

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>41</i>
<i>NUMBER</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Winter 2008</i>	

ISSN 0030-1973

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER

Volume 41 Number 2

Winter 2008

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: Dana Oswald, University of Wisconsin, Parkside

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 © 2009 The University of Tennessee.

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

THE YEAR'S WORK IN OLD ENGLISH STUDIES

2006

CONTRIBUTORS

Frances Altvater	<i>University of Hartford</i>
Dabney Bankert	<i>James Madison University</i>
Tom Bredehoft	<i>West Virginia 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>
Peter Dendle	<i>University of Pennsylvania—Mont Alto</i>
Nicole Guenther Discenza	<i>University of South Florida</i>
Michael Fox	<i>University of Alberta</i>
Eugene Green	<i>Boston University</i>
John Harkness	<i>Augsburg College</i>
Richard F. Johnson	<i>William Rainey Harper College</i>
Dianne Jonas	<i>Yale University</i>
Stefan Jurasinski	<i>State U of New York—Brockport</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>
Andrew Scheil	<i>University of Minnesota</i>
Douglas Simms	<i>Southern Illinois U—Edwardsville</i>
Emily Thornbury	<i>University of California—Berkeley</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	10
a. History of the Discipline	10
b. Memorials and Tributes	21
3. Language	23
a. Lexicon, Glosses	23
b. Syntax, Phonology, Other Aspects	41
4. Literature	67
a. General and Miscellaneous	67
b. Individual Poems	101
c. <i>Beowulf</i>	118
d. Prose	137
5. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works	154
6. Manuscripts, Illuminations, Charters	160
7. History and Culture	176
a. General Sources and Reference Works	180
b. Religion and the Church	169
c. Ecclesiastical Culture	185
d. Society and the Family	190
e. Gender and Identity	192
f. The Economy, Settlement and Landscape	194
g. Magic, Medicine and Science	198
h. Law, Politics and Warfare	199
i. Vikings	206
j. The Norman Conquest and Settlement	208
8. Names	211
9. Archaeology, Sculpture, Inscriptions, Numismatics	216
a. Excavations	205
b. Regional and Settlement Studies	221
c. The Anglo-Saxon Church	227
d. Artifacts and Iconography	231
e. The Bayeux Tapestry	237
f. Death and Burial	240
g. Health, Illness, Diet, Architecture	241
h. Numismatics	243
i. Miscellaneous	248
Abbreviations	250

Foreword

Once again YWOES has enlisted the efforts of a substantial pool of collaborators for this issue: twenty-seven in all. The size of this volume is a testimony to their diligent work, but their contributions are not measured merely by the heft of what you are holding in your hands. They continue to do an outstanding job of summarizing and commenting on an ever-growing body of scholarship in our field. With their collective efforts we have progressed toward the goal of putting the YWOES back on a schedule that leaves a minimal interval between the year reviewed and the publication date of YWOES. We're not quite there yet, but we're not far off, either.

We bid a grateful farewell to Jeannette Denton, Paul Kershaw, Eileen Joy, and Jane Toswell. I must single out for special acknowledgement Eileen and Jane, who between them have reviewed for fifteen issues of YWOES, and for many of those years took on substantial amounts of reviewing in their assigned sections. Each of them approached the task with exemplary conscientiousness, and we will miss their distinctive voices in these pages. Philip Rusche has also decided, for reasons still unclear to us, that YWOES 2005 would be his final issue. We regret that so many items in section 5 of this issue have gone unreviewed, but by the time we realized we lacked a reviewer for them it was too late to recruit another. For the past two issues something similar has happened in the Syntax part of section 3, where a late withdrawal left too much for the remaining reviewer to cover. Sometimes it becomes necessary to move ahead to publication without waiting to pick up all the loose ends. As is our usual practice, we plan to review at least part of the backlog in the next issue.

We welcome three new contributors to this issue: Eugene Green of Boston University to the Language section; and two more to General and Miscellaneous Literature: Thomas Bredehoft of West Virginia University and Peter Dendle of Pennsylvania State University, Mont Alto. We look forward to many years of productive collaboration with them.

Once again, in part because of the large pool of collaborators working in not-quite-perfect coordination, you may notice that a few items are reviewed more than once—an almost unavoidable consequence of cross-listing items in more than one section and of assigning several reviewers to a section. Consider it a bonus, a special service of our publication: search them out as if on a scavenger hunt. As has been our recent practice, we try to mark such reviews with a double dagger.

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

NOTICE

Subscribers are reminded that the *Old English Newsletter* is returning to its original publishing schedule of two issues a year. Beginning with vol. 42, *OEN* will print only the annual *Bibliography* and the *Year's Work in Old English Studies* (in spring and fall, respectively). Other content—news and announcements, notices of recent publications, annual reports from ongoing projects, abstracts of conference papers, and essays—will be available on the *OEN* website, <http://www.oenewsletter.org/OEN/>.

YWOES is set in Adobe Minion Pro Medium 10/12, with headings in Myriad Pro 14/18 and special characters drawn from the Unicode fonts Gentium and Junicode. It is produced on an Apple MacBook Pro using Adobe InDesign CS3.

1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects

a. Teaching Old English

Professor Young-Bae Park provides a stark assessment of "Teaching Medieval English in Korea in the Twenty-First Century," *Textual and Contextual Studies in Medieval English*, ed. Ogura [see sect. 3b], 147–60. Unlike Japan, Korea does not have a well-funded, government-supported university infrastructure to teach medieval English. With its eye on globalization, the Korean Ministry of Education and Human Resources enacted higher education reforms in the mid-1990s that stressed academic preparation toward fluency in spoken, and to a lesser extent, written English. Consequently, the number of graduate students studying and scholars researching and publishing in the field of medieval English studies has fallen dramatically since the 1980s. Pointing to the productivity of medieval scholars in Japan, Park challenges Korean scholars to begin a similar publication campaign in the field of medieval English language and literature.

b. Research Resources, Print and Electronic

A number of research resources that will be of interest to Anglo-Saxonists appeared in 2006. Volumes 31 through 33 of *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter), ed. Heinrich Beck *et al.*, have gone into a second edition. Volume 31 covers the letters *T* through *V*, from *Tiszalök* to *Vadomarius*, with entries on Trewiddle, Tribal Hidage, Trinkhorn, and Undley. Volume 32, covering *Vä* to *Vulgarreht*, includes essays on Verse, Verulamium, and *Vita Columbani*. Volume 33 covers *Waagen und Gewichte* to *Wielandlied*, with articles on Wales, Wansdyke, Wealh, Wergeld, Wessex, West Heselton, West Stow, Whitby, Widsith, and Wieland.

Besides *YWOES*, three compilations of great value to our field are published each year by *The Old English Newsletter*: Robert Butler compiles and edits "Abstracts of Papers in Anglo-Saxon Studies," *OEN* 39.3: 36–139. For 2005–2006, Butler prints over 150 abstracts of papers presented at various conferences and meetings; Heide Estes has printed over 100 notices of current research, work completed, and forthcoming publications in "Research in Progress 2005," *OEN* 39.4: 43–48; and Edward Christie has compiled some thirty annotated entries across ten headings in "Circolwyrde 2006: New Electronic Resources for Anglo-Saxon Studies," *OEN* 39.1: 45–49.

Two print resources which will be of interest to Anglo-Saxonists have appeared in 2005–2006. Richard K. Emmerson has edited *Key Figures in Medieval Europe: An Encyclopedia* (New York: Routledge), which includes entries on Ælfric, Æthelwold of Winchester, Alcuin, Aldhelm, Alfred the Great, Bede the Venerable, Cædmon, Dunstan of Canterbury, and Edward the Confessor, among others. David Scott Kastan has edited the 5-volume *Oxford Encyclopedia of British Literature* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005), which includes entries on Ælfric, Anglo-Saxon Elegies, Bede, *Beowulf*, Cædmon, *Judith*, and Old English language, to mention only a few.

In "Designing the *Old English Newsletter* Bibliography Database," *Digital Medievalist* 2.1, Roy Liuzza describes the genesis and production of the *OEN* database. Liuzza discusses in detail the structure and construction of the data tables, the search routines used to retrieve items from the database, and the codes underlying the processes involved in accessing and displaying the data. Online hosting and maintenance challenges have been addressed by placing the database on a commercial web host. Liuzza closes by suggesting directions for future improvements and expansions of the database. In what otherwise might have been a rather tedious essay about his Herculean efforts to assemble and produce such a database, Liuzza deftly balances personal narration and observation with technical description to produce a compelling account of what will undoubtedly become the electronic database of first resort for researchers in our field.

c. Tolkien and Anglo-Saxon Studies

In "Frodo as Beowulf: Tolkien Reshapes the Anglo-Saxon Heroic Ideal," *Mallorn: The Jnl of the Tolkien Soc.* 44: 29–34, Robert Goldberg explores the similarities between the epic hero Beowulf and Frodo Baggins. At the outset, Goldberg concedes that the two characters in fact possess very little in common; instead, he argues that "Their common bond is the type of hero they are, and the characteristics they share" (29). Goldberg distills the Anglo-Saxon heroic ideal to three qualities: courage, generosity, and loyalty. After an analysis of literary examples from the Anglo-Saxon corpus of these qualities, Goldberg concludes that "Frodo demonstrates that he possesses the qualities of the Anglo-Saxon heroic ideal, though Tolkien reshaped some of those qualities to fit a different time and a different

place” (34). Although Goldberg relies on a number of non-standard sources (ie, Book Rags, Monkey Notes, Mytheme.org) for much of his information, his conclusions are reasonable.

Michael R. Kightley considers the correspondences between *Beowulf* and Tolkien’s *Two Towers* in “Heorot or Meduseld? Tolkien’s Use of *Beowulf* in ‘The King of the Golden Hall,’” *Mythlore*: 119–34. Building on the work of T.A. Shippey, who first suggested that Tolkien used *Beowulf* as a model for his chapter “The King of the Golden Hall,” Kightley delineates exactly how and why Tolkien may have used the Anglo-Saxon epic in this chapter. Kightley argues that Tolkien builds a complex series of correspondences that “maneuver the reader into interpreting the main characters of the second half of the chapter primarily in terms of their counterparts in *Beowulf*” (119). Through much of his essay, Kightley demonstrates the one-to-one correspondences between Theoden and Hrothgar, Wormtongue and Unferth, and ultimately between the aged Gandalf and the young warrior Beowulf. While many of Kightley’s observations are rather predictable, his conclusion that this chapter of *The Two Towers* is “either an isolated experiment into the viability of combining Christian values with the heroism of the north or is a vital key into understanding Gandalf’s character in its entirety” is thought-provoking and compelling.

In much the same vein, Richard W. Fehrenbacher extends Shippey’s examination of the similarities between *Beowulf* and *The Two Towers* in his essay “*Beowulf* as Fairy-Story: Enchanting the Elegiac in *The Two Towers*,” *Tolkien Studies* 3: 101–15. According to Fehrenbacher, Tolkien’s principal narrative trope in *The Lord of the Rings* is the *euclastrophe*, or “a sudden and miraculous grace” often found in fairy tales and which serves to provide the tale with a “happy ending” (104). Through a close reading of the Rohan sections of *The Two Towers*, Fehrenbacher demonstrates convincingly that in these sections Tolkien was essentially able to “rewrite what he saw as the heroic but ultimately doomed pre-Christian worldview of *Beowulf* in order to allow for the *euclastrophe*, the happy ending denied the Danes but central to [his] project in *The Lord of the Rings*” (105).

In a brief note on “A Spliced Old English Quotation in ‘*Beowulf*: The Monsters and the Critics,’” Michael D.C. Drout sources a famous quotation in Tolkien’s magisterial essay on the Anglo-Saxon epic (*Tolkien Studies* 3: 149–52). Tolkien often invented lines of Old English verse and incorporated them in his lectures and writings. A cursory review of the “Monsters” essay reveals two such occasions. The quotation Drout sources

comes at the point in the essay at which Tolkien is discussing the theme of the poem: “lif is læne: eal scæceð leoht and life somod.” The second part of the quotation comes directly from *Widsith* (lines 141b–142a). Drout is unable to source the first element of the quote but rightly points out that the sentiment (that life is fleeting) is quite common in Anglo-Saxon verse, especially the elegies.

In “Dreaming of Dragons: Tolkien’s Impact on Heaney’s *Beowulf*,” *Mythlore* 25: 137–46, Felicia Jean Steele compares the dragon episode in the Tolkien’s *The Hobbit* with Heaney’s translation of a passage in the dragon episode in *Beowulf* (ll. 2287–2290). Steele argues that Heaney’s translation of this passage seems to endow the dragon with a consciousness: “Heaney’s dragon does not simply awake to discover the scent; he awakens from a dream” (138). According to Steele, Tolkien gives “subjectivity and language” to the dragon Smaug in *The Hobbit* (145). In his translation of the moment when the dragon in *Beowulf* awakens to discover the cup missing, Heaney also depicts the dragon as having an internal consciousness. Steele argues that since Heaney claims not to have read *The Hobbit*, he must have been influenced by Tolkien’s criticism, and his essay on “The Monsters and the Critics” in particular.

d. Announcements and Reports on Projects

Progress reports appeared for two on-going projects in Anglo-Saxon studies. In “Anglo-Saxon Plant Name Survey (ASPNS): Seventh Annual Report, January 2006,” *OEN* 39.3: 19, C.P. Biggam reports on the Survey’s work in 2006. As always, 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 another productive year in “Dictionary of Old English: 2006 Progress Report,” *OEN* 40.1: 21–25. Draft entries for *H*, *I*, *Y*, and *L* are well in hand, and with the lemmatization of *M* nearly complete, the assignment of *N* is set to begin. The Project also directs readers to the most recent version of the “List of Texts” cited in the DOE, available under the tab “Research Tools” at <http://www.doe.utoronto.ca>.

e. Essay Collections

With *The Place of the Cross in Anglo-Saxon England* (Publ. of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 4; Woodbridge: Boydell), Catherine Karkov, Sarah Larratt Keefer, and Karen Louise Jolly have completed the second of three volumes to come out of the *Sancta*

Crux/Halig Rod project. All but one of the papers in this volume were originally presented at a conference held at the University of Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies in July of 2002. The theme of that conference gave its title to this volume, which consists of eleven essays divided between three sections, each devoted to one aspect of the cross's "place" in the Anglo-Saxon world. The first section, "The Cross in the Landscape," consists of three essays, each of which explores the ways in which the cross as a literary symbol, a physical monument, and a lexical entity mark the geographic and cultural landscape of early Anglo-Saxon England. The four essays in the second section of the book, "The Cross in the Church," consider the place of the cross in the liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon church and in certain texts and rituals associated with popular religious practices. Four essays on "The Cross in the Text" round out this volume. As a whole, the essays in this volume draw on an impressive range of scholarly expertise and represent an exemplary achievement in interdisciplinary studies of Anglo-Saxon culture. In some few cases the essays reflect their genesis as conference papers, yet they maintain a sophistication of approach to problems and issues of historical source study.

Clare A. Lees and Gillian R. Overing have edited a collection of essays that explore the concept of "place" across disciplinary and temporal boundaries entitled *A Place to Believe in: Locating Medieval Landscapes* (University Park: Pennsylvania State UP). The volume includes ten essays divided across three headings: "Place Matters," "Textual Locations," and "Landscapes in Time." The three essays in the first section, "Place Matters," deal broadly with the intersection of Anglo-Saxon material culture and physical geography to define how the concept of "place" is culturally construed and interpreted through a variety of disciplines. The four essays in the second section, "Textual Locations," demonstrate ways in which one can read medieval texts in the landscape and how medieval texts inscribe the landscapes they describe. The three essays on "Landscapes in Time" challenge modern assumptions about the significance, value, and use of the "ruins" of the past, especially the medieval past. This volume stretches the traditional boundaries of "medieval studies" across the space-time continuum in a series of compelling individual studies and will be required reading for anyone interested in cultural and physical geography and the intersection of these disciplines with medieval studies.

A.N. Doane and Kirsten Wolf have edited *Beatus Vir: Studies in Early English and Norse Manuscripts*, a collection of essays dedicated to the memory of the life and work of Phillip Pulsiano [see sec. 2]. The fourteen

essays in this volume cover the full range of Pulsiano's scholarly interests, from Anglo-Saxon manuscript studies and Old Norse-Icelandic literature to medieval bibliography and hagiography. In the "Introduction" to this fine volume, Doane and Wolf strike the perfect balance between homage and veneration of a man worthy of both (xv–xxi).

Professor Donald Scragg is honored with *The Power of Words: Anglo-Saxon Studies Presented to Donald Scragg on his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. Magennis and Wilcox [see sec. 2]). Magennis and Wilcox have collected thirteen essays. Joyce Hill opens the volume with "Donald Scragg: A Tribute," a biographical essay which delineates Scragg's prolific career and underscores the significance of his vast scholarship. The first section of this volume, "Homiletic and Religious Literature," includes seven essays on Anglo-Saxon religious texts and their contexts, and the second section, "Words, Texts, and Traditions," consists of six essays on aspects of Anglo-Saxon religious prose, with particular attention to manuscript production, composition, and use.

Among the essays in this second section is Andrew Prescott's "'Kinge Athelston That Was a Worthy Kinge of England': Anglo-Saxon Myths of the Freemasons," *The Power of Words*, 397–43. Prescott examines the widespread myth that King Athelstan's son, Edwin, founded the stonemasons' charter, and in the process sheds light on the origins of this seemingly obscure order. As Prescott recounts the story, in the tenth century King Athelstan reintroduced the art of building as it had fallen into grave neglect. The king supposedly had a son named Edwin who was enthralled with masonry and was initiated into the masons' secrets. At his son's request, the king granted the masons a charter that allowed them to hold an annual assembly in England. According to the legend, Edwin convened such an assembly at York, where he initiated masons, instructed them in polite society, and passed a series of ordinances governing the practice of their craft. This legendary account of their origins has endured from the seventeenth century and is known among modern freemasons as the York legend. In his meticulously researched essay, Prescott examines the manuscript evidence of the legend and demonstrates that its genesis lies in pragmatic concerns having to do with issues of wage control over stonemasons in particular, and a desire to appropriate the Anglo-Saxon past to confer a noble provenance for the order's traditions. Following in the footsteps of the honorand of this volume, Donald Scragg, Prescott has revealed yet another example in a long line of later appropriations of the Anglo-Saxon past for expedient political ends.

f. Editions and Translations

The life and martyrdom of King Oswald of Northumbria was a popular legend in the Middle Ages. Marianne E. Kalinke has edited and translated two vernacular versions of this legend in *St. Oswald of Northumbria: Continental Metamorphoses. With an Edition and Translation of 'Ósvalds saga' and 'Van sunte Oswaldo deme konninghe'* (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 297, Arizona Studies in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance 15 [Tempe: ACMRS, 2005]). Kalinke introduces the editions with a study of the continental development and diffusion of the legend. Kalinke's excellent study and edition will serve to bring these important but difficult texts to the attention of a wider audience.

Marijane Osborn has produced an English translation of Otto Bruder's *Beowulf: Ein Heldisches Spiel*, which was first published in 1927 as a play for amateur theater productions (*In Geardagum* 26: 19–52). In her preface to the translation, Osborn analyzes the transformation of the Anglo-Saxon epic in Bruder's play and provides a historical and biographical context for the composition and production of the play ("Bruder's *Beowulf*: A Critical Preface by the Translator," *In Geardagum* 26, 5–18). Although Bruder's play has strong pre-World War II nationalist overtones, it does not contain the sort of proto-Nazi sympathies one might expect to find. Writing in the 1920s, a time of great cultural foment, Bruder represents the hero Beowulf as essentially a German hero, a blond, nature-loving "boy" who will bring about a much-needed national reawakening. Osborn suggests that Bruder's play, with its grand heroic themes and impassioned rhetorical proclamations of brotherhood, may have unwittingly contributed to the racist mythology of the National Socialist movement. Osborn points out, however, that Bruder was born a Jew but converted to Christianity during his military service before World War I. She suggests that in fact much of his work, including this play, is a warning against the racist ideologies of the Nazis.

g. Varia

Stefan Jurasinski overturns earlier scholarship on the authorship and provenance of the late thirteenth-century legal treatise known as the *Mirror of Justices* in "Andrew Horn, Alfredian Apocrypha, and the Anglo-Saxon Names of the *Mirror of Justices*," *JEGP* 105: 540–63. At the end of a long list of instances of judicial misconduct, the *Mirror* describes how King Alfred ordered forty-four judges hanged for their false judgments. Jurasinski reviews early scholarship attributing

authorship of the text to Andrew Horn, chamberlain of London from 1320 to 1328, based on the appearance of the name "Horn" among a list of 76 ostensibly Anglo-Saxon personal names and on the fact that he certainly owned (and possibly copied) the manuscript. Through an analysis of the personal names, however, Jurasinski demonstrates convincingly that the author of the text is dependent on Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britannie* for his vernacular fabrications. Jurasinski concludes that the anonymous author is so completely misled by his sources that he can only have been someone "who credulously followed the errors of his contemporaries, and who was more at home in the realm of English romance than in the serious historical investigation of which Andrew Horn was an early and formidable master" (563).

Aleksander Pluskowski has written a compelling monograph on *Wolves and the Wilderness in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell). Pluskowski explores the misunderstood and complex relationships between wolves and humans in Britain and Scandinavia from the eighth to the fourteenth centuries through an interdisciplinary approach. This wide-ranging study considers the impact of Christianity on human attitudes to wolves, dismissing along the way the popular negative characterizations of wolves.

The best-selling author of the Richard Sharpe series, Bernard Cornwell, has published the second and third volumes of his Saxon Stories series, *The Pale Horseman* and *The Lords of the North* (HarperCollins, 2005 and 2006). The Saxon Stories are set against the ravages of the Viking Age and tell the story of Uhtred who at the age of 10 is captured by the Viking chieftain, Ragnor, in the same battle in which his father is killed. The novels follow Uhtred through his youth as a warrior trained in the Viking ways of war and into his adulthood when he struggles to come to terms with his divided loyalties and his ever-shifting allegiances. Set against the backdrop of King Alfred's reign and his epic confrontations with the Northmen, the novels are entertaining, though ultimately disappointing as historical fiction.

In *Strange Likeness: The Use of Old English in Twentieth-Century Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford UP), Chris Jones considers the afterlife of Old English literature and its influence on several important twentieth-century poets, particularly Ezra Pound, W.H. Auden, Edwin Morgan, and Seamus Heaney. Jones argues that Old English was not simply a compositional phase through which each of these poets passed with nary a glance back. Instead Jones demonstrates that for each of these poets Old English was not only "a formative influence but an enduring one, affecting compositional

technique, range of reference, subject material, and theory of poetic language" (238).

Lee Garver takes Chris Jones's study of Pound one step farther in "Seafarer Socialism: Pound, *The New Age*, and Anglo-Medieval Radicalism," *Jnl of Modern Literature* 29.4: 1–21. Examining only Pound's *The Seafarer*, Garver uncovers not only its connections to contemporary political events but also its latent socialist sympathies. While most contemporary critics have recognized Pound's virulent anti-bourgeois attitudes, they have not connected those views to any historical circumstances. Garver argues that by publishing his translation of *The Seafarer* in *The New Age*, the socialist magazine, Pound not only demonstrated his socialist *bona fides* but also "affirmed his solidarity with striking English laborers, particularly [with] what was understood to be their patriotic efforts to recover ancient Saxon liberties" (2).

In a paean to the Cornish "chough," a dark bird with down-curved bill and broad rounded wings belonging to the crow family, Lucy Newlyn has re-edited

a collection of poems and lore associated with this bird, *Chatter of Choughs: An Anthology Celebrating the Return of Cornwall's Legendary Bird*, illustrated by Lucy Wilkinson, foreword by Jon Stallworthy, afterword by Charles Thomas, 2nd ed. (Penzance: The Hypatia Trust in association with St Edmund Hall, Oxford, 2005). Among the offerings in this volume are two poems in Old English. Joy Jenkyns presents her poem "Last Call" (90–91) in Old English and offers her own translation. In the vein of the Old English elegies, her poem mourns the disappearance of the bird, whose memory she compares to "a poem written in an ancient tongue / when we have thrown away the key" (90). The venerable Oxford scholar of Old English, Bruce Mitchell, offers his own "English-Seaxisc Bletsung / Anglo-Saxon Benediction" (94–95) in honor of this prophetic bird "in whom flies bold King Arthur, both alive and dead, until he returns to relieve our distress and free our dear native land England in her hour of greatest need" (95).

RFJ

2. Memorials, Tributes, History of the Discipline

a. History of the Discipline

For twenty-five years Carl T. Berkhout's bibliographies for *OEN* and *ASE* have brought to the attention of Anglo-Saxonists some 15,000 studies and 5,000 reviews. Moreover, his influential essay collection, *Anglo-Saxon Scholarship: The First Three Centuries*, co-edited with Milton McC. Gatch, and his "bibliography-in-progress," 'Anglo-Saxonists from the 16th through the 20th century' were instrumental in the recovery of past Anglo-Saxon scholars (1). *Old English Scholarship and Bibliography: Essays in Honor of Carl T. Berkhout*, ed. Jonathan Wilcox, *OEN Subsidia* 32 (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute, 2004), honors these two achievements in six important essays on Anglo-Saxon scholars and Old English bibliography (four of which are discussed below), in "An Appreciation" by J.R. Hall (5–15), and in a bibliography of Berkhout's publications (17–21).

One might not expect a history of Old English bibliography to be as entertaining as it is informative, but Berkhout's contribution to his own festschrift, "The Bibliography of Old English: Back to the Future," *Old English Scholarship and Bibliography*, 107–19, is characteristically so. Beginning with Stanley B. Greenfield's 155-item "six-page mimeographed document, in pica type, for 1951–1953," Berkhout traces the development of competing, parallel, redundant, and supplemental bibliographies (in *MLAIB*, *OEN*, *ASE*, and

in Greenfield and Robinson's *Bibliography*) as well as the various permutations of the *OEN* annual report of Research in Progress, nicknamed "with only occasional irony," RIP (107, 109). Of particular interest are the distinctions Berkhout draws in content, coverage, and "semantic reach" among the triumvirate (*MLAIB*, *OEN*, and *ASE*) and his wish, expressed after his 1980 MLA address on "the likely direction of [OE] bibliography and related activity," that "some heroic scholar" would "go through the whole of the Greenfield-Robinson *Bibliography*, examine every entry, and produce an analytical subject index to it" (108, 107, 111). In 2004 that wish, not yet granted, was "adjust[ed] for considerable inflation" (112). The "heroic scholar" was replaced by "an ample team of qualified Anglo-Saxonists in various subject areas," possessed of a "sense of scholarly purpose and professional cooperation of the kind that has characterized so many invaluable collaborative projects," and "the whole of Greenfield and Robinson," by "every publication on every aspect of Anglo-Saxon England from earliest times" (112). Honestly assessing the challenges of and progress toward this index, and citing electronic bibliographic projects underway by Orchard (*ASE*), Liuzza and himself (*OEN*), and an available model (the *World Shakespeare Bibliography*), Berkhout imagines a result that will make "the basic information easily accessible and feedable into a functioning

database even as it awaits proper checking and indexing” (113). “An Appendix: Old English Bibliographies 1951-2000” (115-19), arranged by *OEN* classifications, offers “an idea of the coverage that we might be in for, past, present, and future” (114).

In “An Ideal Bibliography: ‘Printed Books . . . Carefully Collected and Methodically Compiled” *Old English Scholarship and Bibliography*, 73-83, E.G. Stanley also imagines an ideal bibliography. While “Anglo-Saxonists have been fortunate in their bibliographies,” Stanley admits, the “bibliographical record of books and articles of scholarly or antiquarian interest . . . has never been all-inclusive” (82, 76). If we accept that “all-inclusiveness” is desirable, Stanley asks, “how low in obscurity do we go?” (76). The answer is pretty low—“old guesses, misconceptions, and unilluminating translations”; every printing of every edition or translation of an Anglo-Saxon text; every allusion to, for example, a poet such as Cædmon (even rants about his purported mythical status); “the history of [literary] taste”; comparative studies, especially of literary relations between, for example, Anglo-Saxons and Scandinavians; and “literary mentions in any language of anything Anglo-Saxon, literary, linguistic, historical,” including newspaper articles on archaeological finds, local celebrations, Anglo-Saxon monuments, prizes for publications, etc. (78, 79, 82).

[A] good bibliography should record past scholarship, good or bad, and past literary tastes, *bon goût* or *mauvais goût*. It should record all recent scholarship in the knowledge of which we may shape our own contributions, good or bad. Reading widely in what has been written may enable us to assess its quality, and might even enable us to assess our own work, as assuredly it will be less partially assessed by others. (78)

Good bibliography, Stanley argues, enables us to determine what scholars thought, what they knew, and “[o]n what scholarly evidence available to them, in manuscript or print” that knowledge was based; these questions must be answered before forming “any just judgment on what they did” (79, 78-79). Such a bibliography would not only appeal to a broad audience (Thomas Jefferson scholars, for example, interested in his reading habits), but would also help to trace the ancestry of factual information and opinions, “some worthless, some worthwhile” (82). Scholars working on the history of the discipline, in particular, may well salivate at the thought of the all-inclusive bibliography

Stanley imagines, but is it possible? While he is not sanguine—producing quality bibliographies is, after all, “a slow, hard task”—he hopes it might one day be a reality (83).

Helen Damico’s “Reclaiming Anglo-Saxon Scholars,” *Old English Scholarship and Bibliography*, 23-39, surveys the seminal publications that have participated in the reclamation project which Berkhout’s and Gatch’s “modest volume unexpectedly set into motion,” that is, “what one might describe as a publishing industry given over to the preservation, appropriation, and advancement of Anglo-Saxon scholarship” (23). The essays it contained “implicitly illustrated how intertwined politics (of any type) and literature inevitably must be” (23, 24). Damico situates the 1982 collection first by reviewing studies that preceded it; for example, Eleanor N. Adams’s *Old English Scholarship in England from 1566-1800*, J.A.W. Bennett’s unpublished 1939 dissertation “A History of Old English and Old Norse Studies in England from the Time of Francis Junius Till the End of the Eighteenth Century,” and examinations of individual scholars (i.e. John Mitchell Kemble, Sirs Robert Cotton and Henry Spelman, and William Camden), and M. Sue Hetherington’s “survey of lexicography” (25). Next, Damico surveys the work for which Berkhout’s and Gatch’s collection was the impetus, organized chronologically first by figure and second, by important essay collections devoted to “Anglo-Saxon scholars and scholarship” published since 2000 (33). The survey shows that most of the “overlooked or underrepresented” scholars Berkhout and Gatch identified have “found their place in the history of the discipline” (38). This rich bibliographic essay collects and contextualizes influential work on disciplinary history and in so doing testifies to an impetus toward “scholarly self-definition—the need for contemporary Anglo-Saxonists . . . to absorb the work of and be instructed by earlier Anglo-Saxon scholars, and, hence, to appropriate and integrate their creative spirit into one’s own” (38-39).

Before Berkhout, now “the leading modern authority on Nowell,” there was Robin Flower, Deputy Keeper of Manuscripts of the British Museum from 1929-46, a man of “inexhaustible” intellectual interests and “an accomplished Anglo-Saxonist” who gave us a groundbreaking study of the Exeter Book, a Parker Chronicle facsimile, and important work on Nowell and on the Cotton collection (47, 49, 45). In “Robin Flower and Laurence Nowell,” *Old English Scholarship and Bibliography*, 41-61, Andrew Prescott attributes Flower’s interest in Nowell partly to *The Western Island*, a study of the Irish Blasket Islands based on his recording of islanders’

tales and poems on “an early recording machine” (48). This project, Prescott suggests, along with his involvement in restoration and documentation of the Cotton collection, “drew him into a wider interest into the antiquaries of the sixteenth century” (55):

In recording the oral traditions of the Great Blasket, Flower was seeking to record evidence of old stories and texts faced with extinction, in just the way that Laurence Nowell had recorded vulnerable Anglo-Saxon manuscripts which did indeed afterwards perish. (58)

Flower was particularly active in acquisition work (he once dreamed of acquiring wine Queen Victoria drank “on various historical occasions,” 53), but the circumstances of his acquisition of the Nowell transcripts in 1934 “remain obscure” (53). Transcripts of the reports by Wilfrid A. Marsden and Flower on this acquisition are included in an Appendix (59–61), and evidence for the involvement of sportsman, scholar, and medievalist Howard de Walden is considered, although how his “gift of the Nowell material was connected with Flower’s work on Nowell” remains unclear (54). “If there is a thread running through Flower’s career,” Prescott concludes, “it is a fascination with the way in which apparently vanished texts could be retrieved using,” for example, library lists, antiquarian transcripts, and ownership inscriptions (56). His “concern with the recording and recovery of lost or threatened literature ... links Flower’s Irish interests with his interest in Nowell” (56).

Laurence Nowell is also the subject of Rebecca Jane Brackmann’s 2005 dissertation, “Language, Land, and Law: Laurence Nowell’s Anglo-Saxon Studies in Sixteenth-Century England,” Ph.D. Diss., U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (*DAI* 67A: 180), specifically the uses to which he put his personal copy of Richard Howlet’s 1552 *Abcedarium Anglico-Latinum* (U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Q. 423.71 H878a). Nowell

wrote Old English equivalents next to thousands of the Modern English-Latin entries, jotted a glossary of Anglo-Saxon legal terms on the flyleaf, and interleaved a place-name index in which he recorded older versions of English names and some events that happened at each locale. (1)

These three sets of notes reflect Nowell’s research interests: “learning to read the Old English language,

studying the Anglo-Saxon laws and their dissemination, and describing and mapping English places” (1). Brackmann’s dissertation investigates Nowell’s personal interests and motives and the “intellectual contexts in the 1560s” that motivated his protracted study of Old English and Anglo-Saxon England (1). Chapter 1 surveys the lives of Nowell, his predecessors, colleagues, associates, and employer as well as existing scholarship. Chapter 2 positions Nowell’s lexical notes in the context of the inkhorn debates “over the shape of the English lexicon” during a time of rapid vocabulary expansion (24). Nowell, who seems to have favored the revival of obsolete English words, drew 3,000 of his 4,500 entries from *Ælfric’s Grammar and Glossary*, apparently systematically altering the orthography to “standardize” the Old English lexicon ... in the West Saxon literary dialect represented by *Ælfric’s* texts” (38). Brackmann speculates that *Ælfric’s* personal authority as one of the few named Anglo-Saxon authors, the ideological appeal of the *Grammar and Glossary* in its focus on “language as the ‘key’ for understanding books” (an important humanist idea), and his emphasis—also a Protestant emphasis—on education explains the text’s appeal (54). Chapter 3 investigates the layout, sources, and compilation method of Nowell’s 470-entry place-name index which “collects information on English history and onomastics” chiefly from before the Conquest and from later medieval and sixteenth-century sources and texts (73). Brackmann’s analysis of Nowell’s sources challenges the argument that his entries were taken chiefly from Bede and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (90). In fact, despite his “diligent interest in copying and annotating it,” there are surprisingly few entries from the *ASC*, and while the approximately 50 entries derived from the Old English or Latin Bede dwarf entries from the *ASC*, these “still fall short of what we might expect” (84, 89). His “immediate sources,” she shows, were transcripts of Latin histories copied into his own notebooks, in particular one abbreviated “gen.” (90). Over 80 notes in the index are taken from the portion of “gen.” that contains “an abridged version of Henry of Huntingdon’s *Historia Anglorum*” (92), and many others, from the appendices of John Leland’s works, which uniquely “give information on British etymology or names” (106). Nowell’s “habit of condensing his sources in his transcripts, adding additional information in the margins, and then condensing further when he made his entries” and “the tendency of early histories to repeat each other” complicate identification of exact sources, but Brackmann discusses the most likely of these and suggests that Nowell’s decision to alphabetize is connected to ideological presentation of a “unified whole of ‘England’

rather than the smaller, political units of counties” (95, 111). Chapter 4 takes up Nowell’s maps of England (contained in London, BL, Cotton Domitian xviii), which “seem to have no direct relationship” to the *Abcedarium* index even though “both deal with tracing the historic names of places” (143). Brackmann argues, however, that these two projects

need to be considered in two wider contexts ...the later large-scale maps of Britain such as those of Christopher Saxton, and the historical maps made on the Continent. Nowell’s maps, participating in both these concerns, must navigate the competing tendencies toward regionalism and land-based loyalty on the one hand and nationalism and dynastic loyalty on the other (143).

Nowell pioneered the enterprise of chorography, the combination of historical research with map-making into “a history of place, in which [a]rchaeology, law, custom, observation, geography, history—anything that might serve to illuminate the description of an area—were all brought into play” (113). Nowell’s maps and his place-name research thus dovetail in their location of towns “in the broad framework of England, and in their exploration of history to further this end” (114). Emphasizing England’s “national coherence against the other political entities in the Atlantic archipelago,” the maps make a case for “the solidity of the modern English identity,” an important issue to Elizabeth’s government, by mounting a “tacit argument” and “ideological justification” for “a policy of invasion and force” in Ireland (114, 137). “Nowell,” Brackmann concludes, “tries to show southern Britain as an ideological unit, and by reconstructing the ancient names for his map, he tacitly claims that this unity has persisted through England’s history” (148). To do so, however, he had “to ignore what he knew of actual Anglo-Saxon politics,” eliding “his findings into a pattern that better supported his concept of England as a political whole” (148). Chapter 5 investigates Nowell’s compilation of the legal glossary. His process, Brackmann suggests, was to consult multiple manuscripts, copy Old English terms, alphabetize the terms, and finally compile the separate list on the flyleaf of the *Abcedarium* before turning all his legal transcriptions and notes over to William Lambarde before he left for the Continent in 1567. While Nowell’s study of Anglo-Saxon laws did not contribute as fully to “the early Anglo-Saxonists and their work” or to “the political sphere of his day” as did his lexicography or cartography, it has exerted far more influence (153).

Brackmann argues that the glossary did not derive directly from the *Quadripartitus*, a “12th century Latin translation of Anglo-Saxon laws made for their Norman conquerors,” but chiefly from transcripts Nowell copied from BL Cotton Titus A.xxvii (T), the most complete manuscript of the *Quadripartitus* (166). In a detailed comparison of the glossary entries with the nine manuscripts which “constitute six versions” of the text (chart, 175–80), Brackmann shows that, along with BL Add MS 49366 (Hk) and possibly CCCC MSS 70 + 258 (Co), “Nowell’s Old English legal terms match the Titus manuscript and its marginal glosses more closely than any other manuscript of the *Quadripartitus*” accounting “for every word in Nowell’s glossary” (168, 174, 183). That the terms in the *Abcedarium* “do not exactly match what is written in T, or indeed in any other manuscript” is due to the fact that the glossary is at several removes from the manuscript(s) (185). The glossary’s brevity and the words in it not drawn from the *Quadripartitus* are unresolved problems, although Brackmann speculates that Nowell may have had limited access to T. Finally, Chapter 6 explores how William Lambarde’s use of Nowell’s materials for his *Archaionomia*, an Old English and Latin edition of the Anglo-Saxon laws, “stretched forth into what have arguably been some of the most crucial decades of Anglo-American constitutional history” (236). For Lambarde the law was “a focal point for English identity”; its “ancient origins” defined who was English and who was not, “mutually reinforcing other areas on which the English built their identity—Protestantism and the person of the Queen—and as a means of enforcing the dichotomy between English and foreign” (198, 191). For Lambarde, Anglo-Saxon law codes, “unsullied by Roman (and Roman Catholic) influences” offered “applicable and positive examples for modern readers,” unlike those “other aspects of medieval history, embedded in and transmitted by monastic culture” (208, 194). The chapter discusses Lambarde’s articulation of the law’s social function through certain tropes: “a determiner of the true English subjects [the body politic], as a medicine for the body politic of the English nation, and finally as the *sine qua non* for English society [its soul]” (213). The head of the national body was, of course, the monarch, and law the medicine that expelled foreign elements threatening the integrity of the national body and the soul that regulated and animated the nation (229). As a whole, Brackmann’s study shows that for Nowell and his successor Lambarde,

[t]he English language, the English common law, and the English land were all cultural phenomena which could be construed as unique

to the inhabitants of the southern and eastern portion of Britain, and be made to contrast with the habits of others. As such, they could be made a locus of an emotional, or at least non-rational, appeal, not only for the individual cultural or geographic systems in question but for the concept of 'Englishness' to which the systems were linked (29).

Four appendices (a Finding List of Lexical Entries, transcripts of Nowell's Place-Name Index and Legal Glossary, as well as a Chronology of Nowell's Manuscripts), are particularly valuable additions to the study.

A firm publication date can lead to a more nuanced understanding of a text's cultural context and its participation in that context. In "More Evidence for the Date of *A Testimonie of Antiquitie*," *The Library*, 7th ser. 7: 361–76, Erick Kelemen attempts to narrow the publication date for *A Testimonie of Antiquitie*, "probably the first edition of an Old English text in Anglo-Saxon Types," and to assess its participation in the historical moment of its emergence (361). Prepared by John Joscelin under the direction of Archbishop Matthew Parker and printed by John Day, it was later included in the second (1570) English edition of John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*. Kelemen convincingly argues that the first edition was "in the final stages of preparation during a three- to four-month window between October 1566 and January 1567" (362). The second edition may have been set from an "early state of the first edition," London, BL, Add. MS 18160, a printed copy associated with Parker and Joscelin (362). It contains "the original signatures of the bishops named in the printed edition along with two bishops's signatures whose names for some reason were not printed" (362). The careful layout of the manuscript pages, "[a]dherence to the order of precedence in the signatures," and the fact that the only blank spaces are the last three, implies that most of the signatures "were affixed at a single meeting" (365, 368). Kelemen dates that meeting between October 1566 and June 1568. "[A]bsences from the 1566 Parliament, which was in session from 30 September 1566 to 2 January 1567," he shows, account for most of the eight missing names (369). In comparison, a "petition to Queen Elizabeth urging her to support legislation relating to the doctrine of the English church, which was signed by fifteen of the same seventeen bishops" offers compelling if circumstantial evidence for a 1566 publication date (370). The layout of the signatures in that petition, unlike the layout in Add. 18160, in particular those spaces left (and not left) for the signatures of certain bishops, Kelemen argues, shows that while many

signatures were "affixed within a short time-span ... time was allowed for non-signing bishops to mull over their decisions, as was not the case with Add. 18160" (372). This comparison of the record of subscriptions in *Testimonie* and the petition suggests that the signatures in Add. 18160 were almost certainly "affixed in one sitting and then very quickly delivered up to the printer" (372). Moreover, the Queen dissolved Parliament on 2 January 1567, probably in response to the petition, thus marking the end of "the most likely period" when it could have been signed by the seventeen bishops (373). Kelemen therefore concludes that it was signed sometime between 20 October 1566 and 26 June 1568, but the circumstantial evidence provided narrows the probable signing to "between October 1566 and the first weeks of January 1567," just before the first edition was issued (373). This 90-day window places the book amidst "an ongoing pamphlet war" over Eucharistic doctrine, probably a direct response to the titular and topically similar *Testimonies for the Real Presence of Christes Body and Blood in the Blessed Sacrament* (1566), by Catholic apologist Robert Pointz (374). Through "the early English documents it prints," *Testimonie* argues, "that 'Protestant' doctrine was older than Roman Catholics claimed, and that it was actively suppressed with the Norman invasion and with the subsequent accession of Lanfranc to the see of Canterbury in 1070" (374). *Testimonie* deals with Article 29, rejection of "the doctrine of the Real Presence," explains Kelemen, as does the petition and the legislation the petition urged Elizabeth to pass (375). Having deleted Article 29 from the list of 39 Articles in 1564, he points out, Elizabeth is unlikely to have been pleased by its resubmission two years later. When it was, she "refused to allow the legislation to continue in the House of Lords, and soon after the bishops pressed the matter with their petition," dissolved parliament (375). *Testimonie* "entered the scene in the midst of a high-stakes debate where subtleties of doctrine about the Real Presence mattered greatly," and it affirmed "that the English position on the sacrament of the altar was an ancient one, not a recent innovation" (375). "In linking dogma to nationalism, Parker and Joscelin urged the queen away from her conciliatory gestures and towards imposing more discipline on her people" (376). She did not do so, however, until 1570, the year the Pope excommunicated her, and the year Foxe reprinted *A Testimonie*, only affirming Article 29 during the 1571 Parliament. Thus, Kelemen concludes, *Testimonie* "was a player in the profound shift in English history" (376).

The profound difference between Matthew Parker's and Ælfric's views on the issue of "priestly marriage"

is the subject of Aaron J. Kleist's "Monks, Marriage, and Manuscripts: Mathew Parker's Manipulation (?) of Ælfric of Eynsham," *JEGP* 105: 312–27 (313). Parker, Kleist explains, "simultaneously respected, used, distrusted, and denied" Ælfric's views (312). While Ælfric was, like Parker, a learned authority, translator, and teacher interested in historical precedent, he was also a monk, "a product of the Benedictine Reform," and his theology and Parker's were incompatible, particularly in the area of "clerical marriage ... [where] the teaching of the two could not be more opposed" (313, 315). Ælfric was a staunch advocate of clerical celibacy and Parker of clerical marriage—a right he risked his career and his life to defend. Yet Parker drew on Ælfric's *First Latin Letter for Wulfstan, Archbishop of York* in his 1566/67 *A Defence of Priestes Mariages* "to assert that the early English church never forced priests to dismiss their wives," pointing out that Ælfric, "in this one text at least," moderates his position (318, 319). The "context of the extract," however, which clarifies Ælfric's position, "is anything but supportive of Parker's case" (319). "Given the polar difference in their perspectives," Kleist asks, "one might question how Ælfric's writings might serve to advance Parker's argument" (317). Evidence in Parker's annotated copies proves that he knew the whole work and that "the larger context of his Ælfrician passage" did not support Parker's position on priestly marriage (322). Why, Kleist wonders, did Parker choose such a problematic passage for use in the *Defence* when another, which he should have known, would have better suited his purpose, the homily for Sexagesima Sunday (*Catholic Homilies* II.6)? This homily, which invokes Gregory's pragmatic exception regarding the treatment of the "fledgling" Anglo-Saxon church by suggesting that unconsecrated clergy may marry but should remain pure in handling the body and blood of Christ, is the "singular point of contact between Ælfric's and Parker's views" (324, 325). A marginal annotation attributed to the Tremulous Hand of Worcester next to this passage in the manuscript Parker used (CCCC 198) reads *matrimonium*, "tantamount," Kleist observes, "to waving a red flag at a bull," but there is no evidence that Parker noticed it (325). Kleist's essay identifies a fascinating puzzle to which the solution remains elusive. Parker's "awareness of the context of Ælfric's letter for Wulfstan and his dim view of the monastic world in which it was composed," Kleist posits, might suggest that Parker "deliberately twists Ælfric's words to support his own view" (326). Instead, he makes clear that Ælfric did not support, but rather opposed clerical marriage; "reproduces [quotes] word for word;" and explains that Ælfric "did not force clerics to give up their wives" (326). Thus,

Kleist concludes, "while Parker may not remain faithful to the spirit of Ælfric's thought, he is at least careful to remain faithful to the letter" (327).

The work of antiquarian and lexicographer William Dugdale remains largely unknown even though his output, "both published and still manuscript," was prodigious (71). In a five-part essay, "William Dugdale and MS Harley 1129: An Unpublished Seventeenth-century Legal Glossary," *Diachronic Perspectives on Domain-Specific English*, ed. Marina Dossena and Irma Taavitsainen (Bern: Peter Lang), 69–92, Paola Tornaghi introduces one of Dugdale's lexicographical works, a "glossary of legal terms" in MS Harley 1129 (71). The essay describes the manuscript, summarizes Dugdale's scholarly approach and method, assesses the manuscript's significance and its lexical value, and discusses the evidence it provides about Dugdale's collaboration with fellow antiquaries. Probably compiled after 1644, the Harley glossary entries include lemmas, definitions, quotations and detailed source descriptions, some from lexicons compiled by such antiquarians as Cotgrave and Spelman. From 1642 to 1676, during and after the Civil War, Tornaghi explains, Dugdale was engaged with a number of publications which would have provided "legal terms and those peculiar terms connected with legal matters, which are recorded in the glossary," for example, *Monasticon Anglicanum* (with Roger Dodsworth), *The Antiquities of Warwickshire*, *Origines Juridiciales, or Historical Memorials of the English Laws, Courts of Justice, Forms of Tryall, Punishment in Cases Criminal, Laws Writers, Law Books, Grants and Settlement of Estates, Degree of Serjeant, Innes of Court and Chancery*, and *The Baronage of England* (76). Dugdale's "painstaking accuracy" and detailed source information have made it possible for "posterity" to check the correctness of his indications and compare his notation of the *interpretamentum* and of the source," chiefly *Coke's Institutes*, but also *Les Preuves de l'Histoire des Comtes de Poictou et ducs de Guyenne*, and Seldon's *The Historie of Tithes and Titles of Honour* (81, 76). Tornaghi also points to Dugdale's brilliant narrative style and clever sense of what information to include. For example, definitions and explanations of plant and herb terms, chiefly taken from *Coke's Institutes*, were essential because "they needed to be defined and explained whenever they occurred in legal documents" (86). The glossary, Tornaghi argues, in part "bears witness to all the processes of language integration and adaptation that have characterized the history of the English language—Anglo-Saxon entries co-exist with forms whose ultimate origin is Celtic, Latin, French and Latinate" (88–89). To read Harley 1129 in its entirety, then, is to

recover in three languages (French, Latin, English/Old English), a “collection of historical, legal, religious and scientific material taken from a variety of manuscripts and other contemporary works” (81). The manuscript together with Dugdale’s correspondence and autobiography attest to his collaboration with such noted antiquarians and lexicographers as Dodsworth, D’Ewes, Somner, Spelman, Cotton, Junius, and Blount (82). They exchanged “books, manuscripts, and documents ... notes, comments and suggestions ... encourag[ing] one another to pursue their objectives” (82). Despite the time he devoted to his lexicons, Dugdale was secretive about his own publication plans—whether because he felt them unworthy of publication or because he saw them as recreational. Still, Tornaghi concludes, Dugdale’s lexicographical works emphasize his interest in recovering “factual matter relating to the development of great institutions during the Middle Ages such as the legal system, the aristocracy and the monasteries” (89). His accuracy, given the disorderly records from which he worked, is a remarkable legacy, “the expression of an English world which is a melting pot of languages and cultures” (90).

Ironically “perhaps the only person ever made rich by Anglo-Saxon studies,” Joseph Bosworth suffered censure, rebuke, and disparagement for his lexical *opera*, *A Dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon Language*. Thomas Northcote Toller’s “reward for getting it right, for turning Bosworth’s work into a scholarly standard that has served us well for over a century, is that we do not abuse him—at least not any more” (96). In an important reassessment of Toller’s work, “Toller at School: Joseph Bosworth, T. Northcote Toller and the Progress of Old English Lexicography in the Nineteenth Century,” *Bull. of the John Rylands Univ. Library of Manchester* 85 (2003): 95–114, Peter Baker first surveys “Bosworth’s remarkable career” in order to “appreciate fully the mess that Toller had on his hands in 1878” when he succeeded Bosworth (98). Bosworth, whose goal was to “free the study of Anglo-Saxon grammar from its Latin ‘encumbrances,’” admired the work of Rask and Grimm, but chiefly, it seems, because their paradigms were not based on Latin (98). Only as he revised the dictionary late in his life does his work show some grasp of their philological innovations in dramatically expanded entries, longer and more numerous quotations, revised if not always felicitous etymologies, consistent marking of vowel length, and cross-references for “words that appear as second elements of compounds” (106). But inappropriate digressions abound, Bosworth adheres to the “maddening policy, inherited from Lye, of giving each major variant spelling of a word its own entry,”

and he relies heavily on Grein’s *Sprachschatz* (106). Toller, unlike Bosworth, did not have “deeply dysfunctional” relationships with his sources (108). While he, too, drew on Grein, he did so critically; and from the beginning was “deeply engaged in the conversation that is the essence of scholarship: listening, accepting, modifying, rejecting, giving all back in a new form” (108). Of Toller’s many innovations to the dictionary, one of the most important, Baker argues, is his consolidation of entries, “all passages for *hýron* ‘to hear,’ for example, are gathered under the form with *y* in the root syllable, and all other spellings appear as simple cross-references” (109). He also normalizes headwords according to etymology, and employs a “hierarchical scheme” of division and subdivision, thus grouping “related definitions,” marking “shades of meaning within definitions,” and noting “grammatical variations, as when a verb sometimes governed one case and sometimes another” (110). In the 1921 *Supplement* particularly, possibly due to the influence of the *OED*, Toller had “broken free of modern English” (110). Its entries reflect an awareness that modern definitions of words are “not sufficiently synonymous” with Old English words “for one to serve as a definition for the other” (111). Baker concludes that his own work in recent years, preparing student texts and thus “glossary making,” has prompted “‘Toller moments’ ... times when, having been stymied by a passage for some time, I discover with profound gratitude that Toller has already been there and has worked it all out” (111–12). When Toller “inherited the *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* from Joseph Bosworth, a man whose proper time was the eighteenth century,” Baker concludes, “he little suspected that his assignment would be to bring Old English lexicography into the nineteenth. But he accepted the assignment, and went to school, and in the end made us a dictionary that was worthy of the twentieth” (114).

