malmesbury's translation and revision of Coleman's earlier (and now lost) *Vita* of the Saint. Finally, Crook takes the reader through textual evidence external to William's *Vita*, narrating with remarkable precision the vicissitudes of Wulfstan's cult as it developed from "a spontaneous, popular cult" toward formal canonization (207). The spread of sites of veneration during the later Middle Ages seems regrettably to have cost Wulfstan his head and other appendages.

Those who have even a passing familiarity with St. Wulfstan and his cult are likely to know the charming story of how the saint came to adopt a near-vegetarian diet after feeling himself to be spiritually endangered by the prospect of eating goose. There are two versions of the tale, the most familiar being that of William of Malmesbury's *Vita*, wherein Wulfstan is obliged by an urgent lawsuit to bitterly walk away from the meal and later "find[s] fault in the voluptuousness of the moment" (152). A version that Michael Hare ("Wulfstan and the Church at Hawkesbury," in *St Wulfstan and His World*, ed. Barrow and Brooks, 151–166) finds "more plausible" is also the work of William of Malmesbury, but is found in a text that predates the *Vita*, his *Gesta Pontificum*. The circumstances are the virtually the same (an impending lawsuit at which Wulfstan must be present), but here Wulfstan is depicted in an even less flattering light, distracted by the smell of the goose while "reciting the secret of the mass" (152). William's omission of this detail is unsurprising, as Hare suggests, since distraction during the mass constituted a fairly serious failing that would not have agreed with the idealized portrait of the saint in William's subsequent *Vita*. Hare notes that, in spite of the popularity of the story (both versions of which, he believes, are derived in some way from Coleman's version), there has been little interest in the episode's physical location—Hawkesbury, which Hare argues "was the mother church of a wide area ... probably an 'old minster'" at which Wulfstan "was in all likelihood a member of a small community of clergy" (151). In support of this view, Hare summons a wealth of documentary, archaeological and philological evidence, and concludes that the likeliest relation of the church to its domestic buildings perhaps makes the account in William's *Gesta* especially plausible: "At Hawkesbury today it is still easy to imagine how the young Wulfstan could have been beguiled by the smell of roasting goose during the celebration of mass" (166).

The title of the essay by the late Nicholas Howe ("Anglo-Saxon England and the Postcolonial Void," in

Kabir and Williams, 25-47) refers to the literally post-colonial period between the withdrawal of the Roman legions in 410 and the arrival of Roman missionaries in 597, which Howe calls a historiographical void and which James Campbell calls “The Lost Centuries” (*The Anglo-Saxons*, ed. Campbell [Oxford: Phaidon, 1982], 20–44). But Howe’s subject is really Bede’s understanding of the relationship between the Rome of the past and the Christian England of his own day. Drawing in the many Roman ruins and Latin inscriptions with which Bede would have been familiar, as well as referring to Bede’s writings, Howe argues that Bede saw the “void” bridged by a process of cultural reassimilation in which the old province of the *imperium* became a community of Christians who looked to Rome and the papacy for spiritual direction and political guidance. Howe further suggests that the Anglo-Saxon use of Roman *spolia* (e.g., the inclusion of Roman stonework in churches) was not merely an act of homage to the imperial past but was a triumphalist statement that the enduring empire of Rome within human history was Christian, not pagan, and was ruled by a pope, not an emperor. Howe’s postcolonial reading of the Romanized English landscape skillfully blends two discourses, rather like the Anglo-Saxon churches incorporating Roman stonework that Bede and he describe.

In “Wulfstan of Worcester: Patriarch of the English?” (*Anglo-Saxons*, ed. Keynes and Smyth, 114–26), Emma Mason builds on Ann Williams’s assessment of Wulfstan as a worldly, even cunning, manager of Worcester church holdings. According to Mason, Wulfstan functioned as a patriarchal figure for his flock at Worcester, a role that allowed him to guide the church in both political and financial matters. Mason’s specific target in this essay is the perception of Wulfstan as “the archetypal ‘little man,’ harassed by overbearing intruders, but winning through thanks to his ‘simplicity’” (125). Instead, Mason emphasizes Wulfstan’s considerable political savvy and cultivation of a “patriarchal” public image. This image persisted long after Wulfstan’s death and provided the occupied English with a father-figure to whom they could refer in times of difficulty.

Wulfstan’s office, which “cannot have been composed before the bishop’s canonization in 1203” but is nonetheless of “considerable merit in relation to the history of Wulfstan’s cult” is, as Susan Rankin notes in her “Music at Wulfstan’s Cathedral” (*Wulfstan and His World*, ed. Barrow and Brooks, 219–29) somewhat remarkably omitted from the 55-volume *Analecta Hymnica* and thus remains unedited (222–23). Rankin’s study contains valuable insights regarding liturgical music at Worcester Cathedral during Wulfstan’s episcopate,

but focuses primarily on the unedited office, which, as Rankin demonstrates, constitutes in itself a significant contribution to hagiographical literature characterized by narrative organization and a “sophisticated” employment of “literary conceits and rhetorical figures” (224–25). The office also provides some evidence for traditions concerning Wulfstan “which cannot be directly connected with the known *Vita* and *Miracles*” (229).

Susan Edgington, in “The Entrepreneurial Activities of Herbert Losinga, Abbot of Ramsey (1087–91) and First Bishop of Norwich” (*Anglo-Saxons*, ed. Keynes and Smyth, 266–74), examines the enterprising—if ethically dubious—activities of one of Anglo-Norman England’s more ambitious clerics. Edgington points out that Losinga’s publicizing of Ramsey’s “invented” (in both senses of the word) relic of St. Ivo, not only increased the reputation (and budget) of the foundation, but it also allowed Losinga to buy his way into the bishopric and set a pattern of relic-promotion he was to follow for the remainder of his career.

Richard and Fiona Gameson’s “From Augustine to Parker: the Changing Face of the First Archbishop of Canterbury” (*Anglo-Saxons*, ed. Keynes and Smyth, 13–38) uses the figure of Augustine as a case study “to watch the changing presentation of a particular character and sequence of events, and to see how individual writers responded to an evolving tradition” (13). Starting with Bede, the authors point out that the *Historia ecclesiastica* treats the archbishop as little more than an instrument of Pope Gregory’s missionary agenda, and a rather dubious one at that. In Bede’s account, Augustine’s relative dearth of miracles and seeming incompetence when initially confronted with the “Irish Problem” combine to form a remarkably tepid portrait. Later authors tended to treat Augustine more generously, however they only do so by gradually moving away from Bede’s account. For example, only about one-third of the material in Goscelin’s *Vita* can be traced back to the *Historia ecclesiastica*. The Gamesons conclude their article with an extended reading of Archbishop Parker’s treatment of his predecessor, emphasizing the ways in which he draws upon different narrative traditions from Bede and Goscelin to Wace and Geoffrey of Monmouth in order to characterize Augustine as “the foundation-stone of an elaborate edifice supporting the Church of England” (38).

In “Before the Coming of Popular Heresy: The Rhetoric of Heresy in English Historiography, c. 700–1154” (in *Heresy in Transition: Transforming Ideas of Heresy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Ian Hunter, John Christian Laursen, and Cary J. Nederman

[Aldershot: Ashgate], 9–27), Paul Antony Hayward surveys the ways in which heresy figures in such works. The Anglo-Saxon writers he treats are Bede and Ælfric. Hayward suggests that Bede's interest in heresy is to be explained by his adherence in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* to the generic format established by Eusebius of Caesarea's work of the same name. Thus Bede regards heresy as an expression of a flippant desire for novelty. He also deploys the rhetoric of heresy to establish a gratuitous contrast between the English Church and its most immediate competitor, the British Church, and to demonstrate the need for an effective episcopate. Although Ælfric was not an ecclesiastical historian in the strict sense, his works illustrate the continuing use of heresy to consolidate episcopal authority. That is, he is less concerned with the nature of heresy than with the legitimacy of the ecclesiastical structures that had evolved to protect the Church from error.

Joanna Story offers a study of "The Frankish Annals of Lindisfarne and Kent" (*ASE* 34: 59–109). These are historical notes written in the margins of Easter tables long after the events they describe. It is often assumed that paschal annals represent the primitive form of historical record from which longer and more detailed chronological narratives such as the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* evolved, but the manuscripts of these annals show that the two forms were being produced simultaneously. Story argues that the imperial references accompanying the Northumbrian information came from Bede's *Chronica maiora*, rather than vice versa, as earlier scholars had supposed. Indeed, the Northumbrian information is argued to have been independent of the Kentish information: the notes were recorded originally under two separate traditions in two separate places. Because the Kentish information records the dates of the Kentish kings' interments, Story suggests that the record keepers were based at the burial-place of the kings of Kent, namely the monastery of SS Peter and Paul at Canterbury. Thus the Kentish annals cannot have been derived from any of Bede's works. Story concludes by emphasizing the Frankish context of these annals and the testimony that they provide concerning the contribution of Anglo-Saxons to the Carolingian church throughout the eighth century. An appendix provides the text of these notes.

Christin Thijs's "Levels of Learning in Anglo-Saxon Worcester: the Evidence Re-assessed" (*Leeds Studies in English* 36: 105–31) attempts to characterize the nature and quality of scholarly activity at Worcester Cathedral during the late ninth century, when Alfred is known to have summoned at least four clergy from Worcester and its vicinity. Though Thijs concedes that "the evidence

for learning levels in the Worcester area is quite limited for the period prior to the end of the ninth century," ultimately it seems to the author "reasonable to surmise, *inter alia* from Alfred's recruitment of the Worcester scholars, that the centre had already reached respectable levels of scholarship in the latter half of the ninth century" (105). Thijs's study begins with a challenge to the often-repeated view that Alfred's grim assessment of the Latinity of the English self-servingly ignores the achievements of Mercia so as to bring into relief those of his own educational reform. This argument, according to Thijs, fails to consider the possibility that Mercia, "although it fell within Alfred's sphere of influence ... was at that stage still a separate kingdom" and thus not considered by Alfred "part of his own 'entire country'" (106). Thijs's article ultimately becomes an admirably comprehensive survey of current scholarship on evidence for a Mercian "culture of erudition" that many will find quite useful. The study is supplemented by an intriguing excursus on Wærferth's *Dialogues* (yielding the conclusion that "there may have been knowledge of Greek ... and Hebrew in early ninth-century Mercia" [113]) and a sustained attempt to tentatively reconstruct the Worcester library. Thijs concludes that "[t]here was at least some vernacular literary activity based on Latin sources before Alfred's cultural renaissance" even though the evidence for this activity is disappointingly modest, and suggests that Wærferth's *Dialogues* "seems unlikely [to have been] written entirely independently of any pre-existing tradition of vernacular translation" and perhaps even predated Alfred's program of reform (122).

Francesca Tinti introduces her edited collection *Pastoral Care in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (London: Boydell) with a complaint that "the evidence for tenth- and eleventh-century Church organization and delivery of pastoral care has been treated as a useful tool to be employed regressively, that is, to try to reconstruct the situation in the earlier period, for which the evidence is noticeably scarcer" (1). The essays appearing in Tinti's collection aim for a more synchronic view of pastoral care during the tenth and eleventh centuries, a period that witnessed a relatively sudden proliferation of local churches. Most of the studies focus primarily on "texts which convey a sense of some direct interaction between the clergy and the laity," from homilies and penitentials to instructions for priests who visit the sick and dying (14). In "The Pastoral Contract in Late Anglo-Saxon England: Priest and Parishioner in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Miscellaneous 482" (106–120), Victoria Thompson considers the possible significance of the singular conjunction in this codex

of “vernacular confessional and penitential texts” along with “*ordines* for the sick and the dying” (106). Thompson observes that the texts “anthologized in Laud Misc. 482 ... construct the priest both as a figure wielding extraordinary power and as someone who is burdened with extraordinary responsibility, who is himself as needy as the soul he tends” (115). Of particular interest is the fact that this manuscript is one two “preserv[ing] a text concerning the way in which penance could be performed partly by proxy for the very wealthy,” the other being the “national three-day penitential fast” imposed by Ethelred and preserved uniquely in CCC 201 (118–19). Thompson attempts to counter disparaging claims regarding the “laxness” of these commutations by observing that the *mihtig man 7 freondspedig* allowed by this text to employ proxies to perform his penitential sentence is not exactly off the hook: after confession and settlement with those whom he had wronged, the penitent is to abandon his weapons and other “symbols of worldly status ... take a staff and wear a hairshirt,” and sleep on the floor rather than in bed; moreover, “[a]fter the period of proxy-penance is over, he is to feed as many of God’s poor as he can, bathe and entertain them and reward them, and he personally is to wash their feet” (119). Thompson speculates that “[t]hese ‘lax’ provisions may well represent a pragmatic, negotiated compromise, acceptable to the Church and to lay lords, who may themselves have been well aware (like Henry II after the murder of Thomas Becket) of the publicity value of such a penitential extravaganza” (119).

Sarah Hamilton broadly surveys the evidence for the practice of penance in “Remedies for ‘Great Transgressions’: Penance and Excommunication in Late Anglo-Saxon England” (83–105). After a brief but informative discussion of the standard texts from which pre-Conquest attitudes toward penance have traditionally been reconstructed (Latin and vernacular penitentials, confessional prayers and formulas), Hamilton turns her attention to the relative paucity of surviving formulas for excommunication in Anglo-Saxon England when compared to Francia, a gap in the evidence that is all the more surprising given the interest in excommunication as a means of social control evident in late royal legislation. Among the factors responsible for this anomaly, Hamilton suggests that the statements of canon law assembled in Wulfstan’s “commonplace book” show that “excommunication was sometimes viewed ambiguously in the early eleventh century, being only partially distinguished from public penance”; CCC 190 and London, BL Cotton Nero A. i both cite a canon “concerning those penitents who, having sinned publicly,

are excommunicated until they repent,” a situation that would have been unlikely during excommunication as it was traditionally conceived of (99). Evidence that excommunication was resorted to with some frequency is furnished by a body of evidence that, as Hamilton notes, remains little explored by historians of pastoral care: the anathema formulas that conclude many Anglo-Saxon charters (100–102). Hamilton concludes that Frankish practice offers a poor model against which to determine the frequency of, and interest in, excommunication among Anglo-Saxon bishops, nor does the relatively sudden increase in records of excommunication rites in early tenth-century West Francia necessarily show bishops, as had been previously supposed, “assert[ing] their authority in the wake of the collapse of royal authority”; rather, this increase of records reflects “a general increase in the recording of episcopal rites which coincides with the evolution of the pontifical in the late ninth and tenth centuries in East as much as West Frankia” (103). Though Norman bishops would show a much greater interest in recording excommunication rites, their doing so offers, in Hamilton’s view, nothing to counter the conclusion that excommunication was “like its counterpart penance ... an important aspect of the pastoral life of the Church” (103).

Who were the Anglo-Saxon clergy? As Julia Barrow notes in “The Clergy in English Dioceses c. 900–c.1066” (17–26), the scarcity of evidence concerning the pre-Conquest clergy, combined with their being “defined for us” (typically in negative ways) “by the much more literate monks of the Benedictine Reform movement,” means that scholars hoping to widen our knowledge of Anglo-Saxon priests and canons after the examples of specialists in the later Middle Ages face considerable obstacles (17). Nonetheless, Barrow’s consideration of frequently consulted sources such as the *Liber Eliensis*, *Chronicle of Ramsey*, and Domesday Book yields a number of fresh insights. The means by which the clergy expanded its ranks appear, from the evidence of these and other sources, what we might expect: “firstly family networking and inheritance, secondly purchase, and thirdly patronage” (19). The first mode of advancement, though hampered by the Gregorian reform, seems to have survived in “diluted” form: “[F]ather to son succession was still common in the twelfth century, and, although it was being slowly brought to an end, it was to some extent being replaced by new family strategies in which uncles and older brothers in the Church assisted nephews and younger brothers” (25). As for patronage, Barrow dislikes Whitelock’s translation (in the latter’s *Anglo-Saxon Wills*, nos. 29, 31) of *hirdprest* as “chaplain” in Thurstan’s provision for “a priest and two

clerks" so named (23). According to Barrow, "it might be possible to understand the *hired* element in the term *hirdpreost* as a community of clergy rather than the landowner's household. Alternatively, it might be possible to see the two meanings operating simultaneously—a priest might be both a member of a noble household and a member of a clerical community" (23). Barrow goes on to consider what might constitute grounds for further research: that "the jurisdictional framework in which bishops exercised discipline over clergy is not clear" (24) and the surprising "surviv[al] in very large numbers" of English priests "at the level of parish clergy ... well into the twelfth century," something that is contrary to expectations given "the steady disappearance of English clerics from the episcopate in the last three decades of the eleventh century" (25). Barrow concludes that the institutional setting of the pre-Conquest clergy endured remarkably into the twelfth century until tendencies that had long been in place finally cemented: the improved organization of dioceses ultimately allowed bishops "to keep tabs more effectively on parishes" while "the influence of landowners over churches persisted, though now in the more formalised practice of advowson" (25).

The responsibilities of parish (or "proto-parish") priests are sought out in Helen Gittos's study "Is there any Evidence for the Liturgy of Parish Churches in Late Anglo-Saxon England? The Red Book of Darley and the Status of Old English" (63–82). As the title implies, Gittos considers the Red Book of Darley (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 422) to be of special importance for the history of the eleventh-century clergy, for although "the surviving sacramentaries (and to some extent books for the office) may hint at how the clergy of proto-parish churches celebrated mass and office, there is nothing to suggest that any were definitely designed for that purpose" (66). This is decidedly not the case with Darley, a manuscript "almost certainly produced c. 1061," which "seems to contain" in Gittos's view "almost everything that the putative parish priest required," its "material for the occasional offices" being "the most substantial that survives in any pre-Conquest book" (69). Gittos goes on to give a detailed discussion of Darley's rite of baptism, a portion of the text that is of great inherent interest whether or not it was used by a priest (which, as Gittos concedes, is impossible to establish) given the well-known shortage of material surrounding the liturgy of baptism that survives from the period before the Conquest. Ultimately, however, what purports to be a discussion of the Red Book of Darley and its implications for ecclesiastical history turns out to be a fairly wide-ranging exploration of the status of

the vernacular in liturgy. This portion in particular will interest specialists engaged in fields outside of liturgical history. Here Gittos takes to task the somewhat established view that the appearance of the vernacular in liturgical manuscripts indicates the degraded Latinity of those who employed the codices. This thesis, Gittos observes, is largely the product of a credulous reception both of "anti-clerical rhetoric" and of "the idealism of writers like Ælfric, who felt the need to apologise for the act of translation even while they performed on such a grand scale" (81). The author's conclusion that "the presence of the vernacular in the liturgy" should be seen as "evidence for the high status accorded to Old English in the late pre-Conquest period" (82) seems both appropriate and important.

Francesca Tinti's contribution to the volume, "The 'Costs' of Pastoral Care: Church Dues in Late Anglo-Saxon England" (27–51), exhaustively explores evidence concerning the maintenance of baptismal churches in pre-Conquest England. Tinti notes at the outset that "the special relation between a church and its children which was the basis of the obligation to pay tithes in the Frankish world" cannot safely be assumed for England, given the "sparse[ness]" of "evidence for the origins of church dues" (28). In place of the tithes prescribed by the Council of Tribur in 895, here we find less determinate requirements of "*ciricsceat* (literally, 'tribute of the church')," and Tinti registers doubts as to whether this form of payment, whose nature legislative sources such as the code of Ine leave characteristically murky, should be seen as either an Anglo-Saxon pagan survival or "a very ancient Celtic custom taken over by the Church" (28). The *Penitential of Theodore's* reference to an "unspecified *tributum ecclesiae* as well as tithes" is similarly ambiguous (29). Ultimately Tinti decides that texts from this period "do not seem to hint at a compulsory system of ecclesiastical taxation and consequently do not show a direct connection between the delivery of pastoral care and the payment of church dues"; whereas Carolingian churches plainly relied on tithes, in England these seem to have been a later addition to an earlier requirement of tribute, and so "the existence of two main types of church dues" is thus, in Tinti's view, "an English peculiarity" (30–31). The question of whether "there was any sense of an explicit relationship between the delivery of pastoral care and the lay people's obligation to pay church dues" occupies what remains of Tinti's study (31), and in a number of instances (such as the highly systematized lists of church dues in royal codes authored by Wulfstan) Tinti answers in the negative. While regulations drawn up by Wulfstan show increasing interest in organizing

the payment of dues, “it is mainly in Ælfric’s texts that it is possible to identify specific references to the connection between the delivery of pastoral care and the duty to pay church dues in return” (40). After reviewing the payments described in charters and leases, Tinti concludes that while the English laity “were expected to pay their tithes in return for the pastoral care provided by the churches to which they owed their obedience,” this expectation is most likely to be an inheritance of “some of the concepts which formed the basic framework of the tithe system in Continental Europe” (51).

Dawn M. Hadley and Jo Buckberry’s “Caring for the Dead in Anglo-Saxon England” (121–147) focuses primarily on cemeteries dating from the tenth and eleventh centuries, many of which were unknown until relatively recently or insufficiently examined due to a prevailing interest in earlier burial sites. The authors acknowledge that although “burial was not as elaborate as it had been” prior to the tenth century, “the funerary ritual was still used to convey important messages about the status of the dead and perhaps also the likely fate of their souls in the afterlife” (121). In support of this claim, Hadley and Buckberry mention a number of excavation reports indicating that the denial of burial in consecrated ground to perjurers, murderers, burglars and adulterers found in much tenth-century legislation was likely meted out in practice. Numerous “execution cemeteries”—burial sites far from any known churches, and populated with skeletons showing signs of decapitations and other brutal punishments—indicate that this legislation probably was not introducing something new, but rather codifying an established practice, and “[w]hile this evidence does not prove that the Church was influential in such burial arrangements as early as the eighth century, it raises the possibility that felons may have been buried separately from the majority of the population long before the tenth century” (130). Such evidence, the authors convincingly suggest, “should lead us to consider whether burial arrangements not documented until the tenth century may, in fact, have been of greater antiquity” (130). Hadley and Buckberry’s survey of recent radiocarbon dating studies similarly blurs the clean lines of development posited by earlier archaeologists and historians. Burial in churchyards, once assumed not to have been the norm until the tenth century, shows signs of establishment even for members of the laity as early as “the seventh or eighth century” (126); alternatively, “burial near to churches does not appear to have been universal even as late as the tenth century” (127). The long-assumed indifference of ecclesiastics to the methods of burial is established by the diversity of forms

that burial seems to have taken throughout the Anglo-Saxon period; what mattered, as has been said often in recent death studies, is not how one was buried but where one was buried.

In “Das christliche Königtum aus der Sicht der angelsächsischen Missionsschule” (*Das frühmittelalterliche Königtum: Ideelle und religiöse Grundlagen*, ed. Franz-Reiner Erkens [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter], 190–213), Lutz E. von Padberg examines the idea held by Anglo-Saxon missionaries that secular rulers were supposed to work together with their ecclesiastical counterparts to safeguard the spiritual health of the realm. This concept is fully formed in the writings of Bede and was further developed by Alcuin, who demonstrated the theoretical validity of the ideal of a unity that was both political and religious. As the social structure of the time did in fact connect religion with rulership, kings were most likely to accept missionaries, as the examples of Æthelberht and Augustine, Edwin and Paulinus, and Pippin and Willibrord show. After examining how this principle operated in the missions of Boniface and Liudger, von Padberg explores how it relates to the question of sacral kingship. With a clever pun, the divine right of kings becomes the sacred responsibility of rulers (to safeguard the spiritual health of the realm). Thus understood, the divine right of kings entails not autocracy but duty, subordination to God’s will, and even the restriction of the ruler’s worldly power.

d. Society and the Family

David Crouch’s *The Birth of Nobility: Constructing Aristocracy in England and France 900–1300* (Harlow: Pearson Longman) is an unusual dialogue—or “dialectic,” as the author prefers—between history and historiography regarding the topic of medieval aristocracy in England and France. Crouch begins from the assumption that it is nearly impossible to make real progress in understanding medieval aristocracy unless we understand the historically contingent origins of the intellectual positions that most of us take for granted. Therefore, when he considers nobility in terms of conduct, family structure, class feeling, and domination, he begins with an examination of how these categories of analysis have been deployed in the past, the better to present his own interpretations. On the highest level, he sees nobility (defined as a dominant group whose status is legally defined) as something that was structured from aristocracy (defined as a dominant group whose importance is drawn from its economic and social weight). More specifically, he argues that the customs, attitudes, and structures that came to define

aristocracy appeared principally in northern and central France between 900 and 1300. Pre-Conquest England was by no means immune to French influence, but after 1066, English aristocratic society was self-consciously an extension of a dominant French culture. The discussion of England consequently focuses on the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Nonetheless, the pre-Conquest period is the subject of short discussions covering everything from the progressive localization of jurisdiction and lordship in Anglo-Saxon England (200–4) and the absence of castles and knights before the Conquest (204–7) to the perception before 1100 that knighthood was an occupation rather than a social level (244–246). In a brief chapter entitled “The Precocity of England” (252–7), Crouch argues that, despite Wulfstan’s ability to list an ordered series of lay ranks, Anglo-Saxon society did not consist of a hierarchy of groups understood as social classes with common characteristics. Instead, the Anglo-Saxons (and their French contemporaries) had a pragmatic understanding of levels of wealth and saw status as following from that.