In November 1641 Abraham Wheelock contributed two verse compositions containing Anglo-Saxon words “to a book of verses published on behalf of Cambridge University” celebrating Charles I’s return from Scotland (390). The Anglo-Saxon words were set in Great Wheelockian Primer Anglo-Saxon type, which was also used, during its brief twelve-year lifespan, for Wheelock’s Anglo-Saxon Bede and Anglo-Saxon *Chronicle* (1643), Anglo-Saxon laws (1644), Marchamont Needham’s English translation of John Selden’s *Mare Clausum (Of the Dominion, or, Ownership of the Sea, 1652)*, as well as for the capitals in Sir John Spelman’s 1678 posthumous *Ælfredi Magni Anglorum Regis Invicissimi Vita* (390). In “Abraham Wheelock and the Presentation of Anglo-Saxon: From Manuscript to Print,”

Beatus Vir, ed. A.N. Doane and Kirsten Wolf (Tempe, AZ: ACMRS), 383–439, Peter J. Lucas describes and contextualizes Wheelock's type. Funded by Spelman, probably cut by Arthur Nicholls, and containing 30 sorts and a large number of capitals, it was one of four Anglo-Saxon fonts featured in the 1782 sale catalogue of John James's type foundry. The number of "special sort capitals," Lucas argues, suggests that "Wheelock was sensitive to the graphic form of script letters" (392). A comparison of Wheelock's usage with the relevant manuscripts discloses the type's distinctive features and which of these can be attributed to manuscript influence. Lucas is chiefly concerned with "what Michael Twyman called the intrinsic (as opposed to the extrinsic) features of verbal graphic language: the range of characters, the font, the style of letter-forms, and the size of letter-forms" (392–93). In Wheelock's case these include a preference for sinuous shapes, for square G and upper-case square C, for rounded thorn, and for hooked and scrolled terminals on a number of the letters. Like Parker, Wheelock took his inspiration for his innovations and preferences from the manuscripts he used. Since he appears never to have left Cambridge to consult a manuscript, these were almost entirely Cambridge manuscripts, and as in a "country-house detective novel," Lucas quips, "the potential suspects are circumscribed" to about 40 (397). With the aid of correspondence, transcripts made for Spelman, and recent secondary studies of Wheelock's work, Lucas identifies the manuscripts Wheelock used, including those few non-Cambridge manuscripts that were borrowed from Sir Thomas Cotton and others, with particular attention to those used by Wheelock for his West Saxon Genealogical Regnal List. A table of "Manuscripts from which Wheelock took text for printed books or surviving transcripts" (405–406), shows that many of those manuscripts are from "the middle or second half of the eleventh century," some from the later Middle Ages and two "from the end of the eighth century" (407). In a second table, "Summary of Occurrence of Distinctive/Innovatory Features in Relevant AS MSS" (408–11), the distinctive features of Wheelock's type found in the manuscripts are tabulated. The most important of these is sinuosity "because it relates to a large number of letter-forms affecting the overall impact made by looking at Wheelock's Anglo-Saxon text on the page" (412). Based chiefly on the Exeter script from the scriptorium of Leofric, Bishop of Exeter (1046–72), this sinuous style, represented particularly in CUL MS Ii.2.4, "apparently provided the foundation for the overall style of Wheelock's Anglo-Saxon type-designs" (413). The Exeter script "shows an evenness of sinuous approach,"

not evident in Wheelock's type since the latter is "an amalgam of standard roman and special Anglo-Saxon sorts" found in other manuscripts (422). Plates compare manuscript features with "the corresponding features in [Wheelock's] type-designs" (414). Wheelock was familiar with Parker's Great Primer Anglo-Saxon, a prestige typeface influenced predominately by Worcester manuscripts and which attempted to recreate the triumph of prestigious Roman typefaces "over the various national letter styles used in much of Europe after 1530," but Wheelock rethought the process, combining "his model Exeter script from Leofric's scriptorium of the third quarter of the eleventh century ... with Tavernier's Great Primer Roman" (422). The combination "was not a marriage made in heaven," Lucas remarks, "[b]ut it was a good working partnership that clothed Wheelock's scholarship in graceful attire, sufficiently attractive and interesting still to be talked about today ... an attempt to enshrine authority in elegance, the elegance of authenticity" (423). In this way, "Wheelock has securely established himself in the tradition begun by Parker of presenting Anglo-Saxon with as much authenticity as possible" (423). Table 5 (430–31), aligns the manuscripts with handlists and catalogues, and an Appendix (431–39), inventories Wheelock's correspondence with Sirs Henry and John Spelman, and Sir Symonds D'Ewes.

Moving forward in time, if still beginning in "those dark days" when scholarship was produced using a "typewriter," that is, a keyboard-operated device which produced images of letters by causing a piece of metal type to strike an inked ribbon, pressing it against a sheet of paper" and ending, alas, not yet in font-nirvana (28), Peter S. Baker takes us on a witty tour of "Typing in Old English since 1967: A Brief History," *OEN* 40.1: 28–37. The not-entirely-computer-savvy (such as this reviewer) may be somewhat startled to learn that the introduction of computers was actually a regression from the IBM Selectric, and that <þ> and <ð> were not readily available until 1985 (30). Moreover, Baker admits to having "actually done a Very Bad Thing" in creating his popular Junius font, which complicated file exchanges between Windows and Mac and between those who had and had not installed the font (33). After tracing the development of the Junius font from its origins to the most recent Unicode version, Baker turns to printers which have posed no fewer problems than did typewriters in the early years; only in 1985, in fact, did printers become available which could "match the quality of an IBM Selectric" (31). The technical details of the development of soft fonts and of the rasterizer that scales "a character's outline to the current size"

and superimposes “it on a raster grid” are somewhat beyond this reviewer, but Baker’s account of the improvisations employed to overcome hardware and software deficiencies is a testament both to the creativity of desperate Anglo-Saxonists and to the less-than-satisfactory state of affairs in the present (32). Indeed, even the newest innovations—Apple Advanced Typography (AAT) and OpenType (Adobe and Microsoft)—have not fully alleviated problems with file sharing, consistency, and applications. The computer, for all its power, has not yet resolved the deficiencies that plagued typewriters. Figures, drawn from issues of *OEN*, illustrate the mimeograph, the Olympia and the IBM Selectric typewriter, and computer-generated character-sets and fonts; links to free fonts of interest to medievalists are also provided.

William Wylie’s *Fairford Graves* was “one of the most elaborate and romanticized accounts of Anglo-Saxon discoveries among the many excavation reports of the period,” but its influence on Victorian academic and popular culture, particularly in racial and nationalistic discourses, has received little attention, explains Howard Williams in “Anglo-Saxonism and Victorian Archaeology: William Wylie’s *Fairford Graves*,” *Early Medieval Europe* 16.1: 49–88 (84). Reports of archaeological discoveries were as influential in perpetuating Anglo-Saxonism as were, for example, art and literature, and the Fairford graves of Wylie’s report were especially so. Published in 1852 during the period of active “barrow-digging” (1840–1870), Wylie’s report, like Sharon Turner’s *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, “augmented an existing historical and philological focus on the Germanic roots of England’s people, language and customs” (49). Burial rites, Williams argues, “were widely seen to denote the migration and settlement, racial and tribal characteristics, and the material civilization and religious beliefs, of the earliest English” (50). The reports of finds were “less factual than they claimed to be,” often romanticized and ideologically motivated to emphasize English “Teutonic racial origins” and to offer to the Victorian upper and middle classes a material context for Anglo-Saxon racial, cultural, and linguistic heritage (52, 50). A short biography of Wylie, his antiquarian interests, and his fascination with Teutonic origins, is followed by a discussion of the graves themselves and early reports of the discoveries. Williams then analyzes how Wylie and others promoted the importance of archaeological evidence—more reliable than written evidence, burials offered “direct and tangible qualities” and “funerary context”—for understanding the origins of the English (60). Wylie’s style was both “popular and readable” and of a high standard given his day and his

inexperience (61). In it, Wylie emphasized his “learned, cultured background as an Oxford graduate,” his social identity as a “middle-class gentleman and scholar,” and his role as a “custodian of the past,” an “unsung hero” standing in opposition to the ignorant laborers, the “agents of destruction,” who found the graves while digging for stone but have no idea how to interpret what they have found (62). Yet these laborers are also paradoxically “primitive custodian[s] of timeless tradition,” a link to the Saxon past” (63). Contrary to assumptions that nineteenth century archaeologists were more interested in artifacts than landscape, Wylie provides “a history of the region,” comparing civilized Saxon Fairford to the “wild recesses” of the “British” Cotswolds (64). The Saxon graves become “a patriotic monument in a landscape that preserved traces of the Saxon conquest of England” and a “repository of pagan Saxon customs and beliefs” (66, 67). Finally, Wylie’s description of the artifacts themselves is read in the context of Richard Knox’s 1850 *Races of Man* and the application of the concept of craniology. The large and “robust” Saxon bones and skulls emphasize distinctively Saxon physical attributes of size and strength (70). The skulls “were repeatedly employed as evidence for both racial mixing and Teutonic supremacy” by Victorian researchers intent on distinguishing “physical and mental capabilities of the Celt, the Roman and the Saxon” (73, 71). Wylie’s portrayal of grave goods in particular articulates the graves’ function as “repository of Saxon racial history” (80). In “The Saxon Chieftain,” the poem that concludes the report, Wylie defines “the primitive, pagan yet noble Saxon ... in relation to the civilized Christian he was to become” and is thus engaged, Williams argues, in the “Whig search for the Anglo-Saxon roots of Anglican religion and English liberal values” (79). *Fairford Graves*, “widely referenced,” the illustrations from which are still used, has continued to contribute to critical examination of the “historical process of Saxon settlement” (86).

J.A. Hilton’s *Anglo-Saxon Attitudes: A Short Introduction to Anglo-Saxonism* (Hockwold, Nfk: Anglo-Saxon Books), is “a book about books about Anglo-Saxons,” about “methods of studying the Anglo-Saxons,” and about the “underlying assumptions and the uses to which [Anglo-Saxonism] has been put” (7). This 52-page introduction begins with the “[p]rofound political, religious, and cultural changes” of the English Renaissance, one of which was the “rediscovery of Old English and the use of its literature” in the “re-invention of the English nation” (11). It ends in the post-modern period when the Old English language and literature are still employed in the service of identity

politics, even if those identities are now many and fragmented. In seven short chapters Hilton summarizes selected books that have taken as their subject the foundation myth of Anglo-Saxon migration to England, and he extracts from them the twin themes of “English patriotism and English freedom” which inform his Renaissance, Enlightenment, Romantic, Germanic, Democratic, Patriotic, and postmodern period divisions (7). For example, in the sixteenth century Anglo-Saxonism along with the English Bible helped to bring about the English Reformation and to create “the myth of the English as a [Protestant] Chosen People” who enjoyed “God-given freedom, inherited from their Anglo-Saxon ancestors” (14). Through the works of David Hume and Edward Gibbon, who found in the barbarous and superstitious Saxons the source of English freedom, Anglo-Saxonism became a “vehicle” for Enlightenment ideas. The condescension that characterized Enlightenment historians, however, did not characterize Romantic historians who looked to the Anglo-Saxons to shape a metaphor of national reconciliation during the British Industrial and French Revolutions. In the histories of Turner, Palgrave, and Lingard, and in Sir Walter Scott’s novel *Ivanhoe*, Hilton argues, “the ruling classes, represented by the Normans, and the people, represented by the Anglo-Saxons,” were urged to find common cause (24). At the same time, English and Continental scholars such as Jones, Rask, Bopp, and Grimm were seeking to understand language affinities and origins, and their ideas entered England “to cast the light of the past on [England’s] troubled times” (30). From the late nineteenth century England’s relationship with Germany shaped the uses to which Anglo-Saxonism was put. In fiction and poetry, in language studies, and in histories, “Anglo-Saxonism was used to underpin the development of English democracy” and to emphasize the “Scandinavian rather than the Germanic roots of the English” (40). Two world wars with Germany in the early twentieth-century challenged the English conception of its Germanic origins. Hilter, according to J.R.R. Tolkien, had ruined, perverted, misapplied and made “for ever accursed, that noble northern spirit, a supreme contribution to Europe, which I have ever loved, and tried to present in its true light” (46). To Winston Churchill that “noble Northern spirit” meant that “a free man might choose his lord, following him in war, working for him in peace,” and being protected in return (44). “[C]ourage, vigour, enthusiasm, loyalty, appreciation of fair dealings, respect for women, individualism, self-discipline, and the ability to ‘accept adversity cheerfully without whining or self-pity’” were Anglo-Saxon virtues (43). In the postmodern period,

Hilton suggests, when neither Old English nor Latin are taught in secondary schools, “together with the Hitlerisation of history,” the Anglo-Saxon past is a powerful source of inspiration and validation employed in the service of often contradictory ends, “scholarly and popular, Christian and Heathen” (52). For most of the books he includes, the defining moment in English identity is the Norman Conquest, a betrayal into “bondage and slavery” by a “bunch of psychopaths,” the Other against which Anglo-Saxon is defined (50). Hilton’s book does no more than it promises—to focus eclectically on books about Anglo-Saxonism—still, the broad conclusions drawn from the brief summaries disturb, even if the grand sweep of the narrative appeals. Bibliographical Notes (55–59) offer a succinct reading list by period, and the curious two-page Appendix on Democratic Procedure is explained in the Preface: “one of the most positive aspects of Anglo-Saxonism is democracy,” Hilton writes, which is “endangered by a lack of due procedure,” so the appendix is provided to placate “the shades of Morris and Ruskin,” which urge him “to write something that would make the world a better place” (9).

In “R.W. Chambers and *The Hobbit*,” *Tolkien Studies* 3: 137–47, Douglas A. Anderson investigates the effect R.W. Chambers’s work on *Beowulf* may have had on J.R.R. Tolkien’s composition of *The Hobbit*. Before turning to *The Hobbit*, Anderson documents the “little-explored” friendship between the two men through their exchanges of and comments on each other’s work from ca. 1922 when Tolkien first contributed to *The Year’s Work in English Studies* (137). The handwritten manuscript of *The Hobbit*, the writing of which has been dated to the period 1930–1933, attests to several breaks. One such break, Anderson argues, at the end of Chapter six when Bilbo, Gandalf, and the dwarves are “stuck up in the eagle’s eyrie,” tentatively dated to the winter of 1931–32, is suggestive of Chambers’s influence (141). In May 1932, when Tolkien was studying Hengest and Finn materials which would lead to his 1933 lecture series *Beowulf and the Critics*, Chambers sent Tolkien an inscribed copy of his second edition of *Beowulf: An Introduction* (141). Tolkien, suggests Anderson, seems to have found in the “Beorn episode” a direction for his story (142). In Chambers’s discussion of the etymology of the name Beowulf (“O.E. *beorn*, ‘warrior, hero, prince’ seems originally to have meant simply ‘bear’”), lies the “background to Tolkien’s character Beorn” (142). In his unpublished short story, ‘Sellic Spell,’ one can see “an attempt to reconstruct a version—not necessarily *the* version—of the Anglo-Saxon story that lies behind the folktale elements in *Beowulf*” (142). Elements of the

character were also drawn from Bothvar Bjarki (of the Norse *Saga of Hrolf Kraki*), also discussed extensively by Chambers in *Beowulf: An Introduction*. Beorn, Anderson explains, was originally named Medwed, a name which comes directly from Chambers's "discussion of a number of 'Bear's son' stories and their relation to Beowulf" and from parallels in a Russian folktale, "*Ivashko Medvedko*, 'John Honey-eater' or 'Bear'" (143).

By January 1933, when Tolkien shared the typed version of *The Hobbit* with C.S. Lewis, he had changed Medwed to Beorn, disguising the character's literary heritage and giving him a Germanic name more appropriate to the world of his tale. (143)

Thus, Anderson concludes, Tolkien's inspiration came "not only from *Beowulf* but also from *Beowulf* criticism, and in particular the book by 'the *Beowulf*-poet's best friend,' R.W. Chambers" (143).

Joyce Hill begins her assessment of "the state of medieval studies" (encompassing "vernacular literature of Anglo-Saxon England" c. 500 to c. 1100 AD), "Methodologies, Mantras, and Paradigms: Research in Early Medieval English Literature," *JEGP* 105: 87–101, with two cautions: "the study of early medieval English literature is ... not separable from the study of Anglo-Latin literature ... nor ... from the broader western tradition of Latin writings" and neither period nor linguistic nor textual nor topical boundaries are simple matters (87, 88). Such liberally constituted boundaries can mean isolation for Anglo-Saxonists in English departments. Ideally, universities would recognize and support the interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary nature of the field by bringing various specializations together in centers or in other ways to "give the work an identifiable and rich profile," legitimate "interdisciplinary networks," and "provide a recognized critical mass to which the university, if not the individual departments, may be willing to respond" (89). Although *ASE* (1972), *OEN* (1967), *ISAS* (1983), and the Kalamazoo and Leeds conferences were launched in this context, Hill asks whether existing structures and paradigms "support medieval studies to best advantage? And, perhaps even more significantly, is its future supported by the educational systems, financial regimes, and 'politics' within which we operate?" (90). To consider these questions she turns to two historical periods when 'politics' determined publishing and investigative directions. In the sixteenth century the "discovery" of Old English tended to provide political ammunition" used in defense of "a national past which was free from what was at the time

described as 'Romish lies and other Italishe beggarye'" (91). This "frame of reference" did not allow

for the centrality of the church and of the mainly ecclesiastical writings in the understanding of Old English, or more broadly Anglo-Saxon literary culture, and it was certainly not a frame of reference which was prepared to acknowledge fully—or at times even to acknowledge at all—the indebtedness of the literary culture to the Church fathers, the Carolingians, or the religious traditions of the Celts. (91)

In the nineteenth century, when Old English was established in universities, German scholarship and linguistics initially dominated. Vernacular and Latin Christian works were relevant only if "they dealt with Anglo-Saxon history or with the myths and legends and pseudo-history of greater Germania" (92). Both periods demonstrate the opening up of a subject area by "a highly driven external agenda, which establishes predispositions as to what is read and how it is read," and by "mantras and paradigms ... which predetermine methodologies and ... shape the way a subject progresses and is viewed by others" (93). In this way and "by default," large areas are left in need of scholarly attention and "a legacy of misperception" survives "which we still sometimes find ourselves having to combat" (93). A case in point is the addition of Michael Lapidge's "The Anglo-Latin Background" to the second edition of *A New Critical History of Old English Literature* (1986). Examining *ASE* articles and bibliographies and *Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England* monographs, Hill shows (with the aid of a helpful chart) the dramatic increase in publications on Old English prose and on Anglo-Latin, liturgy, and other Latin ecclesiastical texts. For example, Jones's edition of Ælfric's *Letter to the Monks of Eynsham* shows that "so-called 'derivative' texts must be subject to the same careful study as others that we choose to place higher in the textual hierarchy because we think they are in some way more significant" (96). Until we properly scrutinize such texts, Hill asserts, "we do not really know what we have in many of our surviving manuscripts, where content may as yet be only cursorily identified" (96). Hill's survey brings home how little we really know about "the majority of the surviving manuscripts, their means of production, their rationale, or even their contents," many of which have not been studied in detail, properly identified, or edited and published (96). In a final section Hill focuses on the UK, on the "lone-scholar"

model typical of humanities research, and on research funding changes. While improved funding and more opportunities for the collaborative research essential to the field are available, and while the status of the AHRC (Arts and Humanities Research Council), has improved, funds remain inadequate for important projects—searchable databases and digitized manuscripts, for example—and the security of the “resources of time, money, and skills” necessary for these larger projects is in question (100). If UK funding agencies “develop a more interventionist mode in defining award-themes,” she warns, “political and practical reality” can intersect unpleasantly with the “lively and positive characteristics of present research and future possibilities” here surveyed (101).

In their four-part survey, “Old English Studies in Spain: Past, Present and ... Future?” *OEN* 40.1: 38–58, Juan Camilo Conde-Silvestre and Mercedes Salvador assess the teaching of and research on Old English language and literature in Spanish universities from its (late) origins at Salamanca in 1952 to the present, concluding with an extensive bibliography (51–58). Their survey of 36 universities offering degrees in English shows that most students are exposed to Old English in compulsory HEL courses, but that only six universities require a course specifically on the Old English language and only four offer optional courses. Still, even if it “is subsidiary to the history of English and historical linguistics,” and even if there is “cause for concern” in the scarcity of specialized courses and in the lack of compulsory courses dedicated to Old English literature, Old English remains in the curricula (40). A comprehensive survey of textbooks and handbooks published in Spain and a summary of research in Old English language and literature from the 1970s to the present conclude the essay. Some notable findings emerge from this survey and summary. Spanish scholars have evinced little interest in Old English biblical and religious poetry or in Anglo-Saxon prose; considerable scholarly production “has been carried out within the restrictions and limitations imposed by ‘the lack of an academic tradition in Old English studies’” and exacerbated by limited library resources and a draconian system of research funding; and the Spanish Society for the Study of Medieval English Language and Literature (SELIM), founded in 1987, has played a significant role in promoting scholarship (49).

b. Memorials and Tributes

The bumper crop of festschrifts this year include one “not ... of the usual kind” (xvi). *Inside Old English:*

Essays in Honour of Bruce Mitchell, ed. John Walmsley (Oxford: Blackwell), is aimed at a wide audience and its thirteen “lively and accessible” essays open up new research territories on genre, syntax, style, diction, and punctuation (xvi). A brief biographical tribute by Fred C. Robinson on Mitchell’s “incalculable” impact “on the study of Old English as both teacher and scholar” (xviii–xix), and a bibliography of his work (268–78) are included. In an Introduction (1–18), Walmsley takes up the relationship between English philology and English literature between 1828 and 2000, focusing on the “symbiotic relationship which exists between subjects in the school curriculum and disciplines in universities” as this relationship has affected the development of the discipline (3). That is, where a discipline is housed and the perceived relationship between language and literature are central issues in any exploration of disciplinary history. Does one need to study the rules, history and formation of the English language to study literature properly? “The essential difference between philology and literature,” Walmsley argues,

is that whereas literature works on the assumption that the reader has unimpeded access to the work of art, the philologist accepts that the past is a different country: once the frontier has been crossed, the challenges begin. To make sense of these voices from the past, an understanding of the words and the way they are put together—their language—is only the first step. (7)

Leavis’s *Scrutiny*, he asserts, marks a revolutionary moment between the 1920s, when one might ask why study English at all, and the 1930s when the question was why study anything else. *Scrutiny*’s “moral and cultural crusade,” as Terry Eagleton has put it, was to nurture “through the study of literature the kind of rich, complex, mature, discriminating, morally serious responses ... which would equip individuals to survive in a mechanized society of trashy romances, alienated labour, banal advertisements and vulgarizing mass media” (5). The essays in the collection take up this striking “redefinition of the values of English literature in the course of the twentieth century” (10). English literature was initially conceived (“in Oxford, at least”) as “a vehicle for moral values,” strongly tied to its classical origins and to philology. It has since, claims Walmsley, divested itself of the link to classics, “apparently shies away from any claim to objectivity,” and makes no claims to “the moral and intellectual imperatives” which long fueled it (10). Yet philology,

which “demands both a wide range of specialized skills, and effective tools,” Walmsley concludes, is even more important today when the need for skilled editing and annotation of texts in light of new research is great. The philologist, who must find a balance between “requisite historical objectivity” and “awareness of continuity,” must bridge the gap between the literature which embodies “a complete culture” from which we are long separated and our own (15–16).

Taking up a subject central to his career, *Writing Medieval Biography 750–1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow*, ed. David Bates *et al.* (Woodbridge: Boydell), is based on the University of Exeter conference, “The Limits of Medieval Biography,” held in Barlow’s honor in 2003. A preface (vii–x) contextualizes Barlow’s work. *Essays for Joyce Hill on Her Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Mary Swan, Leeds Studies in English n.s. 37 (Leeds: U of Leeds), focuses chiefly on Ælfrician subjects and includes Roberta Frank’s “An Appreciation of Joyce Hill” (1–5). *Insignis Sophiae Arcator: Essays in Honour of Michael W. Herren on his 65th Birthday*, ed. Gernot R. Wieland *et al.* (Turnhout: Brepols) features a bibliography of Herren’s 1963–2006 publications (273–85), and fourteen essays by Latinists, Celticists, Anglo-Saxonists, and a Hispanicist on “imaginative and textual geography” on “the sometimes elusive relationships between words and their referents,” and on textual reception (ix–x). *Names through the Looking-Glass: Festschrift in Honour of Gillian Fellows-Jensen July 5th, 2006*, ed. Peder Gammeltoft and Bent Jørgensen (Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Forlag A/S) pays tribute to Fellows-Jensen, “a central figure at the Institute of Name Research” for her contributions to onomastics and “cultural relations between Scandinavia and Britain and Normandy in the Viking Age and early Medieval period” (vii). A list of her publications is included (322–50). *Corpora and the History of English: Papers Dedicated to Manfred Markus on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Christian Mair and Reinhard Heuberger (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter), focuses on Manfred’s research interests, “historical corpus linguistics ... and the role the computer has played in furthering it” (1). An Appendix of his publications from 1971–2006 concludes the volume (341–58). Words have power this year in two collections which, somewhat confusingly, share the first half of the titles. *The Power of Words: Essays in Lexicography, Lexicology and Semantics in Honour of Christian J. Kay*, ed. Graham Caie *et al.* (Amsterdam: Rodopi), honors Kay’s work on the *Historical Thesaurus of English*; a number of the essays take up Old English lexical problems. *The Power of Words: Anglo-Saxon Studies Presented to Donald*

Scragg on his Seventieth Birthday, ed. Hugh Magennis and Jonathan Wilcox (Morgantown: West Virginia UP), the second festschrift for Scragg (so far), includes an introduction by Wilcox (1–13), a unique biographical tribute by Joyce Hill which also updates Scragg’s publications from a 2002 festschrift to 2006 (15–27) and summarizes his significant administrative positions (23–24). *Beatus Vir: Studies in Early English and Norse Manuscripts in Memory of Phillip Pulsiano*, ed. Doane and Wolf (Tempe: ACMRS) collects fourteen essays on Old English and Old Norse literature and manuscripts, contains an introductory essay celebrating Pulsiano’s life and work (xv–xxi), and a bibliography of his publications from 1978–2003 (xxiii–xxix). *Language and Text: Current Perspectives on English and Germanic Historical Linguistics and Philology*, ed. Andrew James Johnston *et al.* (Heidelberg: Winter) summarizes “Klaus Dietz’s work as a scholar and as a teacher” (7–9) and includes a bibliography of his publications (11–16). Wayne G. Hammond and Christina Scull have edited *The Lord of the Rings 1954–2004: Scholarship in Honour of Richard E. Blackwelder* (Marquette, MI: Marquette UP), a collection of essays on Tolkien, his work, and his legacy based on a 2004 Tolkien conference celebrating the 50th anniversary of the first publication of *The Lord of the Rings*. It includes a reminiscence of Blackwelder by Charles Elston (“Richard E. Blackwelder: Scholar, Collector, Benefactor, and Friend,” 9–12). Blackwelder, a renowned entomologist and zoologist, collected and indexed a library of over 1200 volumes “including many fine editions of Tolkien’s works, nearly all printings of the Ballantine paperbacks,” more than 70 theses and dissertations, and “one of the largest bodies of secondary sources on Tolkien ever assembled,” all of which was given to Marquette University in 1982. He also established the Tolkien Archives Fund in 1987 (11). *Germanisches Altertum und christliches Mittelalter: Festschrift für Heinz Klingenberg zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Bela Brogyanyi, Schriften zur Mediävistik 1 (Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovač, 2002), focuses on Old Norse/Icelandic and Old English subjects and includes a bibliography of Klingenberg’s publications (104). *Etymologie, Entlehnungen und Entwicklungen: Festschrift für Jorma Koivulehto zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Irma Hyvärinen *et al.*, Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 63 (Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, 2004), also contains a number of essays on Old Norse, Old English, and Germanic topics, including a brief biography (1–4), and a bibliography of Koivulehto’s publications from 1966–2004 (473–86).

Stephen T. Driscoll’s obituary, *Scottish Archaeological Jnl* 28.1: v–x, summarizes the life, career, and work

of Leslie Alcock on “early historic fortifications” (vii); Hilda Ellis Davidson is remembered by Jacqueline Simpson, *Folklore* 117: 215–17, for her work in Scandinavian mythology and religion; a bibliography of “The Publications of Marion Archibald to 2005,” compiled by Barrie Cook, *et al.* appeared in *Coinage and History in the North Sea World, ca. AD 500–1200: Essays in Honour of Marion Archibald* (Leiden: Brill), 721–29; Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberg and Kristiaan Versluys remember René Derolez, former chief editor of *English Studies* and associate editor of *ASE* and *Jnl. of*

Indo-European Studies, *ES* 87.1: 1–2. There is a brief mention by Jenny Stratford of Janet Backhouse’s career in *Gazette du livre médiévale* 46 (2005): 108–9; a biography and memorial of the personal and academic life of Joan Turville-Petre (née Blomfield) is offered by T. Turville-Petre and D. Turville-Petre (*Saga Book of the Viking Society for Northern Research* 30: 98–100); and R.M. Liuzza pays tribute to the life and work of Nicholas Howe (“In Memoriam: Nicholas Howe. Feb. 17, 1953 – September 27, 2006,” *OEN* 40.1: 3–4).

DAB

3. Language

a. Lexicon, Glosses

Chris Bishop’s broad survey of OE terms for (giant) ‘monstrous races,’ “*Þyrs, ent, eoten, gigans*—Anglo-Saxon Ontologies of ‘Giant,’” *NM* 107: 259–70, concludes on the note that, following the advice of Hilda Ellis Davidson, we ought “to see Anglo-Saxon culture as an aggregation of both ‘northern’ and ‘southern’ elements, derivative of both and yet wholly unique. It is this aggregate culture that is visibly operant in the Anglo-Saxon ontologies of giant” (270). This might seem somewhat grandiose phrasing, and the “southern” elements could have been specified as biblical literature and commentary and, especially as it influences Bishop’s discussion of *þyrs* at the start, glossary evidence: e.g., the Aldhelm gloss *þyrsa oððe wyrmgalera to marsorum*. More could have been made of the Marsi and other *þyrs* glossary collocations. There is a solid delineation of the role Old Testament history and lore played in shaping and reshaping what would have been pre-Christian Germanic traditions of the giant races (references ranging from Goliath to the Nephilim; 261–69); not entirely convincing phonologically is the attempt to derive OE *entas* from *gigantes* (read γίγας at 263).

OE figures very briefly in Harald Bjorvand’s “Etymologien til *aur* og *golv*,” *Maal og Minne* 2: 97–106. In a discussion of Norse *aur* (‘gravel,’ ‘soil consisting of a mixture of gravel and coarse sand,’ the latter taken from Einar Haugen, *Norwegian-English Dictionary* [Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1974]) appears “gammelengelsk *ēar*” (100), while in the “Germanic affiliation” section (“Germansk tilknytning”; 101–02) appear OE *ūrig* and *ūrigfeðera*; in the like section to the etymology of *golv* (‘floor as of a room,’ or ‘grunnflate i et hus el. rom’; 102) appears OE *gielpān* (103).

The “construe” or syntactic “alphabetic letters” to the Cotton Tiberius A.iii copy of the *Regula Benedicti* are

the subject of Maria Caterina de Bonis’s substantial “La funzione delle lettere alfabetiche nella glossa interlineare alla *Regula Sancti Benedicti* del manoscritto London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A.III,” *Linguistica e Filologia* 22: 55–98. Several introductory sections precede analysis of the use of letters of the alphabet as an interlinear syntactic parser, with De Bonis treating of the manuscript itself, its contents (56–58; including the observation that the manuscript may have once begun with the *Rule*), its Winchester or, more likely, Canterbury filiation (58–60; dialectal evidence is only briefly mentioned at 59 and not further treated), dating (“La realizzazione del manoscritto viene collocata nella prima metà dell’XI secolo”; 59; i.e., xi¹). In the following sections on “The Benedictine Rule in Anglo-Saxon England” (61–64) and “The Study of Latin during the Benedictine Reform” (or ‘rebirth’: “la Rinascita benedettina”; 64–66) the name of Æthelwold comes to the fore—in the broader sense, may we be witnessing a rebirth of the ‘great man’ view of (intellectual) history, one built seemingly solely upon the shoulders of Theodore and Hadrian, Ælfric, and Æthelwold? At any rate, on at last to the “lettere alfabetiche” themselves (66–95); the letters appear interlineally, sometimes alone over the Latin text, other times following the OE *interpretamentum*. De Bonis looks at previous attempts in explanation of what Henri Logeman had called “pavement letters,” in particular Fred C. Robinson’s eminently useful “Syntactical Glosses in Latin Manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon Provenance” (*Speculum* 48 [1973]: 443–75); of interest is the debate as to whether the letters are simply, or mainly, syntactical or syntactical-semantic/lexical (68–69). Some difficulties and inconsistencies in Logeman’s treatment of the letters and his edition of the Tiberius glossed *Regula Benedicti* are turned to, and while there can be much carping about editions of Logeman (*The Rule of S. Benet: Latin and Anglo-Saxon Interlinear Version* [London: N. Trübner & Co., 1888;

EETS]) and his coevals, few seem to take on the task as their descendants (though we do have major editions of the homilies of Ælfric, the *Manual of Byrhtferth*, and the OE Gospels in the last quarter-century). De Bonis approaches the matter with fairness, and supplies a useful list of the chapters in the Rule that are glossed with these letters (71–73). Whole passages from the *Regula* are cited from Logeman, collated with Tiberius, and examined in terms of the sequences of letters employed—no easy task as it can vary chapter by chapter: e.g., in the first chapter (*De generibus eorum vel vita*) in one sequence **a** is used to mark the conjunction *sed*, **b** the clausal sequence SV, **c** the adverb *tunc*, and **d** marks a predicate adjective (80); rarer are two-letter sequences, such as the sequence **f gepyl d h** glossing *deus tolerantiam*, which, in De Bonis's view, marks the Subj-Obj structure in the Latin (82–83). Correlate use of letters is then examined, such as the correlate **a** used to mark indirect or subordinate complements or that used to mark a conjunction or adverb at the start of a new period (86–87). After the citation of many and lengthy examples from the glossed text, the explanation of the significance of the “alphabetic letters” in sequence, paired, or alone, seems too brief, and difficult to locate in terms of any linguistic theory: the use of “determinati sintagmi” (91) isn't actually revealing of the theoretical framework. Otherwise, the summation is admirably clear: e.g., single letters can be used such that **a** represents either a conjunction at the beginning of a new period or the verb to a clause, **b** an adverb or a “sintagma,” and so on (92). The penultimate section takes up the matter of who was behind these “alphabetic” or “pavement letters” and, despite the rubric “L'autore dell'inserimento delle lettere” (92–93), no name is forthcoming; though we do learn that the Tiberius “syntagmatic” (though de Bonis really seems to be leaning toward a morphosyntactic description of the letters' use) method was not one that really caught on or endured (“Il manoscritto, infatti, non mostra i segni caratteristici di uno uso continuo e frequente nel tempo”; 93). Nonetheless, despite some lingering mystery to the method and origin to Tiberius's system of “syntactic glossing” (still probably the best way to describe it), one is alerted to the wider use of glossing (besides its mainstay lexical use) and informed that one more innovation may be ascribed to “il programma educativo e religioso di Æthelwold” (95).

Detective work of a sort is behind A.N. Doane's “The Werden Glossary: Structure and Sources,” in *Beatus Vir*, ed. Doane and Wolf [see section 2], 41–84, as the convoluted history of loss and recovery of the seven Werden Pfarrhof leaves (comprising the glossaries “Werden C,”

fol. 1–6, and “Werden A,” and “a single mutilated leaf” [46], fol. 7, following J.H. Gallée's nomenclature: *Altsächsische Sprachdenkmaeler* [Leiden, 1894]). A reader might profitably begin with Doane's necessarily complex “Quiriation Diagram” (81–84) in the appendix to this study and compare it with that in the EEMF facsimile volume (*The Épinal, Werden, and Corpus Glossaries*, ed. Bernhard Bischoff, Mildred Budny, Geoffrey Harlow, M.B. Parkes, and J.D. Pfeifer, EEMF 22 [Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger, 1988]). Doane's first section situates “The Werden Fragments of the ‘Werden Glossary’” (41–48; cf. Ker, Appendix, item 39), particularly their post-medieval fate. Twenty-five or twenty-six leaves were reported to exist (Ker knew of twenty-five); six leaves belonging to Münster, Universitätsbibliothek Paulinus 271, four as Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cgm. 187 III (e.4), the seven Werden Pfarrhof leaves, and eight further leaves once in the possession of Ferdinand Deycks (he had published their contents in pamphlet form in 1854/5, the leaves being on loan from the Düsseldorf archivist T.J. Lacomblet). Following Deycks's death in 1867 his family refused the return of the leaves to Düsseldorf, though they eventually did wind up as Düsseldorf, Landesbibliothek, MS. Fragment K19:Z9/1 (42–43; which leaves were not known to Ker). The Münster leaves would end up a wartime loss in 1945; the Werden leaves were reported as “lost” in the EEMF facsimile—but, Doane, reports, “As I read this in 1995 I was astounded because sitting on the desk before me were photographs newly arrived of these same seven ‘lost’ Werden leaves,” which, with the cooperation of the Probst of Werden, Doane went to examine *in situ* (the leaves had spent nearly a century locked in a safe in the attic to the Pfarrhof until they were discovered with old parish registers and a few other medieval fragments; 43–44). The article then turns to the fate of the books in Werden, a house founded by the Anglo-Saxon-trained Liudiger (d. 809) in the late eighth century. Werden manuscripts wound up in bindings or were sold off in the later Middle Ages as the fortunes of the house failed (one such manuscript dispersed in Werden's decline is the Codex Argenteus now housed in Uppsala). The “Werden Glossary” itself was comprised of at least three glossaries: the “Second Amplonian Glossary” appears more fully in the Erfurt Glossary (Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek, MS. Amplonianus 2° 42), a *glossae nominum* (Erfurt 3, Werden C); and the “Werden A” glossary, of which Doane promises a full edition (45–46). These seven Werden leaves are all “written in a single distinctive early Carolingian hand showing pronounced Insular symptoms” (47); a detailed “Codicology of the Werden Glossary” follows

(48–55), which concludes that “the ‘Werden Glossary’ was a large-format, carefully-executed volume of at least 112 leaves containing three interrelated but separate Anglo-Saxon glossaries. Werden B (Erfurt 2, ‘Second Amplonian’) would have occupied about seventy-four leaves, Werden C (Glossae Nominum) about sixteen, and Werden A about twenty-two” (55). The place of the Werden Glossary in late classical through early medieval glossary-making and, more specifically, the highly productive Anglo-Saxon tradition is the last concern. The Werden glossaries are seen as distinctive by Doane, blending and reworking the earlier traditions. Three of these are (1) those from the late classical period, “going back to second- and third-century word-lists glossing obsolete and rare words from Republican times” (this was already a concern in the Augustan Age: see Ronald Syme, *The Roman Revolution* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939/rpt. 1960], e.g., “The Organization of Opinion,” 459–75); (2) the Abolita and Abstrusa glossaries from seventh-century Spain, the “Appendix Isidoriana” (that vast tradition of the *Etymologiae* as excerpted, bundled, and rebundled, whose history awaits description); and (3) the Latin-Greek word-lists in the Hermeneumata-tradition (57). These strands of a great and complicated tradition are appealed to in Doane’s description of the Werden glossary bundles (59ff.). This study helps clarify at last one significant strand in glossographical tradition.

Alaric Hall begins with Chaucer’s description of himself (that is, at least, Chaucer the pilgrim) as *elvish* in the prologue to the “Tale of Sir Thopas” in the *Canterbury Tales* and traces the ME form back to OE with an especially extended discussion of *ylfig*. Responding, in part, to Richard Firth Green’s suggestion that readers of Chaucer would have understood *elvish* rather literally as ‘elvish, having the character of elves’ (226; cf. Green, “Changing Chaucer,” *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 25 [2003]: 27–52), Hall eventually argues that the form meant rather, “depending on context, ‘delusory’ and ‘abstracted’” and that “the Old English word *ælfisc* consolidates our extensive Old English evidence for elves’ power to inflict mind-altering ailments. *Ylfig* provides similar evidence, but with an unexpected additional implication: that the influence of elves (apparently but not certainly through the mechanism of possession) could, at least in some earlier Anglo-Saxon cultures, bring about prophetic speech—a rare glimpse into Anglo-Saxon traditional beliefs” (243). The desire to semantically distance *elvish* from elves may have led to some skewing in the argument: “Although its evidence is less secure than the attestations of *elvish*, *ælfisc* and [MHG] *elbisch* which I have considered, *ylfig* is like

them in hinting that Chaucer may have used *elvish* without elves at the forefront of his mind, and without necessarily calling them to the minds of his listeners” (243). In the Chaucerian context, this requires some semantic double-pleading: that in the Prologue to “Sir Thopas” elves are not at the forefront of the imagination, nor are they, a bit less convincingly in the three instances of the term in the “Canon’s Yeoman’s Tale” (*oure eluysshe craft; our elvish art; this eluysshe nyce loore*: all referring to alchemy), while admitting that there were cultural traditions in medieval England of elves practicing secret crafts or ‘possessing supernatural skill or powers,’ being ‘mysterious, strange,’ or ‘elf-like, otherworldly’ (232; Hall citing the *MED* entry, s.v. *elvish*). If Hall’s semantic range argument for *elvish* might seem plausible rather than convincing, his discussion (227–31) of the OE occurrence of *ælfisc*, glossing *alucinare* (classical [namely, Ciceronian] *alucinor*, ‘to wander in mind, talk idly’) in a note to c. 52 of Fulgentius’s *Expositio sermonum antiquorum ad grammaticum calcidicum* in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 83 (a German manuscript) is solid philological work: embedded in the argument over Chaucerian *elvish* is an excellent word-study of OE *ælfisc*. The turn to later texts and to *ylfig* (‘affected by elves(?), raving, mad’) to establish a more generalized sense of ‘delusory, abstracted’ for *elvish* might be a bit overplayed: one would think ‘distracted’ the better gloss based on the *alucinare* entry, and the emphasis upon elves causing mental delusions or illnesses, or even possession, seems to emphasize nonetheless the agency of actual elves (and so we are back to them at the forefront). It might be noted that OE has a solid tradition of attributing physical ailments to elves also: the *Leechdoms* treat of ‘elf-shot,’ which could cause any number of ailments, and one finds the unspecified *ælfād* along with *ælfside(n)* and *ælfsogeða/ælfsogeða* (cf. Toronto *DOE*, s.vv.; on the latter two cf. McGowan, “Old English Lexicographical Studies” [diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1991], 67ff.).

Wolfgang Haubrichs’s “*Nomina stirpium; Sippenname und Ethnonyme: Probleme einer Typologie der Personengruppenbezeichnungen*,” in *Language and Text*, ed. Johnston *et al.* [see section 2], 57–78, seems both a work-in-progress (it is seemingly a sample, and a fairly extensive one, of a much larger work) and an example of the German scholarly *Hinweise* genre (there is also an impressive bibliography at 72–78). The typology part of this schematic examination of tribal, people, family names and “ethnonyms” is programmatic: *Relationale Bezeichnungen, Qualitative Bezeichnungen, Ethnonyme als nomina stirpium*—and there are many subdivisions. There is a comparative use of Latin/

Roman terms for the onomastic and ethnonymic practices under observation: e.g., the general notation that *cognationes* involves “eine horizontale Extension” and *genealogiae* a vertical one (57). Of OE interest are those tribal and family names from such poems as *Beowulf* and *Widsith* that find their place in Haubrichs’s typological classification: under “Qualitative Bezeichnungen” the *Glomman* (“Im Vergleich zu Tieren” they are ‘wolf-people’; 60) and the **Skeld-ingōz*, the *Scyldingas* of *Beowulf* occur in an extended section of “Bezeichnungen nach der Herkunft und Zugehörigkeit” (64, with some valuable comments on Scyld Scefing’s name; the *-*ingōz* section is a veritable mine of information). Haubrichs’s study is particularly worth notice for the comparative Germanic evidence adduced: OE is but a small part of this, but regarding the OE in the larger Germanic context is illuminating.

Antonette diPaolo Healey’s contribution to the Bruce Mitchell Festschrift, “Straining Words and Striving Voices: Polysemy and Ambiguity and the Importance of Context in the Disclosure of Meaning,” in *Inside Old English*, ed. John Walmsley [see section 2], 74–90, alludes in its title to T.S. Eliot’s “Burnt Norton” and focuses on the figure of Henry Sweet and his *Student’s Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon* (1896) as a means of investigating how “Shifts in application, specialization, figurative language and wordplay all suggest the inherent flexibility of language to accommodate itself to changing contexts, giving rise both to polysemy and, at times, ambiguity” (88). That “Sweet’s principle of trying to understand Old English from the Anglo-Saxon point of view seems a good place to begin, if possible” (88) is illustrated with test examples from letter *F* from the Toronto *Dictionary of Old English* project, for which Healey serves as editor. The adjective *fæst*, for example, is examined under the heading “shifts in application” in terms of “four main [semantic] groupings”—People, Concretes, Abstracts, and States (79). The senses, besides ranging, obviously, from the literal to more figurative, move from ‘steadfast’ or ‘stubborn’ (“People, their attributes, feelings, etc.”) to “constipated (bowels)” (“Concretes”; the *DOE* having adopted Henry Sweet’s “pragmatic solution for complex words ... to contextualize his definitions by listing their referents enclosed within parentheses”; 75) to ‘firm, fast (alliance)’ and ‘strict (principle, rule)’ (79–80)—in essence, a dictionary adopting some of the principles of a thesaurus. Other *F*-words fill out the roster of examples illustrating the headings “specialization of meaning,” “figurative language,” and “words in play.”

At some seventy pages (199–270), Dieter Kastovsky’s contribution on “Vocabulary” to Cambridge’s

one-volume *A History of the English Language*, ed. Hogg and Denison [see section 3b] is substantial overall and in detail, especially for those interested in the earliest period of English vocabulary. After a general introduction to the fundamentals of lexemes, changes in meaning, and word-formation processes, the section on “Old English” encompasses thirty pages (216–46): OE is genuinely given pride of place in this history of English vocabulary. Terminological statements are clear and concise; e.g., lexemes “serve as labels for segments of extralinguistic reality which a speech community finds nameworthy” (199). Or that “vocabulary is as much a reflection of deep-seated cultural, intellectual and emotional interests, perhaps even of the whole *Weltbild* of a speech community” (201)—note here the use of *Weltbild* as this German scholar of English makes frequent recourse to contrasting examples from German or other early Germanic languages. Less convincing are a few examples from Modern (or the increasingly fashionable ‘Present Day’) English: “In a bar in New York I saw the following ad: *When was the last time you were Jägermeistered?* In order to understand this, it is not enough to know that English has an expression *to wine and dine a person*.... One also has to know that *Jägermeister* fits into the wining/dining scenario and not the attack scenario, i.e. that this is a German liqueur and not the name of a person or instrument” (202)—which comes across as more of a quaint ‘Euro in NYC’-type story than illustrative of any semantic ambiguity a native speaker of American English would ever feel. The statement that “Arbitrary creations play an important role in brand names, e.g. *Kodak*, *Viagra*, *Xerox*, etc.” (214) may miss the use of faux or pseudo-Latin in brand names, as of prescription drugs and luxury cars: the appeal of the Latinate Altima, Lexus, Acura, Infiniti, etc., is risible but lucrative in North America. Though the one-volume Cambridge *History of English* is both a condensation and updating of the multi-volume chronological series from the press, one will not detect any consequent gaps in coverage in Kastovsky’s discussion of the vocabulary of OE: he begins with “the stratification of the vocabulary” (217–20), full investigation of which is, of course, hampered by the dearth of spoken OE evidence: “Diaphasic variation is difficult to assess in view of the nature of the OE texts. The only attempt at representing spoken language is Ælfric’s *Colloquy*, a Latin didactic text with an interlinear gloss, from which we may gather that *ēalā* glosses ‘oh, lo, alas,’ which would seem to belong to spoken language” (218). “Foreign influence” (220–26) includes the critical matter of determining and dating Norse loans (Kastovsky dates the earliest Scandinavian loan-words

to the Treaty of Wedmore A.D. 886; 224). And “Word formation” (226–46) is Kastovsky’s specialty, so the coverage is intensive, with twelve sub-sections: noun compounds; compound adjectives; compound verbs; nominal suffixes; adjectival suffixes; verbal suffixes; zero derivation; nominal derivatives; adjectival derivatives; verbal derivation; adverbs; and a concluding section (for the OE coverage) on “The typological status of Old English word formation,” which has a particular emphasis upon the verb system: “Old English is in a stage of transition from stem-based to word-based inflection and derivation. The verb system is stem-based, and it is only towards the end of the Old English period and during the Middle English period that with the loss of the infinitive ending the verb develops an unmarked base form.... The Indo-European ablaut system had gradually become more and more opaque during the Germanic and pre-Old English period” (245). The sheer mass of examples cited will give any reader an appreciable sense of the nature of the vocabulary of OE in Kastovsky’s sketch of its history.

In “Female Husbands in Old English Lexicography,” in *Language and Text*, ed. Johnston *et al.* [see section 2], 169–78, Lucia Kornexl pours more cold water on the alleged late OE **hūs-bonde*, f. ‘the mistress of a house’, which derives from the passage from the OE prose Exodus (in the OE Heptateuch): *Ac þa Israhelyscan wif biddað æt þam Egyptyscan wifum, æt heora neahgeburum & æt heora husbondum ...* (171), which, grammatically, requires “female husbands.” Kornexl notes the word could always have been satisfactorily reduced to ‘householders’ or ‘heads of the house’ (deriving from the Vulgate *hospita*). The DOE is singled out for praise in its handling of gender assignment, since “the stringent principles applied by the DOE will no doubt finally rob OE *husbonda* of its feminine ghost partner, whose form and definition presumably tell us more about the Victorian predilection for ‘marking women’ than about the relevance of gender for the Old English system of personal nouns” (176). One does feel a bit sorry for the poor dead horse being flogged here yet again.

“Aldred’s Multiple Glosses: Is the Order Significant?” by Tadashi Kotake, in *Textual and Contextual Studies in Medieval English*, ed. Ogura [see sec. 3b], 35–50, looks at Aldred’s “multiple glosses in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*” (35) in terms of two broad types in rendering the Latin imperfect: “literal translation,” which Kotake places in small capitals to indicate a gloss that “uses the Old English grammatical category closest to the Latin equivalent,” and “morphologically marked expression,” involving the use of OE periphrastic “BE-verb with present or preterite participle” (38). For example,

a morphologically marked expression occurs with the OE rendering *gesætt <ue>l wæs sittende* to Lat. *sedebat*. This is a relatively simple criterion, producing the observation that “Aldred uses LITERAL TRANSLATIONS as first glosses and more morphologically marked ones as second” (39) or, in the case of glossing infinitives, that “the closest Old English form to Latin infinitives ... both active and passive (excluding passive perfect infinitives), is the simple infinitive” (40). And, concerning glossing the subjunctive: “The use of subjunctive in double glosses translating Latin infinitives is found in four examples, and all of them are used with simple infinitives. This combination is not used to translate Latin active present infinitives, but passive infinitives and the infinitives of the semi-deponent verb *fieri*” (42): of interest is that only four instances of such glossing occurs, in a corpus of “multiple glosses” Kotake estimates at 3159 (37 n. 4). Kotake finds Aldred’s glossing of Latin deponent verbs more complex, inverting the expected pattern: “Aldred uses the forms which convey the meaning of the Latin more precisely than the other as the first gloss, and LITERAL TRANSLATIONS as the second. This situation may be derived from the fact that the LITERAL TRANSLATIONS produce unnatural Old English verb forms” (46–47).

Two studies in introduction to glossographical studies—the one on the glossarial corpus with Germanic vernacular *interpretamenta*, the other on the nature of the glossarial practice itself and the relationship between lemma and interpretation—issued from the pen of Patrizia Lendinara in 2002, were listed in the 2005 OEN bibliography, and receive mention this year: “Teoria e prassi dell’attività glossatoria nel mondo germanico medievale,” in *Antichità germaniche: II Parte; II Seminario avanzato in Filologia germanica*, ed. Vittoria Dolcetti Corazza and Renato Gendreau (Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso, 2002), 3–29, and “Glosse o traduzioni,” in *Tradurre testi medievali: obiettivi, pubblico, strategie*, ed. Maria Grazia Cammarota and Maria Vittoria Molinari (Bergamo: Bergamo University Press/Edizioni Sestante, 2002), 249–77. “Teoria e prassi” is Lendinara’s able and comprehensive introduction to bilingual Latin-Germanic glossaries (OE, OHG, OS, OFris, etc.), across the span of which her scholarship has ranged (cf. her collected papers, *Anglo-Saxon Glosses and Glossaries*, Variorum Collected Studies 622 [Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999]). We begin with late classical and medieval Latin conceptions of *glossa*, as defined by lexica of Latin in the modern period and by the early glossaries themselves: some evolution in the term is seen from the explanations given to “difficult words,” to commentary, to correction (3–4). The evolution of glossaries is

covered in detail, from the Greco-Latin late classical forebears to the Latin-vernacular products the Anglo-Saxon monks took to so prolifically (only the OHG glossarial corpus in rivalry). Much of this may be familiar to the reader of *CGL* (*Corpus glossariorum Latinorum*, ed. Gustav Loewe and Georg Goetz, 7 vols. [Leipzig, 1888–1923]), Keil (*Grammatici Latini*, ed. Heinrich Keil, 8 vols. [Leipzig, 1857–80]), or Steinmeyer-Sievers (*Die althochdeutschen Glossen*, ed. Elias Steinmeyer and Eduard Sievers, 5 vols. [Berlin: Weidmann, 1879–1922]), but the narrative here is judicious. The *glossae collectae*, the *Hermeneumata pseudo-Dositheana* (which Lendinara sees as the model for glossaries “di tipo didattico,” 7; see now Flammini’s Teubner), *Abstrusa*, *Abolita*, *Abrogans*, the *Vocabularius Sancti Galli* (St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 913), and lesser-known examples, such as the later, smaller format (125 x 87mm) Latin-Latin and Greco-Latin-Latin glossary in London, British Library, Harley 3826 (Ker, item 241; 9 and n. 33). The latter part of Lendinara’s survey (16ff.) turns to the work and methods (“prassi”) of glossators; an interesting light here is cast upon the Codices Argenteus and Ambrosianus, the Gothic versions of Scripture, as a form of glossarial activity too (26–28). “Glosse o traduzioni” looks to “Il rapporto tra lemma e interpretamentum” (250–54; e.g., the minor Cleopatra Glossary entry *obrizum: smæte gold*) and sources to lemmata as a key to the lexical choices glossators make in an enterprise that may involve commentary, translation, or more. Examples range mainly in the Anglo-Saxon corpus of Latin-Latin and bilingual glossaries, some of them famous as—in a Herbert Meritt vein—“hard” or “difficult words”: the Épinal rendering *uuidubindlae* to *inuoluco* (Erfurt *uuy-dubindlae*; 263), or the Brussels Glossary pairing of *fulix* and *ganot* (on the *fulica atra* in glossary tradition see Lendinara’s study, reviewed in this section last year). Another concern is context, particularly the Latin, as the editing of glossaries was so often preoccupied with filling out and delimiting the vernacular material; one example: the bird-name *porfirio/porphyrio* is glossed quite simply *auis orientalis* in Bern, Burgerbibliothek 258, a glossary in the “Rz” tradition (see vol. 5 of Steinmeyer-Sievers, “Untersuchungen über die Bibelglossare” [108–407], at 108–135 [“Rz. Und sein Einflussbereich”]), while the earlier *Vocabularius Sancti Galli* (St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 913) offers “una interpretazione ricca di suggestione”: *Porphirionem dicitur quod ipsa in Libia sit, esseque auium pulcherrima pene; ideoque eam uolunt reges habere in domibus suis sepiissime* (270).