Hirokazu Tsurushima uses two late-tenth- and early-eleventh-century trials to determine “The Origins of ‘The Society of Good Men’ and of Their Locality in Eleventh-Century England” (*The Haskins Soc. Jnl, Japan, Studies in Medieval History* 1: 33–37). By “good men” he means members of the gentry, a kind of lesser nobility formed by the operation of royal government on the local level. In the first case, a title-deed on its own was not enough to decide who owned disputed pieces of property and had to be supported with the oaths of good men who remembered the agreement. In the second case, the title-deed was set aside at the wish of the good men in attendance, who wished to settle the dispute by arbitration rather than deciding the case on the basis of the deed and supporting oaths. The latter would have cemented hostility between the parties, whereas arbitration restored amicable relations. Tsurushima concludes that, *pace* Peter Coss, the “long eleventh century” did indeed see the birth of gentry in England.

Andrew Wareham’s *Lords and Communities in Early Medieval East Anglia* (Woodbridge: Boydell) offers a major contribution, not only to our understanding of the East Anglia itself, but to the study of local history in general. Focusing on the effect of the feudal transformation on East Anglian aristocracy and society, Wareham provides a subtle, detailed analysis of the political consequences of property use, abuse, and exchange in the English middle ages. That said, readers should be warned that Wareham’s volume is for a specialist audience, and those not fully conversant with the scholarly literature in his field may find his prose cumbersome,

if not opaque. In particular, Wareham frames his analysis as a response to the 2000 English Heritage report, *Power of Place: the Future of the Historic Environment*, and familiarity with that document (available in .pdf on the English Heritage website) provides a helpful background to his argument. Still, there’s much of great value here, and Wareham’s insights into East Anglian culture will be of use, not only to historians, but to students of Anglo-Saxon literature, law, and archaeology as well. Wareham opens the volume with a critical history of what he calls “the feudal transformation hypothesis” (1), analyzing it in its American, French, and German manifestations. He then considers four families—those of Ealdorman Æthelwine, Wulfstan of Dalham, Ealdorman Ælfgar, and Ealdorman Byrhtnoth—as case studies to explore the development of aristocracy and society in relation to the feudal transformation. These cases are then followed with a series of broader examinations of eleventh-century notions of social order, the formation of lordships, the politics of land use, and the social mobility regional aristocracy before and after the Norman Conquest. In pursuing these lines of analysis, he seeks to answer two broad questions: “On one level, a historical explanation is needed for why there was so much investment in the ecclesiastical built environment across Europe from the end of the ninth century. Yet these medieval societies did not come to be regulated by theological principles and dominated by clergies. There was a secular reaction, encapsulated by the process known as the feudal transformation. On a second level, there is a need to explain the context of the secular reaction against ecclesiastical power from within European society, and the ways in which it has shaped European society” (155). While one might quibble with Wareham’s assertion that the case studies in this volume are “sufficient” to answer these questions (155), he nonetheless offers a useful, provocative means with which to start.

e. Gender and Identity

Kirsten Fenton’s article, “The Question of Masculinity in William of Malmesbury’s Presentation of Wulfstan of Worcester” (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 28: 124–37), examines how William employs normative gender expectations in his characterization of pre-Conquest Englishmen, and the way in which these expectations become a means of characterizing Anglo-Saxon culture itself. Fenton points out that William defines masculinity through a series of recurring traits—restraint, *virtus*, and the ability to manage anger, to name the most important. William judges his male characters by these

traits regardless of their social station, thereby suggesting that he understands his masculine ideal as a universal equally applicable to clerics and laymen. According to Fenton, it is the universality of this ideal that is most important because it allows William to cast such prominent pre-Conquest figures as Wulfstan of Worcester and Dunstan in the mold of traditional Germanic heroes. Doing so, Fenton suggests, allows William both to counter the claim that the English lost at Hastings because they were somehow less “manly” than the Normans and to frame the English past as heroic and a worthy source of national pride.

In “Grave Matters: Anglo-Saxon Textiles and Their Cultural Significance” (*Bull. of the John Rylands Univ. Library of Manchester* 86.2 [2004]: 203–21), Christina Lee protests the marginalization of the study of textiles found in Anglo-Saxon graves, a marginalization that she believes is linked to the textiles’ having been mainly created and studied by women. An illustration of the desired kind of study is provided by comparing the finds from the cemeteries at Alton (Hampshire), Buckland (Kent), Castledyke (E. Yorkshire), and Sewerby (E. Yorkshire), which contain inhumations dating from the mid-fifth to the seventh century. The Castledyke textiles (mid-sixth to seventh century) include unusual fashions for four women and one man. Overall, Castledyke contains a wider variety of textiles for men compared to earlier burials, and it shows that women were given patterned twills as grave textiles at a much earlier stage than men. At Buckland (also mid-sixth to seventh century), patterned twills do not appear with females under the age of ten but occur chiefly with young women between the ages of ten and thirty. A high thread count, indicating a finer cloth, is most prominent with females of childbearing age. Textile design may also point to a growing diversification and specialization of female work, for the increased use of linen in the sixth and seventh centuries required highly specialized tools that may not have been available to all.

Pauline Stafford reads one of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*’s many problematic embedded narratives in “Chronicle D, 1067, and Women: Gendering the Conquest in Eleventh-Century England” (*Anglo-Saxons*, ed. Keynes and Smyth, 208–23). Pointing out that the entry for 1067 in the D-text of the *Chronicle* gives unprecedented prominence to a number of women connected to the events of 1066, Stafford argues that “conquest is the key to understanding this entry and that attention to gender, here and more widely, can enrich our understanding, both of the *Chronicle*, and of the Conquest and its aftermath” (208–9). Stafford traces the history of the D *Chronicle* in order to demonstrate that the 1067 entry

was both composed long after the events it describes and that it is a self-consciously constructed narrative, rather than a coincidental combination of otherwise disparate events. “The story should thus be read,” she writes, “as a story of conquest written by a nostalgic, fatalistic if also bitter and angry clerical Northern English patriot” (217). In her reading of the entry itself, Stafford focuses both on the status of the protagonists as women “out of place”—in Anglo-Norman England and the *Chronicle* itself—and as survivors of the 1066 invasion. She concludes, “consideration of [the *Chronicle*’s] treatment of women, as so often, directed attention also to its men, throwing into relief judgments on English elite males. Gender is a symbolic language, and one which can open up to scrutiny emotional and divided responses” (223). Stafford’s is a compelling, significant essay that opens up a number of lines of analysis, both of the *Chronicle* and of post-Conquest England as a whole.

Jóna Guðbjörg Torfadóttir’s “Í orðastað Alfífu” (*Skírnir* 178: 35–57) is a survey of the medieval Scandinavian accounts of Ælfgifu of Northampton, who briefly ruled Norway with Sveinn, her son by King Canute. The Scandinavian authors depict her not only as a tyrant but also as something rather like one of the troll-women of Icelandic folklore. This is apparently a Scandinavian innovation, for more contemporary, non-Scandinavian works such as the *Encomium Emmae* and William of Malmesbury’s *Gesta Regum Anglorum* treat her in an entirely neutral fashion.

f. The Economy, Settlement, and Landscape

Nicholas Brooks investigates the question of *Church, State and Access to Resources in Early Anglo-Saxon England* (Brixworth: Friends of All Saints’ Church, 2003), with attention to the question of the origins of the political structures that made those resources available. After reviewing Roman state controls in the empire as a whole and in Roman Britain, he turns to England between 650 and 850. He finds that royal control of salt had descended directly from Roman governmental controls. In contrast, Roman forest management was not maintained in Britain, and although the roads that served rural communities with woodland rights remained in use, it was not through the continuous assertion of Roman public obligations to repair them. Bridgework, however, was such an obligation and was clearly of Roman origin, perhaps reinstated under the guidance of Archbishop Theodore. The lack of evidence regarding royal monopolies of metals in early Anglo-Saxon England points to a discontinuity in state

control over those resources, and circumstantial evidence clearly shows that this was true for building stone. Until their conversion to Christianity, Anglo-Saxon kings had no need for stone buildings and thus no need to maintain the quarries. After the conversion, ruined Roman buildings long provided a sufficient source of shaped stones and brick—coincidentally, just the materials from which Brixworth church was constructed.

Six hypotheses are presented in James Campbell's "Hundreds and Leets: A Survey with Suggestions" (*Medieval East Anglia*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill [Woodbridge: Boydell], 153–67). One is that hundredal size was related to population, which in turn was an indicator of taxable capacity. Another is that the purpose of leets was to create fiscal balance. A third is that administrative decisions were made at a level lower than that of the shire, probably that of the hundred. A fourth is that the East Anglian geld system had a fairly recent origin in the 990s. A fifth is that Norfolk and Suffolk's two systems of assessment arose from the growing prosperity of the *liberi homines*, which rendered carucage assessment too out-of-date for geld purposes, and the "pennies in the pound" scheme arose as a replacement. Finally, Campbell notes that in East Anglia, unlike the rest of Domesday England, allocation of geld within the village was not determined by an assessment system recorded in Domesday. He suggests that at village level, the system resembled that adopted in 1334: each place had an allocated quota and it was left to the inhabitants to sort out who paid how much.

Christopher Dyer's "Bishop Wulfstan and his estates" (*Wulfstan and His World*, ed. Barrow and Brooks, 137–49) asks us to consider St. Wulfstan of Worcester not as the ardent peacemaker and politician familiar from his *Vita*, but as the manager of the formidable manors belonging to the church of Worcester. This aspect of the bishop's activities receives little attention from his biographers, but as Dyer notes, "we as historians cannot neglect this aspect of Wulfstan's career, because without the income from agriculture and tenants, there could have been no bishopric, clergy, monks, buildings, liturgy, music and books" (137). Dyer begins by carefully defining the area that would have been under Wulfstan's supervision and describing the likeliest forms that economic life would have assumed within these territories. By Wulfstan's time, it would seem, "the use of land and the organization of settlements had reached such a specialized state of development" that the bishop "clearly had limited scope to make radical changes on his estate" (141). These and other constraints lead Dyer to a conclusion that entails no radical revision of how we should understand Wulfstan's activities: "Wulfstan cannot be

regarded as a notable entrepreneur, innovator or social reformer. He took over the stewardship of a great legacy of landed wealth from his long line of predecessors. He looked after it, protected it and passed it on to his successors" (149). Wulfstan's objections to slavery were conventional for his era (and probably conditioned by his estates' substantial reliance on slave labor): though he found the trade objectionable, the primary objection, as it had been for generations, was to "the export of Christian slaves" (148). Above all, Wulfstan's attitude toward the peasants who labored on his manors is marked according to Dyer by "an assumption of aristocratic superiority, combined with some concern for the welfare of the poor," some leaning toward the former view being perhaps suggested by an episode in his *Vita* in which the devil appears to the bishop as a peasant with "a hideous grin, an ugly face, a furious voice and monstrous strength" (147–8). Dyer suggests that this portrait shows churchmen of this era being "impressed by the physicality and coarseness of peasants, and expect[ing] them to behave in a crude and threatening fashion" (147). The *Vita* offers other potential insights on the economic life of Worcester: at least one episode indicates in Dyer's view a highly developed money economy in which "goods could be quickly and easily exchanged" for cash (146).

Harold Fox provides an in-depth case-study of Devonshire boundary and livestock records in "Fragmented Manors and Customs of the Anglo-Saxons" (*Anglo-Saxons*, ed. Keynes and Smyth, 78–97). In particular, Fox examines why portions of Dartmoor in the lowlands of South Devon became detached from the common grazing lands. The origins for these divisions, Fox claims, lie in the late Anglo-Saxon period, and he derives evidence for his conclusion both from onomastics and surviving charters. Fox's analysis is subtle and well-documented, although it will probably be of interest primarily to those working on either local Devonshire history or Anglo-Saxon herding practices.

Although the focus of *Medieval East Anglia* (Woodbridge: Boydell) is on the post-Conquest period, the essays edited by Christopher Harper-Bill include four with valuable information for Anglo-Saxonists interested in landscape and environmental studies: Tom Williamson's "Explaining Regional Landscapes: East Anglia and the Midlands in the Middle Ages" (11–32), Robert Liddiard's "The Castle Landscapes of Anglo-Norman East Anglia: A Regional Perspective" (33–51), and Brian Ayers's "Understanding the Urban Environment: Archaeological Approaches to Medieval Norwich" (68–82).

In "London and Droitwich, c. 650–750: Trade, Industry and the Rise of Mercia" (*ASE* 34: 7–58), J.R.

Maddicott argues that the rise of Mercia was due not so much to military dynamism and adventitious circumstances as it was to the early Mercian kings' ability to draw on trade and industry in order to promote their power. Especially important in these efforts were London, which was England's greatest trading port, and Droitwich, which was England's chief source of that indispensable trading commodity, salt. After surveying the evidence that attests to the primacy of London's position as a trading center and investigating the changing degree of Mercian control of London, Maddicott notes the value of tolls for the king and the prestige that derived from controlling the old Roman *civitas*. After discussing the Droitwich salt trade and the evidence for its exploitation by Mercian kings, Maddicott argues that the major market for salt was London. Mercian actions to gain control of London and Droitwich were roughly synchronous and motivated by the same fiscal and commercial considerations. The founding of monasteries may also have played a role in the promotion of the production of salt and its marketing in London, for the Droitwich salt interests held by the clerics of Worcester almost certainly generated a saleable surplus. Finally, Maddicott raises the interesting possibility that Droitwich was the Mercian Yeavinger—a former British center newly integrated into an Anglian system of lordship that it was designed to support. The Mercian kings, in all probability like the Northumbrian kings, may well have taken over not just British territory but British authority, already strong and well formulated.

The persistence of prehistoric field boundaries in west Cambridgeshire is the subject of Susan Oosthuizen's "Sokemen and Freeman: Tenure, Status, and Landscape Conservatism in Eleventh-Century Cambridgeshire" (*Anglo-Saxons*, ed. Keynes and Smyth, 187–207). Oosthuizen points out that the most field boundaries in central England had been revised or eliminated by 1150, however those in the Bourn Valley remained largely unchanged well into the nineteenth century. This persistence, she argues, reflects the survival of archaic patterns of estate organization and land tenure through the introduction of open field grazing in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Oosthuizen observes that West Cambridgeshire boasted a higher concentration of sokemen and freemen than other parts of England, a difference that reflects a unique pattern of land use and ownership. She traces these differences to the presence of royal estates in the Bourn Valley as early as the eighth century, the boundaries and rights of which reflected social relationships between clans that had settled the valley 200 years before. According to Oosthuizen, then, the conservatism of west Cambridgeshire's landscape

management reflects a unique history of field use dating back to its earliest settlement.

Aliki Pantos's and Sarah Semple's edited collection, *Assembly Places and Practices in Medieval Europe* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004), developed out of a two-day conference at Oxford's Institute of Archaeology in 2000. As such, the articles largely approach their subject from an archaeological perspective, yet the essays included here will doubtless attract interest from historians, legal scholars, and literature specialists as well. The title of the collection is somewhat misleading, since the papers largely focus on the north Atlantic in the early Middle Ages. Although there are essays on Scandinavia, continental Europe—with the exception of a single essay on the Frankish *mallus*—remains undiscussed. Nonetheless, for those interested in Anglo-Saxon, Irish, Welsh, Scottish, Danish, and Manx assembly practice, this volume will provide a valuable resource. Although the assembly is an institution that scholars have long believed was present among Anglo-Saxon groups before, during, and after the migrations to Britain, its physical traces have been difficult to identify. In "Assembling the Dead" (109–34), Howard Williams suggests that, in the absence of a distinctive archeological site-type, assembly functions were integral parts of other kinds of sites. One possibility is a cremation cemetery such as that at Loveden Hill, which has several features that lend themselves to an assembly place: its catchment area was quite large; the mounds on top of the hill might have been believed to be ancient barrows, making the hill a place of intercession with the sacred; and it was only one choice of burial site for people living in the vicinity. Thus the place may have been special for selected groups or communities who defined their identities in relation to the hill and the gatherings that took place upon it. Interestingly, a seventh-century whetstone like that from Sutton Hoo has been found nearby. Another possibility is a cremation cemetery such as those at Caistor St. Edmund. These cemeteries overlook the site of the Roman *civitas* capital of the Iceni. The ruined enclosure of the town may have been a place of continued political authority, assembly, and ritual practices in the fifth and sixth centuries even if it was abandoned as a center of population. In "Locations of Assembly in Early Anglo-Saxon England" (135–54), Sarah Semple takes a similar approach by supposing that Anglo-Saxon assembly sites might have combined administration with cult practice, as Irish and Scandinavian assembly sites did. She sees Yeavinger and Sutton Hoo as prototypes from a period when Anglo-Saxon society was moving from tribal organization toward state formation, but between them they present a core

group of signifiers or functions that could be used to identify full-fledged assembly sites: the use of prehistoric monuments, a royal residence, evidence of ritual or religious activity, evidence of kingship, and above all, centrality of burial. Of the locations that meet most of these criteria, Portsdown III (Hampshire) is notable for its addition of elite primary and secondary barrow burials to already extensive burial grounds. Laverstock (Wiltshire) and Boars Low (Derbyshire) likewise exploit prehistoric monuments, but for isolated high-status burials. The practices seen in these places may have been intended to lend authority to newly emergent elite groups. Roche Court Down (Wiltshire), with its deviant interments, may also have functioned as an early center of funerary practice and tribal ritual. Semple concludes by observing that it was in the interest of the Church to separate people from places of burial that were locations of pre-Christian belief and practice, so that the majority of early royal/ritual sites would have fallen out of use after the Conversion and would remain in the archeological records—misleadingly—as cemeteries. Pantos's contribution to the volume, "The Location and Form of Anglo-Saxon Assembly-Places: Some 'Moot Points'" (155–80), will doubtless be the source of some controversy. Arguing that traditional place-name study has had a "detrimental" effect on the study of assembly places, Pantos claims that an over-reliance on onomastics has led "to the widespread acceptance of assumptions which are not always supported by the evidence of the sites themselves" (156). Particularly problematic to Pantos is the tendency to associate sites of assembly with a single, often isolated, geographic feature, such as a stone, a mound, or a tree. Pantos argues that assembly sites were chosen largely for pragmatic reasons and to reflect the purpose of the gathering. According to Pantos, these sites were seldom as isolated as onomastic evidence would suggest and were selected based on a combination of features. Perhaps more controversially, Pantos suggests that archaeological evidence indicates that certain assemblies gathered for specialized purposes, such as the carrying out of executions or trade-regulation, and that the sites of these meetings might be chosen for features specific to the purpose. Whether or not proponents of the onomastic approach ultimately find Pantos's claims convincing, he does make a strong case both for a reevaluation of the evidence concerning assembly sites and for a rejection of the characterization of the outdoor assembly as a primitive holdover of archaic Germanic practice.

Phillip R. Schofield's "Seignorial Exactions in eastern England, c. 1050–1300" (*Pour une anthropologie du prélèvement seigneurial dans les campagnes médiévales*,

ed. M. Bourin and P. Martínez Sopena [Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 2004], 383–409) will be quite useful to scholars desiring an overview of the past half-century's work on the manorial economy. The study is concerned primarily with "the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, as well as northern and central Essex (broadly, East Anglia)" (383), and Anglo-Saxonists should be advised that, in spite of its title, its primary focus is the thirteenth century (which does not, of course, necessarily diminish its usefulness). The emphasis on East Anglia is justified by the author's observation that (as Domesday indicates) "eastern England was 'freer' than other parts of England in 1066," by which he means that this region, given the "combination of new settlement and lack of institutionalised slavery ... generate[d] a large 'class' of freemen" robust enough to survive the imposition of the "Norman yoke" (384). Much of the article is devoted to an exhaustive consideration of the evidence for the various rents extracted by lords from their free and unfree tenants. Food rents being conventionally viewed by scholarship as the most archaic of exactions were displaced as early as the twelfth century by "money rents and labour services," surviving after this period "in the form of small renders to the lord, often at Christmas and Easter" (389); accordingly, they do not take up a great deal of space in Schofield's study. Money rents become fully visible toward the end of the period delimited by the article's title, but are probably of earlier ancestry, and display not long after their appearance a tendency to become confused with other exactions: "Payments arising from pre-Conquest payments owed to the Anglo-Saxon state and based upon units of that state—the county and its divisions, the hundred and the hide—had also corrupted into private rents by the high middle ages ... The Danegeld, for instance, a levy inevitably associated with eastern England, was gifted to the abbey of Bury St. Edmunds in 1021 while, in the mid-eleventh century, Edward the Confessor had donated the revenue from the jurisdiction of eight-and-a-half-hundreds to the abbey" (395). In addition to the types of payments made by tenants in early medieval England—itself a somewhat thorny issue—Schofield discusses the schedule on which payments were made, and the "social and cultural context" that seems to have surrounded these payments (399). It is especially in this latter section that Schofield poses some searching questions: "Did landlords only adapt their attitudes to rent in order to maximise their economic interest or were there other considerations of equal or greater importance? Most especially, in what ways did landlords employ the extraction of rent as an opportunity to display power or munificence?" (400). Among Schofield's

conclusions about the attitude of the tenantry toward rents—for which the evidence is predictably scarce—is his judgment, based upon the work of earlier specialists in economic history, that peasants sought above all “a relationship with their lord that was capable of being prejudged and against which prior calculation could be made” (405). The essay concludes with a convenient collection of primary documents.

In “The Lesse Set By: An Early Reference to the Site of Middle Saxon London?” (*Trans. of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Soc.* 55: 27–33), Robert L. Whytehead reviews archeological and documentary evidence concerning the site of Middle Saxon London. A late-fifteenth-century description of the city of London having most housing between Ludgate and Westminster fits with what can be discerned from the archeological evidence, principally from the Covent Garden area, for a town that reached its greatest extent in the mid- to late-eighth century. Whytehead also proposes some solutions to the difficulties raised by the description’s claiming to pertain to 982. The description might characterize the city after a disastrous fire; better yet, it might be in the wrong place and actually pertains to London after one of the later eighth-century fires.

g. Medicine and Science

In her article, “The Old English Pharmacopoeia: A Proposed Dating for the Translation” (*Avista Forum Journal*, 13.2: 9–18), Maria D’Aronco revisits arguments concerning vernacular versions of the Latin *Herbal* and *Medicina de Quadripedibus* that she had initially advanced ten years earlier (in “Lerbario anglosassone, un’ipotesi sulla data della traduzione,” *Romanobarbarica* 13 (1994–95): 325–66). Seeking “unequivocal and objective criteria that will permit us to make a relatively reliable hypothesis about the period in which the translation was made” (10), she points out that “there are very few plant names which may be attributed to the common heritage of the Germanic languages” (13). Ultimately, she argues that the translation was carried out near the end of the Anglo-Saxon period, perhaps as late as the eleventh century but more likely towards the close of the tenth. The very fact of the translation, she suggests, implies a reading public “that knew little or no Latin and was not necessarily dependent on the monasteries, which therefore implies a much wider circulation of medical material” (16). In the end, her study of the sources for the translation leads her to conclude that the Pharmacopoeia was “the result of a well defined translation project whose aim was to offer an audience unable with sufficient confidence to tackle in

Latin the most authoritative learning available in the field of pharmacy” (16).

D’Aronco’s “I germani e la scienza: il caso dell’Inghilterra anglosassone” (*I germani e gli altri*: 3; *Seminario avanzato in filologia germanica*, ed. Vittoria Dolcetti Corazza and Renato Gendre, *Bibliotheca germanica* 13 [Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso, 2003], 81–114) is a seminar presentation that concentrates on medical and pharmacological knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England. Disagreeing with scholars of an earlier generation who asserted that Dark Age medical manuscripts were mere literary material with little relationship to the actual lines of treatment, D’Aronco argues that Old English works such as the *Leechbook* display a concrete knowledge of practical medicine. After touching on the medical training of Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury, Bede’s references to the practice of medicine, and the monastic production of works dealing with practical medicine, she turns to the Old English translations of the *Herbarium*. These works—accurately rendered and graced with high-quality illuminations—are argued to be useful and practical. Yet a few errors have crept in, and D’Aronco suggests that the appearance of the phrase *ad serpentis morsum* where we would expect the Old English name for *alutam* comes from the scribe accidentally skipping over the English name and the boilerplate “this plant is good for” (or words to that effect) and resuming with the Latin name of the affliction for which *alutam* is a remedy. Also, the divergence between the Latin and Old English descriptions of the properties of *hedera nigra* is argued to be due to misreading, not mistranslation. D’Aronco then examines the relationship between the three manuscripts of the Old English *Herbarium*: V (BL Cotton Vitellius C.iii), H (BL Harley 585), and B (Bodleian Lib., Hatton 76). The deluxe volumes V and B are shown to be independent of one another and also not copies of H. D’Aronco argues that their lost exemplar was an illustrated one and was produced at one of the large Benedictine scriptoria in Winchester. H has the aspect of a volume destined for practical use, but various correspondences with V and B suggest that it may be derived from an illustrated exemplar related to those used by V and B. Finally, similarities between V and the Montecassino manuscript *Biblioteca dell’Badia*, 97, are evidence of the close ties between Winchester and the center of Benedictine monasticism.