W.B. Lockwood’s “On the Philology of *cod* and *stag*,” *Trans. of the Philological Soc.* 104: 13–15, really needs to be read in conjunction with earlier studies of his—quite

earlier in the case of his “Word taboo in the language of the Faroese fishermen,” *Trans. of the Philological Soc.* (1955): 1–24—to make much sense of these additional notes. Lockwood had shown in an earlier study that *cod* was elliptical for *cod-fish* and, as “the trade in question was in Viking hands” (13), ON *fiskr* lies behind the *fish* part. His argument that ‘fish’ used in place of the particular type of fish (e.g., Norse *fiskr* in place of *þorskr*) seems to be a case of what is often now called taboo deformation. As to *stag*: “The modern form goes back to Late Old English **stagga*, inferable from recorded *stagon*, apparently accusative ... a term of Scandinavian origin which partly replaced native OE *heort*, now *hart*, the Common Germanic name with IE connections, the basic sense being ‘horned (deer)’. As its etymology will suggest, *stag* was in the first place a nickname, presumably evasive, bestowed by hunters on the quarry so that he should not learn that he was in danger” (14)—which seems to be a case of taboo deformation again.

The first of three studies in 2006 by Sara Pons-Sanz casting doubt on Norse derivation to certain OE terms (particularly as postulated in Erik Björkman’s *Scandinavian Loan-Words in Middle English*, 2 vols. [Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1900–02]), “Anglo-Scandinavian Trade or Paganism? OE *hæden* in the First Cleopatra Glossary,” *Modern Language Rev.* 101: 625–37, opens up to a subject of broader interest than its title might imply. While the study begins with Björkman’s formulation that “if a word in English has a form which cannot be explained by means of internal English sound-laws, but which is easily accounted for by assuming a Scandinavian origin, we are, for the most part, entitled to consider the word in question a Scandinavian loan-word” (625) and ends with a caveat to this phonological form-specific argument, in between it elaborates a well-supported exposition of semantic extension and possible cultural factors conditioning it. The article begins with OE *heden* and ON *heðinn* (‘jacket of fur or skin’) and discusses previous etymological suggestions that derive these from PGmc. **hadinōn* (whence ON *hadna* ‘a young she-goat’) or these and OE *hæden* ‘heathen’ from the same source (Björkman). The appearance of OE *hæden* in the Cleopatra Glossaries (in the First Glossary preserved in London, BL Cotton Cleopatra A.iii) glossing *mas-truga* (= *mastruca* ‘garment made of skins, a sheepskin, a skin’) occasions extended comment. Though, in form and on superficial notice, the OE word seems an evident candidate for classification as an ON loan, Pons-Sanz finds the Cleopatra Glossary attestation “an early date in a manuscript originating from a non-Scandinavianized area” (perhaps St. Augustine’s, Canterbury; 626); she had fairly quickly dispensed with the idea of

OE *heden* as a Norse loan on the basis of its appearance in the even earlier Corpus Glossary: “OE *heden* and ON *heðinn* should therefore be analysed as cognates, rather than as loanword and etymon, respectively” (626). OE *scinn* (MS *cinn*; cf. ON *skinn* ‘skin, fur’) is brought into play as it too appears in the First Cleopatra Glossary, and this occasions speculation about their origin if accepted as Norse loans: “The presence of two Norse-derived terms referring to furs and skins in the First Cleopatra Glossary could be accounted for by the fact that furs were some of the most valuable exports from Scandinavia.... The borrowing might initially have taken place in those areas which had closest contact with the Scandinavian newcomers” (627). The (*s*)*cinn* matter is rapidly explained away as perhaps having to do with, seemingly, the process of dissolving of glossarial fasciculi and *glossae collectae* as the bilingual glossaries developed, producing a lemma *et mentum uel imes* in which the Latin and Greek terms were understood separately: this point could have used more elaboration (628–29). Pons-Sanz then turns to the glossary evidence to link OE *heden* (‘robe, hood,’ or, more expansively, ‘leather, fur or sheepskin garment, possibly hooded, worn by monks’) and OE *hæðen* ‘heathen,’ that is, in her formulation, “interpreting <hæðen> as a by-form of OE *heden*” (630). A not entirely convincing phonological argument follows (on Kentish raising, and scribal confusion of <d> and <ð>), and one that might have been sharpened by consulting the ongoing work of Hans Sauer with the language of the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary. But what follows is the argument that “the association of the terms could have been triggered by the context of the lemma” (631); and so to *mastruca*, which begins with Isidore’s citation of Cicero’s *Pro Scauro: Quem purpura regalis non commovit, eum Sardonum mastruca mutavit?* (The translation provided by Pons-Sanz, “Did the Sardinian sheepskins have any effect on him who had been unmoved by the regal purple” [631] might obscure the rather more literal effect of *mutavit* in an age of “new men” from the mouth of one who was himself a *novus homo*.) And so being established are a “dichotomy between those people who wore highly processed clothing (textiles of all sorts) and those whose clothing was relatively unprocessed (skins)” (632–33)—and, now following Isidore, the “suggestion that those who wear animal skins are almost transformed into beasts” (632). This cultural phenomenon, often originally sacral, is given extended treatment and amply supported—it is interesting how much evidence is Celtic and how often ecclesiastical texts inveighed against dressing up in calf or deer skins for “heathen rites” (e.g., the penitential of pseudo-Theodore; 633). A

reference to such practices of some sort in Aldhelm’s “Letter to Heahfrith” may either “be added to the list of our sources on Anglo-Saxon paganism” or reflect “old practices carried out in Ireland, whence Heahfrith is said to have just returned,” or indeed such practices are “likely to have started in Celtic Britain and to have survived in various forms during the Roman occupation and after the Anglo-Saxon invasion” (634). The upshot is that, for the Cleopatra glossator, the association of “Isidore’s explanation of L *mastruca* with pagan customs ... could have very easily led him to enter the gloss <hæðen> instead of the intended <heden>” and that while the “phonological form of a term is rightly interpreted as our most reliable evidence for its etymological study ... the apparent possibility of associating an English term with a Norse word may have led us to adopt what seems to be the easiest option without looking for other solutions which, albeit harder to identify, might be more appropriate” (637). Even if Pons-Sanz’s overall argument leaves some readers unconvinced, particularly those hewing more to the phonological/internal argument, the course of speculation the study takes is of great interest.

Pons-Sanz takes up again the matter of whether an OE form is to be identified as a Norse loan or find its etymology in the native OE stock with “OE *māl* as a Gloss for L. *clasma* in Aldhelmian Glossaries,” *N&Q* n.s. 53: 395–98. Here the matter concerns the initially curious matching of lemma *clasma* (‘lesion’) from the *Prose de virginitate* passage *Ceteris enim uiolati foederis clasma concorditer reconcilantibus solus ultricem cruentae mortis uindictam exsolues* (XXXVIII); the pared down immediate lemmatic context is *uiolati foederis clasma*, and the OE interpretation *mal* (written in the text and repeated in the margin in the Cleopatra II glossary in an Aldhelmian fascicle) Pons-Sanz takes as more likely OE *māl* ‘spot, mark, blemish’ (Chaucerian *mormal* comes to mind, though a different development) rather than Norse loan *māl* ‘suit, cause, case, action, agreement, covenant’ (396). This is another piece to Pons-Sanz’s program in excising certain hypothesized early ON loans to OE and arguing *contra* Björkman (*Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*). In this case, the matching of the lemma and *māl* to its latter sense above seems entirely unobjectionable. It might have been interesting to have seen a little more on the glossary context itself—more on what occasioned the Brussels glossator to Aldhelm to enter *pace* (following Goossens, presumably triggered by *foederis*)—and evidence that there was any real problem with readers associating the lemma with *māl* ‘suit, case’ rather than *māl* ‘blemish.’ Read “Crandell” for “Crabdell” at 398 n. 28.

The third in Pons-Sanz's series of studies arguing against (early) allegedly "Norse-derived terms recorded in Old English texts" (146) and in favor of location in the original OE stock—a sort of "return of the native" theme—alludes in its title "Sharpening, Confiding, and OE *getryccað*," (*N&Q* n.s. 53: 146–50), to Holtzmann's Law of *Verschärfung* (which may also be translated 'intensification'), here cited via Eduard Prokosch (*A Comparative Germanic Grammar* [Philadelphia, 1939]) and Laura Catherine Smith's master's thesis—here comes another pun—"Holtzmann's Law: Getting to the *Hart* of the Germanic *Verschärfung*" (University of Calgary, 1997). Essentially, Pons-Sanz is casting a skeptical eye toward explanations of OE *getryccað* (as found in the glosses to John in the Lindisfarne Gospels, rendering *confidete*) as being under Norse influence (ON *tryggva*), and what sort of relationship there is between OE *trēowian* and *getryccað*. The latter occupies significant space in the article. Pons-Sanz follows Holthausen (*Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3rd ed. [Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1934]) in associating the OE form under question with PGmc. **truk-* and so a native form, though there are a number of problems with its etymology and development: generally considered a class III weak verb, "as far as Old English is concerned, its forms alternate between those of weak Class I and weak Class II verbs" (148). Relationship between *getryccað* (Lindisfarne) and *getricce* (*Regula Benedicti* gloss) is then investigated, namely why the latter did not appear as *getrycge* if derived from a *ja*-stem adj. from the same etymological root as the verb (whence *trugian*), and answered negatively: "Despite their formal similarity, there is no need to consider that <getryccað> and <getricce> are etymologically related" (149). A somewhat tenuous argument by lemma is used to connect *getricce* rendering *contentus* (in sense 'content', < *continēre* 'hold together, keep together') with *contentus* as meaning 'stretched, strained' (< *contendere*). It is not an obvious argument, and involves some finessing, but is predicated upon the notion that Æthelwold in his rendition of the rule (and presumably all others of the "Age of Æthelwold"; 149 and 149 n. 28) would, with his "interest in clarity and accuracy" and "fondness for etymology and wordplay (including lexical variation and doublets)," seek "to capture and exploit the meaning of the Latin term" and be led "to render L *contentus* with *ēaðhylde* and the adjective under consideration" (149). The immediate passage to hand concerns a visiting brother monk and the hospitality to be extended to him provided *contentus fuerit consuetudine loqui*, the p.p. in question usually rendered simply as 'content'. This in pursuit of connecting *getricce*, as it was

used also to gloss *contentus* (bearing in mind a presumable Æthelwoldian delight in the possibilities of derivation from both *contendere* and *continēre*), with either PGmc. **trek-* or **truk-* (having to do with 'drawing, pulling'). This is a long way to go to put some distance between *getryccað* and *getricce*. And it does leave our wandering brother (*monachus peregrinus*) both content and stretched/strained at the hospitality extended by his brothers under the Rule. Æthelwold may have been fond of puns, but he may not want to claim this one. Returning to the titular premise, the handling of *getryccað* here seems reasonable; Prokosch and Pokorny are employed, but as Holtzmann's Law is given short shrift one would have liked to have seen Ringe consulted as the latest statement on the prehistory of OE.

Another installment in Hans Sauer's excellent work on the language of the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary concerns this time "Adverbs and Adverbials in the Earliest English Text (Épinal-Erfurt)," in *Language and Text*, ed. Johnston *et al.* [see sec. 2], 255–68. Sauer's title serves as a reminder of this glossary's importance to the study of early OE ("[i]n its original form it was probably compiled around 680–690"; 255), in its two surviving witnesses: Épinal, Bibliothèque municipale 72 (ca. 700, of English provenance), and Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Allgemeinbibliothek, Codex Amplonianus F. 42 (ca. 800, the work of a German scribe in Cologne). About one-third of the glossary's 3,000 entries have OE *interpretamenta* and Sauer focuses here on a relatively small subset of the OE glosses: instances of adverbs (by Sauer's count, about 34; 256). Sauer begins his analysis of adverbial forms under the rubric "Adverbs: An inflexional or a word-formation phenomenon?": one consideration under which is "recursivity" (or the application of word-formation processes in sequence; e.g., ÉpErf *anuillīcae* < *an-wille-lice*, that is *anwille* + *-lice* > *anwille-lice*; 257). The element *-mælum*, as with *styccemælum*, is analyzed as involving the 'suffixoid' *-mælum* (adverbial dative plural) rather than being formed from an unattested *styccemæl* (259). Innovation in OE, as opposed to inheritance from IE, involves "the OE suffixes *-lice*, *-inga/-unga*, and *-mælum* ... newly created in Old English by combination (*-lic* + *-e*, *-ing* + *-a*, *-mæl* + *-um*) and ensuing reanalysis. Most of them died out or became unproductive" (260), excepting, of course, *-lice*, which "arose by secretion (reanalysis) from *-lic* + *-e* ... [and] must have originated in pre-literary Old English, i.e. well before ca. 680–690, because it is frequently attested in ÉpErf and therefore must have been well established by ca. 680" (260). Surprisingly frequent, albeit in this relatively small sample, are the phrases functioning as adverbials (*a forðh* 'always, continuously'; *huuanon-*

huuoega ‘from anywhere’; *suae suithae* ‘as much as’; 263). These account for fourteen formations, adverbs in *-lice* 12 (264).

Fabienne Toupin traces diachronically “A Medieval Linguistic Puzzle: The Displacement of Anglo-Saxon *nimen* by Scandinavian *taken*,” *Bulletin des Anglicistes Médiévistes* 68 (2005): 13–38. The ‘riddle’ Toupin refers to in her title is the matter of why “*taken* should have had the upper hand in the competition” (14), overtaking *nimen* in the ME period. Late OE is the critical period, as is often the case for Scandinavian loans in competition with native forms, and IOE *tacan* and eME *taken* are turned to in terms of their appearance: *tacan* occurs twice in Ælfric’s *Catholic Homilies*, but in the sense of ‘touch’ and in phrasal form with *on* (“a phrase evidently modelled on ON *taka á*,” 16); it is not likely a recent innovation as *oftacan* occurs in the *Homilies* and so “*tacan* must have been in current use for some time before the derivative could be coined in the typically native matrix <of + motion verb>” (16). Toupin turns then to the evidence of later entries in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (D Chronicle 1067–1079; E Chronicle 1122–1131 and 1132–1154), in which *niman* and derivative forms (*ofniman*, *beniman*) hold steady in use, either occurring more frequently than *tacan* and its derivative or phrasal forms, or maintaining a sort of parity in usage. Some semantic differentiation may be occurring: phrasal uses such as *wið toc* (E 1127, modeled on ON *taka við* ‘receive’) and *toc to uuerrien* (E 1154 or later, modeled on ON *taka at* + infinitive) were not to be found within the range of use of OE *niman*. In the eME period *taken* is on the rise and will gain ten derivative forms; dialect evidence witnesses the decline of *nimen*, particularly in Northern and East Midlands dialects (where *taken* had gained its stronghold). Cited frequently by Toupin, especially for the tables of occurrences of *taken* and *nimen* (33–36; a further table, Appendix 5 at 38, lists “the 40 senses of OE *niman*,” from ‘get into one’s hands by force or artifice’ to ‘move oneself, go, proceed’), is Alarik Rynell’s *The Rivalry of Scandinavian and native synonyms in Middle English, especially taken and nimen* (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1948). Toupin then turns to the matter of verb pairs such as *cuman/gan* and *bringan/niman* and the need for a ‘dissociative’ use with one of the pair (e.g., a verb expressing extra-EGO activity or, in the immediate semantic context, indicating movement away from the speaker; 23–24). Thomas Fraser’s theory that preverbal *be-* could serve this function (thus *becuman*) is cited: see his “The System of Verbs Involving a Speaker-Hearer Relationship: *come/go, bring/take* in Old and Middle English,” in *Papers from the 5th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, ed.

A. Ahlqvist (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1982), 54–61. Drawing on earlier work of her own (“Was Deicticity a Semantic Component of the Old English Motion Verb *cuman*?” *Bulletin des Anglicistes Médiévistes* 60 [2001]: 1–24), Toupin observes that “*bringan/niman* can be assumed to have followed the same marked term/unmarked term organizational principle, in which case *niman* would have been deictically neutral and *bringan* deictically marked (i.e. associative),” and that “*tacan* has no clear-cut deictic profile either” (25): so this, at least, is not the motivation for the lexical displacement. Rather, Toupin finds that of *niman*’s many uses (forty in all), most are metaphorical, only one-fourth spatial; following the theory of Marie-Line Groussier (“Pourquoi la préposition vieil-anglaise *mid* a-t-elle disparu au profit de *with*? Arguments en faveur d’une origine cognitive de cette disparition,” *Diachronie* 2 [2001]: 21–37), that “the larger the extent of the spatial sense of a contender, the more vibrant it is and the more likely to win the competition” (26). This was something ON *taka* could offer: “Contact with ON was responsible not only for the introduction of *taka* in the IOE dialects spoken within the Danelaw but also, and more importantly, of the almost immediate setting up of a rivalry between *taka* and OE *niman*. What triggered this competition was the partial synonymy of n- and t- verbs in Scandinavian, a phenomenon unknown in the other Germanic languages... Accordingly ... there ensued a one-sided competition. *Niman*, having too few spatial senses compared to the extent of its metaphorical meanings, was no match for *taka*, a strong contender invigorated by its spatial senses” (28–29).

Ferdinand von Mengden argues fairly convincingly that OE always had a base-10/decimal system of numbers, some curious forms notwithstanding, in “The Peculiarities of the OE Numeral System,” in *Medieval English and Its Heritage*, ed. Ritt *et al.* [see sec. 3b], 125–45. After a languid introduction to the very basics of numerals, atoms (e.g., 1–9 in a decimal system), bases (e.g., 10), and complex numerals (“combinations of a base and a less complex numeral”; 129), with much indebtedness to the comparative linguistic work on numerals by the late Joseph Greenberg (135–42), von Mengden turns to the OE numeral system itself (132–42). Thus a form such as *ðreo ond hundændleftig* (for ‘113’) makes sense as ‘three and (hund) eleven-ty,’ while it is only up to 129 that OE numerals show any discrepancy with the practice to be found in contemporary English. Von Mengden vigorously rejects any notion that the early Germanic tongues were duodecimal, ON *hundrap* ‘120’ taken as a “disturbance” in a system “still generally decimal” (143). Not fully satisfactorily dealt

with, in this reviewer's opinion, is the *hund* in OE decades 70–120: *hundseofontig*, *hundehtatig*, *hundnigontig*, *hundteontig*, *hundendleftig*, *hundtwelftig*. The “circumfixed” form seems baffling, and the *hund* prefix semantically troublesome; von Mengden offers that while the formation 70–120 in OE “represents a phenomenon extremely rare in natural languages” (133), the structure *hund* + atom + *tig* does not represent “three distinct morphological constituents,” but that “the multiplicand ‘x 10’ in the higher valued expressions is represented by one discontinuous morpheme, i.e. by a circumfix.... The structures of both expressions, *six-tig* and *hund-seofon-tig* represent a multiplication of an atom (‘6,’ ‘7’) with the base ‘10.’ Accounting for an additional function of the element *hund-* is therefore not feasible—neither on arithmetic grounds nor by insinuating any other meaning or grammatical function of *hund-*” (134). This argument that “we accept the analysis of *hund-* forming one discontinuous morpheme together with *-tig*” (135 n. 11) might make a kind of morphological sense on surface or abstractly, but it seems semantically unsatisfying, slippery even. One cannot help but wonder what Anglo-Saxons thought or meant when they counted ‘hund-seven-ty, hund-eight-ty,’ etc.

In “From *agen* to *own*,” in *Medieval English and Its Heritage*, ed. Ritt *et al.* [see sec. 3b], 147–64, Letizia Vezzosi begins by tracing the semantic development of MdE *own* with “the notion of possession” (147) back to OE *agen*, which could indicate both possession and contrast and could “express an unexpected co-reference relation” (152; Vezzosi attributes to that last function some 27% of the form's occurrences). Two small points regarding her citation of the OE Orosius's *Æfter þæm Xersis wearþ his agenre þeode swiþe unweorþ*: read ‘Xerxes’ for ‘Xerses’ in the MdE translation (152) and the comment “That a king should become contemptible in the eyes of his own people seems to have been something unexpected at the time” makes no sense in terms of the passage's ultimate origin in Herodotus, who writes precisely about why Persian kings could become contemptible in the eyes of their people and observed, as one of his “laws” of history, that happiness seldom resides in any one place for long: nothing unexpected about it. That “OE *agen* is still preferred in those contexts where some kind of possessive relationship is implied, and when it modifies abstract nouns they are always characterised by a high degree of nouniness” (152–53) in contrast to, in her example, *his selfes*, seems solid; “nouniness,” however, does call to mind such jocular locutions as “truthiness.” Syntactically, *agen* “occupies a fixed position in the phrase, namely a rigid post-determiner position: exceptions are invariably

due to Latin influence” (153–54); while, semantically, “[a]lready in the OE period, *agen* was not invariably used in the purely possessive sense,” as it could “determine the referential identification of its head NP ... more extensively in terms of relatedness, ‘appurtenance,’ or appropriateness and rightfulness” (157). And so, “[i]n the course of the OE period *agen* changed from an attributive adjective that re-asserted the possession relationship between the *possessor* and the *possessum* into a type of pre-modifier/determiner which re-established the identity of either the possessor or the possessum” (162). Vezzosi dates to eME the development by which *his own* “came to function as a means of evoking alternative values to the possessor,” while “in Modern English the primary meaning of *his own* has become definable as a contrastive identity function: it is an element which contrastively identifies the nominal it interacts with, and is similar in this respect to English intensifiers used as adjuncts” (162).

Manfred Voss contributes a streamlined edition of a noted (and notably fired damaged) glossary fragment with his “Zur Abschrift des alphabetischen Cleopatra-glossars in MS British Library Cotton Otho E.i,” in *Lan-gauge and Text*, ed. Johnston *et al.* [see sec. 2], 393–409. Anyone who has worked with Otho E.i (Ker, item 184) can appreciate the difficulties that obtain with so badly damaged and fragmentary a manuscript: some of the lines were positively miniaturized on the fire-shrunken vellum. Nonetheless, as what was ostensibly a later copy of the great glossaries in BL, Cotton Cleopatra A.iii (Ker, item 143), the Otho fragments have great interest for the transmission history of Latin-OE glossaries and OE lexicography. Voss's linguistic analysis is valuable (402–04), some of the glosses evidencing Kentish or at least SE features (and so the often underutilized but quite valuable *Beiträge zur Sprache und orthographie spätaltenglische Sprachdenkmäler der Übergangszeit (1000–1150)* of Willy Schlemilch [Halle: Niemeyer, 1913] comes in handy). The checking of Junius's copy of the OE material (now Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 77; cf Ker, 238–39) and the printing of 260 of the OE entries are also valuable. The relative brevity of the contribution is curious: more extended comments on the relations between Cleopatra A.iii and Otho E.i and any real commentary to the entries are missing. Very few receive notice; e.g., the ever baffling *laembis lieg* (glossing the ostensibly Greco-Latin *bofor*; Cleopatra glosses *lendislieg*): “Sowohl Lemma als auch Interpretament sind bislang nicht zufriedenstellend geklärt” (400 n. 22); and so it remains.

It is hard not to admire the chalcenic among us—the textual scholars, the taggers of corpora, the toilers on reference materials, and so forth. The fortitude required to undertake such projects and see them to completion is a rare virtue, to say nothing of the altruism of their works, whose rewards usually pale in comparison with the amount of labor needed to produce them. Thus does Alejandro Alcaraz Sintes make a “Proposal for a Dictionary of Syntactic and Semantic Complementation of OE Adjectives,” *Selected Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis*, ed. McConchie *et al.*, [see section 3a], 34–40. As expected, this is another corpus-based project, and it appears from the author’s description here that all of the heavy lifting has already been performed. Alcaraz Sintes’s dictionary is a complete collection of clauses with complemented adjective predicates and NPs with complemented adjective modifiers based on findings from the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus in Electronic Form*. The author rightly points out that all of the standard lexicographical resources in Old English generally fail to provide anything like comprehensive syntactic descriptions of their lemmata. Complete grammatical descriptions of lexemes was an impracticality, even if it had been the mission, of Bosworth and Toller and Hall, but the availability of electronic corpora, which make comprehensive grammatical description (of a kind) possible, renders old lexicographical methods antique, and, furthermore, this researcher’s project makes standard grammatical works like Bruce Mitchell’s *Old English Syntax* appear somewhat quaint. Alcaraz Sintes’ project is a preview of the sort of lexicography that should be standard practice in the very near future. The author presents an elaborate notational system for describing entries, including semantic class, synonyms, antonyms, positional/syntactic information, semantic roles, syntactic structure as predicate, type complement, type of referent, semantic role of each element of the structure, transformational relations, and examples. The author also notes how electronic publication of such a resource would provide several advantages over print, particularly in the use of sortables for all of the different kinds of information presented. Alcaraz Sintes’s project is complex because it is comprehensive, and the author has staked out a rather modest territory of Old English grammar and given it one of the most complete descriptions of any area of Old English grammar that can be found at this time.

Some works of scholarship defy one’s efforts to provide meaningful reviews of them. Such is the case with Juan Gabriel Vásquez González’s “Corpus Linguistics and the Rediscovery of A-S Heathenism,” in *Selected*

Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis, ed. McConchie *et al.*, 166–77. The author attempts to argue that the use of Old English *gedāl* expresses pre-Christian notions that life is a gift distributed by a pantheon of old gods and goddesses. The author states: “In what follows, I will show that the GEDĀL group is the ultimate expression of the return of man’s own life and spirit to the heathen gods in Anglo-Saxon England” (167). I am not sure that this is quite what follows, and, in any case, drawing connections to such exogenous matters is not usually the goal of corpus linguistics. (In fact, I would submit that the sum of what corpus linguistics has so far taught us about Old English is that the language is far more unstable and indeterminate than the reception history of the philological handbooks have stated). Since many of the *gedāl*-compounds are *hapax legomena* (*gāstgedāl*, *frīðgedāl*, etc.), the author insists that their interpretation hinges on understanding these terms as a group and that doing so reveals the heretofore undiscovered meaning of *gedāl* as ‘distribution’, which in turn reveals its original heathen meaning related to “the return of someone’s life to several pagan gods” (176). The trouble with statistics is that they still require interpretation, and so the basic problem with Vásquez González’s work, as I see it, is that the profound meaning he imputes to *gedāl*-compounds is out of all proportion to his relatively meager findings. In fact, it seems as if the author simply cloaks his hypothesis in the rhetoric of corpus linguistics in order to bolster its persuasiveness. In effect, the author gathers the nineteen poetic uses of *gedāl*-compounds, considers the contexts of the passages in which they occur, and then deduces their meanings as specifically referencing pre-Christian polytheistic ideas of the afterlife. It is a burden to accept that the evidence of nineteen poetic compounds in mostly religious verse convey the extent of meaning that this author insists upon.

In “On the Prehistory of Old English *oleccan* ‘To Flatter,’” (*Sprachwissenschaft* 31: 229–36), Alfred Bammesberger establishes that, given its initial accent (as seen in *Genesis* 1959 oð his ealdorgedal *oleccan* wile), this OE verb must be denominal, specifically from Proto-Germanic *ō-lukk-a-, and not as some have proposed, from *ō-lukja-.

Bammesberger applies his wealth of knowledge of Germanic historical linguistics to bring to light a new Old English word—new that is to the dictionaries. It has always been there in the Old English prose *Exodus*. In “The Old English Adjective *mēnig* ‘strong’” *N&Q* n.s. 53: 144–46, Bammesberger shows that in the beginning of the sixth chapter this word corresponds to

Latin *robusta*, so it cannot be a variant of *monig* 'many'. Instead, it reflects a Germanic **magn-īga* (with the same base as OE noun *mægen*, whose immediate reflex in early Old English would have been **megnig*). This in turn, by the same change that yields *sæde* 'said' from *sægde*, would give the attested form, which should now take its rightful place in the dictionaries.

The Corpus of the Dictionary of Old English should expunge 'cert æm ic hicge.' In "A Doubtful Old English Gloss in Bede's *Vita Sancti Cuthberti*," *N&Q* n.s. 53: 10, Carl T. Berkhout points out that *hicge* nowhere else means anything like Latin *certare* 'struggle, contend'; the gloss is in the left hand margin; and it is common for glossators to mark "I think" (*oponor* or *puto*) next to glosses of which they are unsure. For all these reasons, it is best to interpret the gloss as a variant of this latter practice, and to remove the apparent gloss from the corpus.

C. P. Biggam's "Old English Colour Lexemes Used of Textiles in Anglo-Saxon England" (in *The Power of Words*, ed. Caie *et al.* [see sec. 2], 1–21) goes through the various kinds of cloth and clothing to categorize how various Old English color terms, including *brunbasu*, *clap*, *godwebb*, *hæwen*, *seolc*, *wull* have been applied to said textiles. The most striking result is the importance of woad, which dyes fabrics a wide range of blues (*hæwen*), across a number of these categories. In medical texts, woad-blue wool's use is in many cases medically justified given the properties of the plant as "vulnerary and styptic [...] aiding in the healing of wounds and the staunching of blood" (6). Suddenly tales of warriors dyeing their bodies blue before entering battle start to make more sense.

Blue is the only basic color term in Modern English that is borrowed from French, not derived from Old English where the literate superordinate term for this color was *hæwen*. C.P. Biggam's "Political Upheaval and a Disturbance in the Colour Vocabulary of Early English" (in *Progress in Colour Studies; Volume I: Language and Culture*, ed. C. P. Biggam and C. J. Kay [Amsterdam: John Benjamins], 159–98), an engaging investigation of the history of this anomaly, finds that the Old French *bleu* and the closely related *bluet* were widely used for a category of woad-died woolens of various shades of blue, and this usage made it a natural candidate as the new superordinate term for this color. This finding offers a striking historical example and confirmation of the well known typological pattern found throughout the world and discussed in the famous work by Brent Berlin and Paul Kay, *Basic Color Terms: their Universality and Evolution* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1969): languages with a large number of basic color

terms generally are from cultures with a well developed dyeing technology.

Ewa Ciszek's "-*dōm* in Medieval English" (in *Medieval English and Its Heritage*, ed. Ritt *et al.* [see sec. 3b], 105–24) finds that this suffix became productive in late Old English and remained so into Middle English "as it seems to have coined as many as 20 new transparent derivatives and not only from Germanic stems but also from French and Scandinavian ones" such as *dukedom* and *wrongdom*. These patterns closely parallel what the author found for the suffix *-ship* in an earlier article, "The development of *-s(c)hip(e)* in Early Middle English" in *Naked Words in English*, ed. Marcin Krygier Liliana Sikorska (2005), 27–46.

How do we determine the history of Middle English words that have equally convincing origins in Old English, Old French, and/or Latin? Sorting out criteria for considering this and related problems (such as re-borrowing) is the task Bernhard Diensberg sets for himself in "Survival of Old English Lexical Units of Either Native or Latin Origin or Re-Borrowing from Anglo-French in Middle English" (in *Language and Text*, ed. Johnston *et al.* [see sec. 2], 41–56). The article handles the examples on a word-by-word basis, which leaves the reader wishing for more and clearer explanatory prose between the sections. The word *proud*, with its many problems, provides Diensberg the opportunity to go into a more extensive and detailed discussion of the scholarship (51–53). The Old English *prūt* presents various phonological problems, since "we have no immediate basis for [an] Early Old French **prut* which might have led to our OE form" (52). On the semantic side, the Early Middle English meanings, in the *Lambeth Homilies* and Layamon's *Brut*, are generally negative: 'haughty, arrogant'. The more positive meanings of this term, 'brave, bold, valiant' are probably "due to [later] Old French courtly culture ... and thus point back to a re-borrowing of Anglo-French *pru*, *prou* adj. 'profitable; worthy, bold'" (52). This (partly) reflects the general pattern seen through many of the examples given: Old English generally provides the form, but the semantics are often influenced or completely overtaken by the Old French meanings.

As much an investigation into the relative merits of three corpora for this kind of word study as a study of the root in question, Hans-Jürgen Diller's "The Decline of the Family of *mōd*: ICAMET and Other Corpora" (*Corpora and the History of English*, ed. Mair and Heuberger [see sec. 2], 51–77) makes valuable contributions in both areas. Searching the Dictionary of Old English Corpus, Diller finds, somewhat paradoxically, that the prose uses of the root *mōd* are at once morphologically

more creative (including forms such as *un-þole-mōdnes*, while poetry only shows simplex and simple compounds) and semantically more metaphorical (including forms such as *hefigmod* where the first element is not itself a term expressing emotion, while in poetic compounds the first element generally already expresses emotion: *bliðe-mod*, *forht-mod*, etc.). From the Middle English Dictionary online, Diller discovers that it is in Layamon's *Brut* alone that pleonastic poetic usages continue to be used in Middle English, a reminder of the uniquely traditional nature of this monumental work, and that eMED is ideally suited for this kind of study. His highest praise, though, is reserved for the Innsbruck Computer Archive of Machine-readable English Texts (ICAMET), the project of Manfred Markus to whom the volume is dedicated. The advantage of this corpus is that it can make fine-shaded distinctions in uses across genres. Here we find that in later ME, forms with *mod* are largely restricted to religious texts and contexts.

When two words merge into one or when one word splits into two, how does a dictionary like the *Oxford English Dictionary*, based as it is on historical principles, represent this messy process? This is the question Philip Durkin attempts to look into in "Lexical Splits and Mergers: Some Difficult Cases for the OED" (*The Power of Words*, ed. Caie *et al.* [see sec. 2], 57–66). An example of lexical split is represented by Present-Day English *mantle* 'loose sleeveless cloak' (from OE *mentel*, from Lat. *mantellum*), and PDE *mantel* 'ornamental structure of wood, marble, etc., about and around a fireplace' which appears in Middle English from the Anglo-Norman and Old French reflexes of the same Latin form. *OED* distinguishes these by their clearly divergent semantics, in spite of the overlapping spellings they show through much of their history. Completed mergers are of course treated under the one heading of the modern form, as in *mare* which gets its form from OE *meaerh* 'horse' but its meaning from *mīre* 'female horse' (and related forms). But in some cases the merger is not complete. The example given is MEAN ^a 'inferior in rank or quality; unpleasant' from OE *mæne* (variant of *gemæne*) 'possessed jointly, belonging equally to a number of persons' and MEAN ^a 'moderate, middling; average' from Latin *medianus* through Anglo-Norman. Here the lexicographer explicitly notes the problem and concedes that in many cases the one can not be readily distinguished from the other. This "most frustrating situation of all for the lexicographer ... is also perhaps the most interesting indicator of an area for further study by the specialist in historical semantics" (66).

Małgorzata Fabiszak and Anna Hebda's "Emotions of Control in Old English: Shame and Guilt," *Poetica* (Tokyo) 66: 1–35, investigates the difference in usage between the words for 'shame' and for 'guilt' in Old English (*scamu*, *gult*, and related words) and finds that in the earliest texts (up to 950), there is a complementary distribution between them, with words for 'shame' showing up in religious texts while words for 'guilt' show up almost exclusively in legal texts. Somewhat more surprising, during the next period, from 950 to 1050, while 'shame' words continue to be used exclusively in religious texts, the majority (18) of instances of 'guilt' words show up in religious rather than legal (5) texts. The most obvious conclusion is that religious language was already applying the legal terms for 'guilt' to the moral realm to express the commission and consequences of sin, but the authors focus here instead on putative metaphors involving 'guilt' as trade, dirt, and illness. Unfortunately, as the authors admit, this distribution may merely indicate the preponderance of religious texts from this period. "On the whole, shame seems to be strongly related to the failure to meet one's moral or other standards, while guilt, in one of its two senses, is linked to the violation of usually legal or social norms. In its second, religious sense, guilt, like shame, is related to moral shortcomings, but when the GUILT words are used, the emphasis is on the punishment that can be dealt for the sin. In the case of SHAME, there is moral torment, but no implication of a more concrete punishment" (28).

Andreas Fischer's "Of *fæderan* and *eamas*: Avuncularity in Old English" (in *The Power of Words*, ed. Caie *et al.* [see sec. 2], 67–77) investigates the usage of these terms for paternal and maternal uncle (respectively) and determines that, in spite of its special place in the society and distinctive lexical designation, *eam*, the term for mother's brother, does not occur significantly more frequently in our texts even when accounting for differences in genre. The one area where usage of this term seems particularly telling is in poetry: in the Finn episode in *Beowulf*, Hnæf and his nephew are united tragically on the funeral pyre (l. 1117); in line 880 of the same poem the avuncular relation of Fitela to Sigemund is emphasized, glossing over the incestuous background of the relationship; and likewise in Riddle 46 the term is used to disguise for the purpose of the riddle the incestuous relationship between Lot and his daughters. These examples from poetry bring out the special but negative—either tragic or unnatural—possibilities of this relationship.

Piotr Gąsiorowski's "The Etymology of Old English **docga*" (*Indogermanische Forschungen* 111: 275–84)

proposed that English word *dog*, usually considered of uncertain etymology, can actually be derived from the rare OE color term *dox*, related to Modern English *dusk*. The geminate and -n stem can be explained as a variety of hypocoristic whose elements can be seen widely in Indo-European, but together in OE otherwise only clearly in *frocga* next to *frox* (compare German *frosch*), and perhaps in *focga-* (an element seen in some place names) next to *fox*.

Marcin Grygiel's "On the Cyclicity of Meaning Alterations in English Historical Synonyms of MAN/MALE HUMAN BEING" (in *Selected Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis*, ed. McConchie *et al.*, 60–68) begins with the untenable assumption that "semantic change is a cognitively motivated process" (60). While cognition is obviously involved in semantic formations, excluding social, cultural, and historical factors leads to a perspective that is quite blinkered. The article includes some discussion of Old English words connected with males such as *ceorl*, *wer*, and *man*. Unfortunately for the author, the historical data presented on these and other items fail to support and often directly contradict the opening premise.

John Hines in "Gerefa §§15 and 17: A Grammatical Analysis of the Lists of Nouns" (*MA* 50: 268–70) reviews the vocabulary of lists of "items of equipment required on a properly supplied and run Late Anglo-Saxon estate" (268). One of many difficulties arises in feminine nouns where both -a and -e appear as endings on the same root: *syfa* and *hersyfe*, *hunigbinna* and *yrsebinne*. Hines concludes that the -a forms are accusative plurals, the -e forms singulars, though it is not clear why there should be such a fluctuation between nearly identical forms. Other words mentioned or discussed include *awel*, *cytel*, *hlædel*, *lorh/lorgas*, *sædlæp*, *sceaðele*, *wifte* (these last two being *hapax legomena*).

Carol Hough in "Colours of the Landscape: Old English Colour Terms in Place-Names" (in *Progress in Colour Studies, Volume I: Language and Culture*, ed. C.P. Biggam and C.J. Kay [Amsterdam: John Benjamins], 181–198) presents a collection of and a preliminary discussion about Old English place-names that include color terms. These are of potential interest because of their probable age, many likely going back to the earliest days of OE settlement. Nothing in the data or discussion, however, points to anything notable in this direction, either in phonology, morphology, or semantics. The least surprising finding is that "blue" is not used to describe landscapes, the apparent exception, Blofield in Norfolk, being explained by its association with woad dying. An oversight here and throughout is the possibility of influence from Old Norse (in this case

from *blár* "color of lead ... of the livid color caused by a blow" > ME *blo*). Overall, this is a valuable collection of items for future study in this field.

Göran Kjellmer's "Popular Etymology and Language Use: The Case of *beanfeast*" (*SN* 78: 59–62) explains this term—which rarely has any connection with actual beans but frequently indicates an annual dinner provided by an employer—as the result of a kind of orthographic folk etymology: originally from OE *bēn* 'prayer', a word that also had associations with activity involving obligation between landlord and tenant, the root was essentially stranded in this compound when all other uses were replaced by the French-derived *prayer*, and so it became seen as equivalent to the term for spheroid legumes, even though it should have retained a spelling **been*. While clearly superior to alternative etymologies, more clarity about proposed timing and examples of similar orthographic folk-etymologies would have further strengthened the case presented.

Ekkehard König and Letizia Vezzosi in "On the Historical Development of Attributive Intensifiers" (in *Language and Text*, ed. Johnston *et al.* [see sec. 2], 151–68) trace the evolution of what they consider an intensifier—the word *own* in phrases such as *his own house*—from Old English *agen*, the past participle or verbal adjective derived from *agan*. The normative sense of rightful ownership in the OE verb developed into the modern intensifier's tendency to convey contrastive focus and surprise in sentences such as "His own people betrayed him." Here the implied meaning is that those who rightfully owed their allegiance did not follow through on that obligation. The phrases with possessive pronoun followed by *own* first overlapped with and then replaced similar OE phrases with possessive pronoun followed by *sylfes* and related forms.

Zoltán Kövecses's "Embodiment, Experiential Focus, and Diachronic Change in Metaphor" (in *Selected Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis*, ed. McConchie *et al.*, 1–7) reviews work done on Old English terms for 'anger', especially by C. Gavaert ("Anger in Old and Middle English: A 'Hot' Topic?" *Belgian Essays on Language and Literature* (2001), 89–101), that shows changes across the OE period in the frequency of use of words for 'heat' in describing anger: words such as *hæte*, *hatheort*, *hathige*, *hygewælm*, *wilm*, *onælan*, *gehyrstan*, *onbærnan*, *ontendan* account for less than 2% of the words describing anger in texts before 850, but that percentage jumps to over 12% in the next period, 850–950, only to drop back again in subsequent periods. Much is made of this with respect to the (lack of) universality in metaphors for emotions even when their embodiment can be shown

to be universal (people everywhere get physically warmer when they get angry). The conclusion is that cultures and languages can focus on different aspects of an emotion's embodiment for their metaphors over time (in this case, heat, but also pressure, agitation, and one might add, swelling, a metaphor for anger of special importance throughout the OE period that is not explicitly mentioned in the analysis). While this conclusion is almost certainly true on its own merits, the unquestioning use of relatively minor changes in frequency statistics across periods when the numbers and types of texts available are so varied is a bit troubling.

After a typically eloquent and thorough review of the relevant literature, Anatoly Liberman in "Gothic *þrustfill*, Old English *þrustfell* 'Leprosy,' and the Names of Some Other Skin Diseases in Germanic" (in *Germanisches Altertum und christliches Mittelalter*, ed. Brogyanyi [see sec. 2], 197–211) agrees with a long-overlooked observation by Samuël Henshall (in *The Etymological Organic Reasoner*, 1807) that the words for 'leprosy' mentioned in the title are actually related to English *thrush* 'disease, especially of infants, marked by white specks in the mouth' as well as to English *thrust*. The latter connection is given support from the term for 'leprosy' in German, *Aussatz*, which developed from the practice of thrusting lepers out of the general community. From these terms, Liberman reconstructs PGmc. **thrusk-/thrust-* "applied to all kinds of rotten, slimy, porous, and perhaps foul-smelling surfaces" (205).

In "Old English *þreowa* and *styccem ælum*" *N&Q* n.s. 53: 22–23, Bengt Lingström suggests two corrections to Mary Clayton and Hugh Magennis's English translation of *The Old English Lives of St. Margaret* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 9, [Cambridge UP, 1994]). First, in the phrase *his tunge þreowe his sweore belygde*, the meaning is probably not 'three tongues,' but rather 'three times his tongue lay around his neck.' In the second instance, Lindström would deprive us of the wonderfully dramatic translation 'having burst all in pieces, the dragon vanished from the prison,' (for *eall sticmælum toðwan se draca ut of þan carcrene*) and replace it with the rather timid 'the dragon retreated very slowly out of the prison' since *styccem ælum* is an adverb meaning 'little by little, piecemeal.'

Javier Martín Arista and María Victoria Martín de la Rosa "Old English Semantic Primes: Substantives, Determiners, and Quantifiers" (*Atlantis* 28.2: 9–28) attempts to apply the theory, still under development, of Semantic Primes to Old English. Predictably, this project throws no light on Old English and little light on the theory. It does, however, display a good deal of naïveté on the part of the authors specifically in the

area of semantics that they are trying to elucidate. To keep to just one example—noting that Modern English phrases that take the form "the one ... the other" can be translations for OE phrases "oðer ... oðer ..." the authors conclude that OE *oðer* must include both the semantic primes for ONE and for OTHER (21). This is a very Modern English-centered approach for a theory that proclaims that it is breaking away from such parochialism (26).

In Middle English, one meaning of the verb *doubt* is 'to fear' while a meaning of the noun *dread* is 'doubt'. The goal of Michiko Ogura's "ME *douten* and *dreden*" (in *The Power of Words*, ed. Caie *et al.* [see sec. 2], 117–130) is to investigate this "semantic and syntactic overlapping" of the native *dread* and the loan *doubt* "together with their prefixed cognates and the synonyms and Old English counterparts" including *ondrædan*, *forhtigan*, and *(ge)tweo(ga)n* (117). The first two of these OE words are used interchangeably to translate Latin *timere* in the Gospels, while the latter shows up regularly in *Boethius*, in Gregory's *Dialogues* and in some homilies, especially in negative constructions. Since in Middle English the borrowed verb *douten* and the inherited *dreden* shared certain syntactic constructions (both take "that" clauses) and occasional semantic contexts ("When one's knowledge is limited, one may doubt and then fear" 126), the verbs tended to converge to such an extent that they show up as manuscript variants of each other.

Hans Peters's "The Old English Verbal Suffix *-ettan*" (in *Language and Text*, ed. Johnston *et al.* [see sec. 2], 241–254) explores the mechanisms involved in the near-total loss of this suffix (*grunt* being the only surviving continuation of this category). While the predominant meaning of this suffix was iterative, it had a number of other functions, and for a number of verbs it was redundant—the verb had the same meaning with or without it (*grimman* and *grimmettan* both mean 'rage, roar'). This functional multiplicity and semantic redundancy, along with phonological factors, contributed to its gradual loss from the language, a development that also followed the general movement of English away from inflectional and toward analytic patterns.

The Present-Day English adjective *smart* can mean 'intelligent, clever' 'well-dressed' or 'painful'. Hans Peters seeks to explore the historical sources of this surprising level of polysemy and to frame the current situation in current semantic theory in "Getting *smart*" (in *Corpora and the History of English*, ed. Mair and Heuberger [see sec. 2], 279–92). 'Painful,' the most peripheral modern meaning of this word, is the prototypical meaning of Old English *smeart*. The first inklings of the

metaphorical development that would lead to the less negative common modern meanings shows up about 1300—MED (1c) ‘of speech: harsh, injurious, unpleasant; also, **pithy, pregnant**’ (my emphases, here and throughout). Further developments in the directions of ‘intense,’ ‘swift of movement,’ and ‘clever’ include ‘of a battle, fierce’ (Layamon’s *Brut*), ‘of love, ardent’ (from about 1300), ‘quick, fast, rapid; also alert, responsive; also, glib; also, **impudent**’ (from about 1450). This last sense continues to today, but is cited by OED as obsolete or rare “except in the construction with *to be* or in *get smart*, both of which are indentified as ‘U.S.’” (280). The full modern meanings of ‘clever’ and ‘well-dressed,’ while first attested in the 17th century, the fashion sense was not common till the late 19th century, when its sudden wide-spread use “was the subject of much comment and criticism in newspapers, etc., from about 1885, and the phrases *smart people*, *smart society*, *the smart set*, etc., have been commonly used as a general designation for the extremely fashionable portion of society (sometimes with implication of being a little ‘fast’)” (281). One of Peters’s main points in the more theoretical section is that semantic change always proceeds through a stage of polysemy. In this case, the polysemy remains, though the center of prototypical meaning shifted significantly.

Rejecting earlier attempts at deriving the forms in question from ON **feysa*, from PGmc **fausjan* (whence the ON form), or from PGmc **funsjan* (cf. OE *fūs*), S.M. Pons-Sanz in “OE *fēs(i)an* / ME *fēsen* Revisited” (*Neophilologus* 90: 119–34) concludes that the Middle English form *fēsen* must have a root vowel /ε:/ but the Old English *fēs(i)an* ‘put to flight / drive away (someone/something)’ must have the root vowel /e:/ or /y:/, neither of which yields the ME vowel. The paradox is (perhaps too) ingeniously resolved by the proposal that ME shortening affected the root vowels in the forms where two consonants followed and this form was generalized; then the ME short vowel, now /ε/, underwent ME lengthening to /ε:/ generalizing this time from the forms where the vowel was in an open syllable.

Given the actual manuscript reading *scearp sæ stan* (versus *scearpest stan* in the editions), and given the medieval definitions of Latin *cautes* and *murices* the words for which the OE phrase is a gloss in the Antwerp-London glossaries, David Porter in “An Unrecorded Old English Compound,” *ANQ* 19.2 (Spring 2005): 3–4, suggests that the compound *sæstanas* ‘shoreline rocks that are nautical obstacles or hazards’ should be added to the *Dictionary of Old English*.

Jane Roberts’s “Some Thoughts on the Expression of ‘Crippled’ in Old English” (in *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed.

Swan [see sec. 2], 365–78) suggests that avoidance of such terms may not be a purely modern phenomenon: “Could it be that *creopere*, *crypel*, and *eorðcrypel* were a little blunt even to the Anglo-Saxon ear? That might explain the surprising infrequency of these words in Old English” (372). As to other terms: “in the Old English period *lam-* forms commanded a wider field of meaning [including more severe forms of affliction] than did *healt*, and I should like to argue that *healt* was the central adjective for impaired movement” (371–2). OE *hinca*, use by *Andreas* of the devil, may be another term for crippled movement, as it may be related to the first element of *hunch-back*.

Jane Roberts’s “What Did Anglo-Saxon Seals Seal When?” (in *The Power of Words*, ed. Caie *et al.* [see sec. 2], 131–57) looks in detail through the various, confusing, ambiguous and seemingly contradictory uses of Old English *insegel* ‘seal’. It can mean the ring or other item used to impress the wax, the wax so impressed, the document thus sealed, and the legitimacy or finality thus conferred. This last range is partially captured by the modern expressions ‘seal of approval’ and ‘seal one’s fate’. Oddly, from our modern perspective, in one text, the OE Gospel of Nicodemus, *insegel* seems to seal the lock, key, and door to the prison cell of Joseph of Arimathea, and in other texts wounds are said to be sealed. The main developments in the semantics of both *insegel* and *seal* is from the functions of authentication to meanings such as ‘symbol, token’, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, from the physical bond formed by the wax to the quite recent (19th century) originally technical definition ‘Any means of preventing the passage of gas or liquid into or out of something, esp. at a place where two surfaces meet’ (152).

William Sayers in “*Crank* and *careen*” (*N&Q* n.s. 53: 306–08) points out that, although it has a number of possible Germanic origins (all related to the OE *cringan* ‘to yield, give way’), *crank* in the nautical meaning of ‘liable to lean over or capsize’ is likely from Dutch *krengd* ‘pushed over’. *Careen*, though ultimately from the quite separate Latin *carina* ‘keel’, has essentially the same nautical meaning, and these two terms probably mutually influenced each other based on their semantic and phonological similarities.

Based on Rosemarie Luhr’s “reformulation of Kluge’s Law—that a sequence of Proto-Germanic obstruent ... followed by **n* regularly became a Proto-Germanic voiceless geminate” (357) as well as semantic and morphological insights and analyses, Peter Schrijver’s “The Etymology of English *weapon*, German *Waffe* and the Indo-European Root **Hwep-*” (in *Etymologie, Entlehnungen und Entwicklungen*, ed. Hyvärinen *et al.* [see

sec. 2], 355–66) concludes that Old English *wæpn* (> *weapon*) and *wifel* (> *weevil*) are related to each other and to a family of Indo-European cognates that (beyond the well-known Germanic relatives of these two words) include Latin *vepris* ‘thorn bush’, Tocharian B *yepē* ‘cutting weapon’, and perhaps Irish *femen* ‘twig’. As the “perhaps” here implies, the proposed Celtic cognates are the most tenuous and least convincing. These all go back to an IE root **Hwep-* ‘mow, shave, cut; strew, scatter’ with various affixes (*-on-*, *-ilo-*, *-ri-*, *-o-*, *-men-*), a root also seen in Vedic *vap-* (with the same range of meanings) and probably Hittite *huwapp-* ‘to harrow, harass, scatter’. Given the prominence of the weevil’s long, chitinous proboscis (a ‘cutting’ pointed object), a Germanic **webila-* from this root is certainly a preferable etymology for *weevil* over the traditional ones (connecting it to **webh-* ‘weave’, which weevils don’t do), and should remind us that pre-industrial peoples were generally much more careful observers of nature than the average modern urbanite.

Kenneth Shields’s “Gothic *þius*—Once Again” (*Indogermanischen Forschungen* 111: 285–91) rejects the traditional etymology of this word for “boy, servant” on formal and semantic grounds for an origin in PIE **tek-* ‘give birth’, which indeed has many derivatives in various languages meaning ‘child’ and would connect this Gothic word to OE *þegn*. This semantically attractive etymology does not have any advantages over alternatives as far as its formal development goes, and Shields must call upon irregular or “non-proportional” analogy to explain the apparent loss of the root-final consonant.

In “God’s Mercy and Kindly Thought’: The Meaning of Old English *myne*, Spelt *mine* in the Will of Wulfwaru” (*N&Q* n.s. 53: 287–89), E.G. Stanley convincingly argues that the phrase “Goddess milze and mine” in Wulfwaru’s will cannot mean “God’s mercy and mine” as it has been translated, but must mean “God’s mercy and love” (287). Evidence of some variation in use of <y> and <i> elsewhere in the manuscript provides “feeble orthographic support for the suggestion” considering that the expected form would be *myne* (289).

Ann-Marie Svensson and Jürgen Hering in “On the Ambiguity of Germanic *burg*” (*Interdisciplinary Jnl for Germanic Linguistics and Semiotic Analysis* 11: 35–45) investigate the loss over time of *burg* in English and German as the usual term for small settlements, and their replacement with *town* and *Stadt*. Given the wide range of meanings for this and similar words in these languages—ranging from ‘security’ to ‘animal dwelling’ to ‘hill’—the authors conclude “the polysemy of *burg* may have had a negative effect on the use of the word” (42).

Louise Sylvester in “Forces of Change: Are Social and Moral Attitudes Legible in This *Historical Thesaurus* Classification?” (in *The Power of Words*, ed. Caie et al. [see sec. 2], 185–208) points out that the Glasgow *Historical Thesaurus of English*, as a product of its time, inevitably imposes its own structure on the semantic space of its sources, the earlier stages of English. To illustrate this, she looks at the treatment of the ideas of willingness and unwillingness (or consent and coercion), especially in relation to sexual relations (including such words as Old English *ungeorne*, *unwillum*, *forsacan*, *friclo*, *willa*, *lufu*. Nevertheless, the conclusion, with various caveats, seems to be that “Lexicographical projects such as *HTE* may be mined for the information they offer about the lexicalization of concepts in language” (203).

Akinobu Tani’s “*Thesaurus of Old English* for Early Middle English: An Analysis in Light of Word Pairs in the ‘Katherine Group’ Lives” (in *Corpora and the History of English*, ed. Mair and Heuberger [see sec. 2], 293–303) examines the usefulness of the *Thesaurus* for analyzing word pairs in the Middle English Katherine Group and concludes that, because of the high level of OE vocabulary in these ME texts, the *Thesaurus* is a useful though limited tool for such an analysis.

Olga Timofeeva’s “*Word be worde—andgit of andgite*: A Study of the Medieval Rhetorical Formula” (in *Selected Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis*, ed. R.W. McConchie, Olga Timofeeva, Heli Tissari, and Tanja Säily [Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project], 135–42) studies the phrase *word be worde*, *andgit of andgite* and its Latin counterpart *nec verbum ex verbum, sed sensum ex sensu* (and their variations). These are found so commonly in prefaces that, rather than any kind of reliable guides to an actual method or theory of translation employed in a particular text, it can be assumed that they are rhetorical formulas that served, as did other such formulas, to establish the validity of the whole composition; “just a superficial aspect of much more complex processes of conceptual borrowing” (141).

Johan van der Auwera and Martine Taeymans’s “More on the Ancestors of *need*” (in *Corpus-Based Studies of Diachronic English*, ed. Roberta Facchinetti and Matti Rissanen, Linguistic Insights 31 [Bern: Peter Lang], 37–52) examines the origins of the impersonal use of OE *neodan* ‘it is necessary’, but remains uncommitted either to a nominal origin or a development of this semantics from *neodan* ‘compel’. The general findings are summed up: “modern *need* replaced a negatively polar *þurfan* and a set of polarity neutral nominal constructions. Modern *need* inherits features of both,

though. The auxiliary *need* is a polarity negative *need* and the full verb is polarity neutral" (50).

Manfred Voss in "Zur Abschrift des alphabetischen Cleopaträglossars in MS British Library Cotton Otho E.i" (in *Language and Text*, ed. Johnston *et al.* [see sec. 2], 393–409) presents for the first time the Latin-Old English bilingual Cleopatra glossary material as preserved in the fire-damaged Otho E.i manuscript. The range of variation between the OE forms in Otho and those in the earlier manuscript indicate that West Saxon dialect continued to exert a strong influence at the scriptorium at St. Augustine's at the turn of the millennium.

Debra Ziegler's "Omnitemporal *will*" (*Language Sciences* 28: 76–119), in spite of the title, seeks to establish an account of the development of *will* as a future tense marker from its lexical meanings 'want, desire' that is well grounded both theoretically and from the texts. (Relatively little of import is said about the gnomic or omnitemporal use of *will*.) The Old English passages most often cited as showing a point of ambiguity between these two meanings are *Beowulf* 442–4: *Wen' ic þæt he wille, gif he wealdon most, in þæm guðsele Geotena leode etan unforht*, "I believe that he **will**, if he should prevail, devour the people of the Geats without fear in their war-hall"; and 1180–85: *Ic mine can glædne Hroþulf, þæt he þa geogode wile arum healdan, gyf þu ær þonne he, wine Scildinga, worold oflættest; wene ic þæt he mid gode gyldan wille uncran eaferan, gif he þæt eal gemon*, "I know, my festive Hrothulf, that he **will** piously maintain the youthful if you earlier than he, oh friend of the Scyldings, leave the world; I expect that he **will** repay our offspring, if he remembers all that." But Ziegler rejects a possible reading where each *will* could be interpreted as desire or intention ('...that he **intended to...**'), but rather reads these passages as intermediate between simple future and probability ('...that he **is likely to...**'). How she can be so sure of such readings is unclear to this reviewer. The claim here is that the meaning evolved through the following stages: VOLITIONS > PROCLIVITY > PROBABILITY > PREDICTION. She claims further: "At each stage illustrated, the degree of knowledge that a hearer or addressee can attribute to the speaker becomes less" (112). It is not clear, however, that a statement of prediction ('this will happen') involves less certainty on the part of the speaker than a statement of probability ('this could happen'); indeed, the opposite would seem to be the case. But this latest claim seems to be intended more to serve her larger theoretical apparatus (which would take us too far afield here to fully describe), and the interesting proposal of the above stages of development can stand without

it, though, as Ziegler readily admits, more research is needed here.

JUH

Three articles on lexical items appear in the festschrift for Bruce Mitchell, *Inside Old English*, ed. Walmesley [see sec. 2], each of which, in following the editorial design of the volume, directs its comments at a level that allows beginners to follow the topic, but they still make contributions that established scholars will value. Risto Hiltunen, in "*Eala, geferan and gode wyrhtan*": On Interjections in Old English," 91–116, takes up the familiar but little-studied topic of interjections. After a survey of scholarship concerning OE interjections and current trends in modern language, the study turns its attention to OE data collected from the Helsinki Corpus, which is an especially invaluable source because of the largely oral (and thus ephemeral) nature of interjections. Not surprisingly, most OE examples come from reported speech. The survey considers *eala*, *la*, *hwæt*, *efne*, and *wa*, and concludes "[t]hey are essentially emotive words capable of expressing a variety of moods and sentiments" which serve a variety of discursive functions (110). In the same volume, Matti Rissanen investigates "Latin Influence on an Old English Idiom: 'To Wit'" (222–41), and in doing so demonstrates the value of corpus-based language study in this and other applications. After surveying the various electronic corpora available, he turns his attention to the specific construction identified in the title, which curiously has all but disappeared in Modern English as a verb. It survives only in the phrase, "to wit," the verb having been displaced almost entirely by "to know." The scope of his investigation extends into Middle English, which is when the verb *wit(e)* gradually disappears. The earlier constructions of "to wit" show two functional uses, "*it is to wit* being used as the discourse marker and *that is to wit* as the appositive connective" (236). Also in the same volume Fred C. Robinson takes up "Germanic **uargaz* (OE *wearh*) and the Finnish Evidence" in a short but lively article (242–47). Attested in various Germanic languages, cognates of **uargas* can mean either 'wolf' or 'outlaw, criminal, thief', yet from the written record it is not clear which meaning is primary. Even though lexicographers seem to favor 'wolf', the evidence from written Germanic sources is inconclusive, so Robinson turns to Finnish, which borrowed an early reflex of the word, just as it borrowed other Germanic words over its history. That borrowing now appears as Finnish *varas* (gen. *varkaan*), and it means 'thief', which thus provides compelling evidence of the primary meaning of the early word. Robinson goes on

to demonstrate how some passages from OE and other Germanic languages yield a less contorted interpretation if we restore the primary meaning ‘thief’. He takes the lesson further: “In a broader view, the Finnish solution to the philological puzzle of **uargas* should alert us to the potential for further philological enlightenment from the remarkable museum of Germanic fossils that the Finnish language offers us” (246).

Joseph P. McGowan offers an intriguing exposition of a peculiar kind of glossing, which he characterizes in the title of his “Elliptical Glossing and Elliptical Compounds in Old English” (*Beatus Vir*, ed. Doane and Wolf [see sec. 2], 359–81). In the glosses under investigation, the scribes would use a kind of short-hand when writing out more than one gloss that made use of a common element, in a way analogous to our writing “tenth- or eleventh-century text,” where “century” is used only once. Thus, for example, the Latin *in gymnasio* is glossed on one occasion as *on leornincg t larhuse*, where the reader is to understand the expanded form of the first element as *leornincg-huse*. Expanding on Herber Dean Meritt’s 1938 study, McGowan gives a taxonomy of such constructions, using categories having to do with the completeness of the uncompounded gloss and whether the possible compound is documented elsewhere. One of the direct benefits of the study is to make available more compounds for inclusion in the *Dictionary of Old English*, allowing of course for the sometimes tenuous nature of the written evidence: some of the compounds created by such expansion are *hapax legomena*. What remains clear from McGowan’s valuable and concise study is that such elliptical compounds may help “recover (or uncover) OE words once plain to the scribes, but now obscured by their methods of abbreviation” (377).

DD

3b. Syntax, Phonology, Other Aspects

Phonology

Mark Atherton’s contribution to the pedagogy of the Old English language, *Old English* (London: Hodder Education: McGraw Hill), comes in the form of a self-teaching text intended for those not studying the language in a formal college or university course setting. But the book follows a now-familiar strategy of classroom grammars of Old English that, first, seek to minimize the presentation of the grammar and, second, attempt to disguise its presence in the book by burying it deep within readings and cultural and historical matters that are far less likely to offend the sensibilities

of the vast majority who view the very term “grammar” as one of opprobrium. Perhaps surprisingly, Atherton’s book seems to accomplish more with this strategy than some recent classroom grammars, and this may be due to the fact that the pace of self-taught study of Old English, compared to that of an academic term, allows for the extreme linguistic gradualism which recent textbooks favor. Still, it is hard to imagine that even the most assiduous self-teachers would come away from this book with the reading knowledge of Old English that is its stated aim. Though there is much to admire in the breadth of topics that Atherton introduces, one has little or no sense of a logical trajectory of introduction of the formal grammar of Old English (indeed, as is often the case with these kinds of textbooks, one often has little or no sense that the formal grammar of Old English is of much importance at all)—the presentation of the grammatical contents is so strewn about the book that it would be difficult for the self-taught to stitch them together as a coherent whole. Each unit presents texts, grammar, and vocabulary, but these lessons are often obscured by the clutter that crowds Atherton’s presentation of cultural contexts, connections to Modern English, and practice exercises, which often do not relate to the grammatical content of the unit in which they appear. Despite the lack of coherence, the historical, cultural, and textual information, among other kinds, that the author provides to newcomers to Old English is, indeed, interesting and useful, and it is more likely to sustain the interest of those who are not studying the language under the lash of an instructor.

Alfred Bammesberger makes another short but useful contribution with “Altenglisch *æt heāfdum* und der elliptische Dual,” *Novalis Indogermanica: Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. Matthias Fritz and Susanne Zeilfelder (Graz: Leykam), 25–34. Bammesberger begins with the curious locution found in *The Dream of the Rood* 63b, “gestodon him *æt his lices heafdum*” ‘they positioned themselves at his body’s head’, where the dative plural form *heāfdum* seems to require a singular meaning (e.g., in *The Cambridge Old English Reader*, Richard Marsden’s note on the line (198) says that “*hēāfdum* is pl. but with sg. meaning (known as a ‘locative’ dat.),” and Campbell’s *Old English Grammar* (§574.4) says that “a locative dat. sg. *hēāfdum* is frequent”). But Bammesberger suggests that the construction *æt ... heāfdum* is neither frequent nor locative. The construction occurs only six times in Old English, and Bammesberger argues that it is a reflex of an Indo-European “elliptical dual,” a topic that he has written on before (see “-um (> -on) as Marker of the Instrumental

Singular in Old English and Old Frisian," *Neophilologus* 85 [2001]: 287–90). There is evidence for the use of the elliptical dual in several Indo-European languages, as Bammesberger explains, a construction for a grammatical category that expresses the association of one thing and the group to which it belongs. The author suggests that *æt ... heāfdum* is a traditional expression in the plural because of the associativity of body parts (29), and he furthermore points out that Old English records several "group" plurals where singular meaning must be required (e.g., *Beowulf* 2353b, "Grendeles mægum") as evidence for the viability in the language of a rather rare Indo-European semantic structure.

Janet Bately's short essay, "The Place Which Is Called 'at X': A New Look at Old Evidence," *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed. Swan [see sec. 2], 343–63, examines all of the instances of the use of this naming formula with what scholarship has usually identified as a pleonastic preposition (e.g., "on þære stowe þe is cweden æt Wiremuðan"). Bately notes that some earlier scholars declared that this preposition sometimes became prefixed to the place-name and that the practice was very common, but she identifies and lists each instance of the formula with a preposition preceding the place-name and finds that there are only a handful of examples (making the construction far less than common); that *in* and *on* are used in addition to *æt*; that sometimes no preposition is used; that the formula occurs almost exclusively with place-names in England; and that the formula seems to be a literary convention of demonstrable artificiality. Where foreign place-names are used instead of Anglo-Saxon ones, Bately shows that most "are instances of an OE naming-formula with OE *æt* in works that have Latin texts with an *ad*-construction as their source, notably the Old English Bede" (358). Bately's study supersedes earlier commentary on the naming construction by Charles Plummer and Bruce Mitchell, and Bately suggests that the "use or non-use" of the construction was "a matter of individual choice and register" and that, therefore, "arguments for a pleonastic or prefixed *æt* based on the forms taken by modern place-names such as Barrow, Cottam or Sale are easily dismissed" (357). In short, Bately corrects the scholarly record on a minor matter in place-name constructions in works as varied as the Old English Bede, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and the charter materials.

Schreibung und Lautung im mittelalterlichen Englisch: Entwicklung und Funktion des englischen Schreibungen ch, gh, sh, th, wh und ihrer kontinentalen Entsprechungen, *Anglistische Forschungen* 364 (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter), by Klaus Dietz, is a thorough examination of the use of <h> as a diacritic by scribes

writing Old and Middle English to mark the fricative combinations <wh, sh, th> and the affricate combination <ch>. The standard explanation holds that the emergence of <h> as a diacritic in English traces its origin to French scribal practices, but Dietz demonstrates that diacritical <h> is found in Old English and that the eventual enlargement and standardization of its use probably derives from the pronunciation of medieval Latin, in which *h* was functionless and therefore particularly useful for representing vernacular consonants. Dietz's study begins with the observation of the spelling and pronunciation of place names and their unexpected developments, such as the pronunciation of *Cirencester*, which point to medieval spelling pronunciations modeled on Latin. He points out that while the combination <ch> for /x/ and /k/ had been in use since the 10th century, its use for /ç/ does not occur before the third quarter of the eleventh century. Later, <k> is limited to /k/ before front vowels and <c> for /k/ before back vowels, and only later still, then, does <c> form an alternative spelling for /s/ on the basis of French orthography. Thus, earlier <ch> spellings for /k/ are against an Anglo-Latin background, while later French usages reinforce the dissemination of <ch>-spellings. In the mid-14th century, however, <ch> for /ç/ and /x/ reappears in the north strictly on the model of French spelling. The combination <th> similarly derives from Anglo-Latin and is of northern provenance but eventually is promoted through the Chancery Standard in which <th> is used exclusively. <3h ~ h3>-spellings can be found in 10th-century Old English. In the early Middle English period, the digraphs are in diatopic competition with <3>- and <h>-spellings, but Dietz shows that <gh>-spellings were in use in London in the mid-thirteenth century. <wh>-spellings may also be shown to have existed in Old English, although it was not until the fourteenth century when, again, London-area scribes conventionalize <wh>, although <hw> continues for some time, especially in the south. Spellings with <sh>, <ng>, <qu(h)>, and <yh~3h> are mostly Middle English innovations.

The author skillfully untangles many strands of early English orthography to reveal that the history of spelling is a much deeper well than usually has been thought until some recent forms of historical linguistics have come to insist upon the primacy of texts over speech. But what makes Dietz's book rather different from the corpus-centric studies so fashionable at the moment is that in addition to meticulously cataloging spelling variations the author does not piously proclaim his data admit no possibility of actually conveying facts about the English language as well. To the contrary, the book

reaffirms the view that diachronic and diatopic spelling variations often make the most sense when we do not ignore the possibility that phonological phenomena contribute to the choices made by medieval scribes. At the same time, however, Dietz is not hell-bent on establishing phonological explanations for every variant, a predilection among some earlier historical phonologists that led to the current backlash against reading phonology into the manuscripts—one of the most valuable contributions of his study is the linkage of English scribal conventions to continental scribal conventions, a veritable blank slate in our understanding of the history of the English language. In all, the book is a very balanced analysis of the uses of *h* in early English writing and brings to bear a richly elaborated set of linguistic and non-linguistic contexts on a series of questions that moves the current discussion of English historical phonology forward while suggesting that the relationship between graphemics and phonemics is not as hopeless as some insist.

Mechthild Gretsch's "A Key to Ælfric's Standard Old English," *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed. Swan [see sec. 2], 161–77 offers a preview to a meticulous forthcoming study on the language of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*. Gretsch's work is based on Peter Clemoes and Malcolm Godden's collation of all of the manuscripts of the *Homilies*, which should reveal, Gretsch proposes, something of the way in which Ælfric revised and corrected his work. Thus, the larger aim of this study is to illuminate some of the specific linguistic characteristics of so-called "Standard" Old English, while most sources simply insist on the uniformity of late Old English without describing how it is uniform. The author analyzes Ælfric's inflectional morphology using a complete inventory of variant readings from the handwritten notes of Clemoes and Godden, since their edition contains no comprehensive overview of inflectional morphology (or of the vowels of stressed syllables) nor does its *apparatus criticus* normally record these variants. Gretsch's work here suggests that a vast *terra incognita* exists in the geography of our knowledge of the most prolific (and most abundantly preserved) writer of Old English. Variant spellings in Old English are overwhelmingly the domain of stressed vowels and inflectional syllables, so it makes sense that any discussion of a standard during the period must focus on uniform patterns of spelling for these segments. Gretsch's essay is a prolegomenon to a vast amount of work that still needs to be done, work that cannot be accomplished with the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus in Electronic Form* since Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* there are based on Clemoes and Godden's edition. In Old English studies, we do not enjoy

the luxury of very many texts preserved in multiple manuscript copies, so it is a curiosity that scholarship has not paid more attention to this aspect of the Ælfrician corpus. Gretsch works her way through the inflectional morphology of nouns, adjectives, pronouns, and verbs of *Catholic Homily* I.23 *Dominica secunda post pentecosten* in ten late tenth- to twelfth-century manuscript versions as a case study to demonstrate the viability of several open questions regarding the status of "Standard Old English," of which Ælfric is presumed to have been the most strident practitioner. In brief, Gretsch finds that the inflections of nouns and adjectives have very few variants (although patterns of variation with the suffixes *-ung*, *-ðu/-ð/-t* [from Germanic **-iþo*], and *-nys* in the feminine *ō*-declension suggest that there was some inflectional instability here), that pronouns show some attempt at standardization with the replacement of *i* with *y* (as in *hyne* for *hine*), and that verb inflections remain remarkably stable. What Gretsch's preliminary study shows is that "in some cases Ælfric indeed seems to have admitted a moderate number of spelling variants (for example with some forms of personal pronouns), and that in some other cases he seems to have developed his eventually fairly stable spelling only after a period of hesitation and experimentation" (171). Variation across different texts is a matter rather separate from variation within multiple manuscript copies of a single text, and Gretsch's work stands out as one of the few contributions to Old English studies that explores this small domain of our limited corpus.

Terry Hoad's "Preliminaries: Before English," *The Oxford History of English*, ed. Lynda Mugglestone (Oxford: Oxford UP), 7–31 is a brisk tour of the Indo-European and Germanic origins of the language mainly for neophytes in the realm of historical linguistics. The chapter contains all of the fundamental information that students new to the study of the history of the English language need, and, though the chapter is well written, there is nothing particularly innovative in how the author presents this information—neither the audience nor the subject matter leaves much room for open-field running. But the volume's general emphasis on language change and variation in English, particularly with respect to population migration, feature prominently in Hoad's chapter. The chapter includes sections on "Languages on the Move," "Looking Back: Indo-European Origins," "The Less Distant Past: Germanic Precursors," and "Entering the Historical Period: The Division of Proto-Germanic." Noticeably absent from Hoad's contribution, as is true for the complete volume, is the usual appearance of a brief primer on

language and linguistics so that students new to the historical study of language can quickly acquire the basic terminology and methodology deployed in the linguistic history of the English language. This is not an oversight. The editor and contributors have chosen to slant the volume toward external aspects of the history of the English language. Most textbooks on the subject have treated internal types of change as primary, but the recent emphasis in historical linguistics has favored a view of language change that elevates the importance of the social and cultural factors that actuate change. Two reasons seem to have contributed the most to the earlier point of view: first, historical linguistics remained far more concerned with structural aspects of language change long after general linguistics moved on to other matters; second, and more importantly, structural aspects provide us with a self-verifiability of technique since analysis of this kind is tied to the logic of written records, comparative methodologies, parameters of language, and linguistic reconstruction that hypotheses based on mostly-irrevocable social and cultural conditions cannot duplicate. It does not appear that our ability to discover the social and cultural past has improved very much; only our willingness to stake arguments about language change on the countless imponderables of social and cultural history has enlarged. This boldness derives from the fact that language is a socially embedded phenomenon, as demonstrated by mountain ranges of sociolinguistic research, and any asocial theory of language change is surely inadequate. Still, Hoad manages to incorporate a basic structural overview of why the Indo-European hypothesis is beyond plausible questioning and how the Germanic languages mark a clearly distinct sub-group of Indo-European without explicitly defining grammatical categories or discussing forms of analysis. The author achieves this mostly through the artful avoidance of linguistic terminology, which tends to bog down students' early going in the study of the history of the English language.

The sudden death of Richard M. Hogg in September 2007 deprived the community of English language researchers of one of its brightest lights and one of its most delightful characters. The humanity with which he comported himself in the company of colleagues was mirrored by the joy that he took in the study of language. It must have been with no small measure of personal amusement that the jaunty Scotsman made himself one of the world's foremost authorities on the history of the English language—Doctor Johnson, to Hogg's eternal pleasure, would have been appalled. Hogg's chapter on "English in Britain" in *A History of the English Language*, ed. Richard Hogg and David

Denison (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), 352–82, is a cheerful romp through 1,500 years of linguistic history in an island nation whose septentrional inhabitants' speech has been viewed, historically, with something less than charity by those in more meridional parts. Hogg follows a traditional chronology, with short sections on Old English, Middle English, Early Modern English, and Modern English, but he manages to pack a tremendous amount of learning into this thirty-one-page introduction to the history of the language. Students will find the chapter particularly useful (and it may therefore serve as a freestanding reading assignment in courses in which instructors want their students to know something about the history of the English language without having to devote a lot of time to it), but even scholars of English will find their time in reading the chapter rewarded with the author's ability to paint a larger picture of the English language that is all too often out of focus for those whose attention is usually drawn to the minute. Students in the United States are often surprised to learn that linguistic variation in British English is much more extensive than that found in American English, and Hogg's chapter is essentially a history of dialects in British English (and he leaves unfinished a long-in-the-works history of English dialects, as well as the second volume of his *Old English grammar*), which illustrates the ways that a difference of thirteen-hundred years' additional history manifests in English speakers across Britain. The larger picture that emerges from Hogg's focus on dialects is the continuity of English from the mid-fifth century to today because of, not in spite of, its diversification through time.

It is remarkable to note how little one will learn about Old English dialects by reading about Old English dialectology. One of the most instructive features of *The Handbook of the History of English*, ed. Ans van Kemeade and Bettelou Los (Oxford: Blackwell), 395–416, is the stark contrast provided by a comparison of the chapter "Old English Dialectology" by Richard Hogg with the immediately following chapter on Early Middle English dialectology. The two chapters look nothing alike—Hogg's recitation of the usual description and standard bibliography, with some titles now more than a century old, feels absolutely dowdy next to the recent work of Margaret Laing and Roger Lass on the *Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English*. The message that these two chapters convey is that the study of Old English dialects is dead in the water, even though Hogg makes an undaunted attempt at sanguinity by concluding with the optimistic assessment that "it is slowly becoming clear that the opportunities for real progress are

now far more promising than they have been, dare I say it, for almost a century” (414). It is a surprising statement given that its author dwells almost completely on the fairly distant past of Old English dialectology in the chapter’s preceding pages: only the work of Peter Kitson is held out as recent progress in the study of Old English dialects. Of course, none of this is Hogg’s fault—his subject resists easy inclusion in a volume on the state of the art in the history of the English language because, despite Hogg’s own considerable contribution to our understanding of Old English, there is little that we know about Old English dialects today that was not known by Henry Sweet. The evidence is so thin on the ground that there seems to be nothing to “discover” about Old English dialects. Rather, progress will come in the form of changing attitudes toward Old English texts. Hogg gestures toward such a new posture in this chapter, as he has elsewhere, by carefully examining the way Alistair Campbell described variation in his *Old English Grammar* (§256–§264) as “practically without claim to territorial significance.” The abandonment of linguistic geography as practiced in dialectology naturally leads to questions about the salience of the term “dialect” to the application of variation in Old English texts. Hogg is unwilling to go so far as to entertain these questions, although corpus-based studies in other languages, including Early Middle English, are leading all of historical dialectology in a direction that is most definitely centered on the individual text as the object of study rather than idealized notions of irrevocable linguistic geographies.

Even if Hogg’s chapter seems stale to those familiar with the study of Old English dialects, it is nonetheless a useful, brief overview of the history of a discipline. Hogg begins with a short history of the four-dialect hypothesis, recounting some of his earlier work in Old English dialectology, and follows with sections on “West Saxon and ‘Standard Old English,’” “Mercian,” “Northumbrian,” and “Kentish,” using each section as a case study on how our scant evidence for Old English frustrates the study of Old English dialects. Brief sections on “Syntax” and “Lexis” follow these. In many ways, the chapter is a retrospective of Hogg’s earlier scholarship, but this is fitting since most of his work has dealt with Old English dialects in one way or another. But the addition of a prospective view of Old English dialectology would be helpful, since Hogg believes, as he states, that there are, indeed, prospects for the future of Old English dialectology.

2006 was a very rich year for the study of the history of the English language with, arguably, the two most prestigious scholarly publishers going head-

to-head with the publication of *The Oxford History of English*, ed. Lynda Mugglestone (Oxford: Oxford UP) and *A History of the English Language*, ed. Richard Hogg and David Denison (Cambridge: Cambridge UP). These rather different volumes, each with contributions from the major scholars of the field, nevertheless share an overriding concern for demonstrating why current scholarship on the history of the language prizes the defamiliarization of English through emphasizing its history as a heterogeneous system deployed by diverse speakers. This is an ideology that has formed in reaction to an increasing awareness that much of our understanding of the history of English—or of any language—derives from an immense body of scholarship that mostly ignores the fact that variation is the natural state of language and that the texts that make up our evidence for English are quite imperfect for the kinds of analysis that less recent research valued most highly (namely, identifying diachronic change from written texts as if those objects existed in a hermetically sealed environment, “uncontaminated” by conditions that dwelled beyond the purview of the phonetician, the syntactician, the taxonomist). Mugglestone states in the introduction to her book that “the emphasis throughout the following volume is placed on the construction of ‘a history’ rather than ‘the history,’ recognizing that many pathways could be navigated through the past—and present—of the English language” (2), and Denison and Hogg state in the preface to theirs that “the language has continued to change, and scholarship has advanced along several paths” (xi). That is, there is now more than one way of “doing” the history of the English language, and this truth surely compels these editors to employ a veritable brigade of scholars in bringing these new works on the subject to fruition.

To be sure, Hogg and Denison’s volume is the more conservative of the two, relying, as it does, on the structural exposition of the language as the basis of its presentation. The volume includes an overview of the subject by Denison and Hogg and a mostly traditional division of the components of grammar followed by studies of types of English variation: “Phonology and morphology,” by Roger Lass; “Syntax,” by Olga Fischer and Wim van der Wurff; “Vocabulary,” by Dieter Kastovsky; “Standardisation,” by Terttu Nevalainen and Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade; “Names,” by Richard Coates; “English in Britain,” by Hogg; “English in North America,” by Edward Finegan; and “English worldwide,” by David Crystal. The editors also state that their volume is aimed toward advanced undergraduates, although, in truth, there are many other books available that seem to be far better suited for use as a textbook in a course

on the history of the English language. It is interesting to note that the editors have foregone the more typical arrangement for books of this kind into sections on the chronological stages of English. The obvious drawback of this kind of approach is that it is much harder to illustrate linguistic continuities between stages of the language, but another problem (and a more serious one in Hogg and Denison's book) is that the arrangement puts severe limitations on the depth devoted to any single topic. Thus, Roger Lass's chapter on phonology and morphology covers only a modest acre or two within the vast territory of English historical phonology and morphology. (He doesn't even attempt to discuss Old English in this chapter. See the longer review later in this section). One of the most valuable features of books targeted to undergraduate instruction on the history of the English language is a steady demonstration of the linguistic connections from the earliest stage of the language to the present day, primarily so that students, who generally misapprehend the nature of language anyway, come to realize, one hopes, that there is nothing about English today that was predetermined, that the linguistic past of the language has not been a triumphal march to the present. This basic notion of the naturalness of the chaotic dimensions of language change certainly underlies the book's insistence on variation and synchronic heterogeneity, but one has the sense that the book's arrangement mutes this message more than the typical chronological arrangement of other textbooks on the history of the language.

Mugglestone's volume does not suffer from this drawback because it retains a clearly chronological presentation of the history of the language, and, yet, it also seems ill-suited as a course textbook since its chapters sometimes function more as independent studies on period-specific aspects of the history of the English language rather than as logically ordered contributions to a coherent whole. To be fair, Mugglestone does not explicitly describe the volume as a textbook, but with the "Suggestions for Further Reading" that follow each chapter, it is clear that the book is aimed at students. Still, the contributions are of such a high quality and their content is so well positioned on the leading edge of research on the subject that the volume succeeds as a contribution to scholarship on the history of the English language in its own right. After an introduction by Mugglestone, the book contains chapters on: "Preliminaries: Before English," by Terry Hoad; "Beginnings and Transitions: Old English," by Susan Irvine; "Contacts and Conflicts: Latin, Norse, and French," by Matthew Townend; "Middle English—Dialects and Diversity," by Marilyn Corrie; "From Middle to Early

Modern English," by Jeremy J. Smith; "Restructuring Renaissance English," by April McMahon; "Mapping Change in Tudor English," by Terttu Nevalainen; "The Babel of Renaissance English," by Paula Blank; "English at the Onset of the Normative Tradition," by Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade; "English in the Nineteenth Century," by Mugglestone; "Modern Regional English in the British Isles," by Clive Upton; "English Among the Languages," by Richard W. Bailey; and "English World-wide in the Twentieth Century," by David Crystal. The chapters of *The Oxford History of English* slant very much toward the social and cultural forces that have driven language change in English. Far less attention is given to internal linguistic factors and structural exposition in its discussions of change in English. This feature makes Mugglestone's book, in one way, more progressive than Hogg's and Denison's since recent scholarship in historical linguistics is very much concerned with reading against the grain of the historiography of the English language, which, until recently, fairly can be said to have been mostly stridently structuralist and asocial in its perspective on the history of the language. There was a time when the "history of the English language" meant little more than the history of English phonology. Both of these books represent the turning of the corner that the discipline has undergone in recent years, so it makes perfect sense that two leading publishers would attempt to capture this changing set of priorities with wide-ranging volumes by the world's authorities, even though the large number of history of the English language textbooks currently available would seem to be entirely disproportionate to any need for them all.

Susan Irvine's chapter on "Beginnings and Transitions: Old English" in *The Oxford History of English*, 32–60, is a brief history of Old English literature much more than it is a description of the earliest synchronic form of English, as one might expect in a book on the history of the English language. The author focuses on the major historical backgrounds to the preservation of the language in writing during the Anglo-Saxon period, for example, the conversion to Christianity, King Alfred's influence, and the Benedictine reforms. No paradigms, no frequency tabulations, no derivations, no reconstructions, no rules—Irvine's chapter is simply a narrative of the social forces that contributed to the earliest formation of English. The presentation is very much reminiscent of that found in Albert C. Baugh and Thomas Cable's *A History of the English Language*, which also focuses on crafting a narrative history of the language. This is a reasonable and well-attested approach to the history of English, but it does

de-emphasize the linguistic history of the language to such an extent that those who are unfamiliar with the subject may come away from reading such work with the impression that the history of the English language is nothing more than English history. Irvine's chapter is very much centered on textual aspects of Old English, and this is a wise choice. She rightly insists that her readers understand that "Old English" is an imperfect label since it seems to imply a single, uniform kind of English, and much of her discussion illuminates the ways that texts from the period evince heterogeneity and instability as individual scribes negotiated, almost stroke-by-stroke, the relationship of writing to their vernaculars. And this point underlines the most valuable aspect of Irvine's contribution: even though her chapter may appear to be extremely reductionist in its general approach, she nonetheless thoroughly demonstrates how the individual scribe as the point of contact between the spoken language and the language known only from transcribed records is critical to understanding what those records tell us about English. It is an obvious point, but it is one that has been too often overlooked in the study of the history of the English language, by linguists and non-linguists alike, so Irvine's essay is a much-needed corrective to a general view of the early history of the English language that sometimes places scribal practice far from the foreground. But it is true, too, that historical linguistics, at least, certainly, in terms of the history of English, is focusing more and more attention upon the nature of our early texts as inherently conflicted sources of language data, and so Irvine's discussion of beginnings and transitions in Old English is very much of the moment.

Dieter Kastovsky's survey of "Typological Changes in Derivational Morphology," *The Handbook of the History of English*, ed. Ans van Kemenade and Bettelou Los (Oxford: Blackwell), 151–76, provides a comprehensive view of changing patterns of derivation in the history of English. Kastovsky is a scholar of Old English, so his interest clearly leans toward the earlier periods, making the chapter, on the whole, more interesting to students and scholars of the early history of English derivational morphology, although he by no means neglects the wider diachronic view. The Blackwell series that has produced this volume has a track record of publishing books whose individually contributed chapters do not merely recapitulate scholarship in the usual "handbook" fashion but often stand by themselves as rather formidable scholarly contributions. After recounting an adequate foundation for derivational morphology (152–55), Kastovsky goes on to consider the typology of morphological systems in a discussion that blends the

traditional categories with a more complex set of parameters describing the status of bases, lexical strata (e.g., native vs. non-native), morphophonemic alternations, and the position of affixes. The author then, sensibly, carries forward with a brief description of the Modern English situation in view of the criteria for analysis that he has established. Kastovsky explains how derivational morphology in Modern English blends different systems for derivation on the stem- and word-based patterns of native and non-native forms. The remainder of the chapter is concerned with the historical changes that have led to the current situation of English derivational morphology. Using the criteria established earlier, the author considers each one separately rather than enumerating historical changes in their chronological order. He believes that this approach "has the advantage of highlighting the intricate mechanisms at work in the transformation of the morphological system under investigation" (161). This is an entirely justifiable strategy—studies of the history of the English language are normally so beholden to strict chronology that few bother to reflect on the ways that chronological thinking can handicap our ability to perceive all manner of language changes. Kastovsky considers the stem-based morphology of Old English and its root-based origins from Indo-European in depth, and the fixing of stress in Germanic, according to Kastovsky, eventually leads to a growing loss in morphological contrasts that enables the word-based morphology of Old and Middle English. In effect, the author's non-chronological view is a history of morphological reanalysis in English, as blurring morphological distinctions result in a thoroughly mixed system. Discussion of native vs. non-native word formations naturally favors Early Modern English, although Kastovsky is careful to put this period of heavy borrowing into the context of changing morphological typologies in English, and brief discussion of morphophonemic alternations illuminates the profound ways in which derivational morphology interacts with phonology (especially prosody) in the history of English. The chapter thoroughly demonstrates how inadequate less recent notions of morphological typology are, emphasizing one of the ways that *The Handbook of the History of English* queries the very tradition of scholarship to which it belongs.

Thomas Kohnen addresses "Variability of Form as a Methodological Problem in Historical Corpus Analysis: The Case of Modal Expressions in Directive Speech Acts," *Corpora and the History of English*, ed. Christian Mair and Reinhard Heuberger (Heidelberg: Winter), 221–33. The author points out that since retrievability in electronic corpora relies on the forms of tokens,

searching for functional items, like speech acts, makes variation even more of a challenge for corpus linguists than it normally is. Kohnen's paper is a test case for the practicability of using corpora to test the frequency and variability of forms of speech acts using a small corpus of approximately 129,000 words from Old, Middle, and Early Modern English sermons. Kohnen limits his study by focusing on "directives"—the speaker's exhortation to the addressee for action. Speech-act theory does not lend itself well to the mechanics of corpus linguistics because of Kohnen's primary concern, the variability of forms, but also because of a larger vicious circularity that derives from the nature of competing speech-act theories: one must choose from a menu of speech acts before crafting a corpus for the purpose of retrieving the frequency and variability of forms of the speech acts one has chosen. Still, Kohnen reports that his preliminary findings show that "the frequency of directives employing non-auxiliary modal expressions decreases across the centuries and that these directives show an astonishing amount of homogeneity in Old English and Middle English" (232), a result suggesting that the retrievability of functional items in corpora is not as acute a problem as is sometimes assumed. The author holds that the key to using corpora for the study of functional phenomena lies in the recognition of text-type conventions, and he demonstrates that a tightly controlled and modestly designed study of such a seemingly intractable problem can yield some useful results.

Takeshi Koike explores "The History of the Genitive Case from the Old English Period Onwards," *English Language and Linguistics* 10: 49–75, but the article devotes much of its space to "the study of the synchronic state of the genitive case in OE" (49), which is a wide avenue indeed. The description of the genitive case in Old English (50–54) is a useful comprehensive overview of the situation, and the author explains how word-order variation of the genitive nominal correlates to semantic roles: for example, adnominal genitives expressing interpersonal relationships (e.g., "þæs hælendes moder"), possession, (e.g., "þæs rican mannes welan"), and AGENTIVE OR EXPERIENCER roles (e.g., "þa wearþ he þurh hæþenra manna ehtnysse... gemartyrod," and "His ærist wæs þæra engla blis") usually are preposed, while those expressing PATIENT and CAUSE tend to be postposed (e.g., "for þigene þæs forbodenan bigleofan," and "& mid nanre fyrhte þæs towardan wites"). Koike treats the entire range of genitive functions in Old English, paying particular attention to constituent order, and then transitions to the diminishment in Middle English of the wide range of

constituent structures for the genitive that obtained in Old English. The author suggests that in Old English a genitive nominal had a determiner function that anticipated the eventual change of the genitive's grammatical category in the history of the English language from inflection to determiner. Koike explains that "the genitive nominal is essentially an NP, and that the category of determiner, which did indeed exist in OE, was not so clear cut, so well defined, as in PDE, which made it possible for an item functioning as a determiner to function as something else in other environments" (73). Genitive nominals, therefore, easily satisfied the determiner position in noun phrases in Old English but could themselves function as full noun phrases elsewhere. The author argues that the determiner category hardened during the Middle English period and that genitive nominals became fixed as determiners, so all adnominal functions that were not determinative fell out of English as a result. Crucially, Koike argues that the semantic value of the genitive case in Old English signals "partial or nonparticipation of a designated thing" (73) in a twisting psycholinguistic/cognitive excursus (60–73) that relies on secondary sources from recent theory to Jakobson's analysis of Russian case-marking. As challenging as Koike's article can be (and the massive generalizing from the small number of examples from Old English makes it more so), the gestalt of the exposition, when one works at bringing it into focus, is very compelling since it provides a unitary explanation of the nearly wholesale abandonment of a once deeply-entrenched system in the English language.

The phonetic status of the hypothetical Germanic phonemes usually represented as * \bar{e}_1 and * \bar{e}_2 has long been a matter of debate, especially the former. The particular problem with reconstructing * \bar{e}_1 is that Indo-European * \bar{e} yields \bar{e} in Gothic but \bar{a} in the Northwest Germanic languages (cf. Gothic *gadēþs* 'deed' with Old Norse *dāð* and Old Saxon *dād*), leaving historical linguists with a lot of room for speculation about the phonetic distance from \bar{e} to \bar{a} . Frederik Kortlandt's "Germanic * \bar{e}_1 and * \bar{e}_2 ," *NOWELE* 49: 51–54, is a very brief rejoinder to Patrick Stiles' 2004 endorsement of the standard reconstruction of Germanic * \bar{e}_1 and * \bar{e}_2 as [ā] and [ē]. Kortlandt has trod this ground several times before, so it appears that his reconstructions as [æ̃] and [ea], respectively, have not found many disciples. His rather different conclusions from the vast majority of scholars who have examined the problem are motivated by the vowel system's restoration of symmetry but crucially hinge on evidence for a fronted pronunciation of * \bar{e}_1 in several West Germanic dialects and in Finnish loanwords from North Germanic. He theorizes that the

retraction of * \bar{e}_1 to \bar{a} spread from the High German area northward and developed independently in Scandinavian. Kortlandt suggests that reconstructing Northwest Germanic * \bar{e}_1 as [æ̃] provides motivation (in the form of correcting asymmetry in the low vowels between long \bar{e} and short a) to explain the various backing and fronting developments that take place in the Northwest Germanic dialects. Kortlandt deploys fairly scant evidence for this, but it is evidence that nonetheless needs explanation. The author's appeal to phonological symmetry in this case, however, is only persuasive to those who accept that [æ̃] as a transitional development from Indo-European * \bar{e} persisted long enough to trigger changes motivated by asymmetry, while most will continue to find Kortlandt's evidence for the persistence of [æ̃] to be too sparsely distributed and far too late to explain the vowel phonologies of the Northwest Germanic dialects.

Textual and Contextual Studies in Medieval English: Towards the Reunion of Linguistics and Philology, ed. Michiko Ogura (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang), is a selection of the papers from the first international conference of the Society of Historical English Language and Linguistics held at Chiba University in September 2005. The volume consists of thirteen papers by scholars from mostly Japanese universities: "On Unaccusative Constructions in the History of English" (Michio Hosaka); "The Development of Non-assertive *any* in *The Paston Letters*" (Yoko Iyeiri); "Aldred's Multiple Glosses: Is the Order Significant?" (Tadashi Kotake); "The Interpretation of *Troilus and Criseyde* 3.587: '*syn I moste on yow triste*'" (Yoshiyuki Nakao); "The Demonstrative Pronouns *tho*, *those*, and *thise*, *these*, etc. in the Winchester Malory and Caxton's Malory" (Yuji Nakao); "Grammaticalisation and the Economy of Vocabulary Insertion" (Hiroyuki Nawata); "Element Order Varies: Samples from Old English Psalter Glosses" (Michiko Ogura); "On Word Order in Constructions with Two Predicates in Old English Interlinear Glosses" (Masayuki Ohkado); "Teaching Medieval English in Korea in the Twenty-first Century" (Young-Bae Park); "Prose in Motion: Syntactic Change in the *Ancrene Wisse*" (John Scahill); "Effect of Alliteration on Constructions with Complex Predicates in Old English Poetry" (Hironori Suzuki); "Sword, Fire, and Dragon: Polysemous Compounds in *Beowulf* Reconsidered with Special Reference to *nacod wið draca* (2273) and *þæt wæs modig secg* (1812)" (Hideki Watanabe); and "Middle English Verbs with both Impersonal Use and Reflexive Use" (Fumiko Yoshikawa).

The "reunion of linguistics and philology" referred to in the volume's subtitle is a tip of the hat to Matti

Rissanen's 1990 article on the then-recent intellectual history of corpus linguistics and its promise to wrest the study of language from the practitioners of theoretical esoterica and to restore a bit of philology's respectability by marrying language to text through the possibilities offered by electronic corpora and, specifically, opportunities for the history of the English language through the compilation of the Helsinki Corpus. To be sure, most of the essays in the volume demonstrate a profound concern for quantitative analysis, so much so that some papers can be reduced to a table of token frequencies. The papers by Ogura, Ohkado, Suzuki, and Watanabe are of the greatest interest to scholars of the Old English language. Ogura's and Ohkado's essays (reviewed in the Syntax half of this section) run against the grain of scholarly tradition by using Old English psalter glosses as evidence for Old English syntax, a dataset often regarded as unpromising since the syntax of the Latin text has been thought to interfere with the order of constituents in the gloss. Suzuki's essay is especially interesting in its demonstration of some of the ways that the demands of alliteration as the most salient feature of Old English meter determine patterns of Old English poetic syntax. Through a careful quantitative study of *Beowulf*, *Andreas*, and *Elene*, the author shows an overwhelming tendency for subordinate clauses with modal verbs to pattern as INFINITIVE COMPLEMENT + MODAL when only the infinitive alliterates and both constituents appear in the same half-line, while the order MODAL + INFINITIVE COMPLEMENT predominates whenever the pattern of alliteration differs or when the constituents appear in different half-lines. Watanabe's essay posits highly metaphorical readings of two lines from *Beowulf* and stands out as the least quantitative essay of the volume. On the whole, it is sometimes difficult to know from this volume and from the broader and increasingly dominant practice of corpus linguistics if the purported reunion of linguistics and philology is, in fact, just that or a grotesque experiment in cross-breeding that has spawned progeny whose appearance betrays very little hint of parentage. A shortcoming of this volume is that there is no introductory essay that explains the book's theme or even the connections between the essays themselves, so readers can be left with the impression that this form of research derives neither from linguistics nor philology—there is very little trace of the theoretical formalism that most associate with linguistics, and the inductive argumentation of philology is mostly lacking. What substitutes is the elevation of textual quantification, which, at the moment, appears to be the most valued object of English historical linguistics.

In “What Language Is This? Language Mixing in Anglo-Saxon Inscriptions,” *ASSAH* 13: 118–21, Elisabeth Okasha briefly queries the nature of the mixed languages of five short inscriptional texts and ponders the differences between how Anglo-Saxons may have perceived “code-mixing” and how contemporary speakers conceptualize language distinctions in multilingual communities. The inscriptions that the author examines (a tenth- or eleventh-century stone sundial from Aldbrough, an eighth-century memorial stone from Hartlepool, the eighth-century York helmet, a tenth- or eleventh-century stone from St. Mary Castlegate, and the leather knife sheath preserved in Aachen) mix Old English, Greek, and Latin, for which, Okasha suggests, “it is relevant to ask in what language the original audience might have considered the text to be written” (118). The code-mixing (or “code-switching,” as it is usually referred to in sociolinguistic contexts) of these texts can extend beyond simply using foreign vocabulary fitted to the syntax of a substrate language. The knife sheath, for example, reads “byrhtsige mec f[e]cið,” in which the past-tense of the Latin verb *facio* appears to have the Old English present tense ending *-ið*, which Okasha suggests is a hypercorrection due to the sporadic fortition of /ð/ to /t/ in 3rd person singular present-tense endings. Inscriptions like these indicate that parts of Anglo-Saxon society were so thoroughly multilingual that “[q]uestions as to what language was being used might well have appeared irrelevant or meaningless” (121). The author believes that inscriptional texts evince different kinds of linguistic evidence from those found in manuscript texts because they are ultimately purely pragmatic, whether invoking prayers for the benefit of one’s soul or whether promoting the craftsmanship of the maker, so that awareness of language distinctions is viewed as a matter only for the educated elite who produced the longer literary, legal, and scientific texts which, the author reminds us, disproportionately represent a very narrow stratum of speakers in Anglo-Saxon England.

Who knew that corpus linguists were such a rollicking bunch? The first contribution in *The Changing Face of Corpus Linguistics*, ed. Antoinette Renouf and Andrew Kehoe, *Language and Computers* 55 (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi) is a jaunty composition penned in homage to Gilbert and Sullivan (“I am the very model of a user of technology / For testing out hypotheses on grammar and morphology,” and so forth [1]). The more sober contributions to the volume have a similar sprightliness, though they nonetheless present serious, cutting-edge scholarship. After all, corpus linguists ought to feel cheery these days: their discipline has had

the most profound influence, arguably, on all forms of linguistics that any intellectual movement in the field has had since Chomsky pondered how colorless green ideas sleep at night. The essays in this volume derive from the 24th International ICAME Conference (International Computer Archive of Modern and Medieval English) held in 2003, and it is divided into six sections: section 1. Corpus Creation: “Oh Canada! Towards the Corpus of Early Ontario English” (Stefan Dollinger); “Favoring Americanisms? <ou> vs. <o> before <l> and <r> in Early English in Australia: A corpus-based approach” (Clemens Fritz); “Computing the Lexicons of Early Modern English” (Ian Lancashire); “EFL dictionaries, grammars, and language guides from 1700 to 1850: testing a new corpus on points of spokenness” (Manfred Markus); and “The Old English Apollonius of Tyre in the light of the Old English Concordancer” (Antonio Miranda García, Javier Calle Martín, David Moreno Olalla, and Gustavo Muñoz González). Section 2. Diachronic Corpus Study—from past to present: “Prediction with SHALL and WILL: a diachronic perspective” (Maurizio Gotti); “Circumstantial adverbials in discourse: a synchronic and a diachronic perspective” (Anneli Meurman-Solin and Päivi Pahta); “Changes in textual structures of book advertisements” (Caren auf dem Keller); “Curtains like these are selling right in the city of Chicago for \$1.50’—The mediopassive in American 20th-century advertising language” (Marianne Hundt); and “Recent grammatical change in written English 1961–1992: some preliminary findings of a comparison of American with British English” (Geoffrey Leech and Nicholas Smith). Section 3. Synchronic Corpus Study—present-day: “Social variation in the use of apology formulae in the British National Corpus” (Mats Deutschmann); “How recent is *recent*? On overcoming interpretational difficulties” (Göran Kjellmer); “Looking at *looking*: Functions and contexts of progressives in spoken English and ‘school’ English” (Ute Römer); “Ditransitives, the *Given Before New* principle, and textual retrievability: a corpus-based study using ICECUP” (Gabriel Ozón); and “The Spanish pragmatic marker *pues* and its English equivalents” (Anna-Brita Stenström). Section 4. The Web as Corpus: “WebCorp: A tool for online linguistic information retrieval and analysis” (Barry Morley); “Diachronic linguistic analysis on the web with WebCorp” (Andrew Kehoe); “New ways of analysing ESL on the WWW with WebCorp and WebPhraseCount” (Josef Schmied); and “I’m like, ‘Hey, it works!’: Using GlossaNet to find attestations of the quotative (*be*) *like* in English-language newspapers (Cédric Fairon and John V. Singler). Section 5. Corpus Linguistics and Grammatical Theory: “Corpus

linguistics and English reference grammars” (Joybrato Mukherjee); “Tracking ongoing grammatical change and recent diversification in present-day standard English: the complementary role of small and large corpora” (Christian Mair); and “but it will take time ... points of view on a lexical grammar of English” (Michaela Mahlberg). The final section is the conference’s discussion panel compiled by Jan Aarts.

The whimsy of many of the titles listed here is surely an indication of the good feelings that seem to pervade the field of corpus linguistics at the moment. With the exception of the study on *Apollonius of Tyre*, Old English draws little notice, but, then, it is also true that corpus linguistics has had far less of an influence on Old English studies than any other stage of the language, even though the *Dictionary of Old English* project has made a machine-readable corpus of Old English available since 1981. The answer to why this is so is simple enough: large corpora are much more valuable as sources of data, and the relatively puny corpus of Old English often discourages very firm conclusions on the basis of the kinds of relative frequencies that form the fundamental methodology of corpus linguistics. The primary activity of corpus linguists used to be building corpora, still a tedious process but one that has accelerated in recent years with new technologies that make the job faster. Today, scholars in the field are much more concerned with how to use corpora, and this volume is a thorough demonstration of the many possibilities that electronic corpora provide to those looking for new uses of, at this point, very familiar research resources.