“A Reassessment of the Efficacy of Anglo-Saxon Medicine” (*ASE* 34: 183–95), by Barbara Brennessel, Michael D. C. Drout, and Robyn Gravel, would seem to argue against D’Aronco’s position. The reassessment shows that, at least for ailments with bacteriological causes, the

remedies of the *Leechbook* would not have significantly benefited the patients upon whom they were used. This conclusion surprised the authors, who expected to provide empirical support for an earlier thesis that some Anglo-Saxon remedies would have been effective. The chief remedy tested—that for an eye stye—turned out to take antimicrobial ingredients and turn them into an ineffective mixture, probably as a result of their long stay in a brass pot. Five out of six other *Leechbook* remedies that were tested were equally unsuccessful in inhibiting the growth of bacteria. The authors conclude that further assessment of Anglo-Saxon medicine should be focused not so much on speculating about efficacy in modern, clinical terms but on understanding what people at the time thought of this cultural practice.

h. Law, Politics, and Warfare

In “Land Tenure and Royal Patronage in the Early English Kingdom: A Model and a Case Study” (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 28: 19–46), Stephen Baxter and John Blair use the example of Bampton hundred to illustrate the process by which ancient patterns of extended lordship gave way to more closely focused manorial regimes in the third quarter of the tenth century. Here the exercise of royal patronage led to the creation of a bookland zone that was parceled out to beneficiaries ranging from archbishops to goldsmiths. But although the division of Bampton is consistent with the “maximum view” of the late Anglo-Saxon state’s coherence, integrity, and power, the exercise of royal patronage is argued to have released political forces that were difficult to control. Royal patronage created intense competition within the aristocracy, so that factional rivalry became one of the central facts of court politics in the late Anglo-Saxon period. In this highly stressed polity, seemingly minor developments in the localities could quickly assume national significance, and the stability of the kingdom was thus to a large extent dependent on the king’s ability to balance rival factions.

Clare Downham’s “England and the Irish-Sea Zone in the Eleventh-Century” (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 26: 55–73) was reviewed in *YWOES* 2003.

Two early Anglo-Saxon rulers receive an important reevaluation in David Hill and Margaret Worthington’s *Æthelbald and Offa: Two Eighth-Century Kings of Mercia* (B. A. R. British Series 383 [Oxford: Archaeopress]). Gathering together papers from a conference sponsored by the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies in 2000, this volume provides a much-needed survey of current scholarship on eighth-century Mercia. If Offa receives somewhat more attention than Æthelbald, it

is still refreshing to see this level of recognition for a region too often neglected in favor of contemporary Northumbria or later Wessex. Damian Tyler’s contribution, “Orchestrated Violence and the ‘Supremacy of the Mercian Kings’” (27–33), examines the significance of military success to the careers of Mercian kings from Penda to Offa. Tyler concludes that orchestrated violence gradually lost importance over the course of the eighth century, and that this diminishing role reflects a change in the notion of kingship “from hegemonal and face-to-face, to expansionist and centralizing” (27). Tyler writes, “Unlike Penda, Æthelbald and Offa did not wish to be merely hegemonal wielding *imperium* over other kings. For them, with their more expansive and sophisticated paradigm of kingship, other kings were potential rivals. To be a truly great king meant being the only king, at least within the relatively discrete world of southern England. Therefore they pursued expansionist, centralizing policies whereby the loose, hegemonal overkingship of Penda’s time was transformed into a larger, more integrated structure which absorbed other politics” (28). While one might argue that Tyler’s argument occasionally sacrifices specificity for scope, he does make a compelling argument for an alteration in eighth-century Mercian kingship and for the importance of this alteration in the eventual unification of England.

In the intriguingly titled, “Onuist son of Uurguist: *tyrannus carnifex* or a David for the Picts?” (35–42), Alex Woolf summarizes the career of a king described by David Hill as “[someone] of whom I have never heard and whose name I have forgotten but who is apparently very important” (35). In tracking Onuist’s career, Woolf draws a number of parallels between the Pictish king and his Mercian contemporaries, the point of which are to highlight the many similarities between Anglo-Saxon and Celtic culture. As Woolf points out, “if we look beyond language for the features that have traditionally defined the civilization of the Early Christian Celts we shall find most of them amongst the Early Christian English” (35). The article focuses particularly on Old English records of Onuist’s reign, including the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, in order to discuss the significance of Onuist’s failed invasion of Mercia in the 750s.

Women’s political influence is the topic of Barbara Yorke’s essay, “Æthelbald, Offa, and the Patronage of Nunneries” (43–8). She writes, “the reigns of Æthelbald and Offa ... provide an interesting case history of the ways in which patronage of nunneries continued to be used as a means of supporting royal power when new branches of royal houses won the throne in the eighth century” (43). As Yorke points out, though, the two

kings in question understood patronage in very different ways. For Æthelbald, sponsoring the religious establishment at Repton aided in the creation of power-base around which to build a royal faction. Yet beyond political usefulness or religious devotion, a surviving letter of Boniface's indicates that Æthelbald's royal favor may also be attributed to Repton's nuns, for whom the licentious king displayed a marked predilection. Offa, on the other hand, seems to have been less amorous and more politically savvy. Emulating Charlemagne, Offa used his female relatives to establish connections with religious centers across his realm. Doing so, according to Yorke, provided a means of "taking back lands granted to the church and of outflanking episcopal authority, [and] they were also important for the construction of identity as a royal family in a Christian context, something particularly significant for parvenu dynasties who needed to convince supporters at home and win recognition abroad" (46). Just as important, appointment to a royal convent invested female royals with significant material wealth and political influence which they otherwise might not have had. As such, even as royal patronage of nunneries provided the king himself with necessary support, it also offered women a limited means of attaining power at an otherwise male-dominated court.

One religious establishment of particular importance to Offa was St. Alban's, and it is this relationship which is examined in Richard Martin's "*The Lives of the Offas: the Posthumous Reputation of Offa, King of the Mercians*" (49–54). Focusing on the single surviving text of the *Vitae Duorum Offarum* (likely by Matthew of Paris), Martin considers how the thirteenth century text used strategies drawn from Biblical typology to whitewash the king's reputation and emphasize his connection with St. Alban's. Martin identifies two main elements to the biography, "one purely fictional, and one of a certain historical foundation but still interwoven with much highly imaginative material" (49). A reliance on fiction would have been necessary, given the king's apparent lack of religious feeling and collusion in the murder of Æthelberht of East Anglia. As Martin points out, however, the text neatly avoids this problem: "It would have been most embarrassing for the community at St. Alban's to explain that the man they considered to be their founder was a murderer. Thus transfer of blame is made to Drida, i.e. Cynethryth [Offa's queen], the *femme fatale* from Francia, and emphasis laid upon the piety of Offa in the text" (52). The purpose of all this fancy dancing, according to Martin, would seem to have been a concerted attempt in the thirteenth century to enhance the reputation of St. Alban's by emphasizing

its connection with the Mercian king. These efforts seem to have ended, however, with Matthew of Paris's death in 1263.

Stephen Matthews's "Legends of Offa: the Journey to Rome" (55–9) assesses the evidence for Offa's supposed pilgrimage. That the journey never took place hardly needs repeating, and Matthews's essay does not try to advance such a claim. Rather, Matthews examines the earliest versions of the legend in order to determine what might have made such a tale useful to the St. Alban's monks who first recorded it. According to Matthews, "the need must lie in some threat to St. Alban's Abbey which stimulated interest in its founder in order to enhance its rights and privileges by showing that they came from the most impeccable sources, the Papacy, the Papal Curia (which is stressed in the *Vitae*), and one of England's greatest kings" (56). The claim that the legend's origins "must lie in some threat" seems a bit strong—it seems just as likely that the composition of legend and *Vitae* originate in an early thirteenth-century fundraising or public relations campaign—nevertheless Matthews advances a convincing reading of the legend's immediate relevance.

In "Æthelberht, King and Martyr: the Development of a Legend" (59–63), Sheila Sharp considers the medieval cult of the East Anglian king Æthelberht, which seemingly disappeared for four hundred years following his death in 794. Her essay asks three questions: "i) why did the story apparently disappear? ii) why did it suddenly resurface? iii) how did it survive over such a long period?" (59) In answering the first two questions, Sharp situates the legend in relation to the politics of eighth-century Mercia and twelfth-century Hereford. Her evidence in these sections is compelling, however in answering her final question, the argument turns more towards speculation. She posits the existence of an oral, vernacular tradition to explain the survival of the Æthelberht legend—one possibility, certainly, but hardly the sole, necessary explanation for the legend's survival that the essay makes it out to be.

Margaret Worthington's contribution, "Offa's Dyke" (91–5), summarizes recent discoveries concerning the Dyke's history and purpose. She points out that a date of construction during Offa's reign is not inconsistent with the archaeological evidence, although hardly necessary (and perhaps not even likely). Its shape and location suggest a military purpose, although it cannot be linked to a single event or campaign, and there is sufficient evidence of passages through and over the Dyke to indicate that it probably did not hold this function for long. Worthington writes, "perhaps we should think in terms of a Berlin Wall; erected to meet a particular

need at a particular time and totally unnecessary when the political situation changed" (94). [This article is now superseded by Worthington and David Hill's 2003 volume *Offa's Dyke: History and Guide*.]

Gareth Williams examines the relationship between the development of bookland and the increase in various forms of required military service in "Military Obligations and Mercian Supremacy in the Eighth Century" (103–9). Focusing particularly on the obligations of bridgework, fortress work, and service in the host, Williams writes, "the appearance of these obligations as royal rights under Æthelbald and Offa raises several questions. Does the appearance of these obligations in the charters indicate that they are new? How significant is it that they first develop in Mercian charters? How do they relate to the development of centralized royal authority? How do they relate to offensive and defensive warfare?" (103) Williams tentatively concludes that specific military obligations do develop in conjunction with new notions of bookland during the reigns of Æthelbald and Offa, however he also notes that many features predate the eighth century, and that several may have been borrowed from other Anglo-Saxon kingdoms.

The Age of Athelstan: Britain's Forgotten History (Stroud: Tempus, 2004), by Paul Hill, is written in an informal style for a general audience. Although it is based on scholarly sources and includes informative sections on the possible location of the Battle of Brunanburh and the St. Edward Brotherhood of the Russian Orthodox Church (Woking, Surrey), Hill's considerable enthusiasm for tenth-century England does not wholly compensate for a rather uneven presentation. Difficult topics such as the monastic reform movement could possibly have been omitted altogether, but the unavoidable discussion of the Old Norse material will leave the general reader not merely at sea but also sadly astray.

In *Ruling England, 1042–1217* (London: Longman), Richard Huscroft attempts to provide both an examination of political power in Saxon, Norman, and Angevin England and a textbook for undergraduate students of medieval English history. Professional historians will find little new here, but original scholarship is not Huscroft's goal. Rather, as a summary of the major political developments between the eleventh and early thirteenth centuries, this book aims to condense current knowledge of a difficult period into a coherent, digestible narrative. Divided into three parts ("Late Anglo-Saxon England," "Anglo-Norman England," and "Angevin England"), each with four chapters ("The Reigns," "Ruling the Kingdom," "The Kings and

the Law," and "The Kings and the Church"), the volume takes a systematic approach to the development of English government and legal institutions. Sprinkled throughout are "Debates," single-page subsections concerning particular points of academic controversy, such as "Why did William of Normandy win the Battle of Hastings?" "Was William Rufus murdered?" or "Was Henry II the founder of the English Common Law?" Teachers of undergraduates will find little objectionable in Huscroft's presentation, although to the mind of this reviewer, he does overrate the coherence of England's national identity both during this period and later. More to the point, one wonders if this volume will ultimately find an audience. Most institutions do not offer lower-level courses on English politics between the Confessor and Magna Carta, and its focus is much too narrow for a more general undergraduate course on medieval England. If it does find users, however, Huscroft's volume will provide undergraduates with a helpful introduction to an otherwise complex topic.

Lucy Marten's essay, "The Rebellion of 1075 and its Impact on East Anglia" (*Medieval East Anglia*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill [Woodbridge: Boydell], 168–82), provides an excellent example of the ways in which local history can be used to illuminate larger issues. Focusing on "the evidence [of the 1075 uprising] from East Anglia to see how William's response to rebellion altered the political, administrative, and tenurial structure of the region" (168), Marten's arguments call into question many of the traditional notions concerning the Conqueror's approach to kingship. The most important of these is the convention—inspired by the Chronicle—that William's decisions regarding land tenure and forfeiture were shaped by the subject's ethnicity or nation of origin. As Marten demonstrates, however, William's decisions in such matters more often were based on "the individual's usefulness to the new regime and the need for administrative continuity" (180). In general, the East Anglian sources marshaled by Marten offer a valuable corrective to the tendency to take the Chronicle at its word. She demonstrates not only the significance of the 1075 uprising to East Anglian society, but the way in the issues confronted regionally encapsulate similar problems on the national level.

Justin Pollard has produced quite a good popular biography of *Alfred the Great: The Man Who Made England* (London: John Murray). Solidly researched and clearly written, with an impressive amount of background information skillfully woven into the main narrative, this work enlivens the current understanding of Anglo-Saxon history with a judicious sampling of the medieval legends that grew up around these events.

In “An Early Mercian Hegemony: Penda and Overkingship in the Seventh Century” (*Midland History* 30: 1–19), Damian Tyler attempts to provide what he calls the first serious assessment of Penda’s rule “from the inside.” In doing so, he argues that “Penda’s style of overkingship represented a flexible but essentially conservative reaction to the new strategies of power which Christian ideologies and Christian churchmen were providing for other seventh-century kings” (1–2). Tyler offers compelling justification for Penda’s importance in Anglo-Saxon religious and political history, and his analysis benefits particularly from his consideration of a wide range of sources. These allow him to move beyond Bede’s condemnation (and Stenton’s, whose claim that the king’s overthrow resulted in “the development of civilization in England” opens the essay) to develop a more comprehensive understanding of Penda’s reign. Tyler demonstrates that, despite Bede’s claim, Penda did indeed hold *imperium* over much of southern England and Wales, and that he wielded his power with diplomatic sophistication. If, as Tyler himself concedes, much of the argument is necessarily speculative, he nonetheless offers a strong case for continued study of Penda’s practice of kingship.

In “Talking About History in Eleventh Century England: The *Encomium Emmae Reginae* in the Court of Harthacnut” (*EME* 13.4: 359–83), Elizabeth M. Tyler offers a compelling re-evaluation of the *Encomium* in light of recent advances in our understanding of early medieval literacy. The central question asked by her article is how a Latin text might have been transmitted to and received by an early-eleventh-century lay audience. For Tyler, this question enables an exploration of what she calls “the sociology of Latin”: “how Latin texts structured, and were structured by, the human relationships of the people who made them” (360). At the core of this argument is a claim regarding the immediate purpose of the *Encomium*, namely, that it had been written as an intervention in contemporary disputes about Emma’s place in Harthacnut’s and Edward’s court. Consequently, failure to communicate with a lay audience and to reshape such disputes would mean that the text and its author had failed in their purpose. In resolving these issues, Tyler highlights the multilingual nature of Harthacnut’s court, which she describes as a place of several vernaculars: English, French, Danish, and Flemish. She suggests that Latin, a language specifically associated with none of the national constituencies present at court, may have offered a way to “transcend factionalism” because in was “nobody’s mother tongue” (370). Perhaps more importantly, Latin narrative allowed the *Encomiast* to draw parallels between

Emma and the figures of Classical epic, most notably those in the *Aeneid*. Underscoring the importance of the *Aeneid* to Harthacnut’s court mythology, Tyler examines the ways in which the *Encomiast* alludes to Virgil’s text in order to characterize Emma as a new Octavian. Tyler has written a useful, convincing essay that will offer much to those considering the place of Latin in eleventh-century court culture.

Patrick Wormald’s “Die frühesten ‘englischen’ Könige: von den Anfängen bis 1066” (*Die englischen Könige im Mittelalter: von Wilhelm dem Eroberer bis Richard III*, ed. Natalie Fryde and Hanna Vollrath [Munich: C.H. Beck, 2004], 11–40) begins with a statement of faith that, in spite of the idealized and conventional nature of royal biographies in the early Middle Ages, these sources can still offer some sense of how kings governed, and how the institution of kingship itself was shaped by socioeconomic forces over time. For the latter, Wormald posits two stages of development: a “heroic age” (*Heldenzeitalter*) stretching from the fifth until the eighth century during which kingdoms rapidly arose and were just as rapidly swept away by battle, followed by a period of sacral kingship in which monarchs imagined that their duties mirrored those imposed by God on the rulers of biblical Israel: expanding the realm while using legislation to stamp out immorality at home. The former mode of kingship was doomed by the increasing scarcity of land, which had functioned as the principal currency with which the earlier warrior-kings expanded their ranks, and which ultimately was donated (with excessive generosity, in Bede’s view) to monastic houses (17). Offa’s importance inheres for Wormald largely in his effective seizure and deployment of money as a new source of power, a strategy that seems to have been imported from the Continent. The reign of Alfred represents a major point of transition toward the more sacral conception of kingship with which the period concludes, something which is evidenced most plainly by Alfred’s royal legislation: “Ein groß angelegtes Vorwort, ein Fünftel des ganzen Textes, übersetzt fast drei Kapitel des Buches Exodus, und zwar so, daß die Ähnlichkeit der alten israelitischen Gesetze mit denen der Westsachsen und ihrer Nachbarn in Mercien und Kent sichtbar wird” (26). Additionally, Alfred should be credited with cultivating a network of institutions that can, without anachronism in Wormald’s view, be described as a “state,” and the durability and antiquity of these institutions when compared with continental analogues marks them as distinctly English (30). This essay lacks a standard bibliography and is evidently intended for a non-specialist audience. Most its claims are explored at greater length in the author’s

many brilliant studies, and its worth lies primarily in its convenient summary of the arguments advanced by Wormald throughout his career, offered here in a characteristically entertaining style.

i. Vikings

Benjamin Hudson's *Viking Pirates and Christian Princes: Dynasty, Religion, and Empire in the North Atlantic* (Oxford: Oxford UP) examines two dynasties in particular: that of Olaf *cúarán* Sitricsson (d. 981), who founded the kingdom of Dublin, and that of Godfrey Haraldsson (d. 989), who became king of the Isles. Although both these dynasties had dealings with the English in one way or another, Chapter 5, "From Dublin to England and Norway" (107–27), may be of the greatest interest to Anglo-Saxonists. Here Hudson describes the career of Olaf's son Sitric Silkenbeard after his defeat at the Battle of Clontarf in 1014. Here it is argued that Sitric was able to regain a considerable part of his power by becoming a client of King Cnut in England. Evidence for this includes a joint raid on Wales, English charters, and an English coin-die for an issue of *Sihtric rex Irum* (Sitric, king of the Irish). Hudson points out the economic and religious benefits of such an alliance for Sitric and the military benefits for Cnut. Certainly Sitric's fortunes seemed linked to the latter: less than a year after Cnut's death, Sitric was driven from Dublin and had to flee Ireland entirely, dying in exile six years later.

Isabella Strachan's *Emma, The Twice-Crowned Queen: England in the Viking Age* (London: Peter Owen, 2004), is a popular biography of Emma of Normandy, written in simple language. Harriet O'Brien's *Queen Emma and the Vikings: A History of Power, Love and Greed in Eleventh-Century England* (New York: Bloomsbury) is pitched at a slightly higher level, although it is written in an informal style. O'Brien has clearly done a lot of research, but in rendering dry, scholarly accounts into something more lively, she has inadvertently produced a large number of half-truths and questionable assertions.

j. The Norman Conquest and Settlement

"1066: Does the Date Still Matter?" (*Historical Research* 78: 443–64) is David Bates's inaugural lecture as director of the Institute of Historical Research, University of London. His underlying concern is the disparity between the popular and academic understandings of the meaning of the events of 1066. The public perception consists of the old stereotypes depicted in *Ivanhoe*

and innumerable Robin Hood movies, but the modern academic consensus has moved far beyond this. Bates's survey underscores the facts that 1066 was by no means England's first entry into Europe; that Norman culture was located within the framework of post-Carolingian northern France, rather than being inherited from the Vikings or adopted from the French; and that the Domesday Book—termed a *descriptio* by contemporaries—is as much European as it is English. As the old stereotypes still retain a place in political discourse at the highest level, Bates considers re-education of the public about 1066 to be crucial.

Pierre Bouet and Véronique Gazeau edit the proceedings of the Cerisy-la-Salle colloquium held on October 4–7, 2001, and concerned with *La Normandie et l'Angleterre au Moyen Âge* (Caen: CRAHM, 2003). Essays pertaining to Anglo-Saxon book culture are reviewed elsewhere in *YWOES*; two concern history. In "Introduction: la Normandie et l'Angleterre de 900 à 1204" (9–20), David Bates reflects on recent work in the field and comments on the directions that should be taken in the future. Among other things, Bates would reject colonialism and imperialism as conceptual frameworks with which to understand the Norman expansion; instead, he would see the conjoint history of Normandy and England in terms of a process of state formation. Overall, he argues, there was Norman and French domination in England until around 1090 and pursuit of this domination from 1090 to around 1125, with an acceleration of exchanges and activities associated with more stable conditions. Nonetheless, throughout these years there was also a strong continuity of indigenous influences and contacts with other regions. Katharine Keats-Rohan draws "Le rôle des élites dans la colonisation de l'Angleterre (vers 1066–1135)" (39–60) from her then forthcoming monograph *Domesday Descendants* (Boydell & Brewer, 2002), which provides a prosopographical analysis of post-Domesday sources such as the Pipe Rolls and the *Cartae Baronum* of 1166. Some 73% of families with an ancestor mentioned in the Domesday Book can be identified in the *Cartae Baronum* fragments, clearly showing that the colonization of conquered England was remarkably stable. Keats-Rohan then turns to the question of just how new the "new men" of the reign of Henry I were. She finds that they did indeed rise to positions that completely eclipsed those of their fathers, but they were without a doubt *nobiles* in the technical sense of the period. Finally, she considers the examples of late-tenth- and early-eleventh-century Norman sheriffs—administrators on the local level—who often married English women from the *thegn* class. They made these alliances

with their Anglo-Saxon predecessors in order to consolidate and augment their own power. If the Anglo-Saxon nobility was swept away in and after 1066, such was not the case with the Anglo-Saxon agents of government, who survived the Conquest and maintained their dominant position in each successive generation.

Paul Hill's best work to date is *The Road to Hastings: The Politics of Power in Anglo-Saxon England* (Stroud: Tempus). Again aiming at a general audience, Hill addresses the question of why the English lost the Battle of Hastings. The answer begins with the succession crisis of 975–979 and over the course of twelve chapters covers Anglo-Saxon, Norman, and Scandinavian history up to the coronation of Harold Godwinson. Hill accepts Harold's claim that Edward the Confessor gave England to him on his deathbed, but he suggests that Edward meant for Harold to be the protector of the realm and not necessarily king. As Hill comes to the Battle of Hastings itself, further views are presented. For example, Hill argues that William was not given a papal banner in 1066, as the Bayeux Tapestry shows, but rather that he received it around 1070 in recognition of a *fait accompli*. Harold is said to have rushed south to Hastings without waiting for reinforcements because he wanted to trap the Normans while they were still on a piece of land surrounded by water on three sides; the English fleet would prevent their retreat. Yet in the end, says Hill, it was William who surprised Harold. The exchange of messages between them enabled him to learn the king's location at Caldbec Hill, which was not where Harold meant to fight but was merely the place where the reinforcements were to catch up with him. The *malfosse* (bad ditch) at which some of the fleeing English made a stand is argued to be Oakwood Gill, a deep ravine that runs across the northern part of the battlefield. Hill thinks it likely that the stand was led by a fresh command, perhaps that of Edwin and Morcar, who had been leading the reinforcements. In the end, the answer is quite short: as Stenton said, the English lost because they fought a purely defensive engagement rather descending on the Normans at one of the moments when they were vulnerable. But Hill makes it quite clear that even if the English had won at Hastings, the Normans would not have been long deterred.

Andrew Lowerre's outstanding *Placing Castles in the Conquest: Landscape, Lordship and Local Politics in the South-Eastern Midlands, 1066–1100* (Oxford: Archaeopress) investigates where and why castles were built in Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire, and Northamptonshire during the period in question. Although cast in the form of an archeological report, this closely-argued, technologically up-to-the-minute

analysis deals equally with history and society. Lowerre, who subscribes to the idea that castles are more than just isolated pieces of military architecture, argues that they should not be seen as elements of a grand strategy for the conquest of England as a whole but rather as an integral part of a series of private, local conquests. He finds that four factors often assumed in traditional castle studies to have been particularly important in choosing sites for castles—centrality to the builder's fee, close proximity to lines of communications, close proximity to river crossings, and a panoramic view—turn out not to have been especially popular. Military-minded assumptions about the siting of castles in the Conquest period are thus seriously flawed. In addition, less than half the castles in the south-eastern Midlands met the criterion of having been built on a resource-rich estate. As there seems to have been no single, overarching factor that governed the decisions of even a majority of the region's castle-builders, Lowerre concludes that they were instead guided and constrained by the various tenurial, political, economic, and physical circumstances in which they found themselves, not by a strategic master plan or a single, rigid formula. Lowerre's case studies ably illustrate the particulars.

Donald Matthew's *Britain and the Continent 1000–1300: The Impact of the Norman Conquest* (London: Hodder Arnold) is a survey of the contacts of people in the British Isles with people from the Continent. As this work is chronologically arranged, the first two chapters are of greatest interest to Anglo-Saxonists. In "Introduction," the Anglo-Saxons are argued to be much more eager to establish contact with the barbarian successor states of the Roman empire than to complete the subjugation of the rest of Britain. Continental Christianity was ultimately far more important to the Anglo-Saxon church than was Irish or Welsh Christianity, and trading overseas was one means of becoming a thegn. Matthew emphasizes the openness of the whole British Isles to maritime traffic and points out the absence of governmental oversight of travel; individuals and communities managed their "foreign" interests as they thought fit. Noting that some residents preferred their continental friends and allies to their fellow islanders, he concludes that Britishness was not a product of the Middle Ages. "The Norman Conquest and its implications" draws attention to the Scandinavian and Norman elements of the history leading up to the Conquest and to the multinational force that William assembled. British relationships with the Continent are then considered in the areas of "England and the reform movement," "The Viking legacy," and "The Normans and the British Isles."

It is difficult to determine how best to characterize Peter Rex's book, *The English Resistance: The Underground War Against the Normans* (Stroud: Tempus). On the one hand, his assumptions regarding his reader's prior knowledge and his claim to address a topic hitherto unexamined by professional historians indicate that a primarily academic audience is intended. Conversely, the absence of footnotes, the reliance on (often outdated and occasionally inaccurate) translations, and the generally oversimplified cast to his analysis suggest that he would rather appeal to a more popular market. This "neither fish nor fowl" quality to the volume means that both types of readers will likely leave dissatisfied. The volume purports to be an account of the various popular uprisings against William, with an emphasis on that of Hereward "the Wake," and he does elicit many fascinating details, both about Hereward himself and his contemporaries. On the other hand, his repeated comparisons between post-Conquest England and occupied France seem wrong—for all the Normans' many flaws, one can hardly call them Nazis! However, this comparison does reflect the book's distinctly nationalist cast. Rex writes in the tradition of those eighteenth century Whig historians for whom the Conquest imposed (in the famous phrase) a "Norman Yoke" while historical narrative offered a means of re-accessing a lost Anglo-Saxon identity. Perhaps the most problematic aspect of Rex's narrative, though, is its episodic style. Beginning and ending abruptly, the book moves from event to event, often without transition or connection. References to larger themes or trends that might provide a sense of movement or coherence are largely absent. On the whole, those readers seeking a ready reference to persons or events of the post-Conquest period may find a volume of this sort handy, but those looking either for professional historiography or a rip-roaring narrative would be well-advised to go elsewhere.

In "Domesday Now" (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 28: 168–87), David Roffe restates certain positions from his *Domesday: Inquest and Book* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000) that were misunderstood or that were overshadowed by the debate over the date of Domesday. Roffe argues that the Domesday Book is not about lordship based on landholding but is instead about interlocking and overlapping rights that devolved upon taxation and service. Moreover, it was the inquest records that he says were current and useful; the Book itself he says was used chiefly as an administrative aid within the treasury. Roffe suggests that the contents of the Domesday Book at best tell us what the book itself was compiled for; they do not necessarily reveal why

the data was collected in the first place. Specific points include the following. The ploughland is argued to be a measure of tax capacity, and geld is argued to be not a tax but the articulation of all the duties that a free man owed in respect of his station. Service is argued to be a condition of exemption; that is, if a knight is free from gelds, it is only to enable him to fulfill the demands on him for service. Service and taxation thus appear to be complementary. In the context of Domesday, "manor" is argued to designate a nexus of soke (i.e., tribute of all kinds), not an estate. Domesday values appear to be soke dues rendered in cash, not any sort of overall return from the manor as a whole. This is why they appear in Domesday Book alongside the renders of churches, mills, and the like. Overall, a manor, or more precisely its hall, was a point of interception of dues. Its holder enjoyed the renders of his tenants in return for rendering dues and services to his lord's hall. Domesday is thus argued to be about manors rather than estates and so is not an inventory survey. The data it contains pertain only to the tributary economy and can be used only with great difficulty to learn about other aspects of William the Conqueror's England.

In "Meet the *Antecessores*: Lords and Land in Eleventh-Century Suffolk" (*Anglo-Saxons*, ed. Keynes and Smyth, 275–87). Ann Williams addresses a problem in our understanding of the redistribution of English wealth after the Norman Conquest. Specifically, she asks whether property truly passed from *antecessor* to incomer in a relatively structured fashion, or whether the notion of the *antecessor* was merely a convenient fiction covering a wholesale land-grab. In answering this question, she examines the use of the term in the Suffolk Domesday record. After a detailed and subtle analysis, she concludes that the *antecessor* was a legal fiction, although "it was one with practical use, and not only to incoming landowners as a mechanism to claim and keep their lands. It may also have assisted some English survivors who, by dint of making themselves useful to the new lords, held on to at least part of what they formerly owned" (286).

If the pun may be forgiven, one could say that 2005 was truly a banner year for Bayeux Tapestry studies, with a number of significant works published. Foremost among them are the proceedings of the 1999 Cerisy Colloquium concerned with *The Bayeux Tapestry* (subtitled *Embroidering the Facts of History* [Caen: Presses universitaires de Caen, 2004]), edited by Pierre Bouet, Brian Levy, and François Neveux. These papers were also published in French under the title *La Tapisserie de Bayeux: l'art de broder l'Histoire*, but for convenience I will refer to the English version. Part

One, “Historiography of the Bayeux Tapestry,” contains the following three essays. In “The Great Bayeux Tapestry Debate (19th–20th Centuries)” (17–25), François Neveux sums up the key debates and arguments about the authenticity, creator(s), date, and place of production of the Tapestry. He also surveys the major works about the Tapestry published in the second half of the twentieth century, an effort that is continued by Shirley Ann Brown in “The Bayeux Tapestry: A Critical Analysis of Publications 1988–1999” (27–47). This brings her *The Bayeux Tapestry: History and Bibliography* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1988) up to date; the bibliography itself is found on pages 411–418. In “The Bayeux Tapestry under German Occupation” (49–64), Sylvette Lemagnen describes Nazi research on the Tapestry that was carried out under the direction of Herbert Jankuhn. The Nazis believed that the Tapestry proved that the Viking heritage lived on in Normandy in a relatively pure form but that detailed study of the Tapestry would be required to date it and prove its Norman origins. Jankuhn, accompanied by a photographer, an artist, and a costume historian, worked intensively with the Tapestry in France during the summer of 1941 and then invited a half-dozen eminent German scholars to contribute to an ambitious four-volume study of the Tapestry. Work sessions were held in 1942 and 1943, but few of the contributions had progressed past the draft stage by the time the war and the project ended.

Part Two, “The Artefact as Textile,” contains six essays. In “Publication of Results of the Scientific and Technical Study 1982–1983” (67–8), Hervé Pelvillain explains that the study was undertaken from November 1982 through January 1983, on the occasion of the Tapestry’s being moved to new quarters, and he alludes to the factors that left the results unpublished for more than fifteen years. In “Bayeux Tapestry or Bayeux Embroidery?” (69–76), Nicole de Reyniès delves into the vexing question of why this textile continues to be known as a tapestry when everyone knows that it is really a piece of embroidery. Apparently Montfaucon, who included the Tapestry in his *Monuments de la monarchie française* (1730), never saw the object himself and was using the word *tapisserie* in its most general sense, without qualifying phrases that would specify it as woven or embroidered. The continued use of “tapestry” de Reyniès attributes to a desire to spare the work any association with the degrading image of embroidery, which by the nineteenth century was almost exclusively found in lingerie. In “The Bayeux Tapestry: an Example of Textile Embroidery / A Report on the Setting-Up of the 1982–1983 Research Project and Scientific Analysis” (77–82), Marie-Hélène Didier elaborates on Pelvillain’s

introduction, describing the work that was carried out, the rehangings of the Tapestry, and the ongoing monitoring of its condition. In “The Technical Study of the Bayeux Embroidery” (83–109), Isabelle Bédard and Béatrice Girault-Kurtzeman provide brief technical descriptions of the base cloth, seams, numbered strip, original method of hanging, embroidery, threads, colors, stitches, embroidery technique, present lining, past restoration work, and the tapestry’s present condition, all helpfully illustrated with photographs and diagrams. In “The Bayeux Embroidery and its Backing Strip” (111–6), Gabriel Vial investigates the sixteenth-century cloth that later received numbers identifying the scenes of the Tapestry. Vial is the first to notice that the fabric from which the backing cloth was constructed was itself decorated with bars, a ladder, an oriflamme, and various kinds of crosses. These motifs were produced by an unusual technique in which broché threads form the horizontal lines and colored warp threads replace the regular warp threads to create vertical lines. Comparable pieces are very few, but one is a fringed linen cloth found among the relics of St. Bathilda (d. 680) at Chelles; the technique thus appears to have been used in France for almost a thousand years. In “The Bayeux Tapestry: Results of the Scientific Tests (1982–1983)” (117–23), Brigitte Oger describes how some of the tests were conducted and summarizes their results. The thread samples were wool, hemp, flax, and cotton; their torsion ranged from 100 to 440 twists per meter; no particular metal could be identified as the mordant; the original colorants were produced from woad, madder, and pastel or indigo; the pH value was neutral; some threads seem to have had candles dripped on them; and no bacteria or fungus was found, but ceratin-eating insects such as mites and museum-beetles had attacked the embroidery in its old display case.

Part Three, “Medieval Sources and Historical Narrative,” contains the following six essays. Marjorie Chibnall faces a difficult task in discussing “Orderic Vitalis and the Bayeux Tapestry” (127–33), for in all probability Orderic never saw the Tapestry and would not have regarded it as a valid source if he had. Moreover, the accounts given by Orderic and the Tapestry sometimes conflict. Although Orderic could have been influenced indirectly by works of art, he ordinarily sought the truth in written documents and the testimony of eyewitnesses. Chibnall thus dismisses the Tapestry’s depiction of Odo’s holding a mace rather than a sword as the reason why Orderic emphasizes that Odo’s role in the Battle of Hastings was peaceful and unnecessary. Elisabeth van Houts might have done better to entitle her essay “The Echo of Latin Sources in the

Conquest" rather than "The Echo of the Conquest in the Latin Sources: Duchess Matilda, her Daughters and the Enigma of the Golden Child" (135–53), for she suggests that Matilda's gift of a ship whose figurehead was a golden child may have been based on Virgil's *Fourth Eclogue*. This poem was composed on the occasion of the imminent birth of the child of Octavia and Antonius, a birth heralded as the beginning of a golden age and a new future. Matilda was herself pregnant while the Conquest was being organized, and William of Poitiers or some other learned person may have suggested to her that the image of the golden child would not only symbolize her own baby but also the birth of a new future in England, which William described as a land of silver and gold. Van Houts also suggests that the name of this ship, "Mora," stands for the Greek word *Moirai*, denoting the Fates. Gillette Labory compares "The Norman Conquest in the *Grande Chronique de Normandie*" (155–69), written ca. 1350, to the much briefer account of the Conquest found in its source, Wace's *Roman de Rou*. Labory finds a number of significant divergences, including the omission of the story of Taillefer, the addition of the compiler's own material, the modernization of the story, and some unusual errors. The chronicler, in his taste for fiction and disregard for chronological precision, is much closer to Froissart than to the learned monks of previous centuries. François Neveux insists on "The Bayeux Tapestry as Original Source" (171–95). He first surveys the unique information that the Tapestry provides and concludes that its designer would not have invented episodes that contemporaries would have recognized as fictitious. Thus the siege of Dinan and Odo's active participation in the Battle of Hastings are judged to have actually happened. Next he examines the Tapestry's unique narrative techniques. In particular, he argues that the "scene-inversions" (e.g., 7–13, dealing with Harold and Guy of Ponthieu, and 24–34, dealing with the death of Edward) are deliberate chiasmic arrangements that link simultaneous events. Pierre Bouet's answer to the question "Is the Tapestry Pro-English?" (197–215) is that it is neither pro-Norman nor pro-English. Bouet argues instead that the Tapestry supports both sides at once, insofar as justifying the Norman Conquest does not necessarily entail the denigration of Harold or the English. Its relatively benevolent attitude towards Harold, with not a word of treachery in any of the inscriptions, and its relatively discreet upholding of the Norman claim, can only be explained by a dating to the period between 1066 and 1068, when William hoped to rally all England to his cause. Bouet points out that the inscriptions reveal the combined activity of Norman and English

scribes: *caballi* and *parabolant* can only have come from a native French-speaker (an Englishman would have used *equus* and *loquor*), whereas *ceastra*, *Bagias*, and *Gyrð* show the influence of Anglo-Saxon. In "The Bayeux Tapestry, the Bishop and the Laity" (217–33), Valerie I.J. Flint argues that the Tapestry was designed by Odo both as a deliberate counter to the ambitions of the Gregorian papacy and as a means of reinforcing his threatened status as a feudal bishop. The Tapestry, seen in this light, is less a work of propaganda on behalf of William the Conqueror than one on behalf of the need for continued partnership between the great secular bishop and the feudal laity in the establishment of righteous rule.

Part Four, "The Bayeux Tapestry as Documentary Evidence," contains the following three essays. In "The Bayeux Tapestry and its Depiction of Costume: The Problems of Interpretation" (237–59), Olivier Renaudeau addresses some points of contention concerning the costume of William's companions. For example, the Tapestry depicts a "T" tunic with split basques. These, says Renaudeau, are not breeches or *braies*, as some assert. *Braies*, which in the eleventh century were exclusively undergarments, are seen in the Tapestry only on the dwarf Tuold, who is shown wearing them under his tunic. With respect to armor, Renaudeau argues that the diamond-patterned items are byrnie (i.e., outer garments with overlapping metal plates attached). This quite late use of solid mail is attested by archeological finds as well as by contemporary sculpture and manuscript art. Moreover, the scene of armor being carried on poles only makes sense for byrnie, which are very stiff. (Chain mail is flexible enough to be draped over an arm or stuffed into a sack.) Renaudeau also explains why the Tapestry cannot be depicting mail breeches, argues that the rectangles on the chests of some warriors are plastrons covering the neck slit of the byrnie, and shows that neither the garment that William wears while crossing the Coesnon nor the garment that Odo wears while urging on the young knights are gambesons. As regards "Archaeology and the Bayeux Tapestry" (261–87), Anne-Marie Flambard Hélicher uses recent discoveries to argue that the Tapestry is likely to be more reliable than has been thought. This is particularly true for military and civil architecture, ships and sailing, and everyday objects. John France argues that "The Importance of the Bayeux Tapestry for the History of War" (289–99) is chiefly in the reliability of its details. He cautions that the Tapestry's overall depiction of war is both partial and biased, with the role of the Norman cavalry emphasized because it was from that kind of people

that the audience of the Tapestry was drawn. The roles of the Norman infantry and crossbowmen, in contrast, have been downplayed to the point of almost complete omission. France warns that the Tapestry was never intended to be a picture of contemporary warfare, and its particular view of one long and desperate battle is not something from which general conclusions can be drawn. In particular, it omits the painstaking campaign of persuasion upon which William had to embark in order to gain the support of the Norman nobility. Conversely, modern historians have also interpreted the Tapestry falsely, to support their own biases regarding eleventh-century warfare. For example, the Tapestry shows the cavalry using their lances in various ways. There is no hint of the massed charged of armored men, lances couched, so beloved of the “shock” school of military history.

Part Five, “The Work of Art”, contains five essays. With respect to “The Bayeux Tapestry and Decoration in North-Western Europe: Style and Composition” (303–25), Maylis Baylé adds to earlier scholarship arguing that the Tapestry was produced in England, in the artistic milieu of Canterbury. After countering arguments that the designer relied wholly on earlier patterns for his depiction of specific buildings and that the Tapestry was designed by more than one person, Baylé turns to Scandinavian motifs, animal themes, figures, draperies, colors, and wall paintings in order to determine the Tapestry’s closest parallels. She concludes that these precise points of reference are not part of just any area of Romanesque art but are Scandinavian, Anglo-Scandinavian, and Anglo-Saxon—not Norman. As some of these elements would soon be adopted by Normans, the Tapestry must have been one of the key works that marked the beginnings of Anglo-Norman art. In “Trifunctionality and Epic Patterning in the Bayeux Tapestry” (327–45), Brian J. Levy interprets the many triads of the Tapestry—three kings, three brothers, three domains, three axes, three castles, three great halls, three narrative segments, the Three Orders of society—as instances of the tripartite structure characteristic of *chansons de geste* such as the *Song of Roland* and *Le Charroi de Nîmes*. In its depiction of a secular world bound up with the spirit of sacrality, the Tapestry is also a *visio* not unlike the Luttrell Psalter. Barbara English scrutinizes “The Coronation of Harold in the Bayeux Tapestry” (347–81) and compares the throne, insignia, and so forth with those of Harold’s predecessors in England and those of the emperors. Her analysis ends with a consideration of two puzzles. As regards the date of Harold’s coronation, she suggests that Harold could have been chosen (or elected) king

at Epiphany, shortly after Edward’s death, but was not crowned until Easter. This would explain how the Tapestry could correctly juxtapose the coronation with the April 24th appearance of Halley’s Comet. As regards the depiction of Harold as a wholly legitimate king, English believes that the Tapestry was designed in the early years after 1066, when the Normans were less hostile to Harold than they were to become. In “The Bayeux Tapestry: The Establishment of a Text” (383–99), David Hill traces the developments in the recorded image of the Tapestry. He finds a minimum of 379 places where the present “text” is or may be corrupted. These are not listed; instead he discusses the illustrations created by Foucault and Benoît in the early eighteenth century (the drawings being much more accurate than the engravings made from them), the engravings and plaster casts made by Stothard in the early nineteenth century, and the photographs taken by Dossetter between 1871 and 1872. Hill urges all scholars of the Tapestry to refer to these sources rather than to the modern photographs that make no distinction between the original and the work of later centuries. By way of “Conclusions” (403–10), François Neveux rehearses the points made by the contributors and comments on the emerging acknowledgement of Harold’s importance in the Tapestry. He also notes the consensus that Odo was the Tapestry’s patron, as well as the growing agreement that it might not matter much where the Tapestry was produced.

Growing out of a 2002 MANCASS conference, Gale Owen-Crocker’s edited collection, *King Harold II and the Bayeux Tapestry* (Woodbridge: Boydell), provides a series of useful and interesting contributions to the study of the subjects named in its title. Although it often seems as if there is little new to be said about Harold and the tapestry that records his downfall, the essays gathered here map out a series of new approaches and provocative interpretations that students of the period will find challenging, if not uniformly convincing. The volume does fail in one important respect, however: the images from the Tapestry are too small and often lacking in clarity. Readers would be well advised to keep a better reproduction at hand, particularly as they read through the essays in the second half of the collection.

Opening the volume is an essay by H.E.J. Cowdrey, “King Harold II and the Bayeux Tapestry: A Critical Introduction” (1–15). Focusing on what he calls the “surprising ... amount and continuity” of attention paid to Harold by the Tapestry (1), Cowdrey examines the problems of intention and reception that have dominated Tapestry-scholarship in recent years. He points out that, although the Tapestry’s characterization of Harold is largely positive, two features indicate that this

portrayal is not entirely accurate: first, he writes, “the borders of the tapestry repeatedly hint that the image was radically flawed from the start” (4), and second, the parallel between Harold’s surrender of his sword to Guy of Ponthieu and his re-armament by William suggests that his betrayal was as much of a benefactor, friend and host as it was a violation of a feudal oath. Cowdrey argues that, “if Harold’s perjury to William after his oath taken upon relics in Normandy brought its nemesis, his fate was the more richly deserved by reason of his ingratitude to William who had restored to him the military standing that he had perforce surrendered at Ponthieu” (6–7). Cowdrey emphasizes that the Tapestry resists a wholly pro-Norman or pro-Anglo-Saxon interpretation, and the diverse perspectives offered in the essays that follow largely bear out this claim.

Nicholas Higham’s contribution, “Harold Godwineson: The Construction of Kingship” (19–34), locates Harold’s assumption of the throne in 1065 within the broader context of eleventh-century English power politics. In doing so, he attempts to reconstruct the factors that shaped, first Godwine’s, and then Harold’s political strategies during the reign of Edward the Confessor. The Godwines were an exceptional family, Higham reminds us, not only for their political success, but also for the rapidity of their rise. As a result, they found themselves more vulnerable than other, more established families, and more in need of ensuring a favorable successor to Edward. Pointing out that Harold was only latest in a series of possible successors to Edward supported by the house of Godwine, Higham suggests that Harold’s actions were as much the result of political necessity as personal ambition. He argues, “it is Harold’s political career that should engage us, and that his eventual bid for the throne should be viewed very much in the context of his and his family’s search for security, for themselves, for their political power and for their vast wealth” (22). Higham’s essay provides a compelling alternative to the pro-Norman or pro-Saxon arguments that typically dominate discussions of the Conquest. He rightly highlights the complexity of eleventh-century politics and offers a much needed corrective to those arguments which characterize the English nobility of this period as more cooperative than contentious. Recognizing the political realities confronted by Harold allows Higham to move beyond arguments concerning the “justness” or “rightness” of his actions. As Higham writes, “[Harold’s] candidacy for kingship should be weighed not against some measure of principle, for few seriously doubt that he attempted a usurpation, but against his probable objectives and available alternatives” (34).

Ian Howard follows Higham’s essay with an analysis of the different claims to Edward’s crown in “Harold II: A Throne-Worthy King” (35–52). Observing that eleventh-century England was more Anglo-Danish than Anglo-Saxon, Howard argues that Edward assumed the throne, not because he was Æthelred’s son, but rather because he was the brother of the previous king, Harthacnut. Recognizing the continuing relevance of the Gormsonn family claim to the throne, Howard suggests, allows us to understand why contemporaries would have seen Harold, a relative by blood or marriage to Swein Forkbeard, Cnut, Æthelred, Harthacnut, and Edward, as a legitimate claimant. Howard’s argument is a bit convoluted and, on occasion, seems to be overly driven by a desire to exculpate Harold from charges of usurpation. Nonetheless, he provides an important reminder that Edward’s assumption of the throne in 1042 did continue the Gormsonn dynasty, even as it restored the West Saxon line of Cerdic.

In “The Myth of Harold II’s Survival in the Scandinavian Sources” (53–64), Gillian Fellows-Jensen returns to a problem raised by her edition of the *Hemings þáttur Áslákssonar* (Copenhagen, 1962). Specifically, what is the relationship of the narrative of Harold’s survival contained in that text to other surviving Scandinavian versions? She argues that all the different versions of the Harold survival myth stem from an original exemplar, and that tracing the persistence of various narrative elements permits us to ascertain the approximate shape of that exemplar. Ultimately, she concludes, the version found in *Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar* provides the most reliable representative of the original version. The most valuable feature of this essay is the appendix, which provides editions of the three versions of the survival legend, as found in *Hemings þáttur Áslákssonar*, *Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar*, and *Játvarðar saga*.

Sarah Laratt Keefer’s contribution, “Body Language: a Graphic Commentary by the Horses of the Bayeux Tapestry” (93–108), asks why the mounts of both English and Normans are so frequently depicted behaving in a manner contrary to nature. Pointing out that the so-called *galop volant* (“flying gallop”), numerous erect phalluses, and several examples of mid-episode equine sex-changes in the Tapestry do not conform with what is known of typical horse behavior, Keefer suggests that, “the horse of the Bayeux Tapestry as a group are intended to be formulaic, and indicative of a subtext that was apparently deliberate on the part of the principle designer, and quite possibly at odds with the overt intention of the work as a whole” (95). Keefer situates the horses in relation to other contemporary equine images, particularly those found in the

Cotton Cleopatra *Psychomachia* and the Cotton Claudius *Hexateuch*. In doing so, she suggests that parallel horse images may indicate something about the riders also, so that the more-than-coincidental similarity between Esau's horse in the *Hexateuch* and William's in the Tapestry evokes a comparison between the succession crisis and the sibling rivalry between the sons of Isaac. Although such claims may seem overly speculative in summary, Keefer's evidence is compelling and her analysis suggestive. Particularly convincing is her conclusion that the horses are equally critical of both claimants, and that the suffering of the horses stands in for the needless suffering inflicted by overly-ambitious English and Normans alike.

The articles by Owen-Crocker ("Brothers, Rivals and the Geometry of the Bayeux Tapestry," 108–23) and Chris Henige ("Putting the Bayeux Tapestry in its Place," 125–37) offer complementary arguments regarding the placement of the Tapestry and the manner in which it is meant to be read by its viewers. Pointing out the unusual prominence accorded to Bishop Odo (traditionally responsible for commissioning the Tapestry), Owen-Crocker suggests that we may be in error in assuming that the Tapestry can be read only in a linear fashion. Rather, she suggests, the narrative should be divided into four roughly equal parts corresponding to the four walls of a square room. Hung thusly, Harold's encounter with Edward at Bosham stands across from his defeat at Hastings, while the image of Harold's oath stands across from the image of Odo on horseback. According to Owen-Crocker, understanding the Tapestry in this fashion directs us towards a pro-Norman narrative in which the good servant, Odo, is implicitly compared to the bad servant, Harold. In his continuation of Owen-Crocker's argument, Henige asks whether any evidence survives of a square room that might hold the Tapestry if hung in this way. Although he finds no conclusive evidence, what little he does manage to gather suggests that an Anglo-Norman keep might have provided the right sort of room for such an installation, and that the most likely keep was a now-lost tower at Dover.