Medieval English and Its Heritage: Structure, Meaning and Mechanisms of Change, ed. Nikolaus Ritt, Herbert Schendl, Christiane Dalton-Puffer, and Dieter Kastovsky, *Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature* 16 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang) collects essays that derive from the 13th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics held at the University of Vienna in August 2004. The twelve essays of this volume are organized into three sections covering, predictably, “Phonology and morphology,” “Vocabulary,” and “Syntax and pragmatics.” ICEHL has been a successful, long-running conference that has usually produced beefier volumes than the present one, although the slimness of the book neither reflects negatively on its editors nor correlates to a lack of quality in its contents. The first section on phonology and morphology presents Jeremy J. Smith, “Phonaesthesia, *Ablaut*, and the history of the English demonstratives”; Christian Liebl, “The A and O of a medieval English sound change: prolegomena to a study of the origins and early

geographical diffusion of /a:/ > /ɔ:/”; and Julia Schlüter, “A small word of great interest: the allomorphy of the indefinite article as a diagnostic of sound change from the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries” (the first two are reviewed below). The second section on vocabulary presents Philip Durkin, “Loanword etymologies in the third edition of the *OED*: the benefits of the application of a consistent methodology for the scholarly user”; Michael Bilynsky, “Getting a diachronic view on synonymy”; Ewa Ciszek, “-*dōm* in medieval English”; Ferdinand von Mengden, “The peculiarities of the OE numeral system”; and Letizia Vezzosi, “From *agen* to *own*.” The essays by Ciszek, von Mengden, and Vezzosi are of interest to scholars of Old English. Ciszek makes use of the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus* to account for each of the semantic types of -*dōm* formations and links these findings to developments indicated in the *Middle English Dictionary* to provide an early history of the suffix in English. Von Mengden argues that common explanations of the system of cardinal numerals in Old English as derived from a duo-decimal system are wrong, that the proto-Germanic numeral system was an entirely base-ten system, and that “the key feature for determining the type of numeral system of a language is the arrangement of serially recurring progressions in the counting sequence” (142), which, for Old English, does in fact occur as decades, not as duodecades. Vezzosi’s paper traces the development of Old English *agen* to Modern English *own* as a process of grammaticalization of an innovative use of the lexeme as a functional word closely related to the use of the identity marker and intensifier *himself*. Each of these essays makes very solid use of contemporary techniques in corpus linguistics to provide a data-centered explanation of diachronic changes in the language.

The final section on syntax and pragmatics includes four papers: Ilse Wischer, “Grammaticalisation and language contact in the history of English: the evolution of the progressive form”; W. Garrett Mitchener, “A mathematical model of the loss of verb-second in Middle English”; Päivi Pahta and Arja Nurmi, “Code-switching in the *Helsinki Corpus*: a thousand years of multilingual practices”; and Tamás Eitler, “Audience rules: interspeaker accommodation and intraspeaker syntactic variation in Late Middle English.” Though none of these papers focuses strictly on Old English, most provide some insight into current methodological models in English historical linguistics, particularly through their utilization of electronic corpora. And this new ICEHL volume suggests, too, something of the increasingly marginal place of Old English within studies of the history of the English language. As corpus

linguistics becomes the foundation for “doing” historical linguistics, pride of place is naturally given to those periods that furnish scholars with larger corpora, since the probabilistic argumentation inherent in the use of corpora increases in plausibility as the size of the corpus increases. Old English, thus, attracts less and less attention by scholars of the history of the English language for whom the reconstructive turn required in the small-corpus linguistics of Old English appeals very little.

Eric Stanley's “Aesthetic Evaluations of the Sound of Old English: ‘About the Anglo-Saxon Tongue There Was the Strength of Iron, with the Sparkling and the Beauty of Burnished Steel,’” *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed. Swan, 451–72, is a catalogue of quotations from early commentators on Old English verse who wax rhapsodic on the presumption of a sort of fundamental onomatopoeisis in the stress, alliteration, and rhythm of Old English poetry. Stanley leaves much to his readers' interpretation since the great majority of the article consists of long direct quotations that form an intellectual history of an ideology of Old English verse as a custom-made vehicle for the expression of Germanic heroism, the striking of sword blows and stress patterns forming a perfect and indivisible harmony. The author merely points out that, although this ideology obtained very early on and persisted a long time, it nonetheless stands in the face of all of the Old English poetry that is not heroic, the biblical verse, the theological ponderings, the renderings of Latin sources, the playfulness of riddles, and so forth. “Yet some traditionalists,” Stanley declares, “deafened by the imaginative din of battle and the roar of storm and waves in turmoil, will fail to listen to the quiet moments of devout reflection expressed in often excellent alliterative verse. Such readers probably still wonder, *Quod Christus cum Hinieldo?*” (465). It is hard to resist the conclusion that Stanley is seeing bogeymen in current Old English scholarship who can barely be said to exist. Who “some traditionalists” might actually be, scholars who echo the simplistic, aestheticist line that Stanley quotes *in extenso* here, is left unstated. At any rate, the apparent criticism that Stanley levels at what appears to be a phantom movement in current Old English studies rings quite hollow, not so much for the fact that he declines to identify the “traditionalists” he apparently believes plague Old English studies but because anyone who has spent any time working in recent Old English scholarship (as Stanley has, making this article all the more befuddling) would be very likely to describe the recent history of the discipline as intensely historicist and materialist in its general orientation.

Yumi Yokota's note on “Form and Function of Demonstratives in the Middle English Southern Texts and Speculation on the Origin of *Th*-Type Third Person Pronouns in the North and South,” *N&Q* n.s. 53: 300–03 hypothesizes that THOSE-type demonstratives appear very late in southern Middle English texts, where the normal variants are of the THO-type, because of a functional difference in the use of “these” and “those.” Not only does Yokota's survey of forty-six texts show that THOSE-type variants are restricted to texts from Gloucestershire and Herefordshire but also that there is an overwhelming tendency across all of the texts for “these” to function as determiners and for “those” to function as pronouns. The author reasons that the plural form of “this” is created with the addition of the adjective plural marker *-e* to singular forms, which must have occurred fairly early because of its stronger use as a determiner. But the author suggests that “stronger pronominal function of ‘those’ in the south might not have required a similar plural marker, and as a result *tho* type variants persisted quite late” (302). Persuasive though it is, the note's content does not have any implications for Old English beyond the author's endorsement of Sweet's earlier suggestion that the Old English demonstrative *þā* began to be used as the third person plural personal pronoun “they” because of the confusion of forms that obtained in the *h*-type plural personal pronouns, and the use of *þā* as “they” facilitated the eventual adoption of *þei* from Old Norse *þeir*.

John Walmsley takes up the history of the use of Latin grammatical terminology and concepts in the description of English in “How the Leopard Got Its Spots: English Grammatical Categories, Latin Terms,” *Inside Old English: Essays in Honour of Bruce Mitchell*, ed. John Walmsley (Oxford: Blackwell), 248–67. After beginning his essay with a few dated quotations on the descriptive inadequacies accrued to English through early modern comparisons with Latin, the author frames his historical explorations by stating that “[t]he question, then, is this: did the earliest grammarians to apply Latin-based terminology to English do so out of ignorance or incompetence?” (250). This is, of course, a false choice that proves quite unnecessary as Walmsley goes on to explain how the teaching of Latin in England in the Middle Ages, first in French and later in English, naturally resulted in the fusion of Latin grammatical terms and concepts with the description of English. Walmsley identifies John Brian of Cornwall, whom Trevisa cited in the mid-fourteenth century as “a maister of grammer” who conducted instruction on Latin in English, as the innovator responsible for the eventual emergence of an English-language Latin pedagogy in England and the

later publication of Latin grammars written in English. Walmsley's essay draws on commentary from a number of early modern sources that indicate the ways in which English transformed from a metalanguage in the study of Latin to an object of study with Latin as its analytical frame of reference, but he also points out that even though the Conquest disrupted English grammatical tradition, even Ælfric's vernacular grammar reflected on the grammatical structure of Old English through the explanation of Latin. Walmsley's work in this essay is perceptive to the inappropriateness of theorizing the origins of modern grammatical analysis from the vantage point of contemporaneity, from which we tend to view the past as an orderly progression to the present, so he especially draws on late medieval and early modern commentaries from grammatical treatises that show the earlier intellectual history of the study of English to have been a kind of symbiosis with the study of Latin that naturally facilitated the use of terms and concepts from Latin grammar, even though mid-twentieth century structuralist scholars frequently expressed the opinion that English descriptive grammar suffered from an overabundance of Latinisms. While Walmsley suggests that some concepts in Present Day English, like case, persist as categories of analysis mainly because of the staying power of terms and concepts acquired from the study of Latin, the historical view of why the current situation has obtained reveals a more practical than ideological origin: "[t]he transfer of categories was rather the natural outcome of grappling with the task of teaching English students enough Latin to enable them to read, write, understand and converse in it" (265). Walmsley shows that Ælfric employed a native vocabulary for grammatical analysis but that the Conquest halted what might have otherwise been an uninterrupted tradition of pedagogy that used the familiar language of English to explain the unfamiliar one of Latin.

CMC

Roger Lass's chapter "Phonology and Morphology," *A History of the English Language*, ed. Hogg and Denison, 43–108, holds that dialect variants over time reveal more about linguistic change than general paradigms. His analysis of variants includes, together with surveys of phonological and morphological forms, notes on levels of usage, those voiced from the seventeenth century on. The variants adduced, though subject to the constraints that a chapter imposes, stem altogether from post-Conquest English, a boundary that derives from Lass's view that Old English manuscripts offer a scanty record and manifest the practices of sundry scribes, not

the materials that underlie a reliable, linguistic history. In defending his view, Lass asserts that many details in the study of Old English dialects remain problematic, a stance that summons, despite his over-all thesis, not a single example. Instead, his paragraphs on Old English phonology and morphology supply a synopsis of paradigms that are supposedly detailed forerunners of linguistic changes to occur in the following five hundred years. In a book offered to advanced students, scholars, and instructors, the pages on Old English phonology and morphology do not well serve its audience.

Matthew Townend's "Contacts and Conflicts: Latin, Norse, and French," *The Oxford History of English*, ed. Mugglestone, 61–85 offers much, despite his chapter's title, on Anglo-Saxon England. To begin, Townend excerpts and discusses passages from Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, including Cædmon's *Hymn*, and King Eadred's 946 charter of land granted to Wulfric. Further, he analyzes an inscription on a grave-marker from the Old Minster in Winchester, from Cnut's reign, commemorating a Scandinavian, and another inscription on the sun-dial at Aldbrough church in the East Riding of Yorkshire. Even the paucity in Old English texts of Celtic yields somewhat to revision through the register of its many place-names, especially those for rivers—say, Derwent, Ouse, and Lune. The choice of these texts and inscriptions, together with excerpts from the early post-Conquest centuries, issues from the premise that English opened itself to the influence of its co-territorial languages. That Latin, Norse, and French influence has had extensive impact on English does not imply, however, a similar pattern of contact. Latin influence, generated mostly through documents, manifests itself in Old English mainly through secular and ecclesiastic loanwords (say, *camel*, *chrism*, *litany*, *mint*) and semantic change. Strikingly, semantic change, evidenced in Cædmon's *Hymn*, converts the meanings of words such as *metud*, *dryctin*, and *frea* from non-Christian values to names for God. The epithet *allmectig* is a likely loan-translation of *omnipotens*. Old Norse and Old English, mutually intelligible, worked their influence on each other orally, effecting very likely simplified inflectional patterns and a system of relatively fixed word-order. (One caveat, however, is that Old English itself began to experience losses of inflection and a shift to relatively fixed word-order). Yet mutual intelligibility between Old Norse and Old English also includes varieties of register. Even in formal expression, as in the grave-marker HER LID GVNNI : EORLES FEOLAGA, language contact has an unmistakable pervasiveness. The influence of Old Norse appears in Gunni, the personal name of

the deceased, but also in the loanword FEOLAGA, a variant of Old Norse *fēlagi*, now *fellow*. EORLES, in turn, exemplifies a semantic loan, displacing the Old English sense of 'man, warrior, hero' for a term of rank (seen in the Old Norse cognate *jarl*). Latin, too, has a presence, for HER LID instances a loan-translation of *hic requiescat* ('here rests'), found elsewhere in Anglo-Saxon grave-markers rather than the perhaps expected *hic jacet* ('here lies'). Although Old French of course has its greatest impact on English after 1066, nevertheless earlier contact helped to introduce some words, such as *prud*, now *proud*. As for the influence of Old English on co-territorial languages, Townsend offers a brief review. Speakers of Celtic, residing mostly as subordinates in Anglo-Saxon areas, learned the dominant language at the expense of their own. Speakers of Old Norse, though hardly a subordinate people, also simplified inflections and possibly made inconsistent use of grammatical gender. As for Old Norse poetry, Sigvatr Þórðarson's praise poem for Cnut reveals in an alliterating line *kærr keisara, klúss Pétrúsi* ('dear to the Emperor, close to Peter') the effects of multilingualism. Thus, *kærr* has its source in Old French, the second and third alliterating words stemming from Latin through Old English. In its scope, this chapter offers much to all readers.

In "Differences of Stress Orientation between English and Norse," *Language and Text*, ed. Johnston *et al.*, [see section 2], 205–224, Angelika Lutz interprets the nuclei of vowels for the two languages. Old English accent, as on falling diphthongs, supports a stress closer to the syllabic head; Old Norse accent, as on rising diphthongs, supports a stress closer to the syllable coda. Thus Old English *héalp* exemplifies a stress pattern different from Old Norse *hiálpa*. This juxtaposition applies, also, to Old English long monophthongs and Old Norse diphthongs, as in *stān* and *stein*, as well as to Old English *flēah* and Old Norse *fló*. To retain her thesis of stress closer to the head in Old English and closer to the coda in Old Norse, Lutz examines the development of the monophthongs from Germanic. As for *stān* and *stein*, the vowels of both the reflex of Germanic *ai*, she argues that the resulting Old English *ā* retains the first element of the earlier diphthong. In contrast the Old Norse *ei* has a narrower aperture than the first part of Germanic diphthong *ai* and concomitantly a reduced sonority. For Lutz the process is due to a shifting of accent from Germanic to Old Norse, apparently a development from a falling to a rising diphthong. The Old English monophthong *ā* from *ai* at least preserves, if it does not augment, full stress on the first element of the vowel. For Old Norse *fló* < **flōh* < **flauχ*, the monophthong

preserves full stress on the second element of the vowel. Yet evidence showing in monophthongs a heightened stress on either the first or second elements does not appear; instead, Lutz characterizes the divergent shifting of stress-accent as an assumption. The second and third sections of Lutz's study present her analysis of initial semivowels and consonants in the coda of stressed syllables. Here, her presentation moves from the stability of initial semivowels in Old English to their loss in Old Norse. Stability is due to the heightened stress on the initial element of vowels. Two examples have in Old English short vowels—*wundor* and *wudu*—their stress corresponding supposedly (an unstated premise) to the stressed first element of diphthongs as in *gēar* and *giet*. Her Old Norse examples include *ungr* and *yrkja*—initial Germanic *j* and *w* lost—the stress on the short vowels presumably corresponding to stress on the second element of diphthongs. In the coda of syllables, loss of semivowels occurs first in late Old English, although in the earliest period /w/ became vocalized after short vowels. In Old Norse, stress on the second element of vowels contributes to the retention of final consonants but not to short vowels as in *stallr* < Gmc. **stallaz* and *fullr* < Gmc. *fullaz*. Yet in these instances, too, the unspoken premise is that stress on short vowels follows the model of second element stress in Old Norse diphthongs. Whether or not Lutz's argument achieves concurrence, her array of examples, from earlier to modern centuries offers a convenient overview.

In "Peculiar Vowel Levelling in the Sequences *weor/wyr/wor* in Early English" (*Language and Text*, ed. Johnston *et al.*, 411–426) Jerzy Welna surveys words with comparable consonant sound patterns. Here the word "levelling" betokens the coalescence of the short vowels cited by his title into [u] (spelled u) early on in Middle English, but his study mainly concerns Old English. Welna explores four questions: (1) on chronological processes; (2) on conditioned changes; (3) on the spread of change in lexemes; (4) on frequency of change in poetry and prose. Dating phonologic change proves problematic, since earlier research, as Welna summarizes it, finds Northumbrian *weor* > *wur* in Luick's analysis perhaps during the ninth century, in Brunner's in Late Old English. Further, nothing in Welna's examination, mainly of poetry, offers clarification. Old English poetry, as his survey reports, cannot support reliable conclusions on dating, largely because it contains numerous instances of forms typical of both West-Saxon and non-West-Saxon areas. Welna is reluctant to accept Campbell's analysis of staged changes *eo* > *u*, followed by *y* > *u* and *o* > *u*, because the data supplied appears insufficient. Question 2 on conditioned

changes finds him more fully supportive. Here, the changes outlined by Campbell are subject to qualification. Thus, Welna, citing Brunner, identifies *r* + velar consonant in the coda of a syllable as preventing *dweorȝ* from becoming *dwurȝ*, unlike *sweord* > *swurd*. He also notes that the most frequent change in the vowel nucleus is that of *eo* before *r*+dental consonant. Less often do the vowels *y* and *o* > *u*, as in *wyrm* > *wurm* and *gewordene* > *gewurdene*. All three changes exemplify retracting and/or raising. Exceptions to this pattern include *wyrsa* and *wyrst*, possibly due, according to Luick, to Scandinavian influence. On the spread of change throughout lexemes, Wersla cites *sweord*, *weorðan*, and *weorðian* as most common, but forgoes supplying a frequency table for the words he otherwise records. Lastly, he concludes that the incidence of change, greater in prose than in poetry, is probably due to formal practices in such institutional works as lexicons, documents, and homilies. Sadly, the one important advance in this essay, the spread of change among sundry lexemes, does not enjoy the focused presentation it deserves.

Tadao Kubouchi explores words from Old Norse as used in the Danelaw, particularly in homilies. Their diversity appears in his “Wulfstan’s Scandinavian Loanword Usage: An Aspect of the Linguistic Situation in the Late Old English Danelaw,” *Inside Old English: Essays in Honour of Bruce Mitchell*, ed. Walmsley [see sec. 2], 134–152. The issue chiefly explored is Wulfstan’s conservative practice, as Archbishop of York, in drawing on these loanwords to address his communicants, their ethnic heritage very likely Scandinavian. This issue, however, presents methodological difficulties in determining the nature of Wulfstan’s conservatism. To begin, texts containing Old Norse loanwords are no earlier than 1127; specifically, the word *baðe* is recorded in the *Peterborough Chronicle* a little more than a century after Wulfstan’s death. This difficulty, evident enough, nevertheless gives rise to reasonable suppositions. One is that spoken versions of Old Norse were common enough in York during Wulfstan’s bishopric, yet Kubouchi, concurring with Burnley, regards them as excluded from the West Saxon *Schriftsprache*. Secondly, Old Norse long functioned mainly in non-literary registers, a supposition to help account for their slight occurrence in Wulfstan’s works, which have *grið*, *lagu*, *Oðon*, and *præl*. And third, Kubouchi notes that Wulfstan sought to educate as he preached, to aid communicants in their using the English language. In support of these three suppositions, the chapter provides ample data and discussion of Norse phonology, grammar, and vocabulary applicable to issues involving loanwords.

Jeremy J. Smith’s morphophonologic study of the demonstratives *these* and *those* from Old to Middle English presents links between phonaesthesia and *ablaut*, as well as those between psycholinguistics and dialectology. These tools of analysis inform his “Phonaesthesia, *Ablaut* and the History of the English Demonstratives” (in *Medieval English and Its Heritage: Structure, Meaning and Mechanisms of Change*, ed. Nicholas Ritt, Herbert Schendl, Christiane Dalton-Puffer, and Dieter Kastovsky, *Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature* 16 [Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang], 1–17). Since the Old English contrast *þā* and *þās* depends on *-s*, the development of the modern forms through Middle English argues against a straightforward history. The semantic force of this contrast, including such Old English forms as *se* ‘the, that’ also contributes to the complex history of the demonstratives and their proximal/distal dimensions. To begin his analysis, Smith acknowledges that in *The Owl and the Nightingale* Caligula A text (South-West Midlands) the development of *þā* to *þo* and *þās* to *þos* is simply phonological. Yet the Middle English data available provide numerous examples that phonologic change alone cannot accommodate. Further, in reviewing the usual account given to the emergence of the modern demonstrative, Smith offers reasons to resist it. His principal objection is that the explanation offered is selective, one possibility chosen from several others without due argument. The usual explanation supposes that final *-s* spread to *þo* (< *þā*) and so produced, for a time, two forms, phonologically indistinguishable, with the contrastive meanings ‘these’ and ‘those’. This semantic clash then prompted the use of *thise*, the final *-e* now a feature, especially in Southern dialects, to establish a contrast with the singular *this*. To demonstrate the limitations of this account, Smith centers on forms of demonstratives found in Kent, the border regions of Yorkshire, the areas of Norse settlement, into Scotland as well. The nub of Smith’s surveying variants is that most of them could function effectively in a system of contrastive demonstratives. A corollary to Smith’s view is that forms entering sustained, general usage often enough are the result of several influences, as in the instance of demonstratives. For *these* and *those*, the influences at work include dialect variants, phonaesthesia and *Ablaut*. The phonaesthetic element to notice concerns the contrast between the front vowel /i/ and the back vowel /o/. This phonaesthetic contrast for the demonstratives supports their proximal/distal, semantic dimension. To ground this argument from phonaesthesia as contributing to the general pattern of semantic contrast for demonstratives, Smith draws on

the grammatical functions of *Ablaut*. In brief, in a set of related forms, differences in vowel quality indicate differences in meaning. One issue worth further consideration is the difference in the systemic structure of Old English demonstratives as opposed to what occurred thereafter in Middle and Modern English.

Although Christian Liebl underscores the change from Old English /ɑ:/ > /ɔ:/ as broadly familiar, he finds little in the literature on its origins or its geographical diffusion. To help fill this lacuna he presents "The A and O of a medieval English sound-change: prolegomena to a study of the origins and early geographical diffusion of /ɑ:/ > /ɔ:/" (*Medieval English and its Heritage*, ed. Ritt, *et al.*, 19–35). This essay contains examples of *o*-spellings throughout four centuries, from the ninth to the onset of the thirteenth. This spelling, however, does not always indicate a development of Old English /ɑ:/ > /ɔ:/, but may reflect, especially, a shortening of /ɑ:/ > /a/ or Gmc **ai*/ > /o(:)/. Such shortening, due to reduced stress, affects the Middle English reflex of *nōht*, the reflexes, too, of the second elements in *earfoþ* and *ordāl*, and those in personal names (-*ston*). The evidence for these spellings appears in four tables: (1) Anglo-Saxon manuscripts; (2) Domesday Book; (3) twelfth-century onomastic data—absolute figures; (4) onomastic data—percentages rounded. The Anglo-Saxon manuscripts include versions of *Ælfric's Grammar and Glossary*, *Beowulf*, translations of Bede and Boethius, *Pastoral Care*, selections from *The Exeter Book*, *The Parker Chronicle*, *Genesis A*, and several other items. Thirteen counties give witness to this sound change in Domesday Book, from Kent to Cornwall and northward through Cheshire to West Riding of Yorkshire. Domesday Book does not support a geographical center for the development of the /ɑ:/ > /ɔ:/ change. Tables 3 and 4 are more inclusive: each has geographic divisions—the South; the East Midlands and London; the West Midlands; the North and Lincolnshire. The data in these tables now offer some evidence of geographic centers for the sound change: Kent, some South-East counties, the East Midlands, also the West Midlands. Liebl is careful to note the uncertainty that spellings stem from local practice or that homorganic lengthening before *-mb* and *-nd* occurs without exception. The over-all thrust of this study is that it may reveal an early impulse toward the transformations identified as the Great Vowel Shift.

In a morphophonologic review of Germanic *n*-stems (e.g. OE *ēage*, ON *auga*, OHG *ouga*), Frederik Kortlandt argues that changes to their endings, particularly in Scandinavian, are due to innovations. To support this claim in "The Inflection of the Germanic N-Stems,"

NOWELE 48: 3–7, he resists appealing to a mechanism of replacement in endings to explain their changes from Proto-Germanic. Instead, his argument holds that as in all other declensions of nouns, so in *n*-stems, change is innovative. This approach spurs him to lay out first the inflections of *n*-stems as reconstructed in Proto-Germanic. From this initial paradigm, the emergent contrasts (as reconstructed with the aid of Van Helten's law) among Scandinavian, English, and Upper German dialects reveal clearest differences on the Continent. One salient contrast involves feminine nouns, a raising of **ōn* > **ūn*, occurring after the formation of Old English dialects (these manifesting, instead, a shortening of **ōn* > *an* at an early stage). The assumption is that the vowel of **ōn* in West Germanic developed first into [æ], then into [â], subsequently [a], as in Old English *guma*. Kortlandt also examines the chronological delabialization of original **ōn*. He reviews for Scandinavian delabialization the evidence supplied by inscriptions and infers that **ōn* developed into a nasalized vowel as the Runic ending *-o* yielded to *-a*, some time during the fifth century. In Scandinavian, finally, Proto-Germanic **ō* became *-u* in the nominative, singular case; the nasalized vowel, as in the accusative, singular case, became subject to umlaut. Both vowels, *-u* and its nasalized counterpart, were eventually lost, yielding homophony in the nominative and accusative, singular cases.

Hironari Suzuki advances his study of complex predicates through his considering alliterative patterns in half-lines, the 'a'-verses and the 'b'-verses, as well across the caesura and across lines. His survey, "Effect of Alliteration on Constructions with Complex Predicates in Old English Poetry," *Textual and Contextual Studies in Medieval English*, ed. M. Ogura, 179–192, includes *Beowulf*, *Andreas*, and *Elena*. The thesis presented asserts that alliteration is the chief determinant in ordering non-finite forms of verbs and accompanying modal or other auxiliaries that together comprise complex predicates. In an arrangement of four over-all tables, Suzuki sets out his evidence. The first over-all table (1) on clause types and word order frequencies presents modal auxiliaries in collocation with infinitive forms, also other auxiliaries collocated with participles as well as infinitival forms. By large percentages in all three poems auxiliaries (modal or otherwise) more often precede non-finite forms in main clauses, less often in subordinate clauses. This pattern holds no matter what non-finite form the verb takes. As for modal and other auxiliaries preceding or following non-finite verb forms before and after the conjunctions *ond* and *ac*, Suzuki finds too few to merit further review here. The second over-all table (2) records in subordinate clauses

the occurrence of alliteration on modal auxiliaries and infinitive forms. The table registers frequencies in 'a'-verses, 'b'-verses, across the caesura and across lines. The 'a'-verse (first half-line) contains few instances of the complex predicate, the 'b'-verse substantially more examples—almost always with the infinitive form alliterated. The complex predicate rarely spreads itself over the caesura, somewhat more often across lines, the infinitive form alliterated in about half the examples, the modal auxiliary far less. The third overall table (3) focuses on alliteration and the orders of modal auxiliaries and infinitive forms in main clauses. The frequency of these complex predicates in main clauses is nearly twice as great as those reported for the second overall table (2) on subordinate clauses (209 to 109). In these tables, too, the infinitive forms typically draw alliteration and appear after modal auxiliaries. The 'b'-verse presents the greatest incidence of infinitive forms (all under alliteration) preceding modal auxiliaries. Across the caesura—the modal auxiliary in the 'a'-verse, the infinitive form in the 'b'-verse—alliteration does not fall on either part of the complex predicate. Across lines, of more than fifty examples, about half instance alliteration on the infinitive form. The fourth overall table (4) presents complex predicates comprised of auxiliaries other than modals (e.g. finite forms of *beon*, *weorþan*, and *habban*) collocating with participles or infinitive forms. Suzuki first discusses complex predicates with participles. In subordinate clauses, the 'b'-verse contains many more instances than the 'a'-verse (except in *Elena*) of the alliterated participle preceding the auxiliary. In main clauses, the order of forms in the complex predicate mostly resembles the pattern outlined in the first overall table (1). Here alliteration falls on participles mainly in the 'a'-verse but also in the 'b' verse (if they precede auxiliaries). Across lines, the incidence of an auxiliary preceding a participle about equals that of infinitive forms recorded in the third over-all table (3): again about fifty examples, half the participles bearing alliteration. Suzuki's summary of predicates constructed with auxiliaries and infinitive forms differs somewhat from his findings for collocations with participles. The frequency of these complex predicates in subordinate and main clauses reveals appreciable differences. In subordinate clauses, complex predicates with participles have 115 examples, with infinitive forms 50; in main clauses 230 examples of predicates with participles, 174 with infinitive forms. In subordinate clauses the 'a'-verse offers few instances of complex predicates with infinitive forms; the 'b'-verse several times more (parallel to the proportions with participles). In main clauses, however, the infinitive form in 'a'-verses,

if occurring after an auxiliary, typically alliterates, but in 'b'-verses the infinitive form alliterates, mainly if it precedes the auxiliary. Across lines the complex predicate with auxiliary and infinitive form is rather numerous—103 instances altogether. Again, in nearly half the examples, the infinitive form alliterates, the auxiliary but 17 times. Suzuki concludes that the recurrent practice of alliterating the non-finite form in complex predicates helps to determine the pattern of word order outlined in the tables above. His argument is more convincing for instances of these complex predicates in 'b'-verses and across lines than in 'a'-verses and across the caesura.

Dieter Kastovsky's chapter "Typological Changes in Derivational Morphology," in *The Handbook of the History of English*, ed. Kemenade and Los, 151–176, traces developments from Indo-European on. His review of roots as a formal pattern includes those that have vowels identified with ablaut, e.g. *mVd- OE *metan*, *Vd- OE *etan*, *wVr- *weorþ-an*. The over-all features that identify this pattern both in Indo-European and Old English are those of consonantal skeletons filled with alternations of vowels in various ablaut series. Moreover, these roots linked to following determinatives (used as derivational elements) help to specify forms in nominal, adjectival, and verbal paradigms. These determinatives could serve, too, as inflections. In the development of Germanic from Indo-European and the shift from movable to fixed stress the structures of roots also underwent transformation: ablaut alternations became unpredictable. Also, the appearance in Germanic of further, secondary derivational elements among verbs and nouns led to changes in the nature of morphological structures. The root-based structures in Indo-European evolved to stem-based patterns in Germanic through the use of the secondary derivational elements; Kastovsky presents two classes of Old English weak verbs as exemplifying stem-formatives: (1) *-j-/-i-* *trymman* (2) *-ōi-/-ō-* *lufian*. Reconstructions of these verbs for fifth century pre-Old English illustrate a sequence of stem base and stem-formatives: **trum+j+(an+az)*; *luf-ōj(an+az)*. That these evident formatives do not for the most part appear in West Saxon is due to fusions with person/number endings or syncope according to Sievers's law. For the class 1 weak verb, Old English retains through *i*-umlaut some indication of the *-j-* formative, as seen in the vocalic change of **trum+j* (pre- Old English) > *trymm-* (West Saxon). Another indication, in Kastovsky's view, manifests itself through a reanalysis of weak class 1 and class 2 preterite forms. So pre-Old English **trum+i+(d+æ)* and **luf+ō+(d+a)* present a sequence of stem base + stem

formative + inflection; in Old English proper the preterite forms *trymede* (-e- < -i-) and *lufode* (-o- < -ō-) have an altered structure of stem base + preterit inflection. This reanalysis of a stem formative led also to a contrast between inflections and verbal suffixes—these long obsolete except for -n(ian), as in *fasten* and *red-den*. In contrast to the posited stem-formatives in early Old English verbs, those for nouns retain no apparent trace even in Germanic; here, Kastovsky argues, stem-based formatives directly preceded inflections early on. The loss of endings in nominative and accusative forms of strong masculine and neuter nouns (adjectives, too) promotes a reanalysis of stem-based forms (e.g. *dag*, *word*) into word-based forms + inflections. The development of word-based forms in Old English did not eliminate stem-based forms, however; together with the word-based *dag* and *word*, the stem-based *lufian* and *endian* enjoy some currency. What brought on the loss of stem-based forms was the change of final vowels to schwa as in *luf-u* > *luf-e* > *lufe* in early Middle English. This typological change from stem-based to word-based patterning also works in the infinitive forms of verbs, from Old English -an > -en > -e, a development not merely phonetic. Kastovsky's discussion of Middle English includes a few notes of interest on pre-Conquest forms. Old English vocabulary reveals little borrowing, no more than three percent of the lexicon; verbal prefixes, by and large, are semantically opaque (*un-* the most salient among these). A third topic concerns morphophonemic alternations. Here Old English offers much variability, due to ablaut alternation characteristic of verbs but also nouns and adjectives. See his collection of lexical items that include among eleven related forms, the verb *drincan*, the noun *drenc*, and the adjective *druncenig*. Besides functional uses of ablaut, Old English also displays allomorphic contrasts, as in *i*-umlaut (*dōm* - *dēman*), geminates (*gram* - *gremman*), palatal alternatives (*lugon* - *lyge*), Anglo-Frisian Brightening (*grafan* - *græf*). The array of these morphophonemic alternations becomes rather unpredictable by late Old English. Another feature still in need of further study is quantitative alternation due to vowel shortening and vowel lengthening before consonant clusters in late Old English. The chapter as a whole contains, as well as Old English typologies, others developed in later centuries.

Although Elizabeth Closs Traugott's "The Semantic Development of Scalar Focus Modifiers" includes examples from Middle English on, her analysis invites a revisiting of Old English. Her chapter, in *The Handbook of the History of English*, ed. van Kemanade and Los, 335–359, begins with contrasts between intensifiers

and downtoners as a strategy toward furthering valuable refinements. Since intensifiers vary in degree of impact, Traugott suggests generalizations aimed at grading, historically, their differences in force. A similar historical range of generalization seeks to distinguish degrees of difference among downtoners. A further issue concerns the analysis of degree modifiers (*so*, for instance) that serve as intensifiers or downtoners. One procedural feature mentioned but not developed is that both intensifiers and downtoners (as well as generalizations governing them) depart historically from norms. Yet what norms are and whether they remain or undergo change throughout the history of a language are issues still to explore. Even so, Traugott offers ways to think about norms. One approach is to regard norms and departures from them as subjective, discernible in the ways that speakers express their perspectives and attitudes as participants, for example, in conversation. If some expressions of perspectives and attitudes gain wide currency as indicators of intensifiers or downtoners, then a basis for norms becomes tenable. Recent work on intensifiers reveals five categories of degree adverbs in current use: local/ dimensional (*highly*, *extremely*), quantitative (*much*, *vastly*), qualitative (*terribly*, *violently*), emphatic (*really*), taboo (*damned*, *fucking*). A comparable analysis of downtoners, however, does not appear. Despite this reliance on subjectivity, difficulties, ambiguous or uncertain, challenge analysis. Indeed, these difficulties—how, say, does one confidently identify patterns of intonation in texts?—imply procedural limits. Yet the need for reliable analyses of intonation is highly desirable since much recent work centers on focus modifiers. If the late twentieth century enhanced such analyses, the impulse to undertake historical research is possibly irresistible but daunting. One helpful approach is to draw on three classes of focus modifiers as indicators of how to lay out patterns of intonation. These three classes comprise (i) exclusives—*only*, *merely*; (ii) particularizers—*exactly*, *just*; (iii) additives—*also*, *even*. Faced with the elusiveness that attends historical recovery of intonation, Traugott attends to lexical analyses of focus modifiers in texts of the past. Here her approach is that of the lexicographer, the definitions given to *even* relying on cogent inference. Her next step is then to suppose a sequence of development in the definitions posited for *even*. The strength of supposition depends on concurrence; whether her sequence for *even* wins approval depends on critical review. That the future will generate models of analysis theoretically grounded is a theme that concludes the chapter. Some possibilities that Traugott offers for study include (a) the genres of texts; (b) age

and gender; (c) patterns of intonation evolving during the past century; (d) evolving, grammatical structures. How well these possibilities fit Old English texts is an issue still to examine, but Traugott's overall program lays out a course highly worth investigating.

EG

Syntax

Paola Crisma and Chara Gianollo, "Where Did Romance N-Raising Come from? A Parallel Study of Parameter Resetting in Latin and English," *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2004: Selected Papers from "Going Romance," Leiden, 9–11 December 2004*, ed. Jenny Doetjes and Paz González, *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series IV, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 278* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins), 71–93, examine the phenomenon of so-called N(oun)-raising, a comparative perspective in a subset of older Indo-European languages, Classical Latin (CL), Late Latin (LL), and Old English (OE), in order to determine whether the N-raising is an innovation in Latin or the inheritance of an older Indo-European pattern subsequently lost in languages outside the Romance family. The first conclusion, illustrated by representative data, is that OE and CL are quite similar with respect to the syntax of the noun phrase. In later stages, Latin and English diverge. This is partly due to the emergence of articles in English and their absence in Latin. The section on the syntax of the OE noun phrase contains very detailed tables outlining various word order patterns from a number of texts over a time period up to the 11th century. They show that OE had N-raising to a functional projection above NP and that this N-raising was subsequently lost. The proposed trigger for this loss is the declining frequency of post-N genitives which results in the resetting of the N-raising parameter in English. Next, the authors consider N-raising in the history of Latin. Their first conclusion, after consideration of a variety of data and construction types, is that there is no N-Raising in CL. They then argue that the development of N-Raising occurs during the LL period and that parameter resetting took place during this period due to ambiguity in the primary data and to the development of post-N genitives that become predominant in LL. Their overall conclusion is that N-Raising existed in OE but not CL and was subsequently lost in English and was a later development in LL; it is thus not necessarily a stable grammatical feature but rather one subject to diachronic change.

Jutta M. Hartmann and László Molnárfi, eds. *Comparative Studies in Germanic Syntax: From Afrikaans to Zurich German*, *Linguistik aktuell / Linguistics Today*

97 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins) contains papers presented at the 20th Comparative Germanic Syntax Workshop, Tilberg, 2005. There are ten papers included in addition to the introduction. The papers cover a range of Germanic languages and a number of topics in current syntactic theory. A requirement for inclusion in the volume was that papers address at least two Germanic languages or cover different diachronic stages of the same language. The five papers reviewed here take either or both of these approaches. Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson's essay from the volume, "The Nom/Acc Alternation in Germanic," 13–50, is concerned with the distribution of accusative case and the nominative/accusative case distinction across the Germanic languages. The proposal is that there are only two accusatives: *Relational Acc*, and *Non-relational Acc* where the term relational is used to indicate whether the Acc case-marked occurs in the presence of a nominative DP or not. The paper is divided into five sections: section two gives an overview of accusative case-marking in Germanic in the light of Burzio's Generalization. In section three; arguments are given for a morphological account of relational (structural) case where accusative is taken to be dependent on the presence of nominative case. The fourth section discusses predicative case in English. In section five there is a discussion of the notion of morphology and syntax as "distinct codes."

The initial descriptive section divides the Germanic languages into those that are case-rich and those that are case-poor, and this discussion is confined largely to the standard languages. Representative examples are given of the distribution of the relational cases in Germanic together with examples of accusatives that occur with various adverbials, so-called quirky accusatives (for example, accusative subjects on the subject of certain predicates in Icelandic), and the 'accusative unaccusative' construction in Icelandic. There are predicates that exhibit dative on the subject argument and accusative on the theme argument (Faroese and Middle English) where it appears that accusative is licensed in the absence of nominative case. Sigurðsson takes such constructions to involve a "silent nominative" and notes that this pattern is unexpected under Burzio's Generalization. A further problem is the licensing of accusative in English gerunds where there is no visible nominative; however, Sigurðsson proposes that there is a "silent nominative" here also. The next section of the paper is concerned with nominative/accusative variation on predicate nominals in Germanic and can thus be divided into predicate-nominative and predicate-accusative languages. Sigurðsson notes that accusative case-marking of the English type in predicative DPs

in case-rich languages is unusual and he proposes that this arises due to historical change where languages such as English have extended the function of nominative/accusative (his relational cases) from arguments to DPs in general. The final section presents discussion on the nature of the relationship between syntax and morphology suggesting that morphological case “interprets” syntax rather than directly expressing it.

Gertjan Postma's paper, “Toward a Syntactic Theory of Number Neutralisation: The Dutch Pronouns *je* ‘You’ and *ze* ‘Them,’” *Comparative Studies in Germanic Syntax*, ed. Hartmann and Molnárfi, 181–200, is concerned with number neutralization in the system of weak pronouns in Dutch and their diachronic development. The proposal here is that the number neutralization of subject pronouns is established by syntactic means and is related to the presence of asymmetric verb-second which occurs in a subset of the older Germanic languages (see table p. 197). This in turn is related to the presence or absence of agreement features in C. In an analysis of Old English, Postma proposes that there was in fact number neutralization in the forms of third person pronouns. The facts for Kentish, as a conservative dialect, are taken to be more suggestive of this fact with a singular form *hio* ‘she’ used as singular and plural subject and in object position. Further, Kentish has been described as conservative with respect to the Verb-Second constraint. Thus Postma concludes that number neutralization is not tied to particular forms, as the behavior of Kentish *hio* parallels that of German *sie* ‘she, they, her, them’. Again, it appears that for Kentish, number neutralization is present as is asymmetric Verb-Second, and Postma proposes this to be the original situation. Subsequent change in the pronominal system leading to distinct singular and plural third person forms then had implications for asymmetric Verb-Second. Taken together with the borrowing of the third person Norse pronoun *they*, the system then underwent a loss of neutralization. The proposal is that this loss of neutralization and loss of asymmetric Verb-Second are not independent developments.

The focus of Thomas McFadden and Artemis Alexiadou's “Auxiliary Selection and Counterfactuality in the History of English and Germanic,” *Comparative Studies in Germanic Syntax*, ed. Hartmann and Molnárfi, 237–62, is on the retreat of *be* as a perfective auxiliary in the history of English. They use corpus data to show that the rise of *have* as a perfective auxiliary was connected to the restricted use of *be* in past counterfactuals. They discuss initially the distribution of *be* and *have* in OE as determined by the main predicate—as a change of state verb, or non-agentive verb, etc. During

the ME period, *have* came to be used with verbs previously associated with *be*. One example discussed in detail is the use of *have* with the verb *come*, which was consistently associated with the *be* auxiliary in OE. They chart the rise of the use of *have* as perfective auxiliary with the verb *come* from the OE through the ME to the EModE period—a rise of from 0% to around 26% by 1710. They then divide the usages of either auxiliary according to modality, and they determine that the earliest usages of *have* as auxiliary occur in counterfactuals. The authors note, however, that the use of modals and counterfactuals with the verb *come* are very rare in earlier periods, giving an explanation as to why *have* was not always preferred in such contexts. They conclude that the change is one of general expansion of the auxiliary system and the use of the perfect in more semantic contexts. The authors then generalize their study to all intransitive perfects in ME and find a striking difference in distribution between the auxiliaries, with *have* overwhelmingly preferred in counterfactual contexts. They conclude that this is the determining factor in the distribution of the two auxiliaries and that this is a property of the higher clause area—tense and mood. The paper concludes with some discussion of comparative facts and sets out the conclusion and remaining questions as to the later auxiliary development.

The empirical focus in “The Loss of Residual ‘Head-Final’ Orders and Remnant Fronting in Late Middle English: Causes and Consequences,” *Comparative Studies in Germanic Syntax*, ed. Hartmann and Molnárfi, 263–98, by Mary Theresa Biberauer and Ian Gareth Roberts, is on so-called residual head-final word orders in Middle English. Under the analysis presented here, ME head-final word orders reflect the continued availability of VP-fronting together with DP-raising. These head-final orders indicate the persistence of a verb-final (OV) OE grammar into early ME. The paper includes the following sections: following the introduction, the authors set out their theoretical assumptions with respect to EPP feature checking; then follows a section that summarizes the chronology of the loss of verb-final orders in ME, including an analysis of stylistic fronting and verb projection raising. Finally, the potential connection between late ME changes and the changes affecting the class of modal verbs is discussed. The analysis Biberauer and Roberts have for OE is that it was language which attested various movement operations that can be described as EPP triggered movement: DP-movement or *v*P movement to the T domain, or DP object movement or VP movement in the *v* domain. In their terms, OE is a uniform spec pied-piping language. The loss of optional pied-piping then

results in only DP movement to the T and *v* domains with subsequent loss of object DP movement, resulting in what they term a smaller grammar. Under their analysis, one result of the loss of *v*P raising is that expletive subjects become obligatory and there is subsequent loss of stylistic fronting, which they analyze as V-aux orders of a standard earlier type. The remainder of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the loss of residual OV orders in ME and how this might interact with the reanalysis of modal verbs. Their focus is on the interaction and interrelatedness between the wide-ranging set of changes described and how these changes might be viewed in terms of a cascading type effect.

Carola Trips, “Syntactic Sources of Word-Formation Processes: Evidence from Old English and Old High German,” *Comparative Studies in Germanic Syntax*, ed. Hartmann and Molnárfi, 299–328, compares and contrasts diachronic word-formation processes in English and German. Its basic assumption is that word formation phenomena such as compounding and derivations are part of the morphology and historically have their origin in syntax. The first section of the paper summarizes properties of syntactic phrases that differentiate them from compounds. A summary of this overview is presented in table form (302). In section two, Trips examines the development of suffixes in German and English through a case study of the historical development of the Modern English suffix *-hood*. Data from Old English and Old High German show this suffix to be a free morpheme: *had* ‘entity’ in OE, and *heit* ‘person’ in OHG. By both the Middle English and Middle High German periods, the free morpheme *had* developed into a suffix involved in abstract noun formation (*wayrhede* ‘beauty’ [ME], *warheit* ‘truth’ [MHG]). Thus the change is one from head noun of a DP to a bound morpheme—a “desyntacticisation” process. A second case study, the rise of genitive compounds in English and German, is presented and Trips argues that these also involve a reanalysis of syntactic structure as morphological structure. The parallelisms between the development of such compounds in English and German is the topic of section four of the paper, which discusses the development of *of*-genitives following morphological development of genitive compounds from old syntactic structures containing pre-nominal genitives has occurred. Trips argues that these two case studies are evidence that not all word formation phenomena are governed by syntactic constraints and are thus part of the morphology. The data from the development of genitive compounds is argued to provide evidence that morphological structures may have semantic properties that contrast with those of related syntactic structures.

As the title suggests, the goal of Robert Hasenfratz and Thomas Jambeck’s *Reading Old English: A Primer and First Reader* (Morgantown, WV: West Virginia UP) is to provide the necessary background to enable the student to acquire reading competence in Old English. It also presents the necessary background in Old English grammar in some detail and is designed for use in both undergraduate and graduate courses, particularly for those students who have little background in linguistics or philology. The chapters first present aspects of Old English grammar in a number of detailed lessons, which are followed by relevant exercises. The chapters follow the sequence orthography, phonetics and phonology, nouns, weak verbs and regular verbs, further weak verbs and irregular verbs, translating Old English with information on the use of syntax and morphology, adjectives, adverbs and prepositions, pronominal elements, strong verbs I and II, rarer nouns, and finally impersonal constructions and contract verbs. In addition, there are two appendices—one provides a basic introduction to traditional grammar and includes definitions and illustration of the grammatical terminology used in the lessons, the second provides a summary of sound changes from Indo-European to Germanic, from Germanic to West Germanic, and within Old English. The final section of the book includes additional readings taken from various texts and includes a quick guide to Old English poetry. A glossary is included at the end of the volume. The detailed table of contents enables the reader to easily find a particular grammatical topic. Paradigms are set off from the main text, and each exercise has an accompanying vocabulary list. The volume does not assume a knowledge of either historical linguistics or the history of English, and it presents the necessary background material to enable students to acquire reading knowledge of Old English.

A History of the English Language (Amsterdam: John Benjamins), by Elly van Gelderen presents a history of English that has a grammatical and typological focus with an emphasis on the linguistic analysis of Old, Middle and Modern English texts. The texts are placed within the relevant chapters and present the student with a guide to the linguistic analysis of such texts. The book contains ten chapters that cover the following topics: an introduction to the origins of English and basic English grammar (orthography, phonology, and grammatical terminology), from Indo-European to Germanic, Old English and the changes from Old to Middle English, the Middle English period, Early Modern English and Modern English, and English around the world. Each chapter contains a keyword list and topics for discussion and exercises. Appendices to each chapter contain

further texts and illustrations and a specific appendix on the use of electronic version of the OED. Regional variation in English features in many of the chapters, and the chapter on the English around the world contains discussion of lexical and grammatical differences between varieties. The focus of the book is a full linguistic analysis of various stages of English that covers all aspects of the grammar. There are detailed descriptions of phonology, morphology and syntax of the various stages, which are supplemented by texts chosen to illustrate the various grammatical aspects that are discussed. The exercises at the end of each chapter are designed to extend students' understanding of the concepts discussed. The final chapter presents a short discussion of language change and language acquisition. There is a list of suggested final project and paper topics and a final appendix that contains possible answers to some of the exercises contained in the chapters.

Maurizio Gotti's "Prediction with SHALL and WILL: A Diachronic Perspective," *The Changing Face of Corpus Linguistics*, ed. Renouf and Kehoe, 99–116, is concerned with the diachronic development of *shall* and *will* used in a predictive function. It is a longitudinal study based on corpus data from various time periods beginning with Old English and continuing to present day usage. There is a short description of the use of *shall* and *will* in Old English with reference to their status as pre-modal verbs as part of the set of preterite-present verbs. The author notes that, in Old English, *sculan* began its shift towards present day usage independently of other so-called proto-modals. On the other hand, *willan* was used during the Old English period to convey wish or intention as a deontic-type modal and was occasionally used to express a predictability value when used with inanimate subjects. Only later was it used as a maker of future with animate subjects. The remainder of the paper surveys the predictive uses of *shall* and *will* first in Middle English, then in Early Modern English, and finally in contemporary English. The focus is on the rise in the use of *shall* and *will* as predictive markers, which confirms the grammaticalization process by which the modals first acquired deontic readings and later dynamic and epistemic readings. This process culminates in overlap in usage and the increased frequency of *will* to the express future and the simultaneous decline of the use of *shall* as a marker of futurity.

David Denison and Richard Hogg, "Overview," *A History of the English Language*, ed. Hogg and Denison, 1–42, the introduction to this volume, gives a background overview to the history of English by setting English first within the context of wider Germanic as a branch of the Indo-European language family. There

follows a discussion of the early Anglo-Saxon settlement of Britain and the role of the Viking invasions in the introduction of Scandinavian elements to Old English and their distribution and spread. The linguistic importance of both the Danish Conquest and the Norman Conquest are summarized in the introduction. The next section contains a discussion of the internal population shift and the linguistic influence this had on dialect continuity and the growth of English in major population centers. In addition, there is an overview of the spread of English to other English-speaking areas in North America, Australia, and so on. The next section contains a discussion as to how we might use the historical record to determine linguistic features of earlier stages of English, and the ways in which we can use various records from the earliest writings to English used in electronic communication and other electronic formats. An overview of language change is given: the causes of language change and innovation, diffusion and spread of change, the role that extralinguistic factors might play, and a short discussion of recent and current change.

Olga Fischer and Wim van der Wurff's "Syntax," *A History of the English Language*, ed. Hogg and Denison, 109–98, presents an outline of English syntax and a description of the major changes that have occurred. The approach taken here is to describe the changes that have taken place and then give the types of explanations that have been proposed and to note where such explanations are absent. The changes are grouped as follows: changes in the noun phrase, changes in verbal syntax, and how these changes affect those of clausal constituents including complementation, negation, subordination, and interrogative clauses. At the start of the discussion of individual changes there is a comprehensive table (111–113) that briefly summarizes changes of various types as to how they are attested in Old, Middle, and Modern English, giving the section reference number. The first section discusses changes in the syntax of the noun phrase. Initially there is a description of the elements that can occur as head of the noun phrase and changes to the group including: the use of adjectives generically to refer to a group becoming gradually restricted, the development of the indefinite pronoun *one* and its replacement of the OE pronoun *man*. The development of determiners in English is given in the next section: the rise of indefinite article and the invariant definite article *þe*. Also included in this section are changes in the morphosyntax of quantifiers and adjectives. The section on verbal syntax includes topics in the development of the tense-aspect system including the development of the perfect and progressive, the

development of the tense, mood, and voice systems, with each of these sections divided into sub-topics. Other topics in verbal syntax include change in the system of negation, the interrogative system, and the rise of *do*-support. The next section contains a discussion of changes in the syntax of clausal constituents. The syntax of subjects includes the topics of the distribution of *pro*-drop in Old English, the rise of clausal subjects, changes in impersonal constructions, and the syntactic position of subjects with respect to the verbal constituent. The section on the syntax of objects includes a discussion of clausal objects, the position of the object with respect to the verb (OV and VO orders), and changes in the syntax of indirect objects with respect to ordering of pronominal and full NP direct and indirect objects. Included here is a section on clitic pronouns that gives an overview of their disappearance during the Middle English period and their absence in Modern English. The gradual restriction in the position of adverbs within the clause is outlined. The final sections contain discussions of changes in phrasal verbs and the syntax of preposition stranding. Each section contains a number of examples from texts of various periods given to illustrate the topics under discussion and each topic can be easily located within the chapter using the detailed table given at the start of the chapter.

Thomas Kohnen's "Variability of Form as a Methodological Problem in Historical Corpus Analysis: The Case of Modal Expressions in Directive Speech Acts," *Corpora and the History of English*, ed. Mair and Heuberger [see sec. 2], 221–33, is concerned with corpus retrieval of directives employing performative verbs, imperatives, and modal verbs, and what role the heterogeneity of linguistic forms plays in such a task. What was found in a pilot study was that such directives are very uniform across Old and Middle English, decreasing thereafter. It was found that once the orthographic variants were controlled for, instances of directives could be reliably retrieved. The paper goes on to discuss an extended search of the Dictionary of Old English Corpus and the electronic version of the Middle English Dictionary that confirmed the results of the pilot study. The author concludes that the problem of variability and unpredictability of form in speech act analysis can be overcome because the construction type and lexical forms are largely predictable.