In "Gendering the Battle? Male and Female in the Bayeux Tapestry" (139–47), Catherine Karkov notes that much has been written about the "meaning" of the women in the Tapestry, but "the way in which they function formally within the Tapestry's larger composition and visual narrative" remains somewhat less studied (139). Pointing out that women in the Tapestry only appear as parts of couples, she argues that the positioning of these couples serves to gender the conflicts with which they are associated. Associating these couples

with the gendering of conflict in Prudentius's *Psychomachia*, she concludes that, "the women of the Bayeux Tapestry help to advance the visual narrative; they alert us to key turning points in the relationship of power that it documents; as repeated images they act as visual signposts, or echoes, which help to index the relationships between episodes; as English women, they reflect the political and military vulnerability of the English; and as vulnerable women, they become signifiers of land and lineage, and the loss of the same" (146–7).

Shirley Ann Brown's article, "Cognate Imagery: the Bear, Harold, and the Tapestry" (149–60), examines how a shared symbolic language between the Bayeux Tapestry and such literary epics as *The Song of Roland* conditions the response of each work's reader or viewer. Focusing on the depiction of bear-baiting, occupying a central place in both texts, Brown argues that the Tapestry image "can best be explained as a rhetorical device alluding to a motif in *The Song of Roland*, helping to establish Harold's infamy and undermining the image of an apparently noble and heroic Harold presented in the main register" (156). Harold, on this reading, becomes a version of the treacherous Ganelon, while William implicitly embodies the role of Charlemagne. Although this argument at times seems more speculative than Brown is willing to concede, in developing the notion of "cognate imagery," she nonetheless provides a valuable way to examine the intertextual relationships between visual and verbal narratives.

Building on his earlier research concerning the Tapestry's Canterbury connections, Cyril Hart's "The *Cicero Aratea* and the Bayeux Tapestry" (161–78) examines similarities between images in the Tapestry and those found in Harley 647 and Harley 2506. In particular, Hart argues that the illustrated planisphere accompanying Cicero's translations of Aratus into Latin in these manuscripts provided an exemplar for many of the Tapestry's images. That these manuscripts were housed in the library of Canterbury Cathedral during the period of the Tapestry's construction, Hart suggests, provides further evidence of the latter's Canterbury origins.

In the volume's final essay, Michael Lewis considers the relationship between "The Bayeux Tapestry and Eleventh-century Material Culture" (179–94). He writes, "In order to evaluate the extent to which the Tapestry reflects the contemporary scene we must compare its artifacts with, on the one hand, the relevant archaeological remains and, on the other, the way such items are shown in contemporary manuscript illumination" (180). Taking three test cases—the Tapestry's depictions of the Norman conical helmet, the presence of a gap amidships in Norman sailing vessels, and Bosham

Church and Mont-Saint-Michel—Lewis finds that the depiction of objects only partially reflects the archaeological evidence. From this, he concludes that, “the narrative of the Tapestry relies on imbuing certain artifacts with a symbolic value, and any attempt to evaluate the ‘realism’ of its elements must be alive to this fact” (193).

The answer to the question *Was the Bayeux Tapestry Made in France?* (subtitled *The Case for Saint-Florent of Saumur* [New York: Palgrave Macmillan]) might be “yes,” according to George Beech. And the answer to the question “who commissioned the Tapestry?” might be “William the Conqueror.” Beech begins by showing that the abbey of Saint-Florent of Saumur housed an active workshop of the first order in the eleventh century and almost certainly did business with the English Queen Emma around 1010. Not only was it endowed by William with priories, churches, and lands in Normandy and England—perhaps in payment for services rendered?—but its abbot (also named William) had been one of William’s men in the years immediately prior to the Conquest, before the future abbot had even entered monastic life at Saumur. Thus the tapestry could have been produced at Saint-Florent, and there was a personal relationship through which it could have been commissioned and paid for. Beech then presents several affinities between the tapestry and works of art associated with Saint-Florent. Next, he argues that the Tapestry’s depiction of the siege and surrender of Dinan could only have been designed by a Breton. Finally, he points out that Baudri of Bourgeuil was a monk and abbot of the neighboring abbey of Bourgeuil from ca. 1070 to 1107 and was also a friend of Abbot William of Saint-Florent. Baudri could hardly have avoided knowing the Tapestry well if in fact it was embroidered there, and this helps answer the question of how a monk living in a Loire valley community until 1107 could have written a poem between 1099 and 1101 showing intimate knowledge of a tapestry supposedly produced in England.

Andrew Bridgeford’s *1066: The Hidden History in the Bayeux Tapestry* (New York: Walker & Co., 2004) is written for a general audience, but its thesis warrants scholarly attention. Bridgeford makes a substantial case for Count Eustace II of Boulogne’s having been the Tapestry’s patron, with the Tapestry being intended as a gift of reconciliation to Bishop Odo of Bayeux. In addition to providing a number of ingenious interpretations of scenes from the Tapestry, Bridgeford presents evidence that suggests why the minor figures Wadard and Vital are named in the tapestry. Finally, he hypothesizes that the long documentary silence regarding the Tapestry came about because Odo placed the Tapestry

in the crypt of his cathedral for safe-keeping before he left for the Crusade in 1096. Less than ten years later, the crypt was blocked up and subsequently forgotten until 1412, when it was discovered in the course of digging a grave for Bishop Jean de Boissay. If the Tapestry came to light then, that would explain why there are no references to it between 1102 and 1463.

In “Reading the Bayeux Tapestry through Canterbury Eyes” (*Anglo-Saxons*, ed. Keynes and Smyth, 242–65), Gale Owen-Crocker seeks to add nuance to our modern understanding of the Tapestry’s Canterbury origins. Noting the Tapestry’s many visual allusions to manuscripts known to have been either at St. Augustine’s or Christ Church, Owen-Crocker asks why the Tapestry’s designers chose the manuscript models that they did, and what the use of such images may have meant to a Canterbury audience. She notes that the Tapestry rarely just appropriates an image, but instead situates borrowed figures in a context that suggests some sort of commentary, often a cynical one. This cynicism appears to be directed at both sides in the conflict, reflecting the complicated attitudes towards the Conquest in Anglo-Norman England. Owen-Crocker also suggests that the use of different manuscript images in different ways indicates differences between the attitudes and visual styles of those who designed and wove the tapestry.

In “Squawk Talk: Commentary by Birds in the Bayeux Tapestry?” (*ASE* 34: 237–54), Gale Owen-Crocker assigns the birds in the Tapestry to five categories: pairs of border creatures, unpaired border creatures, birds in natural settings, birds in association with other creatures in unnatural situations, and birds in the main register. After reviewing the problem of identifying the birds in the borders, Owen-Crocker turns to the question of their relationship to the main register and finds that not only do they often echo the action of the main frame, they reveal a voice or voices different in tone from that of the main narrative. They point out the vanity of human splendor, provide light relief, and serve as the immediate audience, expressing curiosity, horror, fear, admiration, imitation, and indifference. Noting similar reactions by humans looking at the Tapestry, she concludes “We are the birds; the birds are us.”

In “Les bordures de la Tapisserie de Bayeux: de l’esthétique à la didactique” (*Bulletin des anglicistes médiévistes* 66 [Winter 2004]: 12–78), Michèle Quefeulou reads the Bayeux Tapestry as though it were a page of a manuscript, with a central “text” bounded by a frame that is both a border containing purely esthetic decorations and a margin containing informative annotations. Quefeulou argues that the discourse is clerical

and compares the tripartite spatial organization of the Tapestry to illuminations of the Apocalypse, whose central depiction of earthly destruction is located between depictions of heaven at the top of the page and hell at the bottom. (Less convincingly, Quefeulou frequently suggests that the imagery of the Tapestry has parallels in Norse and Celtic mythology.) Certain images in the Tapestry are paralleled by illuminations of the Old Testament account of Antiochus IV's massacre of the seven brothers (Dan. 9), thus making the Tapestry another instance of the common interpretation of the Norman Conquest as God's righteous punishment of the English. Space does not permit a summary of the many specific analyses, but their exegetical interpretations and use of parallels from contemporary art and architecture make a strong case for Quefeulou's "readings." Ideally, this long essay will be expanded into a full monograph, thus allowing for larger, better-quality reproductions and the analysis of additional scenes.

SAJ, PK, AR, EAR

[SAJ reviewed Barrow "Clergy," Blair *Church*, Crook, Dyer, Gittos, Gittos & Bedingfield, Hadley & Buckberry, Hamilton, Hare, Jolly, Keefer "Veneration," Proksch, Rankin, Schofield, Thijs, Thompson, Tinti, Wormald.]

[PK reviewed Abrams, Atherton, Barrow "Bishops," Brooks "Introduction," Brooks "Identity," Bullough, Corradini, Cozens, Cubitt, D'Aronco "conoscenza," Dobson, Farmer, Grainge, Higham "Guthlac," Holt, Keynes "Mercians," Lavelle, Luciani, Meaney "Heathenism," Meaney "Felix," Nelson "England," Nelson "Queen," Palmer, Rambridge, Sawyer, Story "Charlemagne," D. Tyler "Orchestrated," D. Tyler "Hegemony," E. Tyler "Encomium," Wickham, Ann Williams "Cunning," Woolf, Yorke "Æthelbald," Yorke "gentes".]

[AR reviewed Brown "Cognate," Cowdrey, D'Aronco "Pharmacopoeia," Edgington, Fellows-Jensen, Fenton, Fox, Gameson & Gameson, Hart, Henige, Higham, Hill & Worthington, Howard, Huscroft, Karkov, Keefer "Body Language," Lewis, Marten, Martin, Mason, Matthews, Oosthuizen, Owen-Crocker, Pantos, Pantos & Semple, Rex, Sharp, Stafford.]

[EAR reviewed Barker "Anno Domini," "Wulfsige's Lifetime," "Sherborne Estate," "Sherborne in AD 998,"

Barker & Le Pard, Barker, Hinton, & Hunt, Bates "1066," "Introduction," Baxter & Blair, Baylé "Lautel," "The Bayeux Tapestry," Bédard & Girault-Kurtzman, Beech, Blair "Les recherches," Bouet, Bouet & Gazeau, Bouet, Levy, & Neveux, Brennessel, Drouot, & Gravel, Bridgford, Brooks, Brown "Bayeux," Campbell, Chibnall, Crouch, D'Aronco "I germani," de Jong, de Reyniès, Didier, English, Everson & Stocker, Flambard Héricher, Flint, France, Goetz, Harper-Bill, Hayward, David Hill, Paul Hill *The Age, The Road*, Kabir, Kabir & Williams, Keats-Rohan, Keynes "Wulfsige," King, Labory, Lee, Lemagnen, Levy, Lomas, Lowerre, Lutterbach, Maddicott, Matthew, Meens, Neveux "Conclusions," "Debate," "Tapestry," Nijenhuis, Noomen, O'Brien, Oger, Owen-Crocker "Squawk Talk," Parsons, Pelvillain, Quefeulou, Raaijmakers, Renaudeau, Reuter, Robertson, Roffe, Rudgley, Semple, Sermon & Watson, Stasch, Story "Frankish Annals," Strachan, Torfadóttir, Tsurushima, van Houts, van Vlierden, Vial, von Padberg *Bonifatius*, "christliche Königtum," Whytehead, Howard Williams]

Dissertations

Brookes, S. J. "Landscapes, Communities and Exchange: A Reassessment of Anglo-Saxon Economics and Social Change AD 400-900 with Special Reference to Kent." Ph.D. Thesis, University College London, 2003. *Index to Theses* 54: 2569.

Crenshaw, Jan Carol. "Special Sanctuaries in Medieval England." Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Houston, 2004. *DAI* 65A: 4307.

Downham, C. E. A. "Britain and Scandinavian Ireland: The Dynasty of Ivarr and Pan-Insular Politics to A.D. 1014." Unpubl. PhD thesis, Cambridge, 2003. [not in *DAI*]

Hulsman, Krista Cheree. "Heathen Magicoreligious Practices: From the Ancient Past through the Reconstructed Present." M.A. Thesis, Univ. of Texas at Arlington, 2004. *MAI* 43: 412.

Preston, Todd M. "King Alfred's *Domboc*: The Life and Afterlife of Alfred's Legislation." Ph.D. Diss., Pennsylvania State Univ., 2004. *DAI* 65A: 2615-16.

Deferred until next year

Nichtweiß, Barbara, ed. *Bonifatius in Mainz*. Neues Jahrbuch für das Bistum Mainz 2005. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern. 448, ill.

8. Names

Andrew Breeze has six articles in this year's bibliography that deal with specific place-names. In "Celtic Philology and the name of Loddon" (*Norfolk Archeology* 44: 723–25), he proposes a derivation of *Loddon*, a small town south-east of Norwich in Norfolk as well as a river flowing into the Thames, from a Brittonic river-name meaning 'young animal' and related to Welsh *llwdn* 'young of animal' and Middle Breton *loezn* 'animal' and notes that many Welsh rivers are named after living things. In "Morville in Shropshire and Myfyr in Gwynedd" (*Jnl of Celtic Studies* 4: 201–03), he derives the first element in the village of *Morville* in Shropshire from Primitive Welsh *myfyr* 'meditation, memory, memorial stone, mausoleum, ossuary, grave, burial place', which was borrowed from Latin *memoria*. He also notes that *myfyr* occurs as a toponym in *Mynydd Myfyr* near Oswestry, *Myfyr* in the Lleyn Peninsula, the farm of *Myfyrian* in Anglesey, and *Glyn Myfyr* in Denbighshire. In "Bede's *Civitas Domnoc* and Dunwich, Suffolk" (*Leeds Studies in English* 36: 1–4), he identifies Bede's *Civitas Domnoc* as *Walton Castle* rather than Dunwich and says that *Domnoc* was an Irish personal name so that *Civitas Domnoc* would mean 'Domnoc's stronghold'. Breeze also suggests that *Domnoc* was probably an Irish monk who occupied what had been a Roman fort that was later given to Felix who conducted his mission there for seventeen years, since Walton Castle had a chapel dedicated to St. Felix and is near modern Felixstowe. In "*Medcaut*, the Brittonic name of Lindisfarne" (*Northern History* 42: 349–57), he supports R. Coates's derivation of Lindisfarne's Old Welsh name *Medcaut* from Latin *medicata* but defines *medicata* as 'imbued with healing power, healing, medicinal' rather than Coates's definition of 'drugged, charmed, healed'. Breeze notes that Welsh *meddyg* is borrowed directly from Latin *medicus* 'physician', so Old Welsh *Medcaut* from Latin *medicata* (*insula*) 'healing island' or 'medicine island' has a parallel. He then speculates that Lindisfarne may have had a reputation for medicinal herbs growing there. In "Celtic Boundaries and *Isurium Brigantum*" (*Northern History* 42: 349–51), he derives the Roman name for *Aldborough*, *Isurium*, from a Celtic prefix *ls-* 'under, on this side' and Celtic **uria* 'clean one' so that *Isurium* means "place in the region on the side of the river **Uria* 'clean one.'" Breeze suggests that the *Ure* as it is now called was a major boundary in ancient Celtic times and supports G. Jones's identification of *Aldborough* as the *municipium* where Caswallon of Gwynedd defeated Osric's army in late 633 on early 634 and where Osric was killed. In "Where Were

Bede's *Uilfaresdun* and *Paegnaleach*?" (*Northern History* 42: 189–91), Breeze identifies *Uilfaresdun* or "the hill of Wilfare" as Diddersley Hill, a mile north of the village of Gilling where Bede says Oswine of Deira was killed in 651. Breeze emends Bede's *Paegnalaech* to *Waegnalaech* and says Bede's <p> was due to the misreading of a wynn. He then derives the first element from British **uagna* 'marsh', so that *Waegnalaech* would mean "brook of the *uagna* marshland stream, meadow stream" which he identifies as *Wawne* in the East Riding of Yorkshire.

There are also other articles this year dealing with individual place-names. Jeremy Godwin, in "Corkickle as a Place-Name" (*Trans. of the Cumberland & Westmorland Antiquarian & Archeological Soc.* 3rd ser. 4: 269–70), shows that, geographically, Ekwall's derivation of *Corkickle* in Cumberland from Middle Irish *corr* 'hill peak' and of the River *Keekle* from Old Norse *Kikall* 'winding stream', does not hold up. Instead, he proposes that the name means "Corc's ravine filled with oak trees" from an Irish Scandinavian-Celtic personal name *Corc* and Old Norse *eik* 'oak' which became *aik*, *aig*, *eag*, and *ick*, plus *gill* 'ravine'. In "Old English *gefnesan*, Present-Day English *sneeze* and the Place-Names *Snogsash* and *Sneachill*" (*NM* 106: 307–09), Carole Hough argues that the consonant cluster *fn-* regularly developed into *sn-* phonologically and not just because of orthographic confusion of <f> and <s>. If so, the verb *sneeze* could have regularly developed from OE *fnese*, not from an OE **fnēosan* as given in the *OED* but from OE *gefnesan* given in the *Toronto Dictionary of Old English*. She suggests then that *Snogsash* in Herefordshire which is recorded as *Fnogesesse* in 1180 should be derived from a personal name OE **Fnog* and OE *æsc* 'ash-tree' and that *Sneachill* in Worcestershire which is recorded as *fnætes wyllan* in an eleventh-century copy of an undated charter could also have as its etymon a personal name OE **Fnæt*. She also speculates that Ekwall might have been wrong in identifying the etymon in place-names like *Halsnead* in Lancashire and *Whipnade* in Bedfordshire among others as OE *snæd*, *snād* 'a piece of land' rather than from OE *fnæd* 'the border' used in a topographical sense.

In "Four Pre-English River Names in and around Fenland: *Chater*, *Granta*, *Nene* and *Welland*" (*Trans. of the Philological Soc.* 103: 303–22), Richard Coates derives the river-name *Chater* from a Neo-Brittonic **catr*, a reflex of which would be modern Welsh *cadr* 'handsome, fine; powerful' used metaphorically topographically. He then proposes that the river-name *Granta* be derived from a **gar-anta* where the second element is

from an Old European river-name suffix **-nta* and the first possibly from a Celtic **gar-* cognate with Icelandic *kar* ‘dirt (on newborn animals)’. He also suggests that the river-name *Nene* may come from a Celtic **an+dwfn* with the first element being an intensive prefix with the meaning of the name being ‘very pleasant’. Finally, Coates derives the river-name *Welland* from British **welwor-weda* ‘pale (blue) appearance’ which has been Scandinavianized, perhaps by being associated with the Scandinavian participial form **vēlandi* meaning ‘treacherous’.

Two essays this year have broad foci on types of elements in names. In “Tree-Name Compounds in Early Place-Names of the South Cumbrian Area” (*Bull. of the John Rylands Univ. Library of Manchester* 86.2: 179–201), Linda Corrigan examines the tree- and shrub-names of the pre-1974 Westmorland and South Cumberland area to determine the relationship between Old English and Old Norse in early place-names by looking at nineteen tree- and shrub-names that occur in such place-names. She concludes that thorns were common and were used to identify major places as well as in field-names, trees were often used in major places, Old Danish and Old Norse personal names combined with tree-names were still common in field-names in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in that area, that names with identical elements in Old English and Old Norse like *þorn* and *lind* could combine with either Old English or Old Norse elements, and that the region’s tree-names showed mixed Old English and Old Norse elements, with slightly more Old Norse influence than Old English influence. Appendix 1 identifies the ninety-seven place-names containing tree-name elements in South Cumbria, their earliest recorded data, and their modern names if known. Appendix 2 identifies the thirty-nine generics (usually Old Norse) in place-names with tree-names in the area along with their frequency and location. In “Animal Names and Their Various Uses in (Early) English, (Early) English Literature and Beyond” (*Naked Wordes in Englissh*, ed. Krygier and Sikorska, 97–104 [see section 3.a]), Wolfgang Viereck notes that animal names were used in personal names given to “tribes, genealogies and simple persons” in Old English as shown in the literature and that they derive from totemistic ideas pre-dating Germanic history. He suggests that since *wulf* is used often as a personal name in English and German, the wolf must have been totem animal for the Germanic people. He also points out the totem relationship also implied a kindred relationship as reflected in the names for fox in Low German *vadderman voss* “Mr. grandfather fox” and High German *Herr gevater* “Mr. godfather.” Oddly, animal names that

had been held in high esteem often later became terms of abuse so that *Hunding* ‘son of a dog’ is a hero in the *Elder Edda*, but *Hundesohn* ‘son of a dog’ in German is now abusive.

Three essays this year deal very broadly with the influence of particular languages on place-names. William Pearson, in “Gaelic Place-Names in North-East England: Even Cleveland and Teesside Part 2” (*Cleveland History: The Bull. of the Cleveland and Teesside Local History Soc.* 88: 10–17), recounts how *Dunham* was borrowed to replace an earlier *Dunholm*, supposedly from OE *dunn-cū-lēum* ‘dun cow glades’ which was a pun on Gaelic *Dún Choluim* ‘Columba’s fort’. He rather randomly discusses other place-names of Gaelic origin in the area such as *Auckland* being derived from a Gaelic *Ath-clíath* ‘ford of hurdles’ by Scandinavians who thought it meant ‘extra land’. He explains that *Burnigill* is anglicized Gaelic *Brugh-na-cille* ‘manor of the cell’ but that other *Brugh-na-* names survive as *-burn* as in *Gisburn* with the first element coming from Old Norse personal name *Gigr*. Pearson also proposes a Gaelic origin of *Guisborough* from Gaelic *Brugh-nagíoch* ‘estate of the breast’ following the common topographical identification of hills or mountains with breasts. He also suggests that Bede’s *Hacanos* (now *Hackness*) comes from an inverted form of Gaelic *Nos-(na-h)Achain* ‘(place of the) rule of (the) prayer’.

In “La microtoponymie anglo-scandinave du Département de l’Orne” (*Annales de Normandie* 55: 125–34), G. Chartier identifies the instances of several place-name elements in Normandy that are of Old Norse or Old English origin that were brought to Normandy by colonists from the Danelaw during the tenth century. The place-name elements include *delle* ‘piece of land’ from OE *dæl*, derivatives of OE *wending* ‘place where the plow turns’, *guerre* ‘triangular piece of land’ from OE *gara* or ON *geiri*, *l’estras* ‘long strip of land’ from OE *straca*, names from *croûte/crotte* ‘close, enclosure’, and *hec* ‘field barrier’. In “Celtic Place-Names and Archaeology in Derbyshire” (*Derbyshire Archaeological Jnl* 125: 100–37), Paul Brotherton derives the first word in *Pennyunk Lane*, a track that runs up the slope of a hill named *Fin Cop*, which projects into a sharp bend in the River Wye, from Brittonic *penn* ‘head (land), top, end, promontory’ and **iouanc* (*jowénk*) ‘youth’, so *Pennyunk* would mean ‘headland of (the) youth’ which Brotherton suggests might also be the pre-English name for *Fin Cop*. He also derives the first part of the first word in *Mouldridge Grange* from a Roman-British era Celtic word **molto* ‘sheep, wether’ and the second part from Brittonic **trig* ‘abode, dwelling, stay, shieling’, so that Brittonic **moltdrig* would mean ‘sheep, wether

dwelling/shieling.' Brotherton proposes that both *Kinder* and *Findern* derive from habitative names containing the Brittonic element *tre* (β) 'farmstead, hamlet' with *Kinder* having as its first element Brittonic **cen*'-edge, rim, boundary' and meaning "farmstead/hamlet at the edge/rim/boundary," and *Findern* having as its first element the Brittonic borrowing from Latin of the source of modern Welsh *ffen* 'boundary, border' and meaning "hamlet on the boundary." He is uncertain whether *Dinting*, a township of Glossop in the extreme north west of Derbyshire, derives from a Brittonic **dind* 'height, (fortified) hill/town, notable place' or from an as yet unidentified element **dunt* or from a territorial name **Dunoding* "the descendents, people, or territory of *Dunod*," a Celtic personal name. At the end of the article, he identifies three more Derbyshire place-names for which there is insufficient evidence to determine Celtic provenance. He speculates that the *axe* in *Axe Edge* and *Axe Moor* may come from a British **iscâ* which he identifies as a probable generic term for 'water, river' from an ancient Indo-European word; that *Pintar's Wood* may have a Brittonic *penn* 'head (land), top, end, promontory' (see above) combine with a Brittonic *tardd* 'spring' in the first part of the name; and that *Chew*, a wood and/or stream near Charlesworth, may come from Brittonic *cīw* meaning 'young of animal, chick' since stream-names in Celtic languages often derive from animals.

Two essays this year which deal with personal names appear in *St Wulfsgie and Sherborne: Essays to Celebrate the Millennium of the Benedictine Abbey 998–1998*, ed. Barker, Hinton, and Hunt (see section 7). In "Bishop Wulfsgie's Name: The Writing and the Spelling," 15–19, Rebecca Rushforth and Katherine Barker focus on the various scripts that were used in Wulfsgie's time (uncial, insular, caroline, runic as well as differentiating majuscule and minuscule) and the fact that Wulfsgie's name is written in insular script initially in *The Pontifical of St. Dunstan* in the second half of the tenth century, but the Latinized version of his name *Uulfsinus* is in anglo-caroline script. They note that the etymology of his name is OE *wulf* and OE *-sige* 'victory'. In "A Note on Anglo-Saxon Personal Names," 20–23, Simon Keynes observe that most names of people of rank in the tenth and eleventh centuries were dithematic,

replacing the monothematic names that were almost as common in the early Old English period. Most Old English names were West Germanic to begin with, but Biblical names were used too. The names began showing North Germanic influence in the late ninth century and Norman influence in the late eleventh century. The protothemes were adjectives like *æthel* 'noble, famous' and nouns like *sige* 'victory', and the deuterthemes were usually gender-specific like *stān* 'stone' or *mund* 'protection' for males and *hild* 'battle' and *wynn* 'delight, pleasure' for females. There was also wide use of pet-names, nicknames, occupational names, patronymics, and locatives in addition to the personal names. The use of alliteration and repeated use of a particular element was common within royal families. Old English and Anglo-Latin literature reflects awareness of the literal meaning of a personal name as well as perceived status, so that a prince named *Æthelred* 'noble-counsel' would be expected to make good decisions as a king and therein lies the irony of the by-name *unrad* 'no counsel' attached to *Æthelred*.