Types of Variation: Diachronic, Dialectal and Typological Interfaces, Studies in Language Companion Series 76 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins), edited by Terttu Nevalainen, Juhani Klemola, and Mikko Laitinen, explores linguistic variation from the perspective of typology and dialectology. There are four papers that

address issues in variation in Old English. Two are concerned with possessives in Old English, Old Norse, and Older Scots (Allen and Bugaj), one is a survey of historical morphology from a typological perspective (Kastovsky), and a fourth on variation and change in adjectival constructions (Schöneborn). In "Historical Morphology from a Typological Point of View," *Types of Variation*, ed. Nevalainen *et al.*, 53–80, Dieter Kastovsky discusses data from English to illustrate how clusters of local changes in a language that may persist over long periods of time may produce cumulative effects that can result in the typological restructuring of a language. The work is divided into four sections: the first section outlines the notion of local and global changes and how they may interact, the second section gives an overview of morphological typology, section three discusses typological parameters, and section four presents the conclusion. The section on morphological typology outlines what is meant by the following descriptors: isolating, agglutinating, inflecting, or incorporating languages. The author notes that Modern English belongs to the isolating/analytic type, whereas Old English is of the synthetic/inflectional type. A discussion of changes in English plural marking follows, together with the suggestion that English may also be moving towards incorporation due to the recent increase of formations such as *proof-read*, *stage-manage*, etc., which have increased to include non-nominal forms and thus a more generalized pattern of word-formation by incorporation. The next section discusses parametric change in English. English has moved towards the situation where stem and root coincide and away from the root-based morphology of Indo-European, where word formation processes and inflection are not clearly separated. In Modern English, Kastovsky notes that inflection is word-based, whereas word formation may be word-based (native word formation) or partly stem- and word-based (non-native word formation). Then follows a discussion of the morphology of the earliest stage of Indo-European as root-based, together with an overview of the verbal system and the variable accent system. The introduction of the Germanic system of fixed stress subsequently had morphological consequences leading to the erosion of morphological endings. Taken together with the development of the weak verb system and the shift from aspect to tense, this resulted in reinterpretation of the strong verb system with the original present as the unmarked form and the ablaut form as the past participle. These changes resulted in stem-based morphology and derivational shifts. The author argues that the loss of inflectional morphology in English also contributed

to the shift from stem-based to word-based morphology. This is illustrated by the examination of a number of paradigms in Old Germanic and Old English. In addition to loss of inflectional endings following the stress shift, sound changes in Old English contributed to further eroding of inflectional morphology. This was further influenced by the merger of unstressed vowels to schwa at the end of the Old English period. The author notes that the development of weak verbs was basically similar. The number of classes of weak verbs is reduced compared with the system in early Germanic. These changes result in a shift from root-based to word-based morphology accompanied by phonological changes and loss of inflectional endings.

Thomas Schöneborn's chapter, "Primary Adjectives in English and German: Variation and Change in Diachrony and Typology" *Types of Variation*, ed. Nevalainen *et al.*, 99–120, discusses primary adjectives that are monomorphemic and belong to the core vocabulary in the history of English and German. The goal of the chapter is to examine the diachronic development of primary adjectives in the two genetically related but typologically distinct languages. The author adopts the set of thirty-six lexemes used in Dixon's work on adjectives that cover the seven semantic types he proposes for the class of adjectives (*Where have all the adjectives gone? and other essays in semantics and syntax* [Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1982], 1–62). Schöneborn compares the Germanic equivalents from Present Day English (PDE) and Modern German (ModG) to Old English (OE) and Old High German (OHG) and considers the following questions: stability over time, how new primary adjectives come to be, and the semantic types that have been acquired or lost. The first part of the analysis compares PDE and ModG, and the results are presented in table form. This establishes the base for the diachronic analysis of the class of primary adjectives. The diachronic perspective examines whether the modern primary adjectives are primary at older stages, determines borrowing, and lexeme replacement by another lexeme (primary or non-primary), and change in a primary adjective to a non-primary one. The primary adjectives in PDE, ME, and OE are set up in table form with their MG, MHG, and OHG counterparts (36 adjectives in all). In addition, the reconstructed Germanic forms are given in a further table, and another table sorts the Germanic primary adjectives by semantic class. The following conclusions are discussed: the class of primary monomorphemic adjectives is not identical in English and German, and they are not of the same semantic class as those generally considered primary as in Dixon's work. This difference extends to

stages of the languages as well; different sets would be required for ME and OE, MHG and OHG, and Germanic. In addition, non-prototypical semantic classes are discussed with respect to earlier borrowing and derivation.

Cynthia Allen's chapter, "Possessives and Determiners in Old English," *Types of Variation*, ed. Nevalainen *et al.*, 149–70, investigates two constructions in Old English exhibiting co-occurrence of a possessive and a determiner. The point of interest here is the construction in which the possessive precedes the determiner, which the author notes is typologically unusual and is found only with adjectives in OE. The analysis presented in the chapter suggests that the construction is possible because adjectives could appear as complements to determiners in OE, giving the order *possessive-determiner-adjective-noun* within the noun phrase. A table is given offering an overview of the of both orders, determiner-possessive and possessive-determiner, showing the distribution of both forms and confirming the fact that the possessive-determine order is only found with noun phrase that include adjectives and occurs in OE and very early Middle English and is found across text types. The author notes that it is found as the sole order in some texts. Allen analyzes the construction as one in which the NP complement of D has a DP specifier with another D head and the adjectival phrase as its complement. Further, the possessive-determiner order is found only with *se*, which Allen suggests may be either a demonstrative or article *se* taking an AP complement. The demise of the construction, the author proposes, is linked to the movement of adjectives to the pronominal position. Allen notes the occurrence of similar constructions in Old Norse and speculates that the possibility of the constructions is linked to the emergence of a determiner-like definite article rather than the usual demonstrative.

The main topic of Joanna Bugaj's "Analytic 'of the samyn' or Synthetic 'its'? The Use of Neuter Possessives in Older Scots Texts," *Types of Variation*, ed. Nevalainen *et al.*, 171–201, is the typological change in neuter possession in the Older Scots period from analytic prepositional forms to the synthetic form *its*. Analytic marking via prepositional constructions expresses neuter possessives in Older Scots: *thairof*, *of the samyn*, and *of it*. These forms are later replaced by the inflected form *its*, and the author notes that the period of transition from one form to the other is the late seventeenth century with a fairly abrupt development of use of the new pronoun form noted, with contact with English as the main cause of the change. Various prose genres from the Helsinki Corpus of Older Scots (Meurmen-Solin

1993) are examined in order to determine the frequency of use of the various forms in the different genres. The frequency results are tabulated individually for the various genres as well as for the overall results showing the shift from analytic to the inflected form.

The topic of Michio Hosaka's "On Unaccusative Constructions in the History of English," *Textual and Contextual Studies in Medieval English*, ed. Ogura, 1–17, is the history of so-called unaccusative constructions in English. The paper is divided into four parts: the first outlines the Unaccusative Hypothesis, the second describes the changes in unaccusatives and their basic structure in reflexive, passive, middle, and impersonal constructions, the third is concerned with the purported gradual restriction of unaccusatives in Modern English, and the fourth with a potential typological relation between unaccusativity and *pro*-drop. The second section of the paper presents a number of examples of unaccusative predicates divided into three classes: those expressed with adjectives and psychological verbs, verbs whose subject is patient or theme, and verbs of existence, happening, and motion. The paper concludes with a short discussion of the possible relationship between unaccusativity and the null subject parameter through a comparison between English and the Romance languages.

Michiko Ogura's "Element Order Varies: Samples from Old English Psalter Glosses," *Textual and Contextual Studies in Medieval English*, ed. Ogura, 105–26, is concerned with word order variation between the Merician *Vespasian Psalter* and the early West Saxon *Regius Psalter*. The author notes that there are 130 instances of word order difference between the two texts and divides the differences into syntactic type. The first type of variation is concerned with word order in the noun phrase with respect to the order of demonstratives, head noun, adjectives, etc. One construction type with 73 examples is that of placement of a subject pronoun with respect to the verb: the order varies between subject-verb and verb-subject with occasional null subject examples. Interrogatives and negated sentence patterns are examined in some detail and representative examples are given. A summary is given with the trends of various word order patterns, and one conclusion is that the West Saxon glosses largely follow Latin word order.

Masayuki Ohkado's "On Word Order in Constructions with Two Predicates in Old English Interlinear Glosses," *Textual and Contextual Studies in Medieval English*, ed. Ogura, 127–46, is concerned with how Old English interlinear glosses might be used to determine aspects of Old English clause structure. What is of issue is the deviation in Old English word order from that

of the Latin original. The paper gives examples of the following: the variable Old English order for auxiliary and main verb when the Latin text has a single verb, the order of determiner and noun across various Old English texts where this is a single noun in the Latin text, and the word order in participle constructions. Tables are given to present the frequencies of various word order patterns. The next section examines the relationship between Old English word order and morphological order in the Latin original. In particular, the question as to whether Latin passive morphology is associated with a particular order of main verb and modal verb is examined, and no statistical correlation is found for this particular set of data. Two further sections are concerned with the syntax of the negative particle *ne* and how its presence interacts with the order of modal and main verb, or a form of the verb *be* and the main verb, and with constructions with and without subjects and whether their presence or absence is associated with a particular verb order pattern. It is found that there is significant verb-*be* order in participial constructions with a subject gap, analogous to Scandinavian stylistic fronting. The conclusions of the paper are that Latin morphology has little effect on verb order, and that verbal order varies according to construction type to some extent.

Ilse Wischer's "Grammaticalisation and Language Contact in the History of English: The Evolution of the Progressive Form," *Medieval English and Its Heritage*, ed. Ritt *et al.*, 165–87, is concerned with grammaticalization and language contact as they relate to the evolution of the progressive form in English. The paper is divided into four parts. The first part provides an overview of the notion of grammaticalization and discusses earlier ideas and proposals on the topic. The second part of the paper presents a summary of some criticisms regarding the status of grammaticalization as an independent phenomenon and gives an overview of those in favor of a theory of grammaticalization. The third part of the paper then turns to the evolution of the progressive form in order to chart the grammaticalization of the progressive construction from the Old English period onwards. The author discusses equational sentences with agent nouns that may have been triggers for reanalysis. The author also mentions that language contact with Celtic, which has parallel constructions, or translations of certain Latin constructions, may have played a supporting role. The view presented here is that the Modern English construction is the direct descendent of the Old English construction and not a new Middle English development, and a number of arguments for this view are outlined. Finally,

the author discusses the role of language contact—Scandinavian, particularly in the north, and French via the use of French participial constructions. A final table summarizes the relevant factors in the grammaticalization of the progressive.

The central topic of Päivi Pahta and Arja Nurmi's "Code-Switching in the *Helsinki Corpus*: A Thousand Years of Multilingual Practices," *Medieval English and Its Heritage*, ed. Ritt *et al.*, 203–20, is code-switching between English and other languages from a diachronic perspective, discussed with material taken from the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*. The second section of the paper presents in table form a quantitative overview of code-switching in the *Helsinki Corpus* for Old English, Middle English, and Early Modern English by providing the total number of switched passages and the average switch length in words. The number of switched passages is highest in Middle English, next highest in Old English, and decreases in Early Modern English. A further table gives the languages other than English used in the *Helsinki Corpus*: Arabic, French, Greek, Italian, Latin, Spanish, and unknown. The next section discusses and summarizes in table form the instances of code-switching in various text types. Religious instruction texts are shown to have the highest occurrence in Old and Middle English. The next table gives a finer-grained breakdown of text types: biography, diary, document, handbook, etc., and it is shown that, in Old English, code-switching was highest in scientific texts due to the frequency of technical terminology in the switched texts. Overall, it appears that texts of a religious or scientific nature have higher incidences of code-switching. Examples of code-switching in various text types are given together with identification of the text type. The authors conclude that their study provides a baseline of the frequency of code-switching in various text types throughout the history of English that can be used for further study of the phenomenon.

DJ

Works not seen

- Alcaraz-Sintes, Alejandro. "Old English Ditransitive Adjectives." *SELIM* 13 (2005–06): 9–49.
- Daniels, Henry. "Genog (*n*)is Genog: On Lexical Redundancy and Ellipsis in Old English." *Paroles et silences dans la littérature anglaise au Moyen Age*. Ed. Carruthers and Papahagi. [see sec. 4a] pp. 29–71.
- Davis, Graeme. *Comparative Syntax of Old English and Old Icelandic: Linguistic, Literary and Historical Implications*. Studies in Historical Linguistics 1. Oxford: Peter Lang, 189 pp.

- Delesse, Catherine. "Absence de marqueurs et non-dit linguistique: l'ellipse en vieil-anglais." *Paroles et silences dans la littérature anglaise au Moyen Age*. Ed. Carruthers and Papahagi. [see sec. 4a] pp. 15–28.
- González Orta, Marta. "The Resultative Construction in Old English: Towards a Semantic Network of Verb Classes." *SN* 78: 123–37.
- Ingham, Richard. "On Two Negative Concord Dialects in Early English." *Language Variation and Change* 18: 241–66.
- López Couso, María José, and Belén Méndez Naya. "Complement Selection in Early English Dependent Desires: A Look at Commands and Requests." *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense* 14: 33–53.
- McFadden, Thomas, and Artemis Alexiadou. "Counterfactuals and the Loss of BE in the History of English." *U of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Ling.* 12 : 251–64.
- Mitchell, Bruce, and Susan Irvine. "A Critical Bibliography of Old English Syntax: Supplement 1997–2000 Part I." *NM* 107: 91–116.
- _____. "A Critical Bibliography of Old English Syntax: Supplement 1997–2000 Part II." *NM* 107: 169–85.
- Ogura, Michiko. "Old and Middle English Verbs of Emotion." *Poetica* (Tokyo) 66: 53–72. [OE *forhicgan*, *forhtian*, *hatian*, *wundrian*, (*ge*)*wynsumian*, etc.].
- Suárez Gómez, Cristina. "Position of Relative Clauses in Early English." *NM* 107: 291–305.
- Stanley, Eric G. "FEAR Chiefly in Old and Middle English." *Poetica* (Tokyo) 66: 73–114. [OE *broga*, *egsa*, *fæ̅r*, *gryre*, etc.]
- Vacher, Aimeric. "The Linguistic and Literary Impact of the Norman Invasion of England: Royal, Legal and Juridical Writing from 1066 to 1189." Ph.D. Diss., City Univ. of New York, 2006. *DAI* 67A: 1.
- Vásquez González, Juan Gabriel. "Corpus Linguistics and the Rediscovery of A-S Heathenism." *Selected Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis*. Ed. McConchie *et al.* [see sec. 3a], 166–77.

Works to be reviewed in YWOES 2007

- Brinton, Laurel. "Pathways in the Development of Pragmatic Markers in English." *Handbook of the History of English*. Ed. van Kemenade and Los. pp. 307–34.
- Croft, William. "Evolutionary Models and Functional-Typological Theories of Language Change." *Handbook of the History of English*. Ed. van Kemenade and Los. pp. 68–91.
- Denison, David. "Category Change and Gradience in the Determiner System." *Handbook of the History of English*. Ed. van Kemenade and Los. pp. 279–304.

- Lightfoot, David W. "Cuing a New Grammar." *Handbook of the History of English*. Ed. van Kemenade and Los. pp. 24–44.
- Pintzuk, Susan, and Ann Taylor. "The Loss of OV Order in the History of English." *Handbook of the History of English*. Ed. van Kemenade and Los. pp. 249–78.
- Seoane, Elena. "Information Structure and Word Order Change: The Passive as an Information-Rearranging

Strategy in the History of English." *Handbook of the History of English*. Ed. van Kemenade and Los. pp. 360–91.

- van Kemenade, Ans, and Bettelou Los. "Discourse Adverbs and Clausal Syntax in Old and Middle English." *Handbook of the History of English*. Ed. van Kemenade and Los. pp. 224–48.

4 Literature

4a. General and Miscellaneous

Daniel Anlezark's well-received monograph *Water and Fire: The Myth of the Flood in Anglo-Saxon England*, Manchester Medieval Literature (Manchester: Manchester UP) won the 2007 ISAS Best First Book Prize. Anlezark argues that for the Anglo-Saxons the Flood story was a "vital myth through which they interpreted the whole of history and their place in it" (1). The Flood myth embodied a primal story of destruction, vengeance and apocalypse, but it also represented an equally primal story of new beginnings and hope: "the dual character of the myth ... presented commentators with a potent historical metaphor, which they exploited in their own changing historical circumstances" (1). Anlezark's introduction defines his use of the term "myth" and surveys background information on the biblical story, the classical Flood traditions (e.g., Ovid), and early Germanic analogs. Chapter 1 ("You see the water, you see the wood: The Bible and the Fathers") surveys biblical references to the flood in the Old and the New Testaments. Anlezark draws out the particular emphases of the Flood story, highlighting the elements that would be picked up by the medieval tradition. Anlezark also includes a brief survey of the main lines of patristic interpretation, including figural understandings of key images, figures, and events: Noah, the ark, the flood itself, the door of the ark, the waters, the birds, and so forth. Particularly constant was the equation between the flood and baptism and the ark and the church, and an eschatological understanding of the story overall. Chapter 2 ("A manifold mystery: Bede on the Flood") provides a thorough survey of Bede's understanding of the Flood myth across a wide range of texts, but also a close attention to his commentary on Genesis: "For Bede the historian, the Flood was a key event in the earlier history of the world; for Bede the theologian, the Flood was an event replete with mystical significance"

(44). Bede follows the main lines of patristic orthodoxy, but he adjusts interpretations when it suits his audience's needs. Bede has four interpretative emphases: an analogy between the ark and the Church, the flood as baptism, the flood as symbolizing the end of the world, and Noah as a type of Christ. Bede's emphasis on the understanding of the Flood story as a story of the Church reflects his concern for the Anglo-Saxon Church and its course in history. The Flood is important to Bede the historian due to its prominence in the structure of universal history and time.

Chapter 3 ("Learning the lesson of the Flood") examines uses of the Flood story mostly in vernacular prose by focusing on the role of the story as a monitory exemplum. In response to Viking attacks, authors adapted Flood-inspired apocalypticism to understand epic threats and calamities. Anlezark first examines homilies in the "Sunday Letter tradition," specifically the "Niall homilies" of the early ninth century. These homilies drew "on an apocalyptic tradition with its roots in the north of England in the first half of the ninth century" (112). The Flood played a prominent role in this apocalypticism and underwrote Alcuin's understanding of the earliest Viking attack in his letters from the 790s. Alfred then adapts the Flood story in the Old English translation of Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy*, particularly drawing out the notion that sinful kings/tyrants can expect divine retribution in the form of a Flood. In the *Catholic Homilies* Ælfric emphasizes that the Flood was sent as a punishment for the sexual sins of the human race; in this case Ælfric adapts the Flood myth for local theological demands. The chapter defines two main traditions of understanding the Flood in Anglo-Saxon England: first, an orthodox tradition exemplified by Ælfric, and another less orthodox tradition charged with apocalyptic fervor and exemplified by the Sunday Letter homilies. In both cases, the Flood story becomes a standard way to represent and

understand historical calamities: "The simple understanding of historical events that saw in fire and sword God's judgment on his sinful people was not only ultimately modeled on the myth of the Flood, but inseparable from it in the medieval religious imagination" (164). Poetry rather than prose is the focus of Chapter 4 ("Flood, covenant and apocalypse in Old English poetry"), particularly *Genesis A*, *Exodus*, and *Andreas*. Anlezark argues that these poets adapt the Flood story for an audience characterized by a sophisticated theological learning. He maintains that the exegetical traditions of the Flood he has developed in his previous chapters are a crucial part of the texture of each of these poems. All three poems share two Flood myth-derived themes: covenant and apocalypse. In *Genesis A* the poet incorporates the Flood myth in an allusive fashion, using "not a laboured typology, but a series of allusions which places before the audience a story of the ancient past peppered with language anticipating the events of the end of time.... The Flood account in *Genesis A* is neither simply literal nor heavily allegorical" (194–5). In *Genesis A* the Flood is cast as part of an ancient battle between God and the giants; this motif is absent from the homiletic tradition and seems to be peculiar to OE verse. *Exodus* and *Andreas* similarly draw upon the varied traditions of the Flood myth in their imagery and structure.

Chapter 5 ("Planting Noah's seed") details the "singular Anglo-Saxon invention" (245) of Scaef, the ark-born fourth son of Noah and progenitor of the Anglo-Saxons in certain extant royal genealogies. For Anlezark this is a fascinating, stark example of how the Anglo-Saxons used the Flood story to imagine their own national origins. Traditionally, the sons of Noah account for the various races of humanity regenerated after the flood; however, the Anglo-Saxons are nowhere mentioned in these post-diluvian lines of descent. In order to place themselves in this universal history, the Anglo-Saxons invented a fourth son of Noah, Scaef, whose descendants become the Anglo-Saxons. In his thorough investigation of the Anglo-Saxon royal genealogies, Anlezark finds that "the incorporation of Scaef is a West Saxon innovation and draws on West Saxon tradition, and that his transformation into the ark-born son is the product of Alfred's reign" (245). This also has important implications for the dating and provenance of *Beowulf*, or more specifically, at least its "prologue" concerning the career of Scyld Scaefing: "this tradition of watery arrival was probably incorporated into *Beowulf* in Wessex" (271). He then tracks the confusion and incredulity provoked by Scaef in the work of later Anglo-Saxon writers, particularly Ælfric. Chapter

6 ("*Beowulf* and the myth of the Flood") argues that the *Beowulf* poet reserved an important place in his imagination for the myth of the Flood. Anlezark investigates "the elements of water and fire throughout *Beowulf*, intertwined in the medieval imagination with the cosmological myth of the Flood" (298). He notes the presence of the Flood story in the middle of the poem on the hilt of the giant sword; as an inset narrative his audience must have been expected to know, the Flood myth "constitutes one of those overt intertexts that the audience is invited to adopt as a guide to understanding *Beowulf*'s action" (293). With the Flood myth as his interpretative key, Anlezark finds that *Solomon and Saturn II* and *Beowulf* share a "common textual background and intellectual milieu" (371) with texts such as the OE *Orosius* and King Alfred's *Boethius*; thus he would place *Beowulf* in a "Alfredian or immediately post-Alfredian period" (371). This conclusion derives further support from Chapter 5 and its argument concerning Scaef and his incorporation into the genealogies during the same period. He also maintains that the *Andreas* poet knew *Beowulf* and that *Andreas* was "aimed at an audience which not only knew *Beowulf*, but also knew the poem well" (358). *Water and Fire* is an impressive, well-researched, very wide-ranging study that contributes simultaneously to many fields of Anglo-Saxon studies; it is a model of clear writing and excellent organization.

Julia Barrow's "Chrodegang, His Rule and Its Successors," *EME* 14: 201–12, reviews three books, one of which is *The Old English Version of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang* edited by Brigitte Langefeld (Frankfurt am Main: Münchner Universitätschriften, 2003). After a detailed history of Chrodegang and his *Rule* (201–206) and a review of M.A. Claussen's *The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the Regula Canonicorum in the Eighth Century* (2004) (206–209), Barrow turns to Langefeld's work, which she describes and characterizes as "a solid addition to our understanding of the output of the Winchester School." In addition to recommending that the book contain an index, she points out shortcomings such as not pursuing certain lines of research sufficiently and not having an up-to-date reading on research relating to the Frankish church (209). Barrow then concludes with her review of J. Bertram's edition of *The Chrodegang Rules: The Rules for the Common Life of the Secular Clergy from the Eighth and Ninth Centuries. Critical Texts with Translations and Commentary* (2005).

Two of the essays contained in *Writing Medieval Biography: Essays in Honour of Frank Barlow*, edited by David Bates, Julia Crick, and Sarah Hamilton

(Woodbridge: Boydell) fall here; others are addressed in other sections of the *Year's Work*. Barbara Yorke's "Carriers of the Truth: Writing the Biographies of Anglo-Saxon Female Saints" (49–60) surveys the problems involved in sorting out historical, biographic detail from the midst of hagiographical writing. Discussing a wide range of examples, Yorke suggests that Lives (and details within them) that avoid the employment of hagiographic commonplaces may well contain reliable biographical detail. "Once these [works filled with stock motifs] have been eliminated, one is left with a small, but valuable, residue of vitae in which hagiographical conventions appear to have been adapted to accommodate aspects of their subjects' real lives" (50). Yorke identifies Bede's stories of the nuns of Barking, and of Æthelthryth of Ely, as well as the St. Mildrith material and Goscelin of St.-Bertin's *Lives* of Edith, Wulfthryth, and Wulfhild as prime candidates for such texts. She concludes that "in the discernible gap between the reality of the women's histories and hagiographic ideals" historians do have at least the raw materials to begin to construct "biographies of a few of the privileged Anglo-Saxon women who were recognized as saints" (60).

In Pauline Stafford's chapter in the same volume, "Writing the Biography of Eleventh-Century Queens" (99–109), she reflects on her own earlier books and discusses, as she puts it, "two things in particular: some issues concerning sources, and the question of determinism and agency. In relation to the latter, in particular, I shall also argue for the significance of biography as a way of approaching and understanding the past" (102). Noting that the writing of biography often implies a perspective which understands the individual as an agent, Stafford notes that "It is one of the ironies of medieval biography that, faced with sources which assert precisely the agency for which a biographer is often seeking, we may feel impelled to ask sharp questions" (105), suggesting that contextualization of all sources is essential. But specifically, Stafford calls for the contextualization of medieval depictions of agency through a study of the "structures and roles, within which all individual lives are lived, and which are thus fundamental to an understanding of those lives, but in a formulation more attuned to their individual enactment and potential problems as would be norms and scripts" (109). As such, Stafford's essay usefully articulates a response to what is in practice a tricky and troubling paradigm of individual agency as opposed to individual subordination to a structural role.

The first two chapters of Catherine A.M. Clarke's *Literary Landscapes and the Idea of England, 700–1400* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer) are focused on the image

of the *locus amoenus* ("delightful place") in Old English literature: primarily in the works of Bede in Chapter One and in OE poetry more generally in Chapter Two. This image, Clarke argues, has played a central role in the "production of an English national identity" (2). Her first chapter ("The Edenic Island") begins with a study of the opening section of the *Ecclesiastical History*, which portrays England as a "place of delight and plenty, ordered by man and appraised in terms of its usefulness and its provision of resources" (8). In contrast to the description of Britain in Gildas's *Ruin of Britain*, one of Bede's most important, if unacknowledged sources, which presents the Edenic island as permanently lost, Bede's description is more hopeful: "Unlike Gildas, Bede allows the image of the *locus amoenus* to re-surface in shadows and echoes throughout the *Ecclesiastical History* and his other works, hinting at the possibilities for future realisation of the past ideal" (15). Some of these places include Book I, Chapter 7, on the martyrdom of St. Alban, and in Book V, Chapter 12, on the visions of Drythelm. Bede's *Life of St. Cuthbert* also deploys the *locus amoenus* image as a means of promoting order and unity, notably when the saint transforms Farne from a harsh wasteland "into a space of delightful order and cultivation" (29). In Chapter Two, "Re-making the *locus amoenus* in Anglo-Saxon England," Clarke challenges "the accepted view of literary landscapes in Old English as hostile, threatening and grim" by identifying numerous places throughout the verse corpus where imagery of the *locus amoenus* occurs (36). Her primary focus is on *Genesis A* and, from the Exeter Book, *The Phoenix* and *Guthlac A*. In her readings of these and other poems, Clarke shows how "Latin literary conventions are re-made within the poetic idioms of the vernacular," a process that allows poets to participate in the construction of a English cultural and national identity (41). Clarke is careful to acknowledge the historical context of the assembly of the Exeter Book in her study, especially that of the Benedictine Reform: "the image of the *locus amoenus* is integral to the rhetoric and ideology of the Benedictine Reforms, and functions as an idealised image for renewal and revival" (61). The last two chapters of *Literary Landscapes* reach beyond the Anglo-Saxon period, first to Anglo-Norman England and then to the later Middle Ages. In each, though, Clarke continues to draw on the foundational work of Bede as she demonstrates how English poets employed the power and flexibility of the *locus amoenus* trope in their constructions of national identity.

Alice Cowen's doctoral dissertation "Writing Fire and the Sword: The Perception and Representation of

Violence in Viking Age England" (U of York, 2004, *DAI* 67C) investigates the representation and interpretation of violence associated with Viking raids in ninth to eleventh-century England. Instead of seeking to address the topic of violence in an empirical way, Cowen examines the ways in which authors present and shape the expression of violence in their texts according to the purpose of their writing. Furthermore, the notion of violence is treated not as an objective absolute, but rather as subject to the perspective of those who inflict, suffer, or witness violence. The texts which form the basis for this dissertation are the A manuscript of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (to the year 891), the well-known battle poems, *Maldon* and *Brunanburh*, the writings of both Wulfstan (*Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*) and Ælfric, as well as texts produced after the Danish conquest. For Cowen "violence is shaped by particular agendas and intersects with other discourses." The dissertation concludes that the representations of violence are multiple, and that they differ before and after the Danish conquest, when the ruling classes created a change in perspective.

Peter Dendle's "Cryptozoology in the Medieval and Modern Worlds," *Folklore* 117: 190–206) explores the similarities and differences between modern cryptozoology and the various ancient and medieval texts connected to monstrous creatures. In short, Dendle views modern monster-hunters as representing "a quest for magic and wonder in a world many perceive as having lost its mystique" (201), whereas the medieval and ancient world found its interest in the monstrous as an expression of "anxiety about how vast and frightening the world was" (193). Dendle's article reviews the various forms of medieval and ancient monster texts such as bestiaries and their uses as tools of natural science, allegory, and tales of the marvelous. Only a paragraph is devoted to relevant Anglo-Saxon texts, namely those found in the Nowell Codex of Cotton Vitellius A.xv: *The Wonders of the East*, the *Letter of Alexander to Aristotle*, and the *Passion of St. Christopher*. Dendle mentions *Beowulf* only in passing as a text adjacent to the other three works containing fantastic creatures. Here one may then realize that, like bestiaries, *Beowulf*, Grendel, and the dragon do a good job in "hybridizing the monstrous and the human" and raising questions "about the essence of 'humanity' by contrasting it with 'animality' or 'deformity'" (194). In all Dendle's article delineates well the medieval from the modern as an answer to "why humanity ... so consistently and ubiquitously populate[s] its border spaces with fascinating and sometimes threatening creatures" (191).

A second publication by Peter Dendle, "Textual Transmission of the Old English 'Loss of Cattle Charm,'" *JEGP* 105: 514–39, takes a novel approach to the scholarship of the Old English charms. Dendle contends that the study of a charm as a work of sociological significance can only begin once one determines whether the charm was in fact ever performed at the time it was preserved in manuscripts (514–15). In some instances a charm may have been preserved in a cultural context where it reflects a living ritual; however, other preservations of charms in manuscripts could merely be scribal relics of rituals no longer practiced. Dendle examines clues provided in the transmission of six variants of the Old English "Loss of Cattle Charm" from the Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman periods to determine which variants belonged to a living tradition. Rather than dealing with a single charm, Dendle divides the variants based on chronological and formal characteristics into two subsections of the charm "complex" (516). In each instance Dendle presents the text fully and faithfully, accompanied even by facsimile images of the relevant manuscript folios, which is a great advantage in reading this article. The first grouping within the complex are variants of the charm, designated the "Alliterative Bethlehem Charms" after the metrical preface to the charm, is comprised of the version found in BL MS Harley 585 and CCCC MS 41. A comparison of the few variants between these texts (such as formulaic variants in the metrical portions) leads Dendle to conclude that "these two texts were committed to writing independently of one another, based on knowledge of actual practice" (519). In regards to textual transmission, the fact that CCCC 41's charm is preserved in the marginalia of other works (perhaps for later recopying) would suggest that it belonged to a "dynamic" Anglo-Saxon practice (524). The second group of the charm complex contains variants preserving the prose portion of the charm: CCCC 190, BL Cotton Tiberius A.iii, CCCC 383, and the *Textus Roffensis*. The nature of textual variations in these versions would suggest the transmission of written, rather than oral texts (531). In the case of CCCC 383 the charm was crossed out with red ink after copying, indicating it probably was copied mistakenly. Dendle suggests that the similarity of legal headers beginning with *gyf* 'if' and the beginning of the "Theft of Cattle" charm *gyf* led to a misperception of these charm texts as legal texts (334–336). These preservations in legal codes are distinct from the charms preserved in charm contexts such as the *Lacnunga*, as the latter groups are often accompanied by "gibberish," that is to say, magic words to be recited in practicing the charm. Dendle supposes that the "gibberish" would have been perceived by the practitioners as "technical and erudite" (537), which is an evaluation that fits with

other interpretations of the “gibberish” as Old Irish or pseudo-Old Irish by H. Meroney in an article from 1945 (“Irish in the Old English Charms,” *Speculum* 20: 172–182, see in particular pp.174–177 and p. 181 for the lines referred to by Dendle). The conclusion reached by Dendle is that the scribes of Harley 585 and CCC 41 participated much more fully in the copying of their texts, suggesting a living practice, whereas the prose texts were written by scribes dutifully copying texts in a faithful, deliberate, and detached manner (539).

René Derolez’s article “Byrhtferðus bene docet,” *English Studies* 87: 253–65, is a posthumous publication alluded to in his *In Memoriam* published at the beginning of the same volume of *English Studies*. Derolez begins the piece with an examination of a Latin sentence from fol. 96 of Ashmole MS 328: *Byrhtferð ipse scripsit bene beneque docet ille suis discipulis*, and suggests that “who knows, maybe Byrhtferð was a good teacher” (254). Derolez challenges the view of Byrhtferð’s works as disorganized, rhetorically repetitive, formulaic, and containing an excess of glossing in approaching his *Enchiridion* from a different perspective, that is, as a pedagogical work (255). From this standpoint the characteristics criticized in Byrhtferð’s works become the traits of good teaching. A sentence such as *Incipit, id est inchoat, vel initium sumit, sive exordium accepit* can be lambasted as pedantic or ostentatious; however, from a pedagogical view such repetition reinforces the students’ vocabulary. Derolez’s article provides several examples of Byrhtferð’s care to maintain contact with students with efficient communication, and to provide contiguity for the students between *lectiones*, along with repetition and variation (264). For Derolez, the *Enchiridion* should not be examined with respect to its “literary pretensions” or as a “scholarly treatise,” but rather as a “teacher’s handbook, a ‘livre du maître,’ a ‘handleiding voor de leraar.’” Perhaps the greatest insight provided by this *Enchiridion* is the glimpse it gives us of the classroom around the year 1000 (263).

Nicole Discenza’s “A Map of the Universe: Geography and Cosmology in the Program of Alfred the Great” (*Conversion and Colonization in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Karkov and Howe [see sec. 1], 83–108) examines the tension between the Anglo-Saxon perception of the world around them and the portrayal of Britain as lying on the margins of the known world in the geography and history of Classical texts translated during the Alfredian program. The marginality of England expressed in maps, augmented by the idealization of the Rome as the cultural, religious, and intellectual center of Western Europe, must have stood in stark contrast against the reality of day-to-day experience of Anglo-Saxons,

whose inhabited world was of course central to them (83–84). In order to make sense of this contradiction faced by Anglo-Saxon translators of classical texts, Discenza approaches the problem with Bourdieu’s notions of *polythesis* (a situation in which a person can hold two contradictory world views without clashing) and *doxa* (a society’s knowledge or conventional wisdom which has yet to be challenged or to come into question) (85). Discenza begins her demonstration of the marginalization of Britain with an overview of the traditional cartographic depictions of the world in the Middle Ages, the so-called T-O *mappae mundi*. Such maps, however, are not known to have been widespread in the time of Alfred, though they are likely to have existed (86–88). However, Discenza notes that the audience of texts produced in the Alfredian program would have had access not only to maps and diagrams, but also to the verbal descriptions of geography as presented in numerous works (89). As evidence of verbal marginalization of Britain, Discenza highlights passages of geographic relevance from *Orosius*, Wærferth’s *Dialogues*, the preface to the *Pastoral Care*, and the prose renderings of the Psalms (89–93). After establishing the first *doxa* (that of a Mediterranean, classical world, where Britain lies at the edge, unchallenged by the lived experience of the Anglo-Saxons), the article turns to the three strategies identified by Discenza, by means of which translators were able to mediate the *polythesis*. The first of these strategies involves “recentering” the world where Britain is presented closer to Rome and the old center. *Alexander’s Letter to Aristotle*, the *Wonders of the East*, and the inclusion of the voyages of Wulfstan and Ohthere into *Orosius* creates a new margin, relative to which Anglo-Saxon England is drawn closer to Rome (94–96). In a slightly different tack, a focus on the English language as the culmination of a line of succession from Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, establishes a direct link leading to the Anglo-Saxon present. Another employment of this strategy can be seen in the beginnings of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* with Julius Caesar’s arrival in Britain (97). The second strategy is the opposite of the first. England can be presented as less marginal not by recentering the world but by the diminution of Rome and Jerusalem. In texts such as *Orosius*, the OE version of Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, and *Boethius* the transitory nature of all earthly powers (such as Babylon), or the insignificance of a geocentric world compared to a theocentric world serves to limit the geographic importance of the mediterranean world in comparison to England (99–101). Building further on this notion a shift from “physical to mental or figurative geography thus represents a third strategy for

translators" (102). The emphasis on learning found in the *Pastoral Care* turns external geography "vague and non-specific," existing only "to figure internal space" (104). A similar de-emphasis on physical geography can be seen in *Boethius* and Augustine's *Soliloquies* where "all the geography and history that matter are mental and spiritual" (107). The results of these strategies of the Alfredian program were that classical and late antique texts could be brought to England to educate the English without running the risk that the readers would feel insignificant and marginalized.

Mary Dockray-Miller's "Female Devotion and the Vercelli Book" (*PQ* 83: 337–54) identifies three primary reasons for understanding the Vercelli compilation as directed towards a female reader. First, she suggests the content of specific texts in the manuscript are suited to such an audience; secondly, she notes that a female audience is specifically addressed in homily 7; and finally she discusses the significance of the female name "eadgyþ" (now erased) on folio 41v. Beginning her essay by invoking Jaussian reception theory, Dockray-Miller articulates the clear reasons why it is perfectly plausible to suppose that the intended reader of the manuscript may well have been female.

The concept of "vernacular theology" in the Anglo-Saxon period is briefly addressed by Daniel Donoghue in "The Tremulous Hand and Flying Eagles" (*ELN* 44.1: 81–86). Building on an earlier essay by Nicholas Watson, Donoghue asks how "vernacular theology" might have operated in Anglo-Saxon England, looking at the period primarily through the lens of the so-called *First Worcester Fragment* (identified by Donoghue by its incipit as "Sanctus Beda was iboren") copied by the well known Tremulous Hand of Worcester. Though brief, Donoghue's discussion of how theological issues were dealt with in Old English from the earliest times to Tremulous Hand's own day is clear and useful, and his discussion of the poem's nostalgic perspective on that usage of the vernacular argues effectively for its awareness of "the ample precedent of vernacular theology in Anglo-Saxon England."

"Prosodic Preferences: From Old English to Early Modern English," *The Handbook of the History of English*, ed. van Kemenade and Los, 125–50) by Paula Fikkert, Elan B. Dresher, and Aditi Lahiri, approaches the development of English stress placement from West Germanic to the present day. Essential to this article is the authors' use of the concept "pertinacity," which is a rule or pattern in a speaker's grammar which persists through time, though its outer realization may change. Alternatively, one may understand pertinacity as the persistence of output forms in spite of a language's

changing grammar (125). This article begins its examination of English prosody at the stage of West Germanic: the Germanic foot, which places stress on the leftmost syllable of the word's root requiring at least two moras of syllabic length for a syllabic foot. These requirements explain the absence of words and roots with a single short syllable. The Old English prosodic system is the product of the interaction of several sound changes: Sievers's Law, i-Mutation, West Germanic Gemination, and High Vowel Deletion. The interaction of these changes has the net effect of altering the morphological system of West Germanic, yet it still adheres to the prosody of the Germanic foot. Although words are restructured, they still retain transparent rules indicated by endings corresponding to the noun's gender, syllable weight, and the presence or absence of mutated vowels, allowing speakers to make generalizations regarding the grammar's structure (131–38).

This transparency, however, is removed as new changes enter into the language during the transition to the Middle English period. Although the number of changes from West Germanic to Old English was relatively larger, all changes affected a single paradigm more or less equally. The introduction of Open Syllable Lengthening and Trisyllabic Shortening, on the other hand, caused a single nominal paradigm to possess forms of different syllable length and prosodic structure, e.g., sg. *hēafod* vs. pl. *heafodu*. In order to reduce the polymorphy within the paradigm, either one or the other of two possible forms became leveled throughout, split equally (and randomly) between long and short variants (141–44). Matters are further complicated when inflectional syllables are also eliminated from the language. The result of this obscurity is that the prosodic system became open to reanalysis (144).

Significant change did not enter English prosody during the Middle English period, but rather during the early Modern English period, when a significant number of Latinate loans entered the language, and most significantly with derivational suffixes which carried with them right-headed prosodic rules (144–45). The application of Middle English prosodic changes on loans during that period indicate that no prosodic influence was taken from Romance or Latin at that time. Rather, by about 1660 English prosody had changed, visible by the fact that French words borrowed after that time retained word-final accent when borrowed into English (147).

Roberta Frank's "The Incomparable Wryness of Old English Poetry," *Inside Old English*, ed. Walmesley [see sec. 2], 59–73) gives an overview of understatement and litotes as one of the hallmark styles of Old English poetry.

Beginning with the note that understatement is largely absent from the prose corpus, whereas it abounds in the Icelandic saga (59–60), Frank also points out that forms of understatement found in Latin literature, such as the denied negative—“a not unlearned man” and the *bête-noire*—“somewhat filthy,” are conspicuously absent from Old English verse as well (61). What does prevail in the compositions of Anglo-Saxon poets is the *negatio contrarii*—“that is not a fair joy,” and a subtype thereof in which a minimalizing adjective or adverb substitutes for the negator—“a little silent” = “loud” (62). After defining the terms, Frank proceeds with a sampling of the hordes of understatements and litotes to be had in *Beowulf*. Important points made are that the narrator “bestows praise not by adding up virtues but by subtracting faults,” and that one needs to be aware when reading that modifiers such as “little” mean “none” and that “often” is to be taken as “always.” Translating sense-for-sense rather than word-for-word in these instances can have adverse affects on conveying the style of the original (64–65). Following her discussion of *Beowulf*, Frank also turns her attention to important instances of litotes in other Old English poems: *Proverb from Winfrid’s Time*, *The Battle of Brunanburh*, *The Battle of Maldon*, *Maxims I*, *Genesis A*, *Widsith*, *Deor*, *Waldere*, and *The Wanderer*. It is also evident that the continental Saxons were fond of understatement as well, as indicated by the English translation in *Genesis B* and the *Héliand* (66–68). And although the wryness of Old English poetry is incomparable, Frank in comparison examines the use of understatement in the skaldic poets, which seems more prevalent in the works of skalds who served King Cnut in southern England (68–69). The piece concludes with three suggested applications for the study of understatement: that a better understanding of understatement can elucidate previously misunderstood passages, that an author’s intended effect of understatement might be clearer, and that one can study specific expressions of understatement as formulas (70–71).

Andrew Galloway’s “Lazamon’s Gift,” *PMLA* 121: 717–34, examines the complex relationship between pre- and post-Conquest literature, a relationship that he argues has been overly simplified by modern histories of literature. To illustrate this relationship, Galloway turns to Lazamon’s *Brut*, whose style and content embody this complexity: “Lazamon idiosyncratically remakes the long-line alliterative style of Old English poetry to recast the Anglo-Norman account of English ‘prehistory’ that had arrived fully grown in twelfth-century England” (718). Galloway focuses specifically on Lazamon’s treatment of gifts and gift-giving, a

traditional element of Anglo-Saxon heroic verse that takes on a new set of meanings, some potentially sinister, in a post-Conquest England that was witnessing the rise of new professional classes and a concomitant change in social structures: “In *The Brut*, and throughout post-Conquest English literature, giving a gift is no simple or even balanced reciprocal act but an unstable center of complex interactions, emerging in a period of a growing monetary, wage-labor, credit economy and of a powerful central court. Indeed, the notion of a gift in such writings is perhaps more distinctly articulated and elaborated precisely as the ‘commercialization’ and professionalization of English society take root” (725). Lazamon consistently expresses anxiety about gift-giving in his work and stresses the importance of giving gifts freely, with no expectation of repayment or reward. The gift of the Round Table to King Arthur serves as a prime example of this shift in perception. In *The Brut*, a craftsman, having witnessed Arthur’s knights fighting over seating arrangements, offers to construct a table that will promote unity. Significantly, he does so out of loyalty to the king, not in expectation of any reward. This example demonstrates continuity with the Anglo-Saxon ideal of gift-giving but inverts the hierarchy assumed there by switching the places of the traditional giver and receiver: “The Round Table can serve this modern nostalgia, for in *The Brut* it is precisely a utopian ideal of the gift between lords and followers, but in terms that overturn the hierarchy of the traditional lordly gift while resisting the model of monetary commerce or wages” (726). In the end, Lazamon “enshrines a central ideal of Anglo-Saxon culture while transforming that ideal to a new model of social and cultural circulation, one designed for the present and the future as much as for the past” (732).

Mark Griffith’s “Whole-Verse Compound Placement in Old English Poetry,” *N&Q* n.s.53: 253–62, seeks to delineate the metrical-grammatical behavior of whole-word compounds in Old English verse. A whole-verse compound is a verse of type A, D, or E contained within a single compound word, e.g. *Bwlf. 23a wilgesipas, 2a þeodcyninga*, and *2152b eaforheafodsegn*, respectively (253). Griffith bases his analysis of these metrical types by identifying the number of such compounds in the OE poetic corpus which are: clause-non-initial, clause-initial, or ambiguous with respect to position (253–54). The data unambiguously point to the tendency (97.2%) of these compounds to appear clause-non-initially. One consequence of this demonstrated tendency is that “whole-verse compounds must be excluded from Kendall’s category of ‘unrestricted’ verse-clause types (III) and strongly suggests that Kuhn’s laws do not fully

describe the regulations governing the order of the elements of the verse clause in Old English poetry" (255). This is further corroborated by the behavior of similar compounds in hypermetrical verses, where they are always verse-final and clause-non-initial (255). Griffith then proceeds with explanations for the behavior of the eighteen ambiguous instances and the twenty-five instances of clause-initial compounds, and it seems to him that many of the clause-initial compounds could be interpreted as being sentence-non-initial, and represent, perhaps, a form of license in their usage. A remaining ten of the 15 clause-initial clauses correlate to "scribal intervention, or authorial permissiveness" (257–59). In a final statement, Griffith concludes that "no Old English poem ... no fitt ... no speech ... no paragraph in the edited texts, not even a single psalm-verse in *The Paris Psalter* begins with a whole-verse compound" (259).

In "The Man under the Skin: Identity, Monstrosity, Expulsion, and the Werewolf," *The Shadow-Walkers*, ed. Shippey [see below], 335–78, Sarah Higley explores the complex history of the Gmc. word *warg-* (e.g. ON *vargr*, OE *wearg*) and its complex meaning of either 'criminal' and/or 'wolf'. After an introduction to part of the etymological problem of both *wolf* and ON *vargr*, Higley presents an overview of what makes (were)wolves monstrous (338–45) and examines several instances of lycanthropy in Greek, Roman, Irish, and Norman-French sources (345–352). An examination of Hittite, Frankish, and Riparian legal texts is also brought in to explore the legal dimension of the Germanic *warg* (352–54). Of greatest interest to Old English scholarship is Higley's treatment of the word *werewolf* from Homily 16b. Higley suggests that the spelling *werewolf*, rather than *werwulf* as one might expect in a compound meaning 'man-wolf' stems from a compound *werig* (a by-form of OE *wearg* 'criminal') plus *wulf*, which matches such ON forms as *vargúlf* (358–365). After exploring wolfish and werewolfish behavior in Old Norse texts, Higley turns to examine difficult passages from *Wulf and Eadwacer*, focusing mostly on the problematic phrase *earne hwelp*. Higley supports an emendation of *earne* to *eargne* 'cowardly' following Mackie and Holthausen, on the basis that there then would be an echo of OE *wearg* 'criminal/wolf'. For Higley "the cross-cultural associations of wolves, wargs, and wolfheads cannot be dismissed as a strong context for this poem, and that it might yield more monstrosities than its yearning tone ... has led us to believe" (369–74). Higley concludes her essay with an examination of wolf and werewolf imagery in the modern era, including modern American films (375–78). Although Higley makes a strong (and I believe correct)

case for her arguments regarding Archbishop Wulfstan's homily and the reading of *Wulf and Eadwacer*, the essay's etymological arguments are at times problematic, especially given the some of the challenges of an obscure and debated etymology. The question of whether Gmc. *warg-* "emerged from a taboo variant for 'wolf', or acquired that meaning later on, along with the meaning 'outlaw'" (336) seems to suggest that the question is whether the two are cognate, which may not be an issue, as Gmc. *warg-* and *wulf-* are unlikely to be cognate (Gmc. *warg-* from PIE **h₂worg^h-os*, Gmc *wulf-* from Pre-Gmc. **wlp-os*, a taboo-variant of PIE **wlk^wos*). Higley's discussion of Puhvel's positing a connection between Gmc. *warg-* and Hitt. *hurkel* 'offender' (a zero-grade form of PIE **h₂werg^h-* 'turn' with an *-il* derivative ending for substantival adjectives), stating that it "does not prove the wolf-connection, either; nor is it used for 'wolf' in the Hittite passage cited above" (355) is perhaps a misunderstanding. The term used for "wolf" in the Hittite law code cited by Higley, UR.BAR.RA-*as*, is not Hittite, but a sumerogram (a Sumerian word spelled out, but presumably read as the Hittite word—just as Latin "e.g." would be pronounced "for example" while reading) for "wolf" combined with the Hittite phonetic complement *-as* indicating the nominative singular ending (exactly which native Hittite word for 'wolf' it represents is not indicated by the text). Puhvel seems to side with those who view Gmc. *warg-* as a legal word (a variant of the same root as Hitt. *hurkel* with o-grade vocalism: PIE **h₂worg^h-os* 'he who turns / has (been) turned') which then via metaphor takes on the sense of 'wolf', because a criminal is to society as a wolf is to society.

David Johnson's "The *Crux Usualis* as Apotropaic Weapon in Anglo-Saxon England" in *The Place of the Cross*, ed. Karkov *et al.* [see sec. 1], 80–95, explores the use of the signing of the cross (the *crux usualis*) as a means of not only defending one's self against evil, but also to keep away ill luck (80–81). Furthermore, Johnson is less interested in the *crux usualis* in its admonitory/theoretical instantiation than he is in its apotropaic uses evidenced in Anglo-Saxon writings (82–83). His survey of evidence takes instances from Alcuin, Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, sermon on *Auguries*, and *Catholic Homilies*, the *Blickling Homilies*, and Gregory the Great's *Dialogues* (83–86) which demonstrate the vocabulary used (*rodetacn*) and that one is expected to make the gesture at every occasion. One motif of the sign from baptism is to be found in *Andreas* (ll. 1334–44) where Andreas is protected from attack by demons. Another apotropaic usage of the baptismal signing is located in *Juliana* (ll. 490b–494a) who is protected from the devil (87–88).

Kinetic uses of the cross, that is to bring about healing, are also evident in Old English texts, such as Ælfric's *Life of St. Martin* and Gregory's account of Honoratus, among others. In these instances the employer of the healing sign is an abbot, bishop, or other person of sufficient piety (89–90). The sign of the cross, however powerful, would fail immediately prior to the Final Judgement, which Johnson sees as a revival of the martyrdom of Christians at the hands of the Romans, where the sign comes to symbolize death (91–92). The final usage of the cross Johnson explores is that of cross as weapon, which he illustrates first with an example of an adder-slaying priest from Gregory's *Dialogues* (92–93). This examination concludes with two further instances of the *crux usualis* as weapon from two versions of the *Life of St. Margaret*, one from BL, Cotton Tiberius A.iii, the other from CCC 303. What is different between the two is that the former has Margaret swallowed by a dragon which is then split asunder by the power of the sign, whereas the latter text tones down the graphic nature of the story by having Margaret slay the dragon with the sign on first encounter, perhaps due to a tendency to move away from sensationalism in saints' lives at the time (93–94).

Karen Louise Jolly, in "Prayers from the Field: Practical Protection and Demonic Defense in Anglo-Saxon England" (*Traditio* 61: 95–147), illuminates the social and religious context of a series of seemingly heterodox prayers in the *Durham Ritual* (MS Durham, Cathedral Library A.IV.19). In the late tenth century, the liturgy was in the process of standardization on the continent: the recently compiled Roman-German Pontifical of Mainz, for instance, would form the basis of all late medieval pontificals. In England, the well-connected ecclesiastical centers to the south such as Canterbury and Glastonbury were also striving to modernize and normalize liturgical practice. Against this backdrop, the small, semi-monastic community of clergy at Chester-le-Street under Aldred (the famous glossator of the Lindisfarne Gospels) recorded some traditional devotional practices that might have raised the eyebrows of some reformers. These popular rites were intended to protect fields from birds, insects, and rodents, among other menaces, as part of an effort to ensure the success of harvests from dangers both physical and spiritual (collectively conceived of as "demonic"). They were added to what was originally a southern English book of the late ninth or early tenth century. The members of the Chester-le-Street community worked closely with the local populace, responding to their spiritual needs with prayers that spoke to their anxieties. These prayers were crafted from the rhetorical components

of well-established liturgical rites: "such benedictions were regularly adapted to meet the particular needs of the community, especially pragmatic ones involving sustenance" (116). Jolly does not offer a definitive source study for these prayers and their constitutive elements, but rather she pursues what she calls "trails": collecting what is known about earlier appearances and contexts of the formula elements, with a view to constructing a general trajectory of their shifting uses and meanings. One such constitutive element is use of the archangel named Panchiel, which has numerous analogues in Irish and early pseudepigraphal sources. Orthodox Roman usage sifted out what it considered non-canonical angelic names such as Panchiel/Phanuel from devotional materials over time, and so its preservation here in a tenth-century Northumbrian prayer provides an invaluable glimpse into the complex and interconnected devotional forms available in the north of England at this time. Jolly argues that these rites should not be dismissed as either backward or heterodox, because they reveal practices of profound meaning to the celebrants at a time when "orthodoxy" as a normative concept was still very much in transition and did not mean the same thing in all communities. Jolly additionally offers an edition and translation of the field prayers in questions, along with relevant analogue material.