Gillis Kristensson argues convincingly, in "A Note on /sk/ in the Dialect of Devon" (*NOWELE* 46/47: 103–07), that the sequence /sk/ in seventeen place-names in Devon such as *Landskerry* and *Scob Hill* where one would have expected Germanic /sk/ to have become /s/ in Old English is not the result of Scandinavian influence but of Cornish influence since /sk/ appeared initially in Cornish too. All of the names with /sk/ apply to small places such as villages, hamlets, and farms. Since Cornwall is in proximity to Devon, Kristensson concludes that Cornish-speaking people moved to Devon and formed enclaves there before the conquest of Devon by the Saxons.

JDC

Works not seen

Kim, In-Souk. "English Place-Names: Traces of Invasion," *Recent Trends in Medieval English Language and Literature*. Ed. Fisiak and Kang. II:139–70.

Postles, David. *The North through Its Names: A Phenomenology of Medieval and Early-Modern Northern England*. English Surnames Study 8. Oxford: Oxbow.

9. Archaeology, Sculpture, Inscriptions, Numismatics

a. Excavations

“Roman Stone ‘Basilica’ Used by Anglo-Saxons,” *British Archaeology* 80 (January/February 2005): 6, is a short account of an excavation at Deerton Street, Kent of a massive stone building built in the first century A.D., which had apparently remained in use until the fifth or sixth century. The building was in the form of a basilica, with an arcaded stone hall with clerestory lighting with separate nave and aisle roofs. The excavators believe it to have been a corn warehouse. They suggest its apparent continuity into the post-Roman period must cast some light on the transition from the Roman to the Anglo-Saxon periods.

The discovery of the Prittlewell tomb has produced a number of related short papers. Ian Blair, Liz Barham, and Lyn Blackmore in “My Lord Essex,” *British Archaeology* 76 (May 2004): 10–17, give a well-illustrated account of the archaeology of the tomb, including reasons for the excavation (a proposed new carriage way to an existing road), plus evidence of previous Anglo-Saxon finds in the area which had led to an expectation of more, though nothing of the richness actually found. The excavation revealed a burial chamber in the form of a walled room. Among the sixty identified finds were a hanging bowl with inlaid enameled escutcheons, a Coptic flagon with a medallion possibly representing a saint, two pairs of glass vessels, a Byzantine silver spoon, a Merovingian gold coin, iron objects, a folding stool, an iron standard, a sword, a lyre, gaming pieces, a gold buckle, and gold foil crosses and braid from the garment of the deceased. The authors consider the grave more certainly Christian than Sutton Hoo, mound 1, which remains the richest. Nevertheless they conclude the Prittlewell tomb invites comparison—could it be the tomb of a king? Martha Bayless, “Tabletop Tactics,” *Archaeology* 58.1: 36–40, is a general account of the archaeology of gaming, much of which is related to the Vikings. However she gives an account of the Prittlewell find—fifty-seven gaming pieces and two dice. No board has survived so the game for which they were intended is unknown. She suggests two possibilities: *tabula* which is related to modern backgammon or *tafl*, a game in which one player had a king and a few men, the other more men but no king. The object of the game was to capture the king before it could escape to a corner. After the arrival of chess in the eleventh to twelfth centuries (illustrated by the Lewis chess men), *tafl* lived on only in Wales and Scandinavia. [See a related article by Bayless in section 3a.]

“The Prittlewell Prince & the Rayleigh Paupers,” *Current Archaeology* 198 (July/ August 2005): 298–301, again mentions this tomb find as the richest since Sutton Hoo, but mainly in order to speculate about the people who might have been ruled by the powerful aristocracy represented by it and the rich associated cemetery. About five miles away, at Rayleigh, is another cemetery that provides a considerable contrast: a cremation cemetery of 145 burials, with finds of little more than handmade pots, fragments of iron (including buckles, knife blades and a chatelaine), and a scatter of beads. There is an absence of shield bosses, swords, and axes, which implies a low status agricultural community. The cemetery is dated from 450–600, which also might imply it is a little earlier than the Prittlewell tomb. The anonymous authors look at the two cemeteries as near contemporaries, however, and therefore an example of different traditions flourishing side by side—the rich cemetery representing Germanic invaders who had moved on from the simple Germanic customs of the past to the import of luxury goods; Rayleigh the cemetery of laborers, possibly descended from the native British farmers. But does this mean these people had taken on Germanic burial customs? There is clearly a contrast here but the reasons for it would seem to demand a broader and deeper analysis.

Sutton Hoo itself continues to be a major subject for scholarly investigation. Martin Carver’s *Sutton Hoo: A Seventh-Century Princely Burial Ground and Its Context*, Reports of the Research Committee of the Soc. of Antiquaries of London 69 (London: British Museum Press and the Soc. of Antiquaries of London) is an important book, a summation of the research program based on excavation and surveys which, between 1983 and 2001 attempted to put into context the well-known ship-burial in Mound 1 (discovered in 1939 and fully published between 1975 and 1983). This book is extremely well-illustrated with color and black-and-white photographs, drawings of many artifacts and a number of interpretative reconstruction drawings, for example of the bridle of a horse, and the appearance of the site on the day of burial at mounds 1, 2, 6 and 17. There are in addition numerous plans and over one hundred tables summarizing various aspects of the work, including analyses of categories of finds; and scientific analyses of bone and environmental samples. The book begins (in Part I: Design) with a summary history of the exploration of the site and a detailed account of the program of field work, excavation and research. The burials are examined in detail in Part II: including the excavation

or re-examination of eight mounds which between them contained a second ship-burial; the burial of a horse and rider; a number of cremations; and a chamber grave of a woman of high rank: all dating to the seventh century. The excavators saw this cemetery as ending in the seventh century; and a new period of use after it ceased to be a princely burial ground from the eighth to the eleventh centuries. In this later phase the burials appear to be those of people executed by hanging or decapitation, some around the site of a possible gallows. These are interpreted as judicial executions probably carried out under royal authority. Part III is concerned with the full context of these phases, including aspects of the environment and its use, and in terms of historical sequences, beginning with prehistoric settlement from ca. 3000 B.C. and concluding with agricultural exploitation of the area from the twelfth century until the present. This wider context includes a field survey of the Deben valley. Chapter 14 in this section is the most important, in which the author places the pre-Conquest burial ground and execution site in their historical context, beginning with the evidence for the sequence of burials and concluding with the later man-made impacts on the area, including the evidence for farming and for barrow-digging from the fifteenth century onwards. This account, as befits the aim, is interpretative of the evidence. Carver points out that the significance of the graves is that they are situated in a burial ground separated from the folk cemeteries of the neighborhood, and largely restricted to an elite group. He further suggests (491) that the rich investments in some of these burials "ought therefore to have a status that reaches beyond the local kin group ... it is possible to propose that the patrons of the burial ground used it as a theatre in which they marked the passing of a leader with a memorial that recorded both an appreciation of the person and a vision of the future, both his and theirs." In this he continues a theme developed in earlier writings that the early burial site represents a political alliance with the pagan North Sea and Baltic regions, and antipathy to the Christian power bloc of Francia and its satellite, Kent. The abandonment of this site then becomes associated with the failure of this vision, and its development as a place of execution possibly begins with the protection of Christian values but continues as a development of royal power and protection. This is followed with an analysis of Sutton Hoo in its local, regional, and international context, trying to determine how far it is unique; how far it can be said to be royal; how it relates to other research on the idea of the "central place"—as background in support of the interpretations presented above, and all current

preoccupations among archaeologists. On p. 12, however, the author disarmingly observes that chapter 14 "represents a synthesis belonging to its time (which) ... will be revised and re-fashioned by future scholars," and hopes, with some justification from the mass of evidence presented, that they will "find their arguments assisted by this book."

Jacqueline I. McKinley, "Archaeological Investigations at The Bostle, Bronze Age and Anglo-Saxon Barrow Cemeteries, Balsdean, East Sussex, 1997," *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 142 (2004): 25–44 is an account of excavations along the site of a new water pipe line. The Bostle barrow group includes three large Bronze Age barrows and seventy-seven smaller Anglo-Saxon barrows. Among the Anglo-Saxon features dug were four ring ditches (three with central graves). The only grave finds were an iron pin shank with mineralized textile (a twill weave, z/s spun) from grave 250; and metal fragments, possibly coffin fittings, from grave 263. The radio-carbon date taken from one femur gave a date range of A.D. 640–880—the mid Anglo-Saxon period. The authors suggest that one ditch without a burial may have been a "cenotaph." The burials were all supine and extended.

Neil Griffin, with contributions from Luke Barber *et al.*, "Roman and Medieval Remains in Middleton-on-Sea, West Sussex," *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 143: 151–72, reports on an excavation from a site for which the strongest evidence is for the Roman period (mid first to fourth centuries A.D.) and the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In between, there was a single poorly preserved Anglo-Saxon grave radio-carbon dated A.D. 680–890, with east-west orientation. No artifacts were found in the grave.

EC

The excavation of a Roman Villa near Barcombe (Sussex), described in Chris Butler and David Rudling's "Recent Discoveries at Barcombe: Saxon and Other Activity at Barcombe Roman Villa," *Sussex Past & Present* 105: 6–7, has been ongoing since 2004. Among the Roman remains is a possible Saxon structure which was attached to the front of the then decaying Roman villa. Depressions in the soil produced large amounts of Saxon pottery and a pit contained an almost complete Saxon pot. This may have been a site of industrial production, as indicated by iron slag and loom weights.

"Cambridge Castle Hill: Excavations of Saxon, Medieval and Post-Medieval Deposits, Saxon Execution Site and Medieval Coinhoard," *Proc. of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 94: 73–101, by Craig Cessford with Alison Dickens, with contributions by Martin Allen and

David Hall, describes a multi-period excavation that contains a Middle Anglo-Saxon execution cemetery, but no early Anglo-Saxon features or objects. The site has been dated to A.D. 640–830, but may have been in use for as little as 80–110 years. Middle Anglo-Saxon pottery (both local and imported ware from East Anglia) was recovered on site. This is one of a number of Anglo-Saxon excavated cemeteries in the west of Cambridge. Nine graves have been wholly or partially excavated; these graves are partly intercutting and have three different alignments. Most of the bodies are laid out supine (there is one prone burial), but cut marks suggest that they have been subject to execution. All of the bodies have been sexed male, or possible male. The cemetery is possibly located to a yet undetected hundred meeting place. Further areas excavated were an inhumation cemetery at nearby Chesterton Lane which will be discussed in full in a later publication, and the Folk Museum site, where cattle bones, deposits of barley and rye throw light on the Anglo-Scandinavian activities in Cambridge.

Graham Hayman and Andrew Reynolds's "A Saxon and Saxo-Norman Execution Cemetery at 42–54 London Road, Staines," *ArchJ* 162: 215–55, examines the excavation of a late Saxon or early Norman cemetery, excavated in 1999 at Staines (Surrey). The site overlies some Bronze Age pits and was located next to the Roman road from London to Silchester. The site is located on the fringes of the hundred boundary and the county border. Altogether twenty-six graves with a total of thirty-five bodies were excavated; some of the bodies were decapitated and some buried in a prone position. At least sixteen bodies were identified as execution victims. One grave contained four individuals that had been decapitated. All but one of the people buried in this place were adults, the other a child of about ten years. Only twenty-seven skeletons could be sexed (some were too fragmented for any analysis), among these there is only one identifiable woman and six skeletons which could not be assigned to be either male or female. No evidence for coffins was found and the burial site has parallels to other Anglo-Saxon execution sites.

"Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Remains at Kent Place, Sherborne Street, Lechlade: Excavations in 2000," *Trans. of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Soc.* 122 (2004): 117–25, an article by David Kenyon and Mark Collard, with contributions by Alistair Barber *et al.*, describes an archaeological investigation ahead of new building activity in Lechlade (Gloucestershire). The investigation revealed pottery dated to the sixth- to ninth centuries in two ditches (D and F). Thirteen of

the found items resemble Anglo-Saxon ware. Additionally the site contained crop remains as well as 135 animal bone fragments (cow/horse/pig/deer and sheep/goat) which showed signs of butchery. The Anglo-Saxon finds suggest a shift of the settlement from the north-east to the current location in the eighth or ninth century.

Linear Earthwork, Tribal Boundary and Ritual Beheading: Aves Ditch from the Iron Age to the Early Middle Ages, BAR Series 402 (Oxford: Archaeopress), by Eberhard W. Sauer, with contributions by Paul Booth *et al.*, is an account of the multi-period excavation of Aves Ditch in Oxfordshire. The excavation revealed a decapitated skeleton from the Anglo-Saxon period, which was dated A.D. 670–870. The middle-aged male (ca. 35 years of age) suffered no pathology but his bones showed signs for heavy physical labor.

"Iron Age and Saxon Settlement at Jugglers Close, Banbury, Oxfordshire," *Oxoniensia* 69 (2005 for 2004): 385–416, by Charlotte Stevens, with contributions by Mark Roughley *et al.*, describes the excavation of a multi-period site north-east of Grimsbury Close at Banbury, which focussed on an Iron Age feature and later field systems. After a break in occupation during the Roman period there is evidence for late Anglo-Saxon activity, such as potsherds which could be dated to A.D. 900–1150. This includes an enclosure, a possible restructuring of the landscape. Plant examination has revealed the presence of hulled barley, some rye, and one flax seed.

CL

Gabor Thomas's "Bishopstone: In the Shadow of Rookery Hill," *Current Archaeology* 196: 184–90 reevaluates Bishopstone as an early Anglo-Saxon settlement site based on new information gathered from the current excavations begun in 2002; these excavations have revealed evidence of a Late Anglo-Saxon, Saxon-Norman timber house core around the church, a metalworking industrial border possibly dating to the ninth century, and a tenth-century expansion. This tenth-century area perpendicular to the church axis reveals post-in-trench hall type structures but also at least one building of the eleventh-century "narrow aisled" type with its different load-bearing timber positioning; the article explains the building differences well, for those who are non-specialists. Other unusual features—a cesspit with timber enclosure and a square-celled building that may have been a bell and gate tower—hint that these timber structures may possibly have been part of a thane's holding. The excavations of Bishopstone also suggest localized drift over time, raising questions about the

validity of the theory of "Mid Saxon Drift" and patterns of Anglo-Saxon settlement.

Like his article in *Current Archaeology*, Gabor Thomas's "Onwards and Outwards: Excavations at Bishopstone 2004," *Sussex Past & Present* 105: 10–13, is a short generalist article outlining the recent excavations and initial finds at Bishopstone. It features a plan of the features from the 2003/2004 excavations, marking the settlement structures and cemetery from St. Andrew's pre-Conquest burials. The seventeen stratified pits here allow for a better dating of the Bishopstone settlement, placing its timber gate post holes to the eighth or ninth century. There is mention of the unusual north-south inhumation carbon dated to 1260–1000 B.C. and preliminary sketches regarding the faunal distributions, which included primarily domestic birds and wild mammals. The frequent occurrence of both game animals and elite status animals like whale leads the author to suggest a high standard of living at Bishopstone. The excavations closed after the final season of excavation in September 2005, so we look forward to more detailed studies of this site.

FA

b. The Anglo-Saxon Church

The "Oldest Door Made by Anglo-Saxon Carpenters," *British Archaeology* 80 (January/ February 2005): 7 is a study of the north door of St. Botolph's church, Hadstock, which (according to legend) is covered with the flayed skin of a Viking. Less dramatically, but more practically, it seems to have been covered in tanned cow hide—i.e., leather. The door has been dated by the tree-ring method to a date range of 1044–67. There is a detailed description of its construction and ironwork, including the suggestion that some of the missing ironwork is preserved attached to the fourteenth century west door.

Tyler Bell's *Religious Reuse of Roman Structures in Early Medieval England*, BAR British Series 390 [Oxford: Archaeopress] is most useful for its lengthy catalogues: of burials associated with Roman structures; churches associated with Roman structures; and a list of comparative Roman structures with burials in south-west Gaul. He includes radio-carbon evidence for the re-dating of some sites. The evidence does seem to show that many early medieval religious sites were in or near Roman structures, but further research is needed to show why these sites were reused: in some cases it might have been inadvertent, in others because the earlier site was a useful source of building materials. These issues are not fully explored but the book represents a useful gathering of the available evidence.

A recent excavation at Leominster, a potentially important site because it was a minster founded ca. 660 by Merewalh, a ruler between the rivers Severn and Wye, proved disappointing when no Anglo-Saxon finds were made. "Leominster," *Current Archaeology* 195 (December 2004/ January 2005): 124–28, however notes that it appears to have been an important site and a center of pilgrimage before the Norman Conquest, with three associated saints (Edfrith, Hæmma and Æthelmod); and there is also a Prayer Book of ca. 1030 associated with it.

"Reconstructing Wulfstan's Cathedral," *St Wulfstan and His World*, ed. Barrow and Brooks [see section 7], 167–88, by Philip Barker, is an attempt by the late author to reconstruct the church which Wulfstan, who became bishop of Worcester in 1062, began in 1084. The crypt of this church survives almost complete, and other surviving remains allow the author to claim that Wulfstan's church was as wide, the nave as long, and the western transepts of the same area, as the present Worcester Cathedral. Information from standing remains is supplemented by evidence from excavations. Barker suggests that the free-standing columns of the crypt, with their simple cushion capitals, were already damaged and worn before the crypt was built, raising the possibility that they were reused from one of the earlier churches on the site, possibly St. Peter's, built ca. 680. The fragments incorporated into the present fabric, which show the original extent of the Norman church, are shown on a plan of the modern cathedral, fig. 17. These identifications are supported by photographs of visible or excavated features, plus drawings of some, leading to an outline plan of Wulfstan's cathedral, and a conjectural elevation, a perspective drawing and a conjectural model. This is a bold exercise, but the detailed evidence on which it is built is fully laid out for the reader's inspection.

Still on the theme of monasteries, Nigel Baker, in "Urban Monasteries in England," *Antiquity* 79: 461–63 is a review of Alan Hardy *et al.*, *Ælfric's Abbey: Excavations at Eynsham Abbey, Oxfordshire, 1989–92* (Oxford, 2003), which provides a concise summary of the main findings of the excavations, and suggests that its major significance for the early medieval period is not only that the building sequence begins in the sixth to early seventh centuries, but that there is evidence for its refoundation in 1005: "the last English Benedictine refoundation before Cnut's invasion," when monks replaced secular clergy and new stone buildings in a basic claustral layout appeared.

Requiem: The Medieval Monastic Cemetery in Britain (London: Museum of London Archaeology Service), by

Roberta Gilchrist and Barney Sloane, is an interesting and important book, notably well illustrated. It challenges previous assumptions that later medieval Christian burials were undifferentiated (“in terms of status, gender and age”) and useful only for demographical and osteological data. The authors created a database of 8000 graves from about seventy cemeteries in England, Wales and Scotland, mainly from medieval religious houses (ca. 1050–ca. 1600), but also including comparative evidence drawn from cathedrals, parish churches and Jewish cemeteries. Alongside this they used material drawn from their own survey of the archaeological literature of the last 150 years, supplemented by the work of other scholars on documentary sources—Books of Hours, wills, monastic and parish records, liturgical texts and hagiography. Their date range would appear to overlap only slightly with the pre-Conquest period in England, but their methodology has enabled them to locate the eleventh century as one of several periods of change in, for example, the adoption of new grave types (particularly of mortared cists and other forms of lined grave); the introduction of lead grave-crosses and plaques; and the presence of wooden staves or “wands,” a practice originating in Scandinavia, possibly representing symbolic pilgrimage. The re-introduction of grave-goods in the eleventh century is emphasized, and there is an interesting discussion of the social and eschatological changes which possibly lay behind this, including the interest in the millennium years 1000 and 1033; and the ascent to the English throne of Scandinavian kings in 1016, which may have increased the popularity of Scandinavian customs. One point made is that 1066 is not significant for change, suggesting that burial rites tended to be common across north-western Europe.

EC

In “How Much Can Anglo-Saxon Buildings Tell Us about Liturgy?” *The Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Gittos and Bedingfield (see section 7), 271–89, Richard Gem uses the Carolingian St. Gall plan as a starting point for discussing the general idea of how architecture can reveal elements of the liturgy, focusing on detailed design elements such as the positioning of the library and areas for liturgical vesting, staging Mass, and Eucharistic bread-baking reveal aspects of liturgical access and procession. In the second section, where Gem addresses the development of the axial tower and its relationship to the main altar, some of the author’s key scholarly positions are clearest: architecture is both responsive to functional necessities and reactive as elements become invested with separate social or

ideological meanings; further, neither documentary nor archaeological evidence can stand alone in determining the liturgical use of a building. The third section is an analysis of some specific Anglo-Saxon buildings and liturgical use, including St. Mary at Reculver (Kent, 699), which he compares against St. Peter (Winchester, 648) to suggest the relationship of nave spaces to altar space and flanking chambers. Gem also contrasts the buildings of Mercia (Brixworth, Northants., mid to late eighth century, with its well defined eastern choir bay, narrow ring apse over the crypt, and flanking single storey chambers and more elaborate towered entrance structure; the early ninth-century Cirencester, Gloucs., with its triple divided nave with its main apse; and the simple nave with unusual western apse of St. Oswald’s Minster, Gloucs.) with their Continental contemporaries. In the section on churches of the tenth-century monastic revival, Gem addresses the ways in which these Anglo-Saxon churches retained the seventh century core design. Gem’s article does not propose answers but raises critical questions of how we understand recurrent elements of Anglo-Saxon church design (the placement of the altar in the nave or in a distinct eastern sanctuary, the development of a choir or presbytery bay, and the development of lateral chambers flanking the altar and choir) and how we study those elements as architectural or liturgical in their impetus.

FA

c. Regional Studies and Economic Studies

Tom Williamson, in “Explaining Regional Landscapes: East Anglia and the Midlands in the Middle Ages,” *Medieval East Anglia*, ed. Harper-Bill [see section 7], 11–32, in attempting to explain the differences between the rural landscapes of East Anglia and the Midlands, is concerned to show that these were shaped both by the natural environment and by farming practices, rather than (as other landscape historians have variously suggested) by ethnicity, population density, or even more vaguely by “cultural factors.” He suggests that modern historians are more interested (he says obsessed) by issues such as power structures and macro-economics, and ignore “mundane matters of agricultural practicality” which, in a society more geared than ours to subsistence, he regards as more important factors. In particular, he examines the differences resulting both from soil types (some more fertile or easily worked than others), and from the relationship between the availability of meadow land and the character of the early medieval landscape—the latter a factor which impacted on the likelihood of nucleated as opposed to more distributed types of settlement, and can be related

to the survival of woodland pasture. This is a very specialized study which provides a much-needed balance to the wider economic studies of the kind he mentions; however, his views should be considered as supplementing rather than replacing them.

Timothy Longman, "The Excavation of an Early Medieval Field System at Hillesley Farm, Hillesley, Gloucestershire, 1997," *Trans. of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Soc.* 123: 95–119, looks at a rural landscape on a much smaller scale. The author provides historical background, including place-name evidence and documentary sources (the earliest a charter of 972) to an excavation of the named area. This included a ditch which did not seem to be defensive. Period 1 produced evidence for occupation before the late eleventh century, though without pottery or datable finds. Period 2 showed that the ditches were drainage gullies or strip boundaries for a field system of late eleventh- to twelfth-century date.

A more ambitious survey of a particular landscape is that undertaken in *Yeaving: People, Power & Place*, (Stroud: Tempus), edited by Paul Frodsham and Colm O'Brien. This is an attempt to place Yeaving (Bede's *Ad Gefrin*), which we are reminded represents "less than one per cent" of the story of the site since the end of the Ice Age, in its archaeological landscape. The area is in fact dominated by Yeaving Bell with its early hill fort, but includes the smaller "whaleback" hill, the site of the Anglian "palace." The editors seek to achieve their aim by allying archaeological studies ("data-gathering") with a phenomenological approach which tries "to place processes of human perception (based ultimately on our five senses) at the centre of research" (16). The book therefore covers a wide date-range pre- and post-Anglian: nevertheless Part III (chapters 5–10) is concerned solely with re-evaluation of the Anglian site. Of the remaining sections, Part V (chaps 13–17) is a study of the life and work of the excavator of this site, Brian Hope-Taylor. If the aim was to bring the area out from under the shadow cast by his study of a very brief period in the history of the area, the book cannot be said to have succeeded.

However, chapters 5–10 are important to our understanding of this royal site. Sam Lucy in chapter 5 ("Early medieval burial at Yeaving: a retrospective") re-examines the complete burial sequence. Lucy takes us beyond the original arguments about whether the archaeological affinities of this site are "British/native" or "Anglo-Saxon," instead turning our attention to new ideas, in which early medieval peoples took "elements of different cultures ... fusing them into a new Anglo-Saxon culture, which does not necessarily indicate the

geographical origin of its users" (143). In doing so, she acknowledges Hope-Taylor's own view that conquest and extensive settlement by pagan Anglo-Saxons were not to be assumed; and the view of Alcock, among others, that the Angles took over a functioning British system of administration. In this light, the fact that the Yeaving burials fit better in a northern British context than a south-England Anglo-Saxon one, is not surprising. Colm O'Brien, in "The Great Enclosure" (chapter 6), looks at the "palace" again also in the light of Hope-Taylor's (and Alcock's) belief in the fusion of two cultures. He suggests that the palisaded enclosure (and those at Milfield and Sprouston) were an Anglian development but probably inherited from an earlier British tradition. He also adduces linguistic evidence to support the idea that the Bernician kings had taken over fortified sites of the British precursors of their state. In Chapter 8, Stephen T. Driscoll ("*Ad Gefrin* and Scotland") further explores these regional connections, in particular of the wider landscape and the continuing importance of ancient assembly places. He too suggests that influence may have flowed in both directions; and that the rise of the church may have been a factor in moves to new royal sites: he uses evidence of a similar move in the Pictish kingdom of Fortriu, to that from Yeaving to Milfield in support of this. Paul Barnwell ("Anglian Yeaving: a continental perspective," chapter 9) takes a look at the connection between the "theatre" and the large post on which it as apparently focused. The latter has affinities with the *staffolus*, which in Frankia designated a place of royal power, where legal business could be transacted and judgment sought. He considered that the "theater" did have affinities with Roman amphitheatres, one of which, at Canterbury, may have continued in use after the Romans had left. In chapter 10 ("An historical context for Hope-Taylor's Yeaving"), Ian Wood reviews Hope-Taylor's arguments for the Britishness of Yeaving, and notes that while these "abuse" the written sources, they still make a number of important points which have been supported by later research (some pursued in this book) on the smallness of the Anglian elite and the British population. He is more critical of Hope-Taylor's emphasis on Romanness, which has become an important theme in Northumbrian studies, especially in sculpture. He is skeptical of the "theater," saying that the reconstruction has become accepted as fact, although as a narrow segment of a circle it in fact has no parallels. At odds with these close studies of aspects of the excavation and its interpretation is the piece by Carolyn Ware ("The social use of space at *Gefrin*," chapter 7), an anthropological study of the placing of the buildings, and how this, and

the placing of doors might have controlled social interaction. It is based on studies of building arrangements in non-Western pre-literate societies. While this could be enlightening, it also has to be based on an acceptance of a particular interpretation of the buildings at Yeavinger.

Some review articles are important because they advance the subject area studies; one such is Andrew Reynolds, "Review Article: On Farmers, Traders and Kings: Archaeological Reflections of Social Complexity in Early Medieval North- Western Europe," *EME* 13: 97–11. Taking into its scope *The Making of Kingdoms*, ed. Tania Dickinson and David Griffiths (Oxford, 1999); Peter Fowler, *Farming in the First Millennium AD* (Cambridge, 2002); *Wics: The Early Mediaeval Trading Centres of Northern Europe*, ed. David Hill and Robert Cowie (Sheffield, 2001); and Stuart Losco-Bradley and Gavin Kinsley, *Catholme: An Anglo-Saxon Settlement on the Trent Gravels in Staffordshire* (Nottingham, 2002), it begins by noting the fact of a revolution in understanding early medieval societies brought about by archaeology, but also notes with regret that syntheses of findings based on this plethora of archaeological evidence are relatively rare. Reynold's article not only gives a concise account of the papers referred to (most of which have been reviewed in previous issues of *YWOES*), but is a powerful plea for the necessity of such studies. He comments on the particular merits and methodology of each paper, but the meat of the work is in his final summation "A preliminary overview: England in north-western Europe," 115–18. In this he picks out what he considers to be major themes: the seventh century as a pivotal era, of which the conversion to Christianity is one aspect (with an ongoing debate on the relationship between documented sources and archaeological evidence); changes in the nature and character of settlement at the level of the individual household and in the wider landscape is another. The feature he picks out of this last he calls the "increasing physical boundedness of early populations" which he links to changes in agricultural practices, the growth of a monetary economy and the levying of taxes, and the development of a judicial administration. He relates these findings back to the books and papers he has reviewed, and ends with a renewed plea to those working in the area settlement and landscape studies to join with specialists in urban archaeology and burial studies, in taking a comparative approach to the development of settlement structure, urban structure and social institutions across the British Isles, continental Europe and Scandinavia.

Urban archaeology is well-represented by *Tatberht's Lundenwic: Archaeological Excavations in Middle Saxon*

London, Pre-Construct Archaeology Monograph 2 (London: Pre-Construct Archaeology, 2004), by Jim Leary, with Gary Brown *et al.* This fascinating study is named for an eighth-century *Lundenwic* resident, the presumed inscriber of his name, Tatberht, in runes on a sheep's bone found at the excavation of the National Portrait Gallery site (there is a specialist report on the inscription by R. I. Page, 103–4). This site is one of four recorded here—the others are 23–31 James Street; the Lyceum Theatre, Exeter Street; 21–24 Maiden Lane/6–7 Exchange Court (this last a partial re-excavation and re-evaluation of an excavation carried out in 1986). The sites were excavated and interpreted separately by different teams of people: this book is therefore an attempt to bring them together to provide a picture of the *wic* in the Middle Saxon period.

The archaeological and historical background is covered in chapter 1, a useful summary of the evidence to date for the existence of *Lundenwic*, its size and its site. It is about one kilometer west of Roman *Londinium* (which however was not abandoned—there is documentary evidence for a king's hall, a cathedral and a monastery and some churches may also date from this period, suggesting it remained an ecclesiastical and administrative centre). It is suggested here that the relocation of the commercial function could have been dictated by, *inter alia*, a major outcrop of brickearth (also a feature at *Hamwic/Southampton*), a sought-after material for hut construction, floor surfaces, loom weights, and possibly pottery. This is interesting in view of the finds and construction methods discussed later. Although there is slight evidence of earlier activity, it appears that *Lundenwic* was established in the seventh century.

Each of the following four chapters (2–5) is a separate site report, with its own attached specialist contributions. All are well-illustrated with site photographs, plans, and drawings of finds. Chapter 2 by Jim Leary, on 28–31 James Street is innovative (for a site report) in having short inset studies on topics which require background information: on Anglo-Saxon bee-keeping, along side an account of the discovery of the remains of a colony of honey-bees; and on the warp-weighted loom to illustrate the discovery of a set of thirty-one loom weights. The specialist report on this topic, by Ian Riddler (19–22) places the find in the context of both earlier and (less common) contemporary assemblages of loom weights, and considers the arguments for and against the *Lundenwic* set coming from a single loom. However although two of the sites produced evidence for textile working, no textile remains were found.

Chapter 6 is an extended specialist report on wattle-and-daub evidence from the National portrait gallery

site. It provides a detailed study of the "fired daub" at this and other *Lundenwic* sites, a technical study of London brickearth used in making the daub, and reports of a set of experiments on wattle-and-daub construction methods, materials, and probable longevity, with a useful glossary of all technical terms used. This must be an important reference point for any future analyses of remains with this kind of construction. It concludes with a brief section on types of repair used to increase longevity.

The final chapter justifies publishing the varied sites as one volume by summarizing the evidence on burial practice, occupation, and craft activity for the periods mid- to late-seventh century; late seventh to early eighth centuries; mid to late eighth century; and late eighth and ninth centuries. In addition there are finds reports bringing together evidence across all sites on two topics: Ian Riddler on antler, bone and horn working (with a section on *Lundenwic* combs); and James Rackham on environmental evidence, including evidence for large-scale butchery and processing, and for marked variations in the proportions of species represented. These finds make *Lundenwic* different from other *wics*, where the lack of evidence for butchery and processing; and limited species variation, have been taken as evidence for supply by an elite through food render and from estates. *Lundenwic* is in these respects more like early post-Conquest towns.

Anthea Harris, *Byzantium, Britain & the West: The Archaeology of Cultural Identity AD 400–650*, (Stroud: Tempus, 2003), is an attempt to look at economic and cultural ties on a much wider scale. The author looks at assumptions that where Roman culture survived after the end of the western Roman Empire in the fifth century, it was only as a residue or as an evocation of Roman power by the new "Germanic" elites to bolster the legitimacy of their hold on newly-conquered lands and peoples. Instead she emphasizes the continuing links between the western part of what had been the Roman world with the continuing eastern Roman Empire until the seventh century. The author implies these connections tend to be overlooked, but as she herself acknowledges her work is a partial restatement of the thesis put forward by Henri Pirenne in *Mahomet and Charlemagne* in the 1930s, which stated that the links with the Roman world were only really broken in the seventh century through the rise of Islam and the expansion of the Arabs into parts of the former Empire in north Africa, the Holy Land, Sicily and Spain. In chapters 2–5, she looks at diplomatic links with Byzantium; evidence of trade (especially with south-west Britain); the role of gift exchange (and the difficulty of

identifying diplomatic gifts among surviving remains), stressing the importance of the evidence for silk in western high-status graves in implying links with Byzantium; and the role of the church in the transmission of motifs and iconography from the Roman world into the western church generally. Chapter 6 looks specifically at Britain and Byzantium between the sixth to the eighth centuries. Continued trading contact with parts of the Mediterranean world and western, non-Anglo-Saxon Britain, especially in ceramics figures in this account; and there is much discussion of how exotic objects arrived in Anglo-Saxon graves—concluding that the majority are so like those traded throughout Frankia, that it appears more likely that England was simply on the end of this trade route rather than in direct contact with Byzantium. In this analysis, the indisputably Byzantine silver in the Sutton Hoo grave is a true anomaly. As I understand the argument, it seems to be that such rare items could have come through gift exchange, and not necessarily from the continent but perhaps from western Britain, with whose elites the Anglo-Saxons were also in contact.

EC

Open-field farming emerged during the eighth century; Susan Oosthuizen's "New Light on the Origins of Open-Field Farming?" *MA* 49: 165–93, based on her research from the Bourn Valley (Cambridgeshire), suggests that the origins of this system go back to a central authority at a time before the parish boundaries were firmly established. She shows that this area had been cultivated prior to the Middle Anglo-Saxon period and that the changes in the cultivation suggest evidence for an early prototype of this form of agriculture and may indicate the existence of an estate created in the eighth to ninth centuries.

J. E. Schofield and M. P. Waller's "A Pollen Analytical Record for Hemp Retting from Dungeness Foreland, UK," *Jnl of Archaeological Science* 32: 715–26, describes an analysis from the naturally formed Muddymore Pit in the gravel beaches of Dungeness Foreland, south-east England. The high frequency of *Cannabis Sativa L.* pollen indicates that the pit was used for hemp retting. The dating of the material has been narrowed to A.D. 1000–1400, a time when the nearby port of Lydd reached the height of prosperity, and where hemp produce were used for rope and cloth. Lydd is located near to one of the Cinque Ports (Romney), which had to supply one out of every five ships. A decline in *Cannabis Sativa* pollen after the middle of the thirteenth century is taken as a possible indicator for a change in the nutrient levels in the pool and there may be indications

of controlling water qualities through channelling and sluices.

CL

The Roman to Medieval Transition in the Region of South Cadbury Castle, Somerset, BAR British Series 399 (Oxford: Archaeopress) is the published version of John Edward Davey's dissertation with slight alterations in illustrations and the omission of the appendices; as such, in addition to its splendid complete bibliography, there is also an extensive introduction which sets this individual study in the context of the larger scholarly literature and debates. Davey is part of a growing number of scholars who argue against the outmoded traditional model of a great Roman economic and social collapse at the end of the fourth century, followed by a definitive Anglo-Saxon conquest that established a new medieval culture. Focusing on this post Roman period of the fifth and sixth centuries, Davey examines the hillfort of South Cadbury Castle, Somerset as a continuous site, typical of settlement patterns in Somerset and the west of Britain, and uses a multi-disciplinary approach to try to understand the site's period context, asking instead questions of self-definition as played out in the area's material culture. In addition to more standard analysis of burial archaeology, he uses geophysical survey, the economic analysis of land distribution and cultural land definitions, settlement patterns, and communication patterns (roads, tracks, and hypothetical routes) between settlements (much of which is thoroughly discussed in the requisite methodology chapter) to argue persuasively that the region shows little change in land division from the Roman period to the medieval parochial boundaries; that there is a dispersed settlement pattern in the area with considerable links among settlements, rather than one center at South Cadbury Castle area; that on the whole it models a system of agrarian development; and that, while the primary Roman economic system gives way to the secondary land based economy, both systems are simultaneously present.

Ralph M. Fyfe, Anthony G. Brown, and Stephen J. Rippon's "Characterising the Late Prehistoric, Romano-British' and Medieval Landscape, and Dating the Emergence of a Regionally Distinct Agricultural System in South West Britain," *Jnl of Archaeological Science* 31 (2004): 1699–1714, is a densely technical article but one that presents some new information for understanding the landscape of Southwest Britain, particularly Devon, through paleoecological studies of the low-lying fens and the changes in pollens. Speculating that there should be greater continuity here than in

the upland areas where Romanization and later Anglo-Saxon colonization were both more pronounced, the authors look at four local vegetation and land use histories (30 m. wide sites in Mid Devon around Rackenford) to suggest a regionally distinct use pattern in the lowlands. The results section includes scientific details of the stratigraphy of the sites, radiocarbon dating, and detailed analysis of pollen distributions. For those not experts in the field, the article concludes with a lengthy discussion of the results, beginning with evidence of Iron Age clearing of trees but without subsequent evidence of arable cultivation, suggesting that "continuity of pastoral activities appears to have characterized land use throughout the late prehistoric period" (1710), then moving to examine the general lack of change in the Roman period (which they correlate to the lack of Roman political pressures in the governance of the area). They note an increase in the cultivation of cereal grains and good quality grazing pollens in the period between 600 and 800 and remaining through 1500, which they relate to the regional system of "convertible husbandry" where field use alternates grain and grass cultivation. This evidence suggests a date for the development of this system of agriculture, possibly suggesting we consider an earlier date than the mid ninth century for the dispersed settlement phenomena.

In "The Eighth-Century Urban Landscape," *Æthelbald and Offa*, ed. Hill and Worthington, 97–102, a short article that seems to have not translated well from its original lecture format, David Hill works backward from the urban landscape of the ninth century under Alfred the Great, with its bipartite structure of *wics* or emporia and fortified and sophisticatedly planned *burhs*, to ask what the landscape of the eighth century under Æthelbald and Offa might have looked like (struggling against the paucity of material culture evidence). He begins by looking at the loosely connected *wic* sites of Southampton, Ipswich, London and, perhaps York to suggest that English *wics* are comparable with continental sites in date and size; he outlines the complexity of transactions at a site like London. In the second section, Hill looks at the definition of "town," focusing on Winchester with its patterns of street layout and their relationship to town functions; he matches Martin Biddle's excavations against a charter of Dunwald to SS. Peter and Paul, Canterbury, made in 762, to suggest that the *burh* can be seen in the boundary definitions here, well before Alfred's time. He joins these points to a discussion of Offa's Dyke, corresponding issues of charter and obligations in the period, and the construction of roads to suggest the possibility of considerable urban development in eighth century Mercia.

Addressing the contentious question of the Saxon migration and settlement, Janet Montgomery, Jane A. Evans, Dominic Powlesland, and Charlotte A. Roberts's "Continuity or Colonization in Anglo-Saxon England? Isotope Evidence for Mobility, Subsistence Practice, and Status at West Heslerton," *American Jnl of Physical Anthropology* 126: 123–38, attempts a new methodology for considering the character and dating of the influx of Angeln people than the more traditional examination of settlement archaeology and artifacts. The authors begin from the premise that with chain migrations, members of the same family/kin group tend to migrate along familiar paths of earlier settlers; studies that focus on genetic inheritance and variations or, as in this study, that focus on the radiogenic isotope decay of strontium and lead as found in bone and tooth enamel offer new ways of looking at indigenous and emigrating populations, offered in conjunction with more traditional scholarship. The authors of this study looked carefully at West Heslerton because of the fifth-to-seventh century date of both the settlement and associated cemetery site and the strong Anglian character of the site. The article first summarizes the West Heslerton site's geography and geology and adds a summary of archaeological finds that draws heavily on botanical and faunal finds since these are critical for understanding isotope distribution (i.e. strontium uptake is suppressed in high protein/high calcium diets, increased in vegetarian diets). The next section is a detailed discussion of samples, since the thirty-three tooth enamel samples were taken selectively from those early graves where the assemblage of grave goods suggested evidence of Scandinavian or Germanic migration; there is a short section here as well on the core sampling procedures applicable only to specialists. In their findings, the authors suggest a low lead level, an order of magnitude lower than those from the preceding late Roman or following medieval periods; "the normal distribution of the Anglian lead data ... supports the interpretation that the Anglian individuals buried at West Heslerton are a single statistical population with respect to their exposure to lead" (129–130). The authors note however that while the lead is consistent with English ore, they cannot, because of trade of lead to the Continent in the Roman period, rule out the possibility of non-English origin. The strontium data is very different from the lead analysis, showing evidence of bimodality in the adult population with one group falling within local dietary parameters and another group being significantly more radiogenic. These distinctly different levels in adults suggest major differences in childhood diet. Comparison against grave findings shows that while

females were evenly distributed between the local and non-local group, all of the osteologically-sexed males were non-local. The authors noted no significant correlation between strontium levels and grave positioning; crouched and prone burials, long thought (Faull 1977) to be native burials, occur in both the local and non-local isotope groups. All four grave-good categories also have both local and non-local isotope distributions, suggesting social status was not associated with origin. The three burials with wrist clasps (regarded as Norwegian) and the three with cruciform brooches (Norwegian/Scandinavian) were all non-local in strontium isotope. The authors are notably reluctant to draw sweeping conclusions, even for the constituency of West Heslerton, and note carefully the ways in which local variations (rather than migration) or the ways in which locations overlap even from Scandinavia to England to possibly account for the bimodality seen here. The article is highly technical and not for generalists but does at least lay out the possibilities for using this analytical method in combination with other archaeological investigations.

FA

d. Artifacts and Iconography

Current Archaeology continues to provide short notices of small finds of particular interest. An example is, "First Anglo-Saxon Era Papal Seal Found (and Second)," *British Archaeology* 79 (November 2004): 7, which describes the find, in 1979, of a papal lead seal (bulla) of Pope Paschal I (d. 824) in Frome Valley, east Herefordshire. It is suggested that the design of such seals (in this case with an abbreviated name and crosses inside a circle) influenced Anglo-Saxon and Carolingian coins. The seal was identified by Tim Pestell at Norwich Castle Museum, which led him to discover another example of John VIII (872–82) found in the 1990s and not previously identified.

The new edition of Lucien Musset's *Bayeux Tapestry*, translated by Richard Rex, (Woodbridge: Boydell), is a useful book for its excellent illustrations. The full "tapestry" appears as a continuous strip across the top of pages 88–267, with one enlarged detail on each double page. Thus those who want to look at stitch detail have some information, as well as those who want to look at the connection between detail and whole. Each double page has a brief commentary on the section depicted. There are brief introductory sections on the history of the "tapestry," its artistic context, the captions, the historical characters, soldiers and weapons, ships, buildings and the environment, the borders and the historical background. The footnotes to these sections add more

references to the very short select bibliography at the end. The great value of this book is in its illustrations, and it functions perfectly as a short introduction to a complex subject.

David A. Hinton, *Gold and Gilt, Pots and Pins: Possessions and People in Medieval Britain*, Medieval History and Archaeology, (Oxford: Oxford UP), is a major example of a very desirable development, in which archaeological finds are put back into their social and historical context. In this case, the finds concerned are small objects such as jewelry. The author declares his aim: “to examine some of the ways in which people in medieval Britain presented themselves ... it considers some of the reasons for people’s decisions to acquire, display, conceal, and discard some of the things that were important to them, and examines how much the wish to acquire, retain, and pass such things on to heirs explains behavior in the Middle Ages.”

The first five chapters are relevant to Anglo-Saxonists, taking us from post-Roman Britain to end of the eleventh century. Part of the book’s value, however, lies in the broader context of artifact development and change in patterns of use (reflecting changing historical circumstances) as far as the first half of the sixteenth century. A brief “Envoi” (260–1) provides a useful summary of these broad changes. The first chapter brings together a vast amount of material for the period after the end of Roman Britain, and in doing so tackles such issues of current concern as, for example, ethnicity, which can be raised from a consideration of the form and style of many objects from graves and metalworking sites. He uses as an exemplar the early sixth-century grave of a young woman in Apple Down, West Sussex, who was buried with a square-headed brooch of a type found mainly in Kent, of which the parallels lie mainly with Jutland (such correspondences have been held to prove Bede’s assertion that the people of Kent had a Jutish origin); and also with two saucer-brooches of a type rarely found in Kent. Hinton entertainingly discusses all the possible permutations of where this woman came from, where she might have resided when alive, whether she married and died in Sussex, or married in Kent and returned to die in Sussex, demonstrating the inadequacy of traditional explanations for the meaning of objects in pre-literate societies based on the distribution of object types. He prefers instead new modes of assessing objects in graves as representing “social” or “symbolic” capital, for example; or in relation to gender or age. These and other theories are thoroughly discussed, with numerous apposite examples.

The book is rich in detail, so it is difficult to pick out specific points but chapters 2–3 (“Expressions of the

Elite” and “Kings and Christianity”) are a subtle analysis of material also considered in the book by Anthea Harris discussed under “Regional and Economic Studies” above; and chapter 3 is also a major contribution to the study of what constitutes a “high-status” site, the differentiation of secular and religious sites, and the development of trade, all important modern preoccupations.

EC

Tanya M. Dickinson’s “Symbols of Protection: The Significance of Animal-Ornamented Shields in Early Anglo-Saxon England,” *MA* 49: 109–63, is a detailed analysis of animal ornamentation on shield decorations from twenty shields interred with final phase burials and seventeen further mounts which may have been designed for shields. The comparison reveals seven distinct types (fish, predatory bird, dragon, quadruped, cruciform, symmetrically-shaped and discoid), some which can be subdivided into more distinct species. Dickinson compares decorations with other forms of animal decoration, such as motifs on bracteates. She interprets the iconography of these shield decorations as symbols of protection, invoking possibly the power of the god Woden/Oðinn. She shows that such shields supported local and regional formations.

Magnús Fjalldal’s “A Lot of Learning Is a Dang’rous Thing: The Ruthwell Cross Runes and Their Icelandic Interpreters,” *Correspondences: Medievalism in Scholarship and the Arts*, ed. Tom Shippey with Martin Arnold, *Studies in Medievalism* 14 (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer), 30–50, is an evaluation of the earliest decipherings of the Ruthwell Cross (Dumfries and Galloway). Transcriptions of the runic inscriptions were published in Hicke’s *Thesaurus* (1703), and Fjalldal shows how the topic attracted Scandinavian researchers in the nineteenth century, such as the Icelanders Þorleifur Repp, an unsuccessful student of Rasmus Rask and Finnur Magnússon, who studied at Copenhagen and was later appointed to a chair in Northern Literature. Both of them tried to decipher the runic inscriptions by applying Scandinavian, rather than Anglo-Saxon runology. Their unusual readings were regarded with suspicion by English scholars, such as John Mitchell Kemble, who provided his own readings (which, Fjalldal claims, were not without errors).

Allan Vince’s “Ceramic Petrology and the Study of Anglo-Saxon and Later Medieval Ceramics,” *MA* 49: 219–245, presents results from a survey executed in the 1990s by the City of Lincoln Archaeological Unit of archaeological thin sections of ceramics held by various institutions and individual collectors. The study

shows that in the Middle to Late Anglo-Saxon period pottery production was carried out in a limited number of centers. He shows that pottery from East Anglia was traded from the Middle Anglo-Saxon period and that *wics* often show a large array of traded ceramics. Even late Anglo-Saxon handmade wares seem to have been produced by specialist potters who may have moved some distances with their skills. Eleventh-century pottery, apart from East Anglian ware, seems to show a change of sources, often accompanied by a change of form and material. Vince also points to future research that needs to be undertaken in areas that are yet under-researched, such as Northern England.