Ruth Kennedy and Simon Meecham-Jones are the editors of a small but important volume of essays addressing *Writers of the Reign of Henry II* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), part of Palgrave's New Middle Ages series. Henry's reign may be somewhat beyond what many Anglo-Saxonists feel is their domain; as the twelfth century continues to be more comprehensively studied by Anglo-Saxonists, however, a volume like this one both usefully addresses the lingering force of Old English alongside (and not merely replaced by) Middle English, as well as reminding readers that twelfth-century Old English literary activity took place within a quite complex and multilingual textual culture. Three essays in particular must be addressed here because of their concern with Old English texts, though the collection as a whole has much to recommend it. First is Mary Swan's "Old English Textual Activity in the Reign of Henry II" (151–68), which begins by presenting a list of twenty "principal manuscripts containing Old English texts produced between ca. 1150 and 1200," which immediately makes clear that Old English in this period encompassed far more than a few late copies of Ælfric's homilies. Swan provides also a brief discussion of *desiderata* in the form of research questions that will help clarify the nature of Old English textual activity in

the second half of the century, and she ends her essay with a discussion of London, Lambeth 487, a book that makes it into Ker's *Catalogue* only because the *Finnsburh* fragment was formerly included within it. Yet as Swan shows, this manuscript juxtaposes pre-Conquest material with apparently post-Conquest English material in such a way as to suggest that both scribe and reader (possibly a private, non-monastic, devotional reader) felt comfortable with both.

Elaine Treharne's contribution, "The Life of English in the Mid-Twelfth Century: Ralph D'Escure's Homily on the Virgin Mary" (169–86), discusses the post-Conquest translation of a Norman Latin homily preserved uniquely in London, BL, Cotton Vespasian D. xiv. This essay, too, emphasizes that Vespasian D. xiv juxtaposes pre- and post-Conquest compositions, but more directly engages the terminological (not to mention linguistic) difficulties caused by scholars' too-frequent habit of labeling post-Conquest texts "early Middle English." Treharne's observation (based on her comments on diction and close reading of the translation) that "The English text bears witness to the Ælfrian homiletic tradition, rhetoric and diction, while simultaneously fully participating in twelfth-century developments in Marian devotion" (181) is an important reminder that the homiletic tradition so powerfully spurred by Ælfric was not merely seen as an occasion for nostalgia in the twelfth century, but rather as a continuing source of both language and inspiration.

Elizabeth Solopova's "English Poetry in the Reign of Henry II" (187–204) is especially useful for its Appendix of "Texts Cited," which lists no fewer than ten poetic texts from a period often seen as a barren spot in the history of English literature. While there may be some debate about including Lazamon's *Brut*, Solopova's discussion certainly serves to suggest that a twelfth-century date for the *Brut* places it in a context for which there is clear evidence of poetic activity, often in similar forms. A major subsection of the chapter addresses "Early Middle English Poetry and Old English Verse and Prose," a topic which has itself seen a surprising resurgence of interest in recent years. Among the chapter's conclusions, Solopova's comment that "Verse preserved from the second half of the twelfth century, particularly Lazamon's *Brut* and poems recorded by the Tremulous Hand of Worcester, suggests that Old English poetry continued to be authoritative but as a stylistic influence among several others" (197) may modify the conclusions of Swan and Treharne by its focus on poetry in particular. But all three essays, especially in combination with the surrounding chapters on Marie de France, Gerald of Wales, Peter of Blois, and the rest,

will offer most Old English scholars, I think, a welcome visit to (and reminder of) the complexities of the post-Conquest literary world.

In "Gender and the Nature of Exile in Old English Elegies," *A Place to Believe In*, ed. Lees and Overing [see sec. 1], 113–31, Stacy Klein examines key differences between male-voiced (represented by *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer*) and female-voiced elegies (*The Wife's Lament* and *Wulf and Eadwacer*) in the Old English corpus. Her study reveals that one of the key distinctions between the two genders of exile is the role of place. Male exiles are forced to move about, whereas women in exile remain confined to a location, in time, space, psychology, and spirituality (114–17). The spiritual progress available to the male exile does not exist for the female (118). In addition to the exile's movement vs. stasis, the expression of place differs between genders. The environments faced by the *Wanderer* and the *Seafarer* are such that they test and lead the exiles to God; a female's environment, in contrast, is an outward expression of her internal psychological state (118–21). Further distinctions appear in the relationship between exile and the heroic world prior to exile. Male exiles express fond memories of the heroic hall, yet the female elegists express only disdain for the world whose feuds brought about their exile (122–24). The connections to the heroic world also reflect the nature of the worlds lost by exiles. A primary focus of the expression of loss and ruin by male exiles reflects the demise of community (126–27). Female elegies, on the other hand, lament the outside world's intervention between the elegist and her lover, harkening forward to the courtly Romance of the High Middle Ages (123–24). The exilic lives expressed in poetry, Klein concludes, appear to mirror the expectations placed on individuals in their communities. Women in exile and the stasis they find themselves in "signifies the inherent problems of heroic culture, of political relations between tribes gone awry."

Stacy S. Klein delivers an important contribution to feminist and gender-based criticism in *Ruling Women: Queenship and Gender in Anglo-Saxon Literature* (Notre Dame, IN: U of Notre Dame P). Her introduction begins with a reading of the frontispiece of the New Minster *Liber Vitae* depicting Canute and Ælfgifu. By comparing the representation of Canute and his queen, Klein sets forth her main preoccupation: how queens functioned as "imaginative figures within the writings of pre-Conquest England" (2). Her intention is to use a focus on queens to investigate textual ideas of femininity and gender more generally. Queens were a way to negotiate a variety of issues: "Anglo-Saxon writers drew on legendary royal wives to explore and to express their

views on the most difficult and debated issues of Anglo-Saxon society: conversion, social hierarchy, heroism, counsel, idolatry, and lay spirituality” (4). Queens are also “mediatory figure[s]” (4) and are often “poised at moments of cultural instability or change” (5). Generally, she argues that the insertion of a queen into a text often upsets cultural norms; it “is an effective strategy for upsetting an audience’s expectations, forestalling their primary reactions and creating a space of cultural critique” (9). Her aim is to read these often highly traditional representations in a historical fashion, placing the literary representations against a backdrop of changing historical ideas of queenship in Anglo-Saxon England: “I seek to understand how medieval writers exploited legendary queens’ symbolic associations for contemporary Anglo-Saxon audiences” (7). Chapter 1 (“The Costs of Queenship”) focuses on “the rhetoric of queenship, royal marriage, and domestic proselytization” in Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica* (19). Queens play an important role in conversion as depicted in Bede’s history; he “uses queenship and royal marriage in the *HE* to lessen the gap between the values of pagan warlords and the ideals of Christian missionaries” (19). Klein argues that Bede minimizes the role of queens in conversion in order to depict the act as divinely sanctioned: “In using women to symbolize earthly wealth and glory gained through the manipulation of sociopolitical relations with other kingdoms, and then fiercely asserting that women were not the forces motivating the early kings’ conversions, Bede grants royal women a crucial symbolic importance as indices of a king’s movement away from his former pagan values and toward new Christian ones” (52).

Chapter 2 (“Crossing Queens, Pleasing Hierarchies”) centers on Cynewulf’s *Elene*. By comparing *Elene* to its Latin source, Klein finds that the representation of the titular character is driven by the “linguistic, material, and social trappings that were particular to Anglo-Saxon discourses of queenship” (57). She argues that the representation of *Elene* is part of a hierarchical system of gendered and political values. In her domination of the poem’s Jews, *Elene* is used “as an exemplar to naturalize and perpetuate a very traditional and highly conservative social hierarchy, figured as coextensive with righteous belief and as critical to the production of communal harmony and personal happiness” (58). She thus argues that the poem presents a picture of earthly harmony, but a harmony and unity that comes through an “absolute conformity to a rigid social hierarchy that demands unquestioning obedience from every member” (78). Yet Klein goes on to argue in the opposite direction that the queen also functions as a destabilization

or deconstruction or critique of such a system: “Cynewulf creates a female figure whose renewed, culturally specific potentiality and own capacity to revise history implicitly destabilize his own poetic vision of social hierarchy because they invite historical revision” (58). Thus the poem “resists being read as an unequivocal championing of a traditional and conservative social order that requires female subservience” (82), through the poetic energy spent on *Elene*’s characterization. She maintains that “the brief span of time during which a Jewish man is placed under the power of a Christian woman unsettles traditional gender hierarchy by fiercely asserting that spiritual gender takes precedence over biological sex—that it is belief rather than the body that determines hierarchy” (83). Klein concludes that while power and hierarchy are at the heart of the poem and its depiction of a queen, the complex traditions behind *Elene* and the complex discursive practices that inform her representation demand to be read and interpreted and, in doing so, unsettle (to some extent) the poem’s emphasis on order and hierarchy: “The depiction of queenship in *Elene* is one that places a great deal of interpretive pressure on its audiences, asking them to recognize the queen as hailing from a broad array of discursive arenas—poetry, homiletic writings, history—but more fundamentally, as inhabiting a vast expanse of time” (66).

In her third chapter (“*Beowulf* and the Gendering of Heroism”), Klein asserts that the function of the queenly women in *Beowulf* is to unsettle and challenge the models of heroic behavior that dominate the poem; the “feminine voices of the poem ... gesture toward the possibility of a new model of heroism that redefines, and incorporates the energies of, preconversion Germanic heroism so as to bring it more closely in line with the Christian worldview of the poem’s readers” (88–9). She argues that the effect of the female figures is to encourage a turn inward, so that the energies of heroic action are instead turned to a fight against inner vices (89). She makes her case by analyzing not only the female characters and their actions, representation and words, but also the depiction of (in her view) “feminized” characters, such as Hrothgar. She concludes by arguing that Hrothgar’s “sermon” is both the expression of a feminine viewpoint and that it results in a direct critique of heroism in the poem. Klein does not wish to suggest that women are only depicted as passive victims of a heroic society (98). She argues that since the poet depicts failed peaceweaving as part of a lost, bygone pagan world, “the poem systematically tallies the extravagant price of adherence to an old Germanic ethos of heroism” (105). She also discusses “transgressive

female figures" (i.e., women who act like men, such as Grendel's mother and Thryth); such characters are used "to consolidate male heroism" (109). This demonstrates that the poem's normative values are rooted in a heroic society that is predicated upon and needs violence in order to constitute itself: "female insurrection must be perpetually reproduced in order to allow the creation of the male hero" (111). Beowulf is to some degree caught in the middle. Klein argues that Beowulf's lack of an heir is significant; his dying without an heir implies a critique of the "old-style" masculine Germanic heroism of the past and an (implied) endorsement of a "feminized" Christian critique of heroism. Again, queens upset cultural norms; through the representation of queens "the *Beowulf* poet effectively forces contemporary audiences to disengage temporarily from identification with these male heroes and their investments in heroic violence, and to become more critical readers of both the text and the ancient, outmoded heroic age that it so vividly portrays" (122).

Chapter 4 ("Queenship and Royal Counsel in the Age of the Unræd") examines Ælfric's adaptation of the Book of Kings in his homily of the same title. In this case she focuses on Ahab's queen Jezebel. Klein argues that Ælfric's representation of the queen responds to contemporary political and social situations; his alterations of the Latin source "reveal the cultural work that [Jezebel] performed for both Ælfric and for late tenth-century audiences" (127). Ælfric "uses the legendary biblical queen to offer a veiled critique of both queenly authority and royal counsel—two especially tense issues during the latter decades of the tenth century, in the light of contemporary changes in queenship and Æthelred's notorious difficulties in securing good counsel" (128). She asserts that Ælfric also attempts to "disrupt the long-standing Anglo-Saxon association between women and counsel and to relocate the capacity for good counsel in pious habits of living rather than biological sex" (128). Ælfric depicts Jezebel (the focus of unwise counsel) as a generic exemplum; his adaptation works "to create a sense of its characters and events as universal phenomena—generic, transcultural, and symbolic rather than particular, rooted, or individual" (137). Ælfric displays an anxiety about women as a source of royal counsel, and Klein argues that this is the result of his unease concerning the partnership between royal power and the Church. This anxiety appears in Ælfric's text as an emphasis on the hidden power of queens to influence the king's decision-making process, particularly when women "direct their counsel toward inciting men to violence, one of the traditional roles assigned to women in various Germanic literatures" (147). She sees

the text as in complex negotiation with the political fortunes of Æthelred's day, simultaneously critiquing the king, but also displacing critique onto the female figure of the queen.

Chapter 5 ("Queenship and Social Reform in Ælfric's *Esther*") examines another of Ælfric's Old Testament adaptations, this time of the Book of Esther, by concentrating on Vashti and Esther herself. For Klein the translation is marked by a deep engagement with current politics: Ælfric constructs "an exemplar for contemporary queenship during a historical moment that witnessed significant changes in the social and symbolic roles available to Anglo-Saxon queens" (164). In doing so, however, he has to negotiate a variety of issues—"communal faith, marriage, and female beauty and sexual practice" (164)—with varying degrees of success. The biblical translation "becomes, for Ælfric, an occasion to propagate reformist ideologies of gender, marriage, and lay spirituality" (164). Ælfric de-emphasizes the role of the queen as an active participant in secular affairs, a representation at odds with the historical reality of the time, when there is evidence that queens increasingly possessed such powers: "Far from representing the realities of late Anglo-Saxon queenship, Ælfric's *Esther* is thus an attempt to create an exemplar that would thrust the function of the queen back in time, confining her to the traditional roles of intercessor and spiritual adviser" (172). Like *Kings*, the *Esther* translation reflects Ælfric's discomfort with royal power (173). Klein finds that Ælfric's depiction of Vashti also reconfigures the relationship of man and wife (or king and queen) as lord and thane; hence her troubled relationship with Ahasuerus resonates as a public breakdown of social order rather than as a private dispute between man and wife (180). The bond between Esther and Ahasuerus correspondingly becomes an idealized vision of the lord/retainer bond, "the reciprocal love between sovereign and subject" (181). In Klein's "Conclusion" (191–8) she reiterates her point that queens were a flexible mobile way for Anglo-Saxons to represent, negotiate or simply revel in the anxiety of political, social and historical concerns. She concludes that her "account of queenship in Anglo-Saxon literature demonstrates that the most central issues in Anglo-Saxon literature and culture, namely conversion, hierarchy, heroism, counsel, idolatry, and lay spirituality, cannot be understood accurately without serious consideration of the role that legendary queens play in pre-Conquest writings" (195–6).

In Johanna Kramer's Ph.D. dissertation "The Poetics of Materiality in Anglo-Saxon England: Religion and Material Reality in the *Æcerbot Charm*, Ascension

Homilies, and *Christ I*" (Cornell University, *DAI* 67A, 181), Kramer's notion of "materialist poetics," which unifies this study, is defined by her as "a form of religious poetry that not only uses images of material reality to point towards some entirely abstract religious entity, but also uses such poetry and other writing to investigate religious experience and to evoke a tangible, palpable, and fundamentally materialist nature of divinity" (4). The *Æcerbot Charm* for unfruitful land (found in BL Cotton Caligula A.vii) and its relation to pre-Christian cultural elements related to the use of earthen materials forms the focus of study in the first chapter, and for Kramer reflects the belief in "the sacrality of the earth" (64). Chapter Two explores the materiality found in Old English and Anglo-Latin homiletic literature recounting Christ's ascension of the cross. The point of connection between the first two chapters is the focus of ascension narratives on the foot-prints of Christ, continuing the notion of the earth's sacred nature, and they "invite meditation on all three liminal moments and especially the tensions that each of them reveals between flesh and specter, earth and heaven, humanity and divinity, disbelief and belief, eternal damnation and everlasting life" (118). Chapter three examines materiality in *Christ I* as "marker of folk traditions and as a style or mode of poetic imagery" (120). Kramer's examination is limited to Lyric 1 (ll. 1–17) of *Christ I*, which she connects to Psalm 117, the Venerable Bede, and *The Book of Kells*. For Kramer "A reading of the text in light of materialist poetics ... opens possibilities of looking beyond textual limits and facilitates the comparative process, allowing us to cross disciplinary boundaries and to situate the poetic text within a larger cultural context" (172). Ultimately Kramer sees materialist poetics as a means by which one may approach texts that "might otherwise not be examined in light of one another" (181).

Michael Lapidge explores the aesthetic implications of postpositioned prepositions (prepositions appearing after their objects, e.g., *ic þe mid wunige* for *ic mid þe wunige*) in Old English verse, in "An Aspect of Old English Poetic Diction: The Postpositioning of Prepositions," *Inside Old English*, ed. Walmsley [see sec. 2], 153–80. Lapidge gives an exhaustive list of all poetic long lines containing such postpositioned prepositions found in the Bessinger and Smith concordance to OE poetry (though he does note numerous instances in which it is not clear whether a word is to be taken as a preposition, or rather as an adverb or even adjective). A number of interesting observations result from his brief analysis: some prepositions, for instance, never appear postpositioned in OE verse, perhaps because they were considered too prosaic (*gemang*, *geondan*, *onbutan*, *onmiddan*,

etc.). Still other prepositions are never postpositioned at all, though Lapidge does not pretend to guess why (173): *ær*, *geond*, *þurh*, *butan*, *foran*, *innan*, *toforan*, *ufan*, *utan*, etc. Lapidge suggests an intriguing chronology of the general trend of postpositioning in Old English verse (though of course, this remains highly tentative due to the small sample and to the uncertain dating of much OE poetry): the greatest number of postpositioned prepositions occur in *Beowulf* and *Genesis A*, two poems which possibly stand toward the beginning of the poetic tradition. By contrast, late poems such as the *Seafarer*, *The Dream of the Rood*, and *Maldon* employ the technique only very sparingly. Lapidge draws special attention to the way prepositions are postpositioned in *Genesis A*, which offers entire half-lines comprised of a trisyllabic noun plus a monosyllabic preposition (e.g., *eastlandum on*, *goldburgum in*), and which on one occasion splits the preposition from its object over the course of two separate lines. Finally, Lapidge notes the use of postpositioned prepositions in Latin texts Anglo-Saxons would have studied, such as Vergil's tendency—also found in OE poetry—of placing polysyllabic postpositioned prepositions at the end of a line of verse.

Mark James Leech's *Anglo-Saxon Voices: New Translations of the Elegies and Battle Poems into Modern English* (Chippenham, UK: Pipers' Ash) appears from a small-scale publisher of chapbooks intended to "inform, entertain, and inspire!" (from their website). The author, whose translation of *The Dream of the Rood* won the 2004 *Times* Stephen Spender Memorial Trust Prize and is reprinted herein, explicitly repudiates scholarly apparatus, instead allowing the poems to speak mostly for themselves: "the Anglo-Saxon poems newly translated in this book are not very accessible to the general reader, and they are often submerged beneath lengthy introductions discussing linguistic variants, sources and complex interpretive theories" (4). This is probably true. Accordingly, very brief introductions to the mechanics and genres of Old English verse are given at the end (some two dozen sentences total), with another page or two accompanying each verse translation. Leech's succinct comments are thoughtful, and likely to be helpful to guiding non-specialists without overdetermining the reader's responses. The selection of poems is mostly familiar (*The Wanderer*, *The Wife's Lament*, *The Seafarer*, *Deor*, *Finnsburh*, *Brunanburh*, *Maldon*, and *Dream of the Rood*), although there are some pleasant surprises as well (*The Rhyming Poem*, *The Descent into Hell*, and "Constantine's Vision" from *Elene*). The translations maintain the long-line form with a caesura, with two (and sometimes three) alliterations per line.

Especially heroic is the preservation of both rhyme and alliteration for *The Rhyming Poem*:

So my joy-givers, my heart's troop, were gone,
my power's prop stolen. I was pushed on
to contempt on earth; my kingly throne
was bewitched. With no blessings, alone (35)

Some readings make the absence of apparatus or commentary regrettable (e.g., the opening line of *Deor*: "Amongst the Wer-men Weland was woeful," with "Wer-men" for *wurman*), but the work does not present itself as scholarship. Uneven production values make the general appeal of the book questionable as well, however. The typesetting mixes "smart" quotation marks/apostrophes with straight ones throughout, and as a physical artifact, the volume is somewhat jarring—the faux leather binding and purple silken bookmark ribbon clash uncomfortably with the cover label and spine label (which are printed out and glued on) and with the paper stock (through which the ink bleeds in some places). The target audience is thus unclear.

In "Scribes of the Mind: Editing Old English, in Theory and in Practice," *The Power of Words*, ed. Magennis and Wilcox [see sec. 2], 243–77, R.M. Liuzza reminds us that an edition is not a medieval text but a representation of a medieval text, and an imaginative ideological artifact in its own right. He surveys the wide variety of approaches used to edit Old English texts, concentrating on its appearance on the printed page and how that appearance alters the reader's perception. He cites all the complicating factors that go into creating an edition, from competing schools of editorial theory (such as "recensionist" and "best-text" models), to the varied contingent factors of a scholar's training, to the constraints of publishers. Ideally, the editor makes the text available for a clear, objective reading by the reader: "the most powerful editorial ideals are transparency and objectivity" (248). But Liuzza dismantles this illusion of unmediated access by comparing a number of nineteenth and twentieth century editions of OE prose and poetry, focusing on the modernization of texts and the reporting of textual variants. Upon closer scrutiny, beneath the supposed objectivity of the editions dwell a host of assumption about what a medieval text is and how we should access it, hence the diversity in editorial approaches: "some of this diversity in editorial practice ... arises from disagreements on a deeper level over the nature of medieval texts and their modern representation" (256). He suggests that "the implications of an editor's choices are often deeper than he or she might realize, and in those depths one finds, more often

than not, some measure of contradiction and theoretical incoherence" (267). In response, Liuzza calls for a greater self-consciousness in the editing process, a more explicit declaration of an edition's aims, audience, and procedures. Lauding the work of manuscript-sensitive scholars such as Fred Robinson and Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe, he reaffirms the centrality of manuscripts to the study of Anglo-Saxon textual culture. In an interesting turn near the end of the essay, he notes that many scholars see the problems of textual editing as particularly amenable to solution by electronic editions, with their apparently limitless capacity to store and organize information. But he argues that in fact "the current practices of electronic editing are as problematic and contradictory as those of printed editions" (272): "Electronic media offer the ability to include quantities of information that would be impossibly unwieldy or expensive in printed form, but the more information one includes, the greater the necessity of establishing a coherent editorial practice for its organization, access, and interpretation" (275). Among many other uses, this would be an excellent essay to introduce students to the wider ramifications of textual editing.

The Text in the Community: Essays on Medieval Works, Manuscripts, Authors, and Readers, edited by Jill Mann and Maura Nolan (Notre Dame, IN: U of Notre Dame P), includes two essays of direct relevance to Anglo-Saxonists and at least one other that is likely to be of interest, as well as interesting essays by Vincent Gillespie, Jessica Brantley, Maureen Boulton, and Dianne Phillips on Middle English, French, and Italian manuscripts held at Notre Dame. After a brief introduction, the collection proper begins with Michael Lapidge's essay on "Versifying the Bible in the Middle Ages" (11–40), which illustrates how underappreciated the Latin poems of Juvenius, Sedulius, Avitus, and Arator are by contemporary readers, though (as Lapidge shows) they would have been known implicitly by many, if not all, educated readers in the early middle ages. A brief reading of some passages from the Old English *Exodus* poem persuasively argues that the "obvious place to look for figural interpretations of Old Testament events is in the poets which every literate Anglo-Saxon author had studied in his schooldays" (28), rather than in commentaries. Lapidge ends with a clear statement of how much valuable work there is to be done, including the preparation of modern editions (and modern translations) of almost all of the Latin poets concerned.

Andy Orchard's essay in this volume, "Computing Cynewulf: The *Judith*-Connection" (75–106) presents the results of a computer-mediated collation of rare verses and poetic expressions shared by *Judith* and *Elene*.

Identifying eleven poetic parallels shared nowhere else in the surviving poetic corpus, Orchard suggests that the evidence for the verses in question having been composed independently through separate access to a oral-formulaic tradition (or its analogous literary descendent) is nil: in fact, a number of the unique parallels are clustered and sequenced in such a way as to suggest that, as Orchard puts it (with admirable bluntness), “*Judith* borrows directly from *Elene*” (98). It is a conclusion that, as Orchard knows, runs against the grain of modern habits of interpreting verbal parallels as evidence of orality (whether primary orality or an “oral-derived” compositional strategy), but Orchard links it rather with “the technique employed by (for example) Aldhelm, Bede, Boniface, Alcuin, Aediluulf, Wulfstan of Winchester, and (so far as we can judge) every single Anglo-Saxon who ever chose to compose Latin verse” (98). As such, although their methods are quite different, Orchard’s essay makes a useful companion to Lapidge’s.

Jill Mann’s essay “He Knew Nat Catoun: Medieval School-Texts and Middle English Literature” (41–74) is printed between those of Lapidge and Orchard, and it stands out as worth special mention among those remaining in this collection for being especially likely to be of interest to Anglo-Saxonists. Though primarily considering Chaucer and his period, Mann also argues for the importance of the “curriculum” works likely to have been studied by medieval authors, including the “Distichs of Cato,” which were, of course, also known in Anglo-Saxon England. For those Anglo-Saxonists who also teach Chaucer, this essay in particular can serve for them, as it does in this collection, as a bridge between the issues discussed by Lapidge and the analogues of those issues of other periods.

Runic Amulets and Magic Objects, by Mindy MacLeod and Bernard Mees (Woodbridge: Boydell), is an ambitious, wide-ranging work that aims to categorize runic texts found all over the world. It does so not through etymology, the method used by many scholars who have studied runes, but rather through a study of comparative epigraphy. This shift in approach allows the authors to move beyond Germanic runic inscriptions (though these are indeed the major focus of the volume) to Greco-Roman and Etruscan traditions, which they suggest provide useful insight on the study of Northern European texts (2). The organization of the book is thematic, a structure promoted by the broadly comparative method of MacLeod and Mees. Among the eight major chapters are, for example, studies on “Gods and Heroes,” “Pagan Ritual Items,” “Christian amulets,” and “Protective and enabling charms.” Information on

OE runic objects is interspersed throughout many of these chapters, but figures most prominently in Chapter 6, “Healing Charms and Leechcraft,” which undertakes a fairly close analysis of the medical literature of Anglo-Saxon England. OE material also makes a considerable appearance in Chapter 9, “Rune-stones, death and curses.”

M.G. McGeachy engages in a fascinating comparative study of Old English poetry and African-American blues in *Lonesome Words: The Vocal Poetics of the Old English Lament and the African-American Blues Song, The New Middle Ages* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan). Her concern is to compare the “vocal poetics” (1) of both traditions and their respective reception/ codification into non-oral media—manuscript form in the case of OE poetry and early album recording in the case of the blues. McGeachy is interested in the formulaic nature of both traditions and certain themes those formulas hold in common, such as loss and travel, loneliness, and confinement. She is also interested in the way both traditions speak to dual audiences: the “original” audience of the oral poem/song and the “second” audience of the reader/listener who encounters the fluid oral text now fixed in a recording medium (4). Her OE poetic corpus consists of well-known poems from the Exeter Book, poems she terms “laments”: *The Wanderer*, *The Seafarer*, *Deor*, *Wulf and Eadwacer*, *The Wife’s Lament*, *The Husband’s Message*, and *The Ruin*. On the blues side she pays particular attention to Robert Johnson, Charley Patton, Bessie Smith, Blind Lemon Jefferson, Leadbelly (Huddie Ledbetter), and others.

Chapter 1 (“Captivated Performance”) analyzes the first-person speaker embedded in both poetic traditions and finds some thought-provoking similarities. For example, McGeachy finds that in both genres the speaker is defined by elements such as a “seeming contradiction of private anguish and public expression” (9), and characterized by a certain biographical ambiguity that enhances the universality of the communicated experience. Both traditions are allusive and intertextual in an oral-improvisatory fashion: “All audiences feel the vitality of the lyrics, but the essence of the interaction between the artist and reader-listener depends upon historical and cultural proximity to the text. In short, the first audience hears the ‘I’ as ‘we,’ while the second audience hears the ‘I’ as ‘they.’ This difference in reception influences how each approaches the performative space created by the text: the first uses the site, participating directly in the expression of life; the second admires it, appreciating its method and artistry” (25). Chapter 2 (“Recording the Formula”) explores the differences that arise in the effect of both poetries when

the original oral medium is fixed into stasis by technology. Her focus in this chapter is on Robert Johnson, who recorded multiple versions of improvisatory blues standards in the 1930s. In her study of six of Johnson's songs (each existing in two different recordings), she examines the interplay between blues tradition and Johnson's artistic innovation within that tradition. She provides close readings and fine analysis of Johnson's use of blues formulas. The comparison of blues recordings to printed text reveals the importance of "paralinguistic utterances" such as humming and other performative flourishes. Multiple recordings of the same songs reveals a great deal of variation in the use of formulaic language and music.

Chapter 3 ("Blues and Trouble ... *Sorg ond Slæp* [Sorrow and Sleep]") focuses on the connection of both poetic traditions to social turmoil. The blues in part spring from the troubled history of the African-American experience in the United States; it was "a mode of entertainment that promoted a way of coping with traumatic experience" (61). She speculates that the OE laments/poems might have been composed in response to a similar situation of upheaval in response to "the violence of the Viking invasions" (62). She then examines a series of shared formulaic themes in response to social turmoil: loneliness and isolation, travel/journeys, prison/confinement, freedom, and so forth. Chapter 4 ("Anthologizing Sorrow") compares the codification and representation of oral texts in the Exeter Book and the landmark album *Folkways Anthology of American Folk Music* (1952). She examines the effect contextualization has on both genres: the Exeter laments assume a somewhat different shape in relation to the other poems of the anthology, and the oral blues recordings assume a different shape in a packaged, marketed audio anthology of American folk music. She summarizes: "Both the Exeter Book and the *Anthology of American Folk Music* employ the principle of variety to convey a vision of truth. The Exeter Book compiler employs multiplicity as a formal feature and as an interpretative device to participate in the wonder of God's power and the hope of future salvation. [The *Folkways Anthology*] employs multiplicity to contemplate an American past, one connected to land and people, authentic in its honesty and simplicity" (113–14). An appendix "A Formulaic Analysis of Robert Johnson's Recorded Blues" (121–42) rounds out the book. This is an original, well-written and stimulating exercise in comparative analysis.

The aim of Fabienne L. Michelet's careful and clearly organized *Creation, Migration, and Conquest: Imaginary Geography and Sense of Space in Old English Literature* (Oxford: Oxford UP) "is to identify the writing

strategies which underlie the political implications of spatial representations and which articulate any sense of self in geographical terms" (33) in Old English literature. An introductory chapter and a short conclusion bracket three separate sections: "Creation" (three chapters), "Migration" (two chapters) and "Conquest" (one chapter). Chapter 1 ("Introduction: An Outline of the Anglo-Saxons' Sense of Space") sets out her theoretical apparatus and defines key terms and concepts, drawing on Henri Lefebvre, Jacques Le Goff, and Paul Zumthor. She is interested in the representation of boundaries and frontiers, centers and peripheries, migration, invasion and dislocation. In this chapter she briefly covers the inheritance of classical and late antique geographical and cosmographical traditions and includes a discussion of key OE words (e.g., *rum*, *stede*, etc.) and their implication for the Anglo-Saxon mental construction of space (19–21). Chapter 2 ("Creation Narratives and Spatial Control") examines a selection of Old English poems that contain scenes of creation of some sort (*Cædmon's Hymn*, *Genesis A*, *Riddles 4* and *66*, *The Order of the World*, *Beowulf*, *Widsith*, *Elene*, *Guthlac A*, *Andreas*, *Juliana* and *The Fates of the Apostles*), with emphasis on the dialectic between creation and transgression. Michelet highlights the control of space as a defining element of power. The creation of space produces attendant anxieties concerning the limits of power, its spatial reach, and the demarcation of boundaries: what is inside is sanctioned, what is outside is antagonistic. In *Genesis A*, *Beowulf* and *Guthlac*, for example, the poems depict the creation of a place and the resulting conflict over territory and dispossession (e.g., Grendel's displeasure at the construction of Heorot).

In Chapter 3 Michelet turns her attention to the spaces of *Beowulf* ("The Centres of *Beowulf*: A Complex Spatial Order"). She argues that *Beowulf's* geography combines "a continual attempt at localizing the centre and a perpetual anxiety about the precise situation and the maintenance of a frontier dividing 'us' from 'them'" (75). She examines varied attempts to establish centers in *Beowulf* as a means to claim power and sovereignty and the resulting engagement or construction of the marginal or liminal entailed by that centralization. She uses the concept of the gaze (an over-used critical shorthand, in this reviewer's opinion): the foreign is assimilated or normalized through the gaze, which turns disruptive invasive elements into passive objects (102). The general trajectory in this chapter is to find binary spatial oppositions in the poem, then complicate them by showing the similarities, recurring images and elements that work against oppositions. Seemingly

contradictory spatial oppositions are in fact dependent on one another. Chapter 4 (“Localization and Remapping: Creating a New Centrality for Anglo-Saxon England”) argues that over time the Anglo-Saxons altered the geographically peripheral position they inherited from classical antiquity and re-imagined themselves as central. The Anglo-Saxons take the traditions of classical geography and “transform them into original narratives in which they redefine the northern confines of the continent and recentre themselves on the map of the world” (127). She utilizes authors such as Caesar, Tacitus, Strabo, Pliny, Solinus, and Isidore in order to illustrate the traditional classical conception of England and the north as a wild peripheral frontier, and to explore the ideological presuppositions behind this geography. In her analysis Britain occupies a liminal position: not exactly the unknown lands beyond the map, yet obviously not central. She examines Bede’s descriptions of Britain and particularly focuses on the anecdote of Gregory the Great and the English slave boys and the way that narrative claims England as a special (i.e., central) land. Then she turns to Ælfric’s *De Temporibus Anni* and the OE *Orosius*, again arguing for a domestication or re-centering of Britain in these texts. She moves to Dicuil’s *Liber de mensura orbis terrae* as a comparative Irish example and to select *map-pae mundi* (the Albi, Ripoll, Saint-Sever and Cotton maps), emphasizing the way maps encode cultural ideas of self-identity and assert imaginative ideological ownership over space and territory.

Chapter 5 (“Integrating New Spaces: Saint’s Lives and Missions of Conversion”) begins a shorter section of the book on “Migration.” This chapter examines the “motif of land possession” (164) in several saints’ lives: *Guthlac*, *Andreas*, *Elene*, *Fates of the Apostles*, *Juliana*. The focus again is on the construction of borders and peripheral regions. In these narratives, a saint such as Elene is an explorer and a conqueror who expands the borders of the Christian Roman Empire; the saint turns a hostile unknown territory into a pleasant, secure, and knowable place by redeeming it from evil and making it holy. She also then relates this dynamic to the journey structure of poems such as *Fates of the Apostles*, *Andreas*, and *Guthlac*. As she summarizes: “when these poems narrate how a particular land is won for Christianity, they conjure a new mental space: the borderlands now integrated into the familiar world” (197). Chapter 6 (“Searching for Land: Scriptural Poetry and Migration”) builds upon the work of Nicholas Howe and others, as the author acknowledges. The focus here is on the depiction of migrations to “a homeland to which one is rightfully entitled and destined” (198) and

the threatened or real dispossession of the homeland. The main focus here is on *Genesis A*, *Exodus*, and *Daniel* and the way these poems create a “sense of collective identity that is derived from territorial possession” (203); loss of ancestral land is a punishment, a “territorial dispossession” (215). The crossing of dangerous, unknown places is a “spatial trial” (222) to found a new homeland invested by images of ownership and appropriation. The third and shortest section of the book, “Conquest,” consists of one chapter (“Chapter 7: The *descriptions Britanniae* and the *adventus Saxonum*: Narrative Strategies for the Conquest of Britain”). Conquest is a natural progression from creation and migration; here Michelet focuses on Gildas and Bede and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and narratives of the coming of the Anglo-Saxons to Britain. She parses out the struggle for territory between conquerors and native inhabitants, with a focus on the ideology and representation of rhetorical claims to territory.

Brent Miles illuminates some possible routes of transmission for Alfred’s treatment of Hercules and some related classical figures in the translation of Boethius, in “Irish Evidence for Shared Sources of Classical Mythology in Anglo-Saxon England and Medieval Ireland,” in *Insignis Sophiae Arcator*, ed. Wieland et al. [see sec. 2], 124–48. Specifically, Miles examines the Latin commentary tradition on the *Consolatio* available to Irish scholars in Ireland (as opposed to Irish scholars working on the continent). Vernacular Irish versions of Vergil’s *Aeneid*, Lucan’s *Bellum civile*, Statius’s *Thebaid*, and Pseudo-Phrygius’s *De excidio Troiae historia* circulated in Ireland, and this material “is a window on the commentary sources available to the Irish which were available also in Anglo-Saxon England, and which were used by Alfred and, later, the reviser of Remigius’ commentary on the *Consolatio*” (131). Miles focuses particularly on the Irish *Togail Troí* (“The Destruction of Troy,” the vernacular version of the *De excidio Troiae historia*) and its relationship with an Anglo-Saxon revision of Remigius’s commentary. He concludes that “the Irish authors manifestly drew on the same sources as the English, most notably the *poetarum enarratio*,” and this can tentatively provide insight into what sources Alfred potentially had at his disposal, and therefore into what he chose—or chose not—to include or expand upon. The tradition Miles describes exhibits a “scholarly and humanistic relationship with pagan antiquity” by Anglo-Saxons that can serve as a valuable contrast, for instance, to Ælfric and other reformers.

In “Formen und Inhalte lateinisch-altenglischer Textensembles und Mischtexte: Durham Cathedral B.III.32 und ‘The Phoenix,’” *Volkssprachig-lateinische*

Mischtexte und Textensembles in der althochdeutschen, altsächsischen und altenglischen Überlieferung: Mediävistisches Kolloquium des Zentrums für Mittelalterstudien der Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg am 16. und 17. November 2001, ed. Rolf Bergmann (Germanistische Bibliothek 17 [Heidelberg: Winter, 2003]), 467–91. Inge Milfull investigates Anglo-Saxon education, monastic culture, and literature in her analysis of texts which mix English and Latin. Milfull begins with an overview of the education of Anglo-Saxons in Latin, which she divides into three periods: the period between conversion and the onset of Vikings in the eighth century, a second period located in the ninth century where Latin-learning declines in the face of Scandinavian settlement, and a third phase in the tenth and eleventh centuries where monastic reforms bring more continental models to England, combined with a more vigorous production of texts in English (468–69).

Durham Cathedral Library B.III.32, a compilation of two manuscripts, contains a Latin hymnal with interlinear gloss, proverbs in Latin and English, a glossed Latin cantica, as well as a copy of Ælfric's *Grammar* and a fragment of a hymn. Milfull views this collection as a teacher's handbook designed for use in a monastic school (471). Milfull goes on to describe the hymnal as a Canterbury-type and identifies the nature of the glossing and the roles of the three scribes (472–73), noting also that extensive glossing of words such as *et* and *est* truly indicates the intended purpose of the text (474). The proverbs contained in the text are only vaguely related to the canonical *Disticha Catonis*, and in some instances the Latin is a translation of the English (477). The prefaces to Ælfric's *Grammar* are notable, moreover, because more care and notation has been given to the Latin than the English preface (478–79).

Turning to the end of *The Phoenix*, Milfull examines the notable macaronic ending to this poem, where the off-verses of the last five lines are in Latin, alliterating properly and with proper accentuation to match with the alliterative on-verses in Old English (with the exception of *merueri* in 668b). Some of the Latin lines, furthermore, are properly formed cadences to hexameters. The wording of the Latin also suggests connections to liturgical texts, which Milfull sees as an appropriate counterpart to Old English poetic formula (483–84). The presentation of Durham Cathedral B.III.32 and its bilingual components, as well as the literary monument of *The Phoenix* are meant as a sketch of functionally differentiated usage of the two literary languages of Anglo-Saxon England (484–85).

Donka Minkova's "Old and Middle English Prosody," *The Handbook of the History of English*, ed. van

Kemenade and Los, 95–124, provides a thorough overview of the development of English word-stress placement from the Old English to Early Modern English periods while simultaneously introducing new ideas challenging long-held notions of English prosody. Minkova's analysis is presented in an Optimality Theoretical framework in which linguistic structures are governed not by rules, but by violable constraints ranked in order relative to one another. The most significant innovation in her work is the departure from the traditional treatments of Old English word-stress that required reference to the Germanic bimoraic trochee. In contrast, Minkova presents a framework in which all important aspects of English prosody can be settled at the level of the syllable or higher (100). Most important among the constraints on OE stress placement are the aligning of stress to the left edge of the word's root syllable (abbreviated ALIGNL) and treatment of monosyllables, for example *scip* 'ship', as equivalents to roots with a binary sequence, for example *deofol* 'devil' (abbreviated PARSESYLL) (105). Following the establishment of this basic framework, Minkova then proceeds to investigate the issue of secondary stress in derivational affixes, i.e. Campbell's notion of 'half-stress' on derivational morphemes such as *-scipe*, *-weard*, *-end-*, and *-ig-* (106–112). Combining data collected by Rusom (2001) with the framework presented in the article, Minkova concludes that "the association between main stress and weight is a *consequence* of the way Old English words were stressed, not a trigger of stress" (112).

An additional benefit of Minkova's prosodic framework is the way it provides for contiguity between Old and Middle English. Though one might expect the influx of loanwords from Latin and Romance languages to have greatly affected Middle English prosody, Minkova's examination of the stressing of Romance loans in four large Middle English poems shows that 84% (*Troilus and Criseyde*) to 97.5% (*Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*) of the instances found bore stress on initial (as in the native English pattern) rather than on non-initial syllables, suggesting nativization of the loanwords' accented syllable (114). In accounting for the multiple stress patterns found in Modern English words, Minkova looks not to Middle English, but to the 20,000 or so words permanently adopted between 1500 and 1700 as the source of non-native stress patterns (118). Minkova concludes her study with three additional hybrid systems to account for stress-patterns found in words such as *calendar* (Hybrid system I), *cement* (Hybrid system II), and *advertise* (Hybrid system III) (118–120).

In the first section of his essay "The Representation of the Mind as an Enclosure in Old English Poetry," *ASE*

35: 57–90, Britt Mize argues that the Anglo-Saxons conceived of the mind as a “potentially secure enclosure” (57), a conception which has been largely overlooked by modern critics of OE literature. The mind’s contents, Mize suggests, can be learned through an act of communication but otherwise remain locked up and at least theoretically under the control of their owner. In other words, the Anglo-Saxons “distinguished sharply between an interior reality and a public, exterior one” (59). Many of the metaphors that refer to the mind, especially compounds like *breostcofa*, *breosthord*, *hordloca*, *modhord*, and *gewitloca*, reflect this distinction between interior and exterior. These words and others like them also make an explicit connection between the mind and “a secure enclosure or collection of treasure items”: both are understood as a place to store objects of value, whether material or immaterial (60).

Having established a mechanism for understanding the mind-as-container metaphor, Mize turns his attention to its function in verse, which he narrows to “a pair of complementary capabilities: containment and enclosure” (72). There is another variable that must be added to this equation, though: permeability, which Mize explains “govern[s] whether or not there is any transmission or conveyance between interior and exterior” (73). These four variables, containment/exclusion and permeability/impermeability, allow for four possible states: the principle of containment coupled with permeability or impermeability accounts for the first two, *the mind holds* and *the mind releases*, while the principle of exclusion coupled with permeability or impermeability accounts for the other two, *the mind repels* and *the mind admits*. The remainder of the essay explores how these four possible mental states function in a variety of OE poems.

Several poems, including *The Wanderer* and *Beowulf*, express the importance of keeping the contents of the mind secret (*the mind holds*), because knowledge of them has “the potential to cause harm or shame in the public world” (74). Others, like *The Husband’s Message* and *Precepts*, advocate for the retention of knowledge not because of the harm it might cause, but because of its intrinsic value to the holder. Poems such as *Maxims I* and *The Order of the World* illustrate the importance of sharing mental treasure (*the mind releases*): “The implicit obligation to deal out one’s wisdom or knowledge voluntarily is represented in other poems, too, as a community-forming and stabilizing force” (76). The third possibility—*the mind repels*—expresses the importance of keeping the mind free from undesired intrusions; Mize cites examples from *Juliana*, *Vainglory*, and *The Riming Poem* to illustrate how this schema

functions. *Christ III* and *Beowulf* are examples of the final combination, *the mind admits*, which describes what happens when “the mind’s interior should be ... opened to something outside of it” (87).

Bernard Muir’s *The Electronic Exeter Anthology of Old English Poetry: An Edition of Exeter, Dean and Chapter MS 3501* (Exeter Medieval English Texts and Studies [Exeter: U of Exeter P] with multimedia design by Nick Kennedy) is sure to generate much future research. To have access on one’s computer to a full-color facsimile of a work as significant as the *Exeter Anthology* is a leap forward in Old English textual scholarship. The editor has taken pains also to ensure that the one place in which the 1933 facsimile of Chambers and Förster supersedes the electronic edition (where the final folios patched with vellum are more legible) will not be a hindrance, as digital images of the relevant 1933 facsimile are included as well.

I have accessed the DVD on both Macintosh and PC machines (using both Windows XP and Windows Vista) and have not encountered any problems with any variation. The DVD itself recommends usage with Internet Explorer as its browser shell, and experiments with other browsers have verified that browsers other than Internet Explorer cause difficulties. One may experience, however, a few minor hurdles with Internet Explorer’s pop-up blocker, which is easily solved by clicking on the appropriate bar.

The opening page of the digital facsimile provides four main menus: “How to Use,” “Accessing the Poems,” “Editorial,” and “Audio Material.” Items under “How to Use” provide the basic information necessary for one to make use of the DVD; however, anyone capable of surfing the Internet will have no problem making use of this item. “Access to the Poems” is self-explanatory, and one has the option of selecting the poems by editorial title, the “Virtual Manuscript Mode,” “Page View Mode,” and “Thumbnail Mode.” One must keep in mind that some titles differ from the ones used in other key editions such as the ASPR, for example *Christ I, II, and III* (or *A, B, and C*) are now *Advent Lyrics 1–12*, *The Ascension*, and *Christ in Judgement*; *Azarias* is given the name *Canticles of the 3 Youths*; *Gifts of Men* is titled *God’s Gifts to Humankind*; *The Fates of Men* is now *The Fates of Mortals*, and *Resignation* is listed under *Contrition A* and *Contrition B*. The list of poems is the only place I have encountered any programming or coding difficulties. When accessing *Canticles of the 3 Youths* which begins on folio 53r, I was brought to the digital facsimile of fol. 53r, where the top few lines of 53r and 53v are blank. Similarly, when selecting *The Riming Poem*, beginning on fol. 94r, the “Page View Mode” opens

to 94v. The quality of the images is truly astounding; one can even make out the texture of the vellum in full color. Nowhere is this perhaps as impressive as on folio 8r, which is splattered with droplets, stained with a ring, covered with incisions from a knife, and at the bottom left and mid right sewn back together. The "Page View Mode" allows one to read along in Muir's edition, as well as access comments and notes without closing the digital image. Perhaps one of the more entertaining features is the button for "Hotspots and Linenumbers" which will highlight words and letters of significance (for example erasures, accents, and the like) as well as line numbers corresponding to the edited text. Clicking on "hotspots" will bring a magnified image to the corner of the screen, which will lead one further to the folio in higher resolution. Rolling the mouse-point over line numbers will bring a box with the scanned text nearby for comparison. In the edited text one can access footnotes, comments and pointers to the line on the folio by clicking on the appropriate space. One final tool available enables a search with varying degrees of complexity, though there are accommodations for Anglo-Saxon characters including vowels with diacritics.

The menu for "Editorial" materials includes the introductory material from Muir's 2000 second edition with the essential information on the manuscript relating to dating, history, provenance, codicology, gatherings, foliation, the drypoint images, glosses, and paleographical and linguistic information about the *Exeter Anthology*. The bibliography is extensive, accessible alphabetically, and by category ("Editions and Facsimiles," "Criticism," "Reference Works," and "Works on Individual Poems"). Muir has also compiled images of all initials in the manuscript which can be viewed together for comparison, and lead to relevant folios when one selects an initial so that one can see them in context. As stated above, some materials are carried over from the 1933 facsimile, namely the introductory material to the facsimile and the reproduction of the images which display letters currently covered by patches. There are also facsimiles of the inventories from 1327 and 1506 from Exeter Cathedral, where no mention of the *Anthology* is made. Finally there is a concise report on the preparations and modifications made to the manuscript for digitization written by Nicholas Pickwood.

The final menu, "Audio Material" contains items which are ideal for the classroom setting. Muir's animated video introduction to the anthology is simultaneously informative and captivating, and short enough in length to be brought into the classroom, and accessible enough for a range of college-level courses. There is also a selection of audio recording and translations into

Modern English: *Advent Lyric 1, Deor, Descent into Hell, Maxims I, Riddle 26, Riddle 44, Riddle 47, The Seafarer, The Wanderer, The Whale, and The Wife's Lament*. For both the original text and translation selections, the text is displayed timed to the audio, so that students might hear and read along. In addition to the poems, one may also listen to lines from six different Latin hymns performed in Gregorian Chant: *O Rex gentium, O clavis David, O Oriens, O Emmanuel, Laudemus Dominum, and O admirabile commercium*, the liturgical texts corresponding to *Advent Lyrics 1, 2, 5, 6, 11, and 12*.

This DVD will be a welcome tool for scholarship and teaching in the years to come. The ability to view the manuscript with such detail will enable research rarely seen heretofore. The attractive presentation may spark interest in Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Studies among the younger generation of students who are becoming more used to electronic literacy.

Bernard Muir's "Issues for Editors of Anglo-Saxon Poetry in Manuscript Form," *Inside Old English*, ed. Walmesley [see sec. 2], 181–202, provides an overview of what manuscript evidence indicates regarding the "transmission and reception of vernacular poetry" (181). Muir begins by making a distinction between the roles of individuals in manuscript transmission, poet and anthologist, which he exemplifies with examples of what one can say about the composition and arrangement of Junius 11 (186–188) and what the thematic arrangement of poems in *The Exeter Book* reveal about exemplars and pre-existing anthologies (188–193). The article switches then from big-picture issues to questions regarding the practices of scribes, correctors and readers and what clues they leave behind. As a focal point for his discussion of scribal accuracy, Muir examines a curious word from line 7 of *Riddle 56*, where a scribe recorded nonsensical *fæft* presumably for *fæst* 'fast', and its relation to a similar and more curious example from *The Phoenix* where the same scribe, instead of writing *fnæst*, wrote *fæft*, noticed his error, and corrected to *fnæft*, failing to change the *f* to *s* (193–96). This example is followed up with others taken from *The Exeter Book* (197–98). Ultimately Muir poses the question "how would a listener or reader understand a corrupt text?" (198). The answer, Muir suggest, lies in the likelihood that readers were familiar with the corrupt nature of texts, and were able to negotiate meaning from context, relying on formulas, morphology and syntax (199). Muir also notes in concluding, that we must conceive of scribes as readers, and that the more prevalent occurrence of scribal corrections being noticed makes the existence of errors that much more suggestive of the possibility that some scribes could have been non-native speakers (200).

Walter Nash's monograph *A Departed Music: Readings in Old English Poetry* (Hockwold-cum-Wilton: Anglo-Saxon Books) is a collection of notes relating to Old English poems and portions of poems which Nash intends, as explained in the foreword, to "be helpful to anyone beginning an acquaintance with Anglo-Saxon texts" (7). The book is divided into three sections, the first comprised of six chapters loosely organized around themes: "The Poetry Business," "Of Cruel Battle and the Fall of Kin," "Exiles and Lamentations," "Rulers of the Darkness," "Avenger and Redeemer," and "Tunes on a Broken Lyre." Following the book's main chapters comes a section entitled "Postscripts" which is a reprinting of the footnotes, with some added information such as a presentation of the Elder Futhark and Anglo-Saxon Futhorc, and additional metrical notes entitled "Matters of metre" on page 152. The final portion of the book includes selections of poems in Old English from the electronic version of the *ASPR* located at Georgetown's Labyrinth website (<http://www.georgetown.edu/labyrinth>), alongside a brief introduction and notes. A select bibliography—a mixture of traditional references and URLs for electronic materials—is organized into sections: "Basics," "*Beowulf*: text, editions, translations, commentaries," "Poetic texts in translation: heroic poems, elegies, wisdoms, riddles, allegory," "Critical editions, commentary, and 'background,'" "Poetics, literary theory, textual criticism," and "Allusions and quotations."

The work itself is a running commentary on a variety of basic cultural, historical, and literary aspects and notes demonstrated with the author's own translations (which are accurate and quite readable). "The Poetry Business" introduces the reader to the basics of the life of the *scop* and contains selections from *Widsith*, *Deor*, *The Gifts of Men*, *Caedmon's Hymn*, *Exeter Maxims*, *The Whale*, *Fortunes of Man*, *Exeter Riddle 16*, and the *Metrical Charm 'Against a Sudden Stitch'*. Chapter 2, "Of Cruel Battle and the Fall of Kin" begins with an introduction to the feud by means of recounting the tale of *Cynewulf and Cyneheard*, and introduces the reader to feuding and the essentials of the lord/thane relationship, the *bēot*, and 'fame' with selections from *Brunanburh*, *Maldon*, *Beowulf*, and *Widsith*. "Exiles and Lamentations" examines the issues of exile, fate, the *ubi sunt* motif, and the motif of *ruin* with selections from *Wulf and Eadwacer*, *The Wife's Lament*, *The Husband's Message*, *The Wanderer*, *The Ruin*, *The Seafarer*, and the "Lament of the Last Survivor" from *Beowulf*. Chapter 4, entitled "Rulers of the Darkness," begins with religious poetry, sampling mostly from *Genesis B*, conveying the tales of Caedmon, Cynewulf and Sievers's philological

triumph of identifying *Genesis B* as a translation from Old Saxon. Chapter Four's religious themes are paired also with a beastly theme which is found in selections from *The Whale* and *Beowulf's* fight against the dragon. Chapter 5's title "Avenger and Redeemer" refers to the two focus poems here, both of which possess atypical heroes: *Judith* and the *Dream of the Rood*. Chapter 6, "Tunes on a Broken Lyre," gives an introduction to the structure of Old English alliterative verse, based primarily on the Sievers five-types system (though with some allusion to the rhythmic systems of Heusler and Pope, 118 n.7). Nash introduces the five types with a rendition of the first five lines of *The Wanderer* presented in a quasi-phonetic spelling for those unable to read Old English, and with bold-face type and/or underlining to indicate stresses (119–20). Only after an introduction to the meter (which makes no mention of the importance of syllable weight) does Nash turn to alliteration, an ordering which might seem to some as counter-intuitive. Chapter Six covers other topics in versification, such as hypermetrics (125–26), *Hakenstil* (128–30), and variation and kennings (131–137). The book as a whole, very readable and with accurate translations, should serve its intended purpose to introduce intrepid young students to important aspects of Old English poetry, though it may prove less suitable for more advanced scholarship.