CL

Based on Pamela O'Neill's doctoral thesis (University of Sydney, 1999), *'A Pillar Curiously Engraven; with Some Inscription upon It': What Is the Ruthwell Cross?* BAR British Series 397 (Oxford: Archaeopress) is an ambitious attempt to understand the Ruthwell Cross both from its existing state and in its possible original form. The first section (chapters 2–4) is a careful examination of the current state and the literature around the cross. Notably, while chapter 2 looks at the form of the cross, chapter 3 is an analysis of the region; O'Neill provides convincing evidence for seeing Ruthwell in the context of late Roman sites and medieval communication routes to assert the vibrant ecclesiastical activity in this area rather than the rather romantic view of isolated Northumbria. She analyzes four separate elements of the Ruthwell Cross—vinescroll, figural carving, Latin inscriptions, and runic inscriptions—and begins with a literature analysis of each (ch. 4) before beginning an unusual, detailed and complex statistical analysis between the Ruthwell elements and other comparable examples. In the chapter on vinescroll, one of the key issues is derivation from either Roman or Syrian/Eastern sources; O'Neill identifies some forty attributes of the vinescroll decoration, from single stem to flower and seed pod presence to leaf shape, and then considers correlation. Her conclusion here is that vinescroll production in England is, as we might expect, regionally isolated, that Ruthwell's east face is linked to Bewcastle and the Jedburgh panel, and, as we might be surprised to discover, that the considerable differences in carving on the upper and lower stones suggest that the stones are neither carved at the same time or by the same sculptor, and that there may be Pictish connections based on the correlations between the Ruthwell scroll and the Hilton of Cadboll slab. The analysis of the figural sculpture in chapter 6 is perhaps the most problematic, necessitating the narrowing of

categories to human (including Christ but excluding angels) and standing poses only; O'Neill again devises about forty categories for her analysis, but there seems to be a higher incidence of outliers here, including the Christ from the Ruthwell Magdalene panel. Her analysis though shows a high correlation between the Agnus Dei panels of Ruthwell and Bewcastle, "plac[ing] Ruthwell and Bewcastle at the beginning of a tradition of figural carving in stone in the British Isles, linking them to slightly later groups from Yorkshire, Scotland, and southern England."⁽⁵⁰⁾ She also again suggests the possibility of Pictish influences, based on the worshipping beasts in the Ruthwell Christ panel. O'Neill's multivariate statistical analysis of letterforms and arrangement of the Latin inscriptions of Ruthwell and forty-eight other works (chapter 7) shows no tight clusters, a problem partly attributed to damage; nevertheless, O'Neill suggests both the lack of similarity between Ruthwell and any other example and the fairly strong similarities between the north and south faces of the Ruthwell Latin inscriptions. Her analysis marks the general close relationship here between text and image. Chapter 8 notes the unusual character of Ruthwell's runic inscription (longer and non-memorial), the uniformity of their carving, and the context of this Anglo-Saxon futhorc which she notes is very particular about describing the *c/g/k* sounds. She interprets the inscription as a poem in the same form/material as the "Dream of the Rood" but emphasizes that the Ruthwell Cross poem is not the same and should instead be seen as a statement, integral to the figural decoration, on the orthodox nature of Christ's incarnation. Chapters 9 through 11 diverge from the historical and statistical analysis of the first two sections to suggest new readings of the Cross to include revelations about the nature of the sculptor as outside the Romano-British mainstream and the nature of the audience for the Cross. O'Neill emphasizes the Magdalene imagery as directed at women of the period; she argues that the Ruthwell imagery is not narrative but thematic on the nature of Christ but may have been created by/intended for a specifically female audience. This book is in fact a different approach to the Ruthwell Cross because of its blend of historical context and statistical analysis; for all the problems of sample sizes and conditions of extant work, the statistical analysis provides a new way of seeing the context around the Ruthwell Cross that helps us to understand the work in itself.

In "No Stone Unturned—A Re-assessment of Anglo-Saxon Long-and-Short Quoins and Associated Structures," *ArchJ* 162: 177–214, a technical but lay-accessible article, what John Potter hopes to propose is a new

nomenclature for distinctive Anglo-Saxon quoins, pilaster strips, and arch jambs, primarily to facilitate a more accurate evaluation of Anglo-Saxon architectural elements within rebuilt architecture. He looks at the placement of long quoins in relation to their bed stratification, noting its deliberate placement vertically against its sedimentary composition, and short quoins, noting their expected horizontal bed alignment; he calls the new elements “BH” (bedding horizontal), “BVFL” (bedding vertical face left), and “BVFR” (bedding vertical face right). Later quoins do not rely on this vertical orientation and can be an effective means for dating masonry on either side of the Conquest date. Similar analysis is done on pilaster strips and the arch jambs; Potter’s examination of the bedding orientation reveals unusual details of consistent Anglo-Saxon construction, such as the mode of arch construction used without (extant) exception is bedding vertical face into the arch (BVFIA) rather than exterior to the arch (BVEIA). The appendix and tables list stone cut analysis in these features for many well-known Anglo-Saxon churches.

Alex Woodcock’s *Liminal Images: Aspects of Medieval Architectural Sculpture in the South of England from the Eleventh to the Sixteenth Centuries*, BAR British Series 386 (Oxford: John and Erica Hedges) is a largely unaltered publication of the author’s doctoral thesis (2003, University of Southampton); almost all of the works discussed here fall outside the primary focus dates of YWOES. As Woodcock notes, the current scholarship in this area favors the terms borrowed from manuscript illumination of “marginal” but that these sculptural forms are sometimes hard to delimit as marginal in placement or in iconography, often conforming to a set of standard iconographies for sculpture placed in these areas; he likely chooses “liminal” as a way of drawing attention to the way in which these images mark thresholds or boundaries of space, audience, and meaning. The first three chapters are a discussion of theory; the following chapters apply Woodcock’s understanding of the theory to the specific regional area of the South of England. The initial chapter is a standard dissertation chapter exploring the historiography of the analysis of these architectural sculptures, noting two major areas of scholarship in their status relegation when compared against the sculptures of primary visual areas such as tympana and capitals and the discussion of the grotesque as an iconographic category. In Chapter 2, Woodcock discusses the idea of the grotesque in the Middle Ages as itself a liminal iconography, “betwixt and between,” which could be connotatively positive or negative. Combined, these two chapters are an effective summary of the theoretical position and could be used

separately from the rest of the locally-specific text. The third chapter, “The Social Life of Medieval Architectural Sculpture,” is a necessarily simplified statement on the context of medieval artistic creation, drawing attention to elements such as the visual connections between Roman spolia and later production, between England and other cultures, between media, and between audiences; as a chapter, it cuts a broad swath but serves as a polemical statement against the traditional position that discounts the significance of the areas of production that are Woodcock’s focus. Chapter 4, “The Severed Head and the Evil Eye,” begins the more focused discussion of these works, primarily looking at the placement of these images at Romanesque corbel tables, cornices, friezes (the roofline), arches (the limen of doors and windows), capitals (a limen between the support and the supported), and Gothic misericords and roof bosses. It also advances Woodcock’s assessment of these images as apotropaic in nature and, as such, not necessarily required to be seen clearly by the viewer. Chapter 5 advances a similar catalogue and analysis of foliate disgorgers and foliate creatures, convincingly drawing out a motif of resurrection/corruption. Chapter 6 picks up a motif of devouring and distorted mouths (as distinct from the foliate forms); I was somewhat disappointed that Woodcock only briefly draws attention to the liminality of the mouth and does not connect the pervasive mouth-puller imagery with the even more pervasive parallel imagery of the sheela-nagig. Chapter 7 addresses human/animal hybrids, with a separate chapter devoted to siren forms. Chapter 9 is devoted to entertainers (those who contort the body and therefore become grotesques/outside the norm) and exhibitionists (those who expose the boundaries of the body); several sheelas on Romanesque quoins are of interest in this chapter and Woodcock provides evidence that sheelas appear to have been clearly associated with the north sides of the architecture in this region. The volume ends with a clear conclusion that summarizes Woodcock’s analysis of the primarily talismanic function of these images, and a useful catalogue of the images from sites in Dorset, Hampshire, Somerset and Wiltshire.

FA

e. Numismatics

The coinage examined in Marion M. Archibald’s “Beonna and Alberht: Coinage and Historical Context,” *Æthelbald and Offa*, ed. Hill and Worthington (see section 7), 123–32, helps to establish the existence of two mid-eighth-century East Anglian rulers, Beonna and Alberht. More importantly however, the author seeks

to use coin evidence to help understand the dynamics of Offa's coming to power in Mercia. Beonna's coins (now totaling 111) are characterized as a reformed coinage of small thick pennies between 12 and 15 mm. in diameter with well-formed runic inscriptions (Beonna or Benna, and issued with the full "REX" in the moneyer Efe's issues). Archibald divides them into three distinct groups based on silver content, statistics of finds, and comparison to Offa's issue. There follows a relative chronology of the coinage in which Archibald suggests that Beonna's coinage falls between Æthelbald's 757 murder and Offa's assumption of power in East Anglia, 760–765, a tight period consistent with issue and wear patterns. It is Archibald's discussion of Beonna's stylistic innovations, particularly the title inclusion and the pairing of the king's and moneyer's names, which is most interesting since they suggest the ways in which coins—circulating objects available to different social strata—worked in this specific and intricate historic context to create a statement of kingship, royal authority and administration of money in East Anglia before the resumption of Mercian control.

Looking at recent finds of sceatta coinage from the reign of Offa (between 757 and 796), Derek Chick's "The Coinage of Offa in the Light of Recent Discoveries," (*Æthelbald and Offa*, ed. Hill and Worthington), 111–22 analyzes the patterns of distribution, noting the expected south-eastern predominance in coastal *wics* and a dearth of coins north of the Humber, patterns which follow established river and land routes. Chick suggests that as few as three mints served as the issuers for these: London and Canterbury, with their strong trade connections, and another East Anglian site as yet unidentified. Using these more recent finds, Chick breaks from Christopher Blunt's model of the larger broad penny being introduced in the middle years of the eighth century by the kings of Kent and suggests their origination before 770 under Offa, based on comparative analysis of inscriptions and portrait designs. The article concludes with a useful discussion of the chronology of the period's coins, placing the early Mang coins ca. 760–765 in London, the light Canterbury coinage beginning ca. 776 then interrupted by Ecgbert's and resumed and continuing as late as 792/3, and concluding with the heavier issue securely around 793.

Anna Gannon's analysis of coinage differs from standard coin examination for its concentration on the iconography of the coins rather than for their metal content. In "Riches in Heaven and on Earth: Some Thoughts on the Iconography of Coinage at the Time of Æthelbald," *Æthelbald and Offa*, ed. Hill and Worthington, 133–38 she examines the secondary-phase silver sceattas of the

reign of King Æthelbald (716–757) for their innovative "bird in vine" motif, a design she relates to Jesus' words in John 15:1–8, taken as a Salvation theme, and for their busts, a motif she relates to the ideals of kingship. Crosses paired with busts and sprigs paired with busts relate to Christianity clearly; the coins with busts that have cups in front of them Gannon shows as having allusions to hospitality and generosity. Other coins are marked with busts and birds, which invite a number of different possible readings. Gannon layers these interpretations with the nuances of Anglo-Saxon riddles and the multivalent perceptions of these objects. Given that these are circulating objects, reaching audiences of varied education and sophistication, Gannon suggests that they might be deliberately intended to connect earthly riches (the coin) with heavenly riches (the ideas represented by the motifs).

How often it happens that the needle, once pulled from the haystack, gets put down and lost never to be found again. James Graham-Campbell takes us on precisely this kind of exercise: a single silver coin of Æthelred II is found in the garden of Rushen Abbey in the nineteenth century, but no evidence of late tenth- or early eleventh-century activity has been found on the site. The coin has since been lost from sight, but in "The Lost Coin of Æthelred II from Rushen Abbey, Isle of Man," *British Numismatic Jnl* 75: 161–63, Graham-Campbell traces back the sources around the 1848 dispersal of the Bradda Hoard (deposited ca. 995) to suggest that one of the haphazardly recorded, "mostly broken" but saved-from-melting-down coins ended up in the school playground on the site before the late 1850s. The value of the article is not for what it tells us about the coins of Æthelred II, but what it tells us about our own histories of archaeology, valuation, and circulation of these coins.

D. M. Metcalf's "The First Series of Sceattas Minted in Southern Wessex: Series W," *British Numismatic Jnl* 75: 1–17, begins with a discussion of the secondary-phase sceattas of Series H in Hamwic and the distribution patterns in Wessex. This might seem an odd beginning to a discussion of the first series of sceattas minted in Southern Wessex, Series W, but Metcalf roots his discussion of Series W in the larger debates of *wic* functions so that we need to begin to understand the ways in which money circulated within the central region in order to understand the peripheries. Metcalf uses regression analysis of the Series H sceattas to argue against Ben Palmer's recent analysis ("The hinterlands of three southern English emporia: some common themes," in Pestell and Ulmschneider, *Markets in Early Medieval Europe: Trading and 'Productive'*

Sites 650–850 (Macclesfield, 2003), 48–60) to see these as valid exchange currency rather than “internal tokens of exchange.” Series W, a corpus presently of over thirty coins, has a distribution pattern that likely centers its minting in south Wessex, possibly predating Hamwic to the late seventh and early eighth centuries. The distribution shows a concentration in the Hampshire Basin but also isolated examples carried considerable distances, suggesting dual function dynamics for this particular mint. The bulk of the article is devoted to the possible dating of Series W. Metcalf narrows the period between the Kentish switch from gold thrysmas to silver sceattas ca. 675–680 and the end of the primary phase ca. 710–715 by looking at the alloy content, distribution, and possible minting locations within easy reach of the Solent but outside of Hamwic, and history of the area to conclude the role Series W played in politics around the reign of Caedwalla around 686. The wergild paid to Caedwalla’s successor Ine by the Kent’s King Wihtried in 694 for the death of Caedwalla’s brother Mul in 687 is suggested as a possible impetus for the minting of Series W. The article concludes with a substantial and detailed catalogue of the Series W sceattas, showing a bearded figure (head and torso) with large hands held open against a large cross staff. The reverse shows a cross and crosslets and a saltire, all from the same center point. The catalogue includes die information and find-spots. Metcalf also addresses modern forgeries and contemporary imitations in the series.

The opening paragraph of Metcalf’s “Monetary Circulation in the Danelaw, 973–1083,” *Anglo-Saxons*, ed. Keynes and Smyth (see section 2), 159–85, addresses the scholarly framework against which his article sets itself: scholars have long assumed, against pre-870s coinage evidence, that Danish settlement acted as a stimulus towards a monetary economy in eastern England, generalizing a marked contrast before and after settlement, and between the economy of the Danelaw and other areas of England. Metcalf emphasizes that the stray find discoveries and collation of the last twenty years have provided substantial new evidence about the circulation of coins in the area in the primary years from 973–1083. Discussion of the specificity of find locale and minting suggests that even considering the Danelaw as an entity is misleading, and it is more revealing to consider the six regions individually; further, with the frequent renewal of these coins, circulation patterns can be described quite closely. In a useful general overview of post-973 Danelaw, Metcalf outlines the eighteen major mint towns, accounting for more than 17,000 coins; he also outlines the various coin and die outputs for these mints. He reads these particularly in the context

of foreign trade, noting differences between port and inland towns, fluctuations in silver, and the distribution of losses, which puts these coins into a circulating economy rather than keeping them local. Metcalf shows coins circulating not only outside the Danelaw to the rest of England but also to Scandinavia, particularly to Gotland. After showing that this is not a closed system, Metcalf differentiates the stray finds in each geographic division of the Danelaw, going locale by locale to show that the shire boundaries were porous and that stray find distribution is in proportionate scale to the mint’s output. The next section addresses weight variations in these coins, noting that the higher weight values were in the western mints and the lower weights generally mark the Danelaw, raising the issue of large foreign transactions using the coins merely as bullion. There is an interesting section on the use of cut halfpennies, showing that these circulated as well as whole pennies. Not leaving the general trends to show the whole picture, Metcalf has a short section entitled “Temporary Aberrations From the Pattern as Clues to the Uses of Money,” in which he addresses things like the rare Second Hand type and the closure of northern mints from 985–991 in the beginning of Æthelred’s rule; in addition to the clear summaries for non-specialists, the connection between the coin evidence and the historical possibilities is something that Metcalf does particularly well. The article closes with future possibilities, advocating for looking at the stray finds from ca. 870–973 in light of what is now understood about the eleventh-century Danelaw.

Part of the long-running project of the British and Royal Numismatic Societies, Marina Mucha’s *Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles 55: Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg, Part IV: English, Irish and Scottish Coins, 1066–1485* (Oxford: Oxford UP and Spink & Sons Ltd.) discusses the holdings of English, Irish, and Scottish coins from 1066–1485 in the Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg. All of these coins come from one of the three collections gathered between the 19th century and 1917 (Reichel, Stroganov, or Plushkin; a full history can be found in vol. 50 of the *Sylloge* series); the work done here by curator Marina Mucha is an important step in more fully identifying and inventorying these long-neglected holdings. While the majority of coins in the volume fall outside the specific Anglo-Saxon period interests, the highlight of the collection (and this volume) is the numerous coins of William I’s *Paxs* type, many representing the rare (Huntingdon, Malmesbury, Rochester) and scarce (Cambridge, Chester, Derby, Dorchester, Ilchester, Leicester, Sandwich, Shrewsbury, and Warwick) mints. Typical of the series,

this volume is fully catalogued with weights, die information, inscriptions, and provenance (when available) and it is fully and competently illustrated in black and white.

FA

Among the few direct non-Anglo-Saxon sources for the settlement of the Danelaw are coins. Mark Blackburn's "Currency under the Vikings, Part 1: Guthrum and the Earliest Danelaw Coinages," *British Numismatic Jnl* 75: 18–43, examines the coinage from the earliest phase of the Scandinavian settlement (pre-895 A.D.). The earliest coins are imitations of existing coinage and few carry the names of Viking rulers. Most have been found as part of hoards. Among the most prominent is Æthelstan, otherwise known as Guthrum, who was the opponent of King Alfred and who after his defeat accepted this baptismal name. One coin minted in the name of King Guthfrith of York was found in the Ashdon hoard (Essex, ca. 895), but coins can also point to otherwise unrecorded rulers, such as a certain Halfdan, who, as Blackwell emphasizes, was not the leader of the Great Army. The minting of coins continued under Scandinavian rule in the Danelaw and there is a substantial body of evidence for Guthrum's reign (approximately 180 dies have been identified for his mints) and the coinage supports the idea that the newly established areas of the Danelaw were economically vibrant territories which had successfully adapted the previous monetary system. Christian symbolism, as well as adaptations of Carolingian and Anglo-Saxon coins, underline the aspirations of the new rulers to be viewed as respected members of a Christian state.

CL

Gareth Williams and Richard Bishop, "Coenwulf, King of Mercia," *Current Archaeology* 194 (October/November 2004): 56–57, describes the find by a metal detectorist, on the banks of the river Ivel, Bedfordshire, of a gold coin of Coenwulf (796–821). Only eight Anglo-Saxon gold coins have been found for the period from the eighth century to the early 1050s, and each one is unique. The authors surmise this is a mancus (a term which could mean a coin, or a unit of account or weight). Coins used in international trade at the time were either dinars (from the Islamic Caliphates) or Carolingian *solidi*. This coin could have been meant to equal one of these. It is suggested that this is possibly one of the first gold coins intended to play a regular part in currency, probably on the basis of its design and ascription. The coin has on one face a garlanded bust (imitating Roman coin design) and the letters COENVVLF

REX M; on the other a central floral motif and the letters DE VICO LVNDONIAE—from the *wic* of London (see *Tatberht's Lundenwic* reviewed above in the section on regional and economic studies). Here the coin is compared to a coin of Charlemagne with the words VICO DORESTATIS. In design, the coin is very similar to Canterbury coins of Cuthred (Coenwulf's brother and subking of Kent), and it is therefore suggested it might be by the same moneyer, ca. 807, when Coenwulf resumed coining at the Canterbury mint.

EC

f. Miscellaneous

"Sutton Hoo Goes to Sea," *British Archaeology* 80 (Jan/Feb 2005): 20–23, is a lively account, with technical detail for those with nautical knowledge to appreciate the achievement, of an attempt by Edwin and Joyce Gifford to show, by using a half-size replica, that the Sutton Hoo ship was suitable for sailing. The tests, after 500 hours of sailing in many different weather conditions, proved satisfactory. The testers were concerned to refute claims that the Anglo-Saxons could not sail, and that the ship was a 'mere rowing galley'.

Roger Bland, "A Pragmatic Approach to the Problem of Portable Antiquities: The Experience of England and Wales," *Antiquity* 79: 440–47 does exactly what it says. It begins by saying that all countries have felt the need to devise a system for the protection of "objects of archaeological, historical or cultural importance found on their territory by members of the public by chance ... 'portable antiquities.'" There follows an outline of the history of relevant legislation in England and Wales from the law of Treasure Trove to the 1997 Treasure Act, including a discussion of the impact of metal-detecting. A system of voluntary reporting and recording of finds has been developed which the author believes works well on the whole, although there is still a significant problem of looting of sites and selling through the internet on sites such as eBay. The writer is the coordinator of the English Portable Antiquities Scheme and is in favor of its continuance, based on cooperation between archaeologists and other interest groups, partly because this provides for some interaction and education about the significance of found objects and their context, and because it rewards good practice. He notes in passing that the smaller number of finds from Ireland and Scotland mean that it is still legally necessary (and possible) there to report all finds.

EC

Jan Ragnar Hagland and Bruce Watson's "Fact or Folklore: The Viking Attack on London Bridge," *London*

Archaeologist 10.12: 328–32 re-evaluates the alleged attack on London Bridge in 1014 by Ólafr Haraldsson (St. Olaf), which is described in Snorri Sturluson's *Heimskringla*. The attack was meant to support King Æthelræd in his endeavor to gain control against Cnut's army. Snorri's main source is the *Höfuðlausn* of the poet Ottarr Svarti who was a contemporary of Ólafr (the poem itself has survived in fragments in several sources). The authenticity of this event has been questioned by some English scholars, but the authors conclude that despite the fact that there is no corroborative evidence in Anglo-Saxon sources, evidence from material culture and Scandinavian sources give a plausible context for the attack, albeit the amount of damage caused may have been exaggerated by Ottarr.

B. Jakob's "Prevalence and Patterns of Disease in Early Medieval Populations: A Comparison of Skeletal Samples from Fifth to Eighth Century AD Britain and Southwestern Germany," Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Durham, 2004, *Index to Theses* 54: 2550 is a detailed comparative study of three Anglo-Saxon (Apple Down, Castledyke and Norton) and three Alamannic cemeteries from the mid-fifth to the early eighth century, which analyzes pathological changes from a total of 928 skeletons. Examinations of dental disease, trauma, osteological changes, metabolic disease and evidence for infectious disease were recorded and Jakob observes that there is a slightly higher amount of pathological changes in the Alamannic populations. The thesis also contains a useful description of the history of paleopathology in Germany and Britain.

Mary E. Lewis's "Impact of Industrialization: Comparative Study of Child Health in Four Sites from Medieval and Postmedieval England (AD 850–1859)," *American Jnl of Physical Anthropology* 119 (2002): 211–23, is a study of four distinctive sites (Raunds Furnells, Northamptonshire; St. Helen-on-the-Walls, Yorkshire; Wharram Percy, Yorkshire and Spitalfields, London) with attention to the impact of urbanization and later industrialization on the health of children. Three of the sites are dated from the late Anglo-Saxon to the medieval period (Raunds, St. Helen-on-the-Wall and Wharram Percy), whereas the Spitalfields cemetery dates from the mid-eighteenth to nineteenth centuries, two of the sites are drawn from rural populations and the other two from urban environments. 831 non-adult (up to the age of seventeen years of age) were studied, and contrary to expectations that continuing urbanization would lead to more health-related complaints (such

as restricted growth due to a lack of nutrients and diseases associated with growing pollution) it seems that it was not until the Industrial Revolution that the urban environment begun to have a real impact on child development. The high amount of metabolic disease in the urban industrialized environment has been blamed on a change of feeding habits.

Philip N. Wood's "Geophysical Survey at Bamburgh Castle, Northumberland," *MA* 49: 305–10, describes a survey by ground-penetrating radar carried out in 1999, which may indicate a vaulted chamber underneath the central lawn and post-Conquest chapel of Bamburgh Castle. This structure may overlie an Anglo-Saxon shrine built for the hands and arms of the Northumbrian saint St. Oswald which were allegedly buried in the Church of St. Peter in the *urbs regia* of Bamburgh. The construction of crypts is known from other Northumbrian sites of the seventh century and this structure may indicate the location of the church of St. Peter.

CL

Works not seen

[Anon.]. "New Light on Prittlewell 'Prince' Grave." *British Archaeology* 83 (August 2005): 9, ill.

Bailey, Richard N. *Anglo-Saxon Sculptures at Deerhurst*. Deerhurst Lecture 2002. Bristol: The Friends of Deerhurst Church, 2005. 32 pp. ill.

Dark, K. R. "Back to 'The Dark Ages'? Terminology and Preconception in the Archaeology of Fifth- to Seventh-Century Britain." *Jnl of Celtic Studies* 4 (2004): 193–200.

Frodsham, Paul, with contributions by Richard Carlton *et al.* *Archaeology in Northumberland National Park*. CBA Research Report 136. York: CBA, 2004. xviii, 382 pp. ill.

Page, R. I. "Seeing and Observing." *NOWELE* 46/47: 211–25.

Richardson, Andrew. *The Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries of Kent*. 2 vols. BAR British Series 391. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2005. ix, 257 pp.; ii, 402 pp. + maps, plates.

Schurr, Dieter. "Hron and fisc on the Frank's Casket." *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 60: 27–37, ill.

Taylor, B. "A Contextual Analysis of the Landscape of Cambridgeshire in the Early Anglo-Saxon Period." M.A. Thesis, Univ. of Durham, 2003. *Index to Theses* 54: 2560.

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
Editor, *Old English Newsletter*
Department of English, University of Tennessee
301 McClung Tower
Knoxville TN 37996-0430
phone: 865-974-6970 / fax: 865-974-6926
e-mail: rliuzza@utk.edu

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

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 *Old English 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
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
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
301 MCCLUNG TOWER
KNOXVILLE, TN 37996-0430**