John D. Niles collects some previously published work and adds substantial new essays in *Old English Enigmatic Poems and the Play of the Texts* (Studies in the Early Middle Ages 13 [Turnhout: Brepols]), an essential study of OE lyric poems, particularly the riddles. His introduction ("Old English Poems and Current Readers") discusses the nature of these "enigmatic poems," an ad hoc generic category Niles creates to encompass this study of several short, knotty, enigmatic poems such as the riddles, *The Wife's Lament*, and *The Rune Poem*: "Some are riddles; others are riddle-like in their manner of simultaneously giving and withholding information. A number of them feature the literary use of runes" (4). But his close focus on a few poems opens out into the world of OE poetics more generally: "I approach these poems as microcosms of the art of Old English poetry in general, which (particularly in its more lyrical forms) relies on its audience's ability to decipher metaphorical language, to fill out many details that remain unexpressed, and to savour whatever satisfaction resides in the solving of upscale crossword puzzles" (4). One implicit argument in all these essays is that the difficulty of these poems is part of their intended charm; the OE poets are mining "the ludic vein in poetry" (44). Three of the eight chapters

appeared in print before; they appear mainly as they were when first published, with minor revisions.

Chapter 1 scrutinizes “Exeter Book Riddle 74 and the Play of the Text” (supplemented by a short excursus: “Footnote: Getting the Exeter Book Right,” 57–9). This essay was published previously in *ASE* 27 (1998) and reviewed in the *YWOES* for that year. Niles’s pattern in this chapter is similar to most of the others in the book: he exhaustively surveys previous solutions in the scholarly literature; engages in occasional methodological digressions (in this case, a subsection “What Makes for Validity in Interpretation?” 26–31); examines the riddle’s minute textual and philological problems; builds his own case for a new (or better) interpretation through overlapping interdisciplinary evidence; and then finally offers a new solution or interpretation. He also provides a set of general principles for reading/interpreting/solving OE riddles: a solution must be “philologically exact” (29), it must be “comprehensive” (30), i.e., it must account for all the details of the riddle; it must have a “good *historical/contextual* fit” (30; emphasis in original), and the solution must have sense of “elegance” (30), i.e., it must provide a moment of surprise and delight in its solution, “a minor rapture that is akin to what a mathematician experiences when, after years of labour, he or she discovers an elegant solution to a complex problem” (31). In this case his solution is that Riddle 74 is a ship, particularly “the wood of a ship when it was a living tree” (33). As he stresses, the riddle’s answer is an OE word: the solution is “an *āc*, or oak-tree, which has been cut down and made into a *bāt*, or boat” (35). Niles ends this chapter with some reflection on what the riddling mode might have meant to the Anglo-Saxon worldview and observes that the riddles are a way to conceptualize and explore the material world in playful poetic form. In the case of chapter 2 (“Exeter Book Riddle 55: Some Gallows Humour”), Niles seeks to provide a solution more accurate than those previously advanced by the scholarly tradition. Niles concludes that the object described by the riddle must be some sort of “wooden structure used to hang and/or store weapons” (75). The “linguistically precise answer” he proposes is **wæpen-hengen* (“weapon-rack”). While this compound is unattested in OE, Niles assembles evidence for analogous words. His summary: “The seemingly bizarre object that the speaker of Riddle 55 claims to have seen in the hall, then, is nothing more exotic than a **wæpen-hengen* or **wæpen-treow* (or conceivably, a *fyrð-wæn*) that is hung with at least one byrnie so that it resembles a gallows” (80). The ambit of Chapter 3 (“New Answers to Exeter Book Riddles 36, 58, 70, and 75/76”) is self-explanatory.

It pairs well with Chapter 4 (“Answering the Riddles in their Own Tongue”) which emphasizes that the solution to a riddle must be an OE word, not a thing, per se, because the specific contours of a particular OE word may very well be the key to solving the riddle. He discusses a large number of riddles briefly in this chapter, noting especially the use of cryptography, riddling play on grammatical gender, wordplay and a variety of other rhetorical strategies. All of his new answers are incorporated into a variorum “Appendix: Exeter Book Riddle Solutions in Old English” (141–8), a useful table of solutions for all the riddles.

Chapter 5 (“The Problem of the Ending of *The Wife’s Lament*”), previously published in *Speculum* 78 (2003): 1107–50 is supplemented by a new “Addendum: More on Curses in the Northern World” (209–11). The original article for this and for the chapter on *The Husband’s Message* (below) were reviewed in *YWOES* for 2003. With this chapter, the book moves to poems that are not riddles, but share pages of the Exeter Book with the riddles and are similarly enigmatic. Niles pinpoints two scholarly traditions concerning the important and ambiguous lines spoken by the Wife at the very end of the poem: one a “genteel” view that sees these lines as expressing a “philosophical resignation”; the other a “vindictive” school seeing these lines as a curse (161). The genteel position is the standard one, but Niles presents strong evidence for the curse as a correct interpretation. He provides a variety of supporting evidence, including the Psalms, formulas for excommunication and legal discourse, charms, the Germanic vocabulary for cursing, archaeological findings, as well as substantial comparative anthropological studies of cursing in various societies. From this he derives three conclusions: it is the powerless (relatively speaking) who tend to have the “power to do harm through words”; cursing is generally seen as a female power/domain; those who curse in this sense do so “out of a sense of shame and loss of place or status” (193). He concludes that the Anglo-Saxons must have believed that cursing had the power to harm people and that a successful curse was not thought to be a permanent condition. Thus the Wife need not be seen as “a demented soul lacking in all decency” but rather a “person who, at the moment in question, is deeply offended and who aims for redress” (186). He interprets the husband’s implied actions in the poem as an offense worthy of curse-retaliation, violating “the customary laws that create and sustain the institution of marriage” (197). This interpretation of the ending changes the overall import of the poem, of course: instead of a poem of “stoic endurance,” it is about the “will to avenge” (150). Niles positions

this conclusion as an important corrective to clichés about the passivity of women in Anglo-Saxon England and about the culture's stoic acceptance of fate. In a compelling conclusion he argues that the poem is "an imagined *cri de coeur* that wells up from the depths of loneliness and pain and finds eventual expression in a curse directed against the speaker's estranged husband" (206). It is curse imagined from a "more raw and primitive past that furnished the Anglo-Saxons with many of their reveries and some of their nightmares as well" (206–7).

Chapter 6 ("The Trick of the Runes in *The Husband's Message*") begins a cluster of chapters on poems that incorporate OE runes into their text. Niles solves the "riddle" of *The Husband's Message* by arguing, against critical tradition, that the "speaker is neither a living person nor a personified rune-stick. The speaker is *the wooden ship itself*; or, to be precise, it is one prominent part of that vessel: it is *the ship's personified mast*" (232). He decodes the runic section of the poem accordingly; the runes are carved into the mast of the ship. Niles connects the poem to *The Wife's Lament* and argues for the presence of a "lost Husband Mini-Group" (analogous to the "Marriage Group" of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*): "One poem reveals the devastation that follows when a love affair goes bad and a woman feels herself forsaken. The other shows the triumph of a man's hope in the midst of recalcitrant circumstances" (250). In Chapter 7 ("Runic Hermeneutics in *The Rune Poem*"), supplemented by "Addendum: A Bonus Ship" (281–3), Niles argues against the idea that the names of Anglo-Saxon runes were fixed; thus he would see the potential for more indeterminacy and flexibility in their poetic use. There was "some creativity in the use of runes and their names" (259). Thus instead of assuming the Anglo-Saxons would have been able to read and interpret *The Rune Poem* with no problems, he instead argues that the poem was as ambiguous, enigmatic and challenging to its original audience as it is for us. Chapter 8 ("Cynewulf's Use of Initialisms in His Runic Signatures") continues the theme from the previous chapter, arguing for a similarly poetic and "creative runography" in Cynewulf's signatures. He argues that runes did not have fixed names and could be used in more creative ways by a poet such as Cynewulf. Release from this assumption allows for a more satisfactory reading of the runes in the context of the various poems' themes even while they still spell out Cynewulf's name. The book ends with a short "Conclusion: On the Dance of Wit and Wisdom," that has some useful thoughts about the category of "wisdom poetry," and four indexes: of Old English words and phrases discussed, Old English

works and passages, modern scholars cited, and a "General Index."

Lucinda Catherine Minna Reeve offers an overview of the literary representations of smiths and metalworkers in "Representations of Smiths in Anglo-Saxon Literary Sources" (M.Phil. thesis, U of Birmingham, 2005, *Index to Theses* 55, 12895). Reeve explores the treatment of smiths and of their handiwork first in major relevant versions of the Völundr/Weland story (e.g., *Völundarkviða* of the Poetic Edda and *Piðrekssaga*), and then in Old English poetry (focusing on *Deor*, *The Gifts of Men*, *The Fortunes of Men*, *The Phoenix*, the riddles, the metrical charms, and *Beowulf*). Weland is a liminal figure, associated with aristocratic dynasty but also with animal features and elemental magic. The Weland story familiar from later Old Norse tellings is presented as influenced by the version of the story current in Anglo-Saxon England, and indeed many features of the story may have originated in England. Reeve draws from place names, surviving stone carvings (and whalebone carving, of course, in the form of the Franks Casket), and some vernacular prose to round out a picture of how metalworkers were esteemed by contemporaries in Anglo-Saxon society. The (perhaps itinerant) worker of precious metals may have enjoyed greater status than the common ironworker, and it is the former with which Old English literature is most concerned. The thesis brings to the surface some paradoxes of the ambivalent figure of the metalworker in Anglo-Saxon society (as seen through the prism of the vernacular poetry): the work of his craft is highly regarded, though there is little reverence for the person of the metalworker himself ("his creations are applauded, but he himself is not," 82). He is regarded sometimes as a nuisance and a character of suspicion; he is on the fringes of society and the mythical resonance of such "exile" helps lend the products of his creation additional wonder.

Jane Roberts's "Guthlac of Crowland and the Seals of the Cross," in *The Place of the Cross in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Karkov *et al.* [see sec. 1], 113–28, tackles a recurring image in hagiographic and homiletic materials associated with Guthlac of Crowland, the sign (or "seal") of the cross. The Old English translation of Felix's *Vita Guthlaci* reinterprets the early scene in which Guthlac's divine favor is signaled to all through the vision of a cross which appears before the saint's door at the time of his birth, with an accompanying hand in the sky reaching down to it: in the OE version (or the late redactions of it that are extant, in any event), the cross is instead held by the divine hand coming out from the sky, and points toward Guthlac's door. Behind this seemingly innocuous variance is a wider

pool of literary imagery and devotional practice which deeply informed Anglo-Saxon spirituality: this imagery invokes the signing of baptism, for instance, and recalls homiletic renditions of the wonders of the third day of the Apocalypse. Editors and translators have found a dative plural phrase (*mid inseglum beclysde*, “sealed up with seals”) problematic, resorting to silent emendation and to positing archaic *-um* forms of dative singular in an expectation of only a single signing of the cross, though Roberts shows ample precedent for multiple signings among literary and liturgical analogues. Aside from Felix’s *Vita Guthlaci* and the Old English translation, Roberts also draws from *The Dream of the Rood*, the Exeter book poems *Guthlac A* and *B*, a Middle English homily (number 12 in MS London, Lambeth Palace Library 487), and a small range of related materials in providing the context for understanding the various potential meanings of the cross in the cycle of devotional narratives related to Guthlac.

Maria Ruggerini in “Tales of Flight in Old Norse and Medieval English Texts,” *Vikings and Medieval Scandinavia* 2: 201–38 examines the motif of the *fljóðrhamr* or ‘winged-cloak’ which enables the flight of mortals and mythological figures predominantly in the *Prose Edda*, the *Poetic Edda* (*Brymskviða* and *Völundarkviða*) and the prose *Velents þáttr* from *Þiðreks saga af Bern* (202–20). Thereafter Ruggerini makes brief mention of two instances of the same motif in Old English literature, one in the *Acta Petri*, the other in Ælfric’s *Passio Petri et Pauli*. In both stories Simon Magus attempts to fly off the Capitoline Hill in Rome. In the *Acta Petri* the prayers of the apostles remove the demonic assistance which enabled Simon to fly, resulting in his death. Ælfric’s version, in comparison, has Simon flying *mid deoflicum fiþerhaman*, which cease to work once the demons’ help went away (221–22). Ruggerini also explores the same motif in the works of William of Malmesbury, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Layamon’s *Brut*, the *Chronicle* ascribed to Robert of Gloucester, as well as other Old Norse works such as the *Breta sögur* and Brandr Jónsson’s *Alexanderssaga* (223–228).

In “The Manuscript Texts of *Against a Dwarf*,” *Writing and Texts in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Rumble [see sec. 6], 96–113, Peter Shaw argues that close attention to scribal errors and corrections may inform us regarding the ways single copies of texts have been altered in their transmission, whereas discussions of alteration of texts in transmission often has been restricted to instances of multiple recensions of texts. Shaw focuses his attention on several textual cruxes in the *Metrical Charm Against a Dwarf* found in BL MS Harley 585 (96–98). Shaw makes many astute observations concerning the

text of the charm and its transmission history, in particular his argument that the prose and verse sections once belonged to two separate texts which the copyist modified and brought together (107–110). The article also contains many strong arguments in favor of manuscript readings over conjectural emendations. However, in some instances, misunderstandings on Shaw’s part concerning the structure of Old English alliterative verse hinder the arguments he makes. In the discussion of line seven of the charm’s verse, *ðæt næfre ðis ðæ(m) adlegan derian ne moste* ‘that this might never have occasion to harm the sick (one)’ [my trans.], Shaw argues well that the scribe most likely altered his exemplar from *ðæt næfre ðis adleg aderian ne moste* ‘that this fever might never have occasion to harm’ [my trans.], given the obscure nature of *adleg*, lit. ‘pyre-flame’, found elsewhere only in *The Phoenix*. Shaw concludes that “if we read the line without the scribe’s miscegenations and corrections, we get a verse with perfectly satisfactory alliteration: ‘ðæt næfre ðis adleg | aderian ne moste’ (that this fever might never harm)” (101). One would expect, on the contrary, that *aderian* would have not carried primary stress on the prefix *a-*, but rather on the root *der-*. Neither version of the line possesses alliteration. Shaw supports the manuscript reading of verse 1b’s *inspidenwiht*, on the basis that the scribe corrected the *-n-* from a previous writing error; however, the many and sometimes convoluted possible explanations provided to make sense of it serve best as support for his statement: “That we are unable to recover that meaning in no way alters the fact that it existed” (105). Shaw makes another strong case for the manuscript reading of verse 3a, preferring *lege* ‘lay (2s imp.)’ over emendations to *legde* ‘laid (3s pret.indic.)’, based on constructions found in numerous charms where an imperative is inserted so as to enact change based on the model provided in preceding portions of the verse (105–107).

Shaw examines many cruxes of this charm in great detail, yet does not approach other ambiguities relevant to his investigation. In his reading of lines 6–9, he translates the text as “Then she settled [the conflict] and swore oaths / that this fever should never hurt / anyone who could know this charm / or who could sing this charm” (110). This translation bears some comments on word choice. Translating line 8, *ne þæm þe þis galdor begytan mihte*, as ‘anyone who could know this charm’ seems to imply that the one who could know the charm is perhaps the speaker of the charm. OE *begytan*, though, is perhaps not best translated by ModE ‘to know’, rather ‘to get, seize, obtain’ or the like would be more accurate. If that, then, is the case, the ‘anyone’ is the one suffering

the affliction. Furthermore, one faces an ambiguity in the translation as we might understand the verse either as ‘anyone who might be able to get hold of this charm’ or ‘anyone whom this charm might be able to take hold of, i.e. affect’. Does *þis galdor* ‘this charm’ refer to the charm against the malady, or some supposed charm which caused the malady? Shaw’s article is best summarized in his own words that “[t]he extant copy of *Against a Dwarf* shows clear evidence for recent stages in the text’s development. In particular, the scribe’s corrections indicate how this individual read and understood—or failed to understand—the charm” (112). The problematic and mysterious nature of this and similar texts will likely always hold an endearing charm.

The Shadow Walkers: Jacob Grimm’s Mythology of the Monstrous, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 291, Arizona Studies in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance 14 (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies in collaboration with Brepols, 2005), a collection of lengthy essays edited by Tom Shippey, brings together examinations of a variety of monstrous figures and supernatural creatures to be found in the early literature of Germanic-speaking peoples. As portions of this book are reviewed individually in other sections of the YWOES (Higley above in 4a, and both Cardew and Evans in 4b), this review will focus mostly on the book as a whole, and the remaining essays, with emphasis given to the sections directly relevant to Old English Studies.

The book begins with Shippey’s introductory essay “A Revolution Reconsidered: Mythography and Mythology.” Here Shippey outlines the purpose of the work “to bring back to scholarly attention the New Mythology of the 1830s, to concede its failure, and to reconsider both the evidence which it could take into account and the evidence which has been unearthed since then, with the intention quite simply of testing its paradigm” (1). In this essay Shippey gives a synopsis of the rise of the Comparative Philological school of thought and the important role played by J. Grimm’s *Deutsche Grammatik* (1819) on philology, linguistics, literary studies, as well as comparative mythology (6–7). The New Mythology, a new approach towards the study of myth away from the model used in studies of classical mythology, has its roots in the comparison of characters and texts displaced from one another in time and space, but whose similarity require us to assume a common origin, much like the discovery of the similarities between Sanskrit on the one hand and Latin and Greek on the other led to the postulation of Proto-Indo-European at the end of the 18th century. Comparative Mythology, then it was assumed, could proceed along lines

analogous to those followed by the *vergleichende Philologie*. If one could reconstruct a hypothetical proto-language, then one could reconstruct a mythology lost, but living in bits and pieces among its descendants (9–13). Shippey positions Grimm’s *Deutsche Grammatik* and his subsequent work *Deutsche Mythologie* in the intellectual and cultural context of the time, commenting on the strengths and weaknesses of Grimm’s methods of research (including the need to reconstruct his “buried theses”—the Thesis of Cognateness and the Thesis of Continuity). Regarding Grimm’s first buried thesis, the Thesis of Cognateness, Shippey critiques Grimm’s notion that the reconstruction of concepts (myths, for example) of a proto-culture in that any such results are unconfirmable by external evidence and one cannot take account for influences of a circumstantial, climatic, cultural and/or religious nature (23). Shippey critiques the notion that mythologies could be reconstructed just as languages are, in that such endeavors are hampered by the editorial hand upon the text, and that the scholar is free to set up criteria to select or ignore evidence to fit theories as needed. In the recent decades, though, a number of works with a solid basis in etymology and comparative linguistics have made considerable progress in reconstructing earlier myths and culture, e.g. J. Puhvel’s *Comparative Mythology* (1989) for Indo-European myths, D.H. Green’s *Language and History in the early Germanic World* (1998), and C. Watkin’s *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (1995). Shippey brings his opening essay to a close with illustrations on the enduring nature of Grimm’s works on our conceptualization of supernatural creatures, as live through the modern computer-games, role-playing games, and fantasy movies that owe their inclusion of monstrous, dwarfish, and elvish creatures to another eminent philologist, J.R.R. Tolkien. Shippey presents the goal of recreating and reinvestigating what is now known regarding non-human and monstrous species of early Germanic literature now that we have access to more knowledge than Jacob Grimm might have had.

In the second essay in the book, “Dwarfs in Germanic Literature: *Deutsche Mythologie* or Grimm’s Myths?” Paul Battles sets forth the goal of providing a survey of sources containing dwarfs in Germanic myth and the goal of evaluating Grimm’s study of dwarfs in Germanic so that one may gain a new perspective for evaluation of Grimm’s *Deutsche Mythologie* (29). The majority of the essay focuses on evidence present in Old Norse texts: skaldic verse, eddic verse, the *Prose Edda*, and the sagas. The second main component of evidence reviewed is of German provenance: *Ruodlieb*, *The Nibelungenlied* and related poems, *Dietrich von Bern* and related poems, as

well as post-Medieval sources labeled *Märchen*, *Sage*, *Volksglaube*, and *Brauch*.

Battles's inclusion of Old English material is found in his examination of four Old English charm texts, and begins by pointing out our uncertainty as to whether OE *dweorg* refers to "the agent of a disease, its symptoms, or the disease itself. Did the Anglo-Saxons really believe that these diseases were caused by dwarfs?" In some instances one might also understand OE *dweorg* as 'fever' (34). Battles's analysis of the relevant passage from the *Peri Didaxeon* text of a charm for an asthmatic points out, however, that the translator of the Latin text *interdum febriunt* ("at times they are feverish") chose to translate *febriunt* with *he riþaþ swilce he on dweorge sy* ("he shakes as if from a dwarf") rather than using the perfectly intelligible OE loan from Latin *febor* (34). It is also suggested by the Old English charm against warts from the OE *Medicina de quadrupedibus* that dwarfs were bearers or bringers of diseases. In one instance, Old English Metrical Charm *Against a Dwarf*, a dwarf is present in bringing the affliction and attempts to ride the victim like a horse. One may wish to see also the recent publication by Shaw "The Manuscript Texts of *Against a Dwarf*," *Writing and Texts in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Rumble, 96–113 reviewed also above, for an in-depth analysis of the text's transmission. The final bit of evidence from England regarding dwarfs comes in an OE plant name: *dweorgedwos(t)le* (Pennyroyal, *Mentha pulegium*) which was commonly used against diseases thought caused by elves or demons. Unfortunately, there is no clear understanding for what a *dwostle* might be (34–35).

Battles concludes in his piece that the evidence as survives do not accord with the picture of dwarfs painted by Grimm in his *Deutsche Mythologie*. First and foremost, one cannot locate dwarfs in a Germanic mythology as Grimm would have it, because there are too many discrepancies between the various traditions regarding dwarfs, despite the fact that ON *dvergr*, OE *dweorg*, and OHG *twerc* all refer to the same entity (70–71). In one sense Grimm viewed dwarfs as mythologized creatures dwelling in Europe prior to the arrival of people (72). The notion that dwarfs are smiths is also attributable in great part to Grimm's writings, as there is no evidence of this from English sources, and only partial reference in Middle High German source material (74). The one common trait shared by all traditions is that dwarfs have the capability of affecting human health (74–75).

Randi Eldevik's contribution "Less than Kind: Giants in Germanic Tradition" takes account of Grimm's shortcomings on the topic of giants and the current state of the question. Eldevik summarizes Grimm's mistakes

with three important points: he did not account for cross cultural contact, he privileged more modern folkloric evidence over medieval sources, and he too readily believed dubious etymologies relating to giants. As the loanword *gigant* indicates, found in *Beowulf* along with native *eoten*, *ent*, and *þyrs*, the concept of giants had already been under influence from other cultures (84). After investigating the *jötunar* of Old Norse myths and sagas, Eldevik turns to etymological questions where Old English terms come to bear. The dubious nature of etymology is still present, where ON *ffl* and OE *fiþel* are tied back to a root with four possible forms: PIE **ba^hmb-*, *b^ha^hmb^h-*, *pa^hmp-*, and *p^ha^hmp^h-* (97). One should note, however, that Pokorný indicates that these roots are a "Lautnachahmung" 'onomatopoeia' of a 'dull bang' (*Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 4th ed. [2002], 94), which, in combination with the variety of forms, should give us pause when evaluating the proposed etymology. Etymology is again of limited assistance in trying to evaluate the nature of OE *eoten*/ON *jötunn* as derivatives of the same root as 'eat'. While there are few instances of prodigious eating ascribed to *eotenas* and *jötunar* in the literary sources, it would only be reasonable that a large being would eat large amounts of food (97–101). OE *þyrs* / ON *þurs* was at first understood by Grimm as being cognate with the root found in *thirst*; however, current suggestions look toward PIE **teu-* 'swell' as a likely source, though some (such as De Vries) are more cautious in accepting an etymology (101–2). Given the lack of cognates for OE *ent* (with perhaps the exception of a dialectal German word *enz*) Eldevik turns to the word's usage in the OE corpus to gain insight. Besides poetic formula such as *eald enta geweorc*, the word appears in church writings referring to the classical figure Hercules. Eldevik concludes from this that the word bore "some threatening and sinister connotations and was not always limited to the relatively benign image of a master builder" (107). In summary Eldevik finds that much remains to be researched on the topic, but that any further investigating should use the earliest Icelandic and Anglo-Saxons sources to avoid Grimm's errors (110).

Given that trolls are an exclusively Scandinavian monster, Martin Arnold's contribution "Hvat er Tröll Nema Þat: The Cultural History of the Troll" has little related to Old English studies. He finds that the role played by trolls differs according to the period in which the texts are written. In the earliest periods reflected by the skaldic and eddic poetry we find trolls as almost exclusively female figures who possess magic and represent a negative complement to the world of the *Æsir* (122–23). The trolls of the *Íslendingasögur* are "signifiers

of wrath, contempt, and awe” and “something beyond the limit of social normality and acceptability” (128). Later sagas have trolls who may represent “the physical form of an invasive out-group” (143). The last stage investigated by Arnold are the trolls found in Icelandic *þjóðsögur* ‘folktales’ of the modern era which tend to preserve the troll in its forms found in the later sagas.

Tom Shippey’s contribution to the collection, “Alias Oves Habeo: The Elves as a Category Problem,” examines the problematic notion of elves as a category alluded to earlier in Battles’s essay on dwarfs. Shippey begins his essay with references to modern Scandinavian adaptations of folkloric motifs relating to the abduction of persons at the hands of the “hidden people” in order to demonstrate that modern Scandinavian perceptions of elves conceptualizes them as others living lives parallel to those of humans (161–68). After the examination of the hidden people of Scandinavia, Shippey turns to an examination of the traces of elves in the Old English corpus. Apart from the numerous compounds such as *dūn-ælf*, *wudu-ælf*, and *munt-ælf* appearing in glosses, which tell us nothing about the essential nature of an *ælf*, there are a number of telling sources in the Anglo-Saxon medicinal texts (168–69). These texts indicate a connection between elves and various maladies. Terms such as *wæteralfadl* (‘water-elf disease’, perhaps chickenpox), *ælfsgoða* (‘elf-sucking’, perhaps anaemia), *ælfþone* (perhaps ‘woody nightshade’) demonstrate some of these connections (170). The allusions to elves in the medicinal texts *Læceboc* and *Lacnunga* give the impression that elves were malignant, nocturnal temptors and disease-bringers. Shippey notes, however, that this is a bias related to the nature of the texts, as medical texts have maladies as their focus. This negativity is at odds with naming practices among Anglo-Saxons (where there are some thirty-five names built on *ælf*-compounds) and positive terms like *ælfscīnu* ‘beautiful as an elf’, a characteristic in line with Scandinavian and Middle English portrayals of elfish beings as beautiful (170–73). For Shippey the strongest indicator of the negative character of elves is the well known occurrence from *Beowulf* 1.112, *eotenas ond ylfe ond orcneas*, where elves are recounted, similar to the unwashed children of Eve, the *huldufólk* of Iceland, as descendants of Cain, unless the *Beowulf*-scribe’s writing ‘Cam’ (purportedly for Noah’s son Ham) is to be preferred (173–74). The early English sources, drawn from texts of various times and natures, present the view of elves as “humans from some separated branch of humanity; they are spiritual creatures who are neither angels nor devils. They can be hostile, but they are also alluring, especially sexually alluring” (175).

Turning then to Old Norse texts, Shippey explores the categorical problem of elves in early Scandinavia. Here of note is that the alliterative binomial formula of *jötvar ~ álfar* of *Álvissmál* is identical to the *eotenas ond ylfe* binomial found in *Beowulf*. Moreover, another binomial formula of eddic verse, *ása ok álfa* ‘of Æsir and of elves’ has a comparandum in the Old English charm *Wiþ Færstice* where one finds twice a pairing of *esa gescot ~ ylfa gescot* ‘shot of Æsir’ ~ ‘shot of elves’. The umlaut plural *esa* of OE *ōs* ‘pagan god’ indicates that this phrase is likely of great antiquity (177–79). The remaining discussion of Old Norse texts focuses on the problem found in Snorri’s *Edda*, first mentioned by Shippey in his introductory essay, that Snorri presents three categories of elves: *svartálfar*, *dökkálfar*, and *ljósálfar* ‘black-elves’, ‘dark-elves’, and ‘light-elves’, with the added mention that *svartálfar* are dwarfs. This conflation of elves and dwarfs is a continuing problem, and the distinction of light- versus dark-elves may reflect Christian influence upon Snorri (179–82). Shippey concludes that the problem of elves is one in which Grimm’s analogy of linguistic reconstruction for reconstructing myth has some promise. For him the problem of elves is similar to the role of ghosts in our modern world. Many if not most of us have never seen a ghost, yet all of us have a good idea of what ghosts are or ought to be. We live in a world where ghost stories circulate with little alteration, yet the extent to which any of us believes them or is skeptical may vary, just as there may have been differing levels of understanding and belief in elves of Germanic legend (185).

Joyce Tally Lionarons’s “*Disir*, Valkyries, and Norns: The *Weise Frauen*” examines female mythological entities in Old Norse myth and seeks to elucidate the evidence relevant to them and what it reveals concerning modern sensibilities as well. Little reference is made to Old English literature, except in Lionarons’s discussion of the etymology of ON *dís*. Lionarons ties *dís* to Indian (sic) *dhisānās* ‘goddess’ and OHG *itis*, OS *idis*, and OE *ides* (275). This might be a tenuous etymological suggestion, it seems to me, as there is no accounting for the discrepancy between the West Germanic forms’ short vowels and the long vowel of Old Norse. More troublesome is the unexplained metathesis that would be required for ON *dís* and OE *ides* to be cognate. The connection between ON *dís* and Sanskrit *dhiṣaṇ-* ‘clever, understanding’ (whence the word for ‘goddess’ arises), is not without problems, as Pokorný ties Skt. *dhiṣaṇ-* to a PIE root **d^heiā-* ‘to see’ (*Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 4th ed. [2002], 234) which would normally produce a long /i/ in Sanskrit, though the same root with an s-extension and feminine ā-stem,

PIE **d^heih_x-s-eh₂-*, would be a viable source for ON *dis*. Lionarons also points out that the references made by Bede to *Modraneht* 'the night of mothers' and November as *Blodmonað* 'the month of sacrifices' may be Anglo-Saxon parallels to the ON *disablót* found in the sagas (278–79). In connection to valkyries, Lionarons makes mention of the use of *wælcyrían* in Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* and the possibility that the *sige-wif* 'victory women' of the charm "For a Swarm of Bees" may also reference valkyries (288–89). The essay concludes by saying that "[t]he valkyries, norns, *völur*, and *disir* of Germanic myth may be female, but they are not women, and they tell us little about the lives and circumstances of human women in the real world" (297). Rather, Lionarons points out, these mythological figures represent the "uncertainty of human life" and "the inevitability of human death" (297).

Peter Orton's "Theriomorphism: Jacob Grimm, Old Norse Mythology, German Fairy Tales, and English Folklore" examines the several traditions of stories involving humans transformed into the shapes of animals in the *Eddas*, Grimm's *Kinder- und Hausmärchen* primarily, with additional study of the topic from modern English folklore regarding a figure known as Black Annis/Cat Anna. There are, however, no significant discussions of Old English literature, as the author concedes no knowledge of the motif in the corpus (304). The key questions taken on by Orton are "why and how the transformation takes place; and what factors determine the species" (330). In conclusion, Orton states that there are no concrete answers to these questions. In the *Eddas* the relationship between transformer and animal are unconnected. In fairytales, however, there is occasional "ironic appropriateness" in the choice of animal (331–32). The modern survival of this motif, however, is strong indication of its "power to fascinate us" (334).

Robert Stanton examines pre-Alfredian traditions of linguistic diversity in "Linguistic Fragmentation and Redemption before King Alfred," *YES*: 12–26. Stanton surveys explications of the sundering of languages in the Tower of Babel story and the unification of tongues at Pentecost. These two exegetically linked tales, as explicated by Gregory the Great, Isidore of Seville, and Bede, "drew language difference, divine (dis)approval, regular religious usage, and national identity together in a cultural conundrum that conditioned any new attempt at translation" (12). He argues that these traditions active in pre-Alfredian England provided a context "for the king's thinking about language contact and the redemptive power of language difference" (13). He shows that the dispersal of languages at Babel was not necessarily interpreted to mean that human languages were the

fallen, evil outcome of divine punishment; rather, these varieties of human languages became a source of wisdom and, through wisdom, redemption. For Gregory the Great, language can be a sign of the unredeemed ignorance of those who do not know Christianity, but it also is the medium through which wisdom and salvation can be achieved. Similarly, although Isidore saw the dispersal of languages as a consequence of human sin, he also saw language as having redemptive power: according to Stanton, individual languages were "God's gift to a particular people" and "Isidore's philosophy of language not only allowed but implicitly encouraged the idea of using vernacular language as a vehicle for expressing religious truths" (19). Bede's discussion of the link between language (in his explication of the Tower of Babel story) and political power also provided a useful precedent for Alfred; Bede even more explicitly sees language diversity as God's gift to humanity. With this context in mind, Stanton returns to the Alfredian *Preface* to the *Pastoral Care* and argues that Alfred not only laments the decline of language learning his age, but he also, more positively, sees translation as a "celebration of the transmission of the Holy Scripture into Greek, Latin, and the vernacular languages of Christian countries. Alfred is now prepared implicitly to situate his own translation programme in this tradition" (26).

Jacqueline Stodnick's "Old Names of Kings or Shadown's: Reading Documentary Lists" (in *Conversion and Colonization in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Karkov and Howe [see sec. 1], 108–31) takes on questions of the reading and understanding by Anglo-Saxon users of documentary lists. The primary text of interest is MS Cotton Tiberius B.v fols. 19v–24r. Stodnick's approach shows, in part, that contemporary readers and copiers encountered similar difficulties in contextualizing the knowledge contained in these lists. Their importance to the medieval audience does not derive from the information within the lists *per se*, but rather the ability "to exhibit nationality as a complex epistemological construct" (110). Stodnick provides a detailed description of the manuscript and the various lists contained therein (111–15). It becomes evident that the lists of popes, disciples, emperors, patriarchs, Anglo-Saxon bishops, and the genealogical and regnal lists for several Anglo-Saxon kingdoms "had an existence as separate texts before their incorporation within list collections" (113–15). The fact that these texts were copied and transmitted benefits our understanding of them, because, as with the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* manuscripts, comparison of Tiberius B.v's lists with other recensions of the same lists can be "revelatory of a certain vision or aim prevalent at the moment of compilation or copying"

(117). Lists might be altered either as a result of systematic change from a programmatic vision (for example, to establish or influence a political aim, such as the rewriting of West-Saxon genealogies to lead from Woden instead of Seaxnet) or through unsystematic copying errors, which nonetheless elucidate the copyists' understanding of the form and content of the text (117–20). Stodnick also probes the ways in which lists are constructed and construct knowledge. A better understanding of how this genre functions prepares us to approach the specific case of Anglo-Saxon lists, particularly as the “moment of reading the list is ... one of recognition that cultures are constituted through conventional structures that organize and authorize knowledge in certain ways, and condition the thinkability of concepts” (125). Although decontextualized nature of Anglo-Saxon lists makes the original intended purpose of their content unrecoverable, for the most part, one can see a pattern emerge from the organization of lists within the collection. Strongest among these is an envelope pattern, where the Anglian genealogical lists stand at the center and the remaining lists radiate outward with associated material (129–30). Stodnick concludes that “the manuscript (and the lists it contains) seems primarily to have been valued by its Anglo-Saxon users for its transformation of text into display—and the representation it is thus able to perform of knowledge, of history, and of place” (131).

John William Sutton, in his Ph.D. dissertation “Performing Death and Masculinity in Old and Middle English Literature” (Univ. of Rochester, 2005, *DAI* 67A, 02), begins his six hundred year overview of death scenes in English heroic and romantic literature with the Anglo-Saxon period. Specifically, Sutton reads death scenes as “performances” (cultural constructs, drawing especially from speech act theory) of “heroic masculinity”: the words and actions of the dying hero, as well as a wide range of circumstances leading up to and surrounding the death scene, contribute to an understanding of the author's attitudes toward death, gender, and violence. Sutton's overall argument is that in the Old English period, dying heroically (which includes such features as remaining an active agent up to the final moment, being granted a final speech in which to pray or to clear up loose ends, being killed by a worthy opponent, etc.) is valorized more or less unproblematically, reflecting a society deeply invested in the need for loyalty between lord and thanes, sacrifice for the communal good, and a range of manly virtues such as physical prowess. By the late Middle English period—especially in Malory—authors instead “craft pessimistic, futility-laden portraits of death in order to expose the failures

and hypocrisies of the warrior ethos” (vii). To lay the groundwork for this broader argument trajectory, in his first two chapters Sutton analyzes the death scenes in the “Cynewulf and Cyneheard” passage, the *Battle of Maldon* (contrasted with the *Song of Roland*), Ælfric's *Passion of St. Edmund* (from *Lives of Saints*), *Beowulf*, and *Judith*. A revised version of the dissertation has now been published by Edwin Mellen Press (*Death and Violence in Old and Middle English Literature*, 2007).

Emily Thornbury undertakes an editorial history of several OE poems, notably *The Ruin* and *Beowulf*, in “Admiring the Ruined Text: The Picturesque in Editions of Old English Verse,” *New Medieval Literatures* 8: 215–44, to demonstrate how the idea of the Picturesque, a powerful aesthetic force in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, affected editors like Benjamin Thorpe and J. M. Kemble. Thornbury defines “Picturesque” as characterized by “the concept of roughness, and the idea of the ruin” (218). The pleasure taken in roughness—marked by irregularities, imperfections, and fragments—marks a conscious move away from the manicured, manufactured beauty that is the hallmark of Classical art and architecture. Ruins are the physical manifestations of roughness, and therefore earned the admiration of many of those living around the turn of the nineteenth century.

In her discussion of Thorpe's work on *The Ruin*, a poem whose fragmented content is tailor-made for an editor fascinated with the Picturesque, Thornbury notes the special care that Thorpe takes not to alter the original text, even to suggest “the decipherment of partial letters in areas surrounding the burn scars” (223). Thorpe is known as a conservative scholar, but his treatment of *The Ruin* amounts to what Thornbury calls the “veneration” of the original text (223). Though she acknowledges the diminishing importance of the Picturesque for later editors and scholars of the poem, Thornbury still notes a similar reluctance to alter or emend this poem in particular. They are influenced instead, she suggests, by a “more modern conception of ruins” that renders them static “at the moment at which public authorities have received control of [them]; the concept of preservation embodied in this view absolutely precludes reconstruction” (224). The effect of these attitudes toward the ruined text, which Thornbury recognizes as stemming from “the view of ruins as sacred things” has had “a dulling effect on Anglo-Saxon scholarship” from its earliest days to the present (225).

Kemble's edition of *Beowulf* has been similarly influenced by the Picturesque; despite his claim that his knowledge of grammar and meter would allow him to emend OE texts “almost without possibility of error,”

Thornbury shows that Kemble was singularly unwilling to supplant the original text with his own readings (227). Instead, “Kemble’s proposed emendations are relegated to footnotes, and qualified by question marks; some appear only in the 1837 volume of translation and commentary” (227). Kemble’s understanding of the aesthetic elements of *Beowulf* is what inspired this decision: he worried that alteration of the text would remove some of the poem’s roughness, which he refers to directly, and with admiration, in the apparatus to his edition.

Thornbury concludes by noting the lingering influence of the Picturesque on some modern editions of OE verse in what she terms a “reverence for manuscript readings” that goes so far in certain cases as “to praise irregularities—even acknowledged errors—as in some sense superior to more normal forms” (235). Thornbury sees the digital edition, which has the potential to include possible emendations and “hypothetical exemplars or archetypes” alongside “the traditional conservative text,” as a tool that might help modern scholars acknowledge how the aesthetic values of past and present editors have played, and continue to play, a role in the transmission of OE poetry (238).

Elaine Treharne’s “Categorization, Periodization: The Silence of (the) English in the Twelfth Century,” *New Medieval Literatures* 8: 247–73 seeks to make known the approximately 900 English prose texts that were produced between about 1060 and 1215, and in doing so, to bust a well-known critical myth that during the years following the Norman Conquest, the output of literature in English had dwindled to almost nothing. The few pieces of verse that have survived from this period have been “continually re-examined” by modern scholars (251), but the prose texts, which include homilies, saints’ lives, histories, wisdom literature, and religious and philosophical works have been all but ignored. Treharne suggests that the root of this discrepancy can be found in “a post-Enlightenment scholarly obsession with hierarchies that privileges periodization, adherence to form, and originality over all other considerations” (250). To understand this phenomenon, Treharne appeals to post-colonial theory, which allows her to examine what has been obscured by medieval and modern scholars alike, “the production of a predominantly ‘adaptive’ textual corpus that both reflects and simultaneously rejects the subordination of the English following the Conquest” (252–3). Modern literary and historical scholars in particular have perpetuated what Treharne views as an “elitist view” of the Norman Conquest that “privileges assimilation, and hierarchically approves the literatures of the colonizer

over other written survivals” (254). Bringing to light these 900 prose works “provides a potential, unacknowledged voice for twelfth-century subaltern cultures” and “evinces the value of untranslated texts, of an English identity effected through linguistic difference that differs from the ‘new’ English identity manufactured by writers, such as Gaimar or William of Malmesbury” (259). The resistance that these texts represent is not limited just to their presence; several make direct reference to “the unacceptability of the status quo” (262), including well-known works like the *Peterborough Chronicle* and lesser-known ones, like the late-twelfth-century *Poema Morale*. Treharne concludes her study with an analysis of the post-Conquest cult of St. Neot, a native hermit saint from the ninth century who is perhaps best known for his role as an advisor to King Alfred. In a homily celebrating St. Neot’s cult, the author depicts an Alfred eager to repent for his sins, which enables his victory over Guthrum and “the salvation of his people” (267). Treharne argues that “Alfred’s victory over Guthrum ... creates an heroic exemplum for the post-Conquest English. He is sanctioned by a native English saint, and his heroism is manifested not only through the divine word of God inscribed in the English of Alfred’s own books, but also through this author’s revelatory text” (267).

A number of the essays in *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West*, edited by Elizabeth M. Tyler and Ross Balzaretta (Turnhout: Brepols), will be of value to Anglo-Saxonists. Nominally covering the period ca. 500–1100, the essays likewise cover Europe more broadly, although five of the volume’s ten essays directly address Anglo-Saxon England. Sarah Foot’s “Reading Anglo-Saxon Charters: Memory, Record, or Story” (39–65) suggests that charters often are and can be read as narrative, in their own right as well as in their twelfth-century collection into cartularies and local histories, ultimately concluding that Anglo-Saxon charters “do reflect a structuralized knowledge of the past” sufficient to justify reading them as “historical narratives” (64). Julia Barrow, in “William of Malmesbury’s Use of Charters” (67–81) fascinatingly reconsiders William’s quotation of spurious and forged charters in particular, arguing that “we need to look out for references to jokes, absurdities, doubts, and qualms in the prefatory remarks to cited documents” (77) as signaling William’s dubiety or even complicity in the fictions represented by those documents, to present a picture of William as less credulous, perhaps, than others have sometimes depicted him as being. The essay includes a useful appendix of “Documents Quoted by William of Malmesbury in his *Gesta Regum*.”

Elaine Treharne's contribution, "Ælfric's Account of St Swithun: Literature of Reform and Reward" (167–88) offers a reading of Ælfric's selection of details for Swithun's *Life* as reflecting "a much larger issue than simply the zealous attempts at dissemination of a local cult by the local hagiographer, Ælfric" (188). Instead, Treharne effectively argues that Ælfric's text is deeply concerned to use Swithun's story to depict the efforts of the Benedictine Reformers as having taken place "within the context of divine approbation" (188). Immediately following Treharne's essay is Catherine Cubitt's "Folklore and Historiography: Oral Stories and the Writing of Anglo-Saxon History" (189–223), an important and intriguing reflection upon the nature of written historical and hagiographical texts from the period and the ways in which modern scholars might trace within them a heritage of oral storytelling. The centerpiece of the essay is a discussion of the *Vita et miracula sancti Kenelmi* (including an appendix of folk motifs included within it, identified according to Stith-Thompson number). But Cubitt considers a spectrum of other texts, including the *Passio sancti Eadmundi*, the *Vita sancti Ecgwini*, and various versions of the tale of Alfred's sojourn at Athelney. Written from the perspective of the historian, this essay can very usefully supplement modern literary readers' almost unconscious habit of equating "orality" with the oral-formulaic method of composition. Cubitt's discussion usefully reminds us that folk-tales and folk-tale motifs, even when recorded in writing, also have the potential to give us insight into the oral culture of the Anglo-Saxons, as well as implicitly emphasizing that their oral culture was always much broader than the poetic tradition alone. Elizabeth Tyler's essay on *Maldon* in this volume, "Poetics and the Past: Making History with Old English Poetry" (225–50) is an earlier version of her chapter on *Maldon* in her book, *Old English Poetics: The Aesthetics of the Familiar in Anglo-Saxon England*, and is reviewed elsewhere in this section.

In *Old English Poetics: The Aesthetics of the Familiar in Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press), Elizabeth M. Tyler argues that the conventionality of OE poetry is self-conscious and thus "was sustained by the active choice of poets to use convention, rather than being generated by tradition" (5). Her approach therefore marks a significant shift away from many other studies of OE poetic style which have focused on more general questions of audience and reception. As a means of undertaking this stylistic analysis of OE verse, Tyler has identified the prevalent use by poets of what she labels "the aesthetics of the familiar," where "familiar" is defined as both what is conventional

across poems and what recurs within a single poem. Tyler has chosen to examine five words associated with treasure—*maðm*, *hord*, *gestreon*, *sinc*, and *frætwe*—in her analysis of OE poetic aesthetics not only because they occur so frequently and in so many different contexts in the corpus, but because what they describe has remained largely static in the face of substantial social, economic, and political changes. For example, while gold had become an increasingly rare metal in actual circulation throughout England, it remained the predominant metal found in OE verse (18–21), and while kings and lords were frequently described in poems as "simple treasure-giver[s]," the historical phenomenon is much more complicated, as evidenced, for example, by the development of Alfred's treasury and its concomitant bureaucracy (23–4). The inherent polysemy of words for treasure also make them a good subject for the study of poetic style. On this aspect of their appeal, Tyler notes that "[a]lthough the language of treasure available to the Old English poet was extensive, it was not a flat convention made up of interchangeable terms which had lost their specificity of meaning over time and in response to the requirements of verse form: these words cannot be described as alliterative synonyms; rather, their patterns of usage indicate that they carry distinct denotations, connotations, associations and figurative possibilities" (37).

Chapter 2 takes up an extensive study of these words, specifically of their collocation with other words in the verse corpus. Collocation, Tyler argues, is a useful means of studying style, since "[i]t ... allows both formulas and other kinds of verbal repetitions to be considered in their larger lexical context" (38). The work Tyler has done here is thorough and impressive, and her study of collocations reveals some surprising connections, notably the four-part collocation of *maðm*, *feorh*, *bycgan*, and *hord*, which occurs twice in less than three hundred lines of *Beowulf* (43–44) and the connection between nobility and treasure (*æðel*- and *frætwe*, which occurs eleven times in a variety of secular and religious contexts (89–90). In the following three chapters, Tyler puts this analysis to use by demonstrating how it reveals the conventionality of OE verse.

Chapters 3 and 4 examine, respectively, formulas and verbal repetition. In her discussion of the role the formula plays in the aesthetics of the familiar, Tyler addresses the relationship between oral and written composition, which many other scholars understand as a strictly teleological transition from the former to the latter. Tyler, by contrast, perceives a less well-defined link: "the poetry that has survived is suspended between orality and literacy in ways we find hard to

conceptualize, or even imagine, with each poem potentially representing a distinct negotiation of these two modes of communication" (113). Understood this way, the formula requires a more complex, fluid definition than the one it has been given, which discounts any role it might play in the stylistic achievement of a poem. Tyler demonstrates in Chapter 4 how verbal repetition functions in both the foreground and background of OE verse as a means of establishing a complex polysemy that constructs the meaning of words and collocations within a given poem, and also among poems.

In her final chapter, Tyler explains that, while the style of OE poetry might be conventional and interested in emphasizing the familiar, it does so in a way that "could also make the familiar startlingly new" (157). She demonstrates the innovative potential of the aesthetics of the familiar in an analysis of *The Battle of Maldon*, one of the few poems that can be successfully historicized. This poem, Tyler shows, employs conventional depictions of treasure in ways that acknowledge the specific social and political concerns of the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, when it was likely composed. One example of this is the collocation of *gold* and *grið*. The poet's use of *gold* is conventional, as Tyler has discussed earlier in her study. But *grið* is strikingly new, an ON borrowing only just entering the OE corpus in the late tenth century. Its appearance here is significant because it allows the Viking messenger to speak, at least in some small part, in his native language, as Fred Robinson has noted. Tyler explains that, additionally, "[t]he coupling of the archaic *gold* with the recently borrowed *grið* juxtaposes the glory of the heroic past with the grimness of the present which importantly allows us to see Old English verse, with its long established conventions, in active dialogue with other discourses in the debate about tribute, rather than as naively representing Byrhtnoth and his men as warriors from a fondly imagined heroic past" (164). As such, the aesthetics of the familiar Tyler identifies is not simply an exercise in nostalgia, "an embracing of the past as the way forward," but rather a means of achieving a literary timelessness that is dynamic and capable of expressing contemporary values (171).

Elizabeth Tyler's "Poetics and the Past: Making History with Old English Poetry," *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West*, ed. Tyler and Balzaretta, 225–50, explores the historical development of the form and content of expression in Old English poetry by detailing the means by which poets integrated the concept of treasure into their works. The first point made by Tyler is that the poetry does not reflect the historical reality. Given that silver was far more prominent than gold

after 700 in England, it is notable that there are only twenty-seven occurrences of the word in the poetic corpus, and these mostly in works which are somehow connected with translations of other texts (228–32). Also the way words occur together or are in complementary distribution indicate much regarding their semantics, for example *sinc* and *maðm*, often translated 'treasure', refer to two different concepts, *maðm* indicating more a preciously ornamented object with secular connotations (233–34).

After examining the intricacies of vocabulary related to treasure, Tyler then turns her attention to the poetics of *The Battle of Maldon*, justifying her interest in tenth-century poetry as a turning point in English literature, where poetry takes on a more political dimension, particularly as Anglo-Saxon society must have placed great worth in the alliterative poetic tradition to have kept it living with little change for so long (235–37). Again, despite the rarity of gold during the age, and ASC accounts of the paying off of Vikings in silver, the *Maldon* poet chose to express treasure by means of reference to gold. It is also no mistake that OE *gold* alliterates with the loan-word *grið* 'truce, peace', as one is often exchanged for the other, and *grið* linguistically marked as Scandinavian reflects the anxiety of the tenth century incursions (240–42). In combination with *Maldon's* expression of social hierarchy, the use of *grið* "addresses acute concern that this hierarchy was under threat from both internal and external pressures" (243). In the context of the use of *grið* in other contexts, one may see the Viking raids as divine punishment (243–45). Tyler continues on with discussion of Byrhtnoth's presentation and downfall, which is a nostalgic representation of a man belonging to a historical social hierarchy, whose death, though signalling defeat in battle, constitutes "a moral victory for the English" (245–48). The timeless character of *Maldon* (whether composed shortly after 991, or after Cnut's reign beginning 1016) indicates that the English were negotiating the relationship between present and past (248–50).

Elizabeth van Houts's "The Flemish Contribution to Biographical Writing in England in the Eleventh Century," *Writing Medieval Biography*, ed. Bates *et al.* [see sec. 2], 111–27, investigates the historical and literary contexts surrounding four or so Flemish authors active in England during the eleventh century. Van Houts begins her piece with a historical overview explaining why it was that Flemish writers found no patronage in Flanders, as well as why there was a market for their work in England. To account for the former is the relative inefficacy of secular leaders to maintain the general stability of the land, resulting often in the victimization

of monks, a situation which does not lend to writings favorable to the rulers (112–15). An explanation of the latter arises from the growing role played by Flanders in the emergent money-economy, the already established trade routes with England, and the evident surplus of wealth in England making patronage possible (116–17). Furthermore, van Houts explains the ability of Flemish hagiographers to write for the English lies, in part, with their familiarity with English saints, stemming from their having already read and studied Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, and their skill in Latin, which was more stylish and accessible than the Anglo-Latin tradition had been (117–19). In addition to their style, which was entertaining and popular with women patrons, there are every-day concerns which made it easier for the Flemish to live in England, such as the already close similarity in native languages (120–22). It may also be that the Flemish foreigners were also more able to sympathize with foreign queens, making their writing more popular with female patrons (122–25). The success of Flemish hagiographers then is an amalgam of their style, linguistic aptitude, command of Latin, and sensitivities which recommended them for patronage of queens (127).

John Azel Warrick's "The Medieval Theatrical Hell-Mouth: Ritual/Colonial Formations and Protestant Transformations in Anglo-Saxon and Early Modern England" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, 2006, *DAI* 67A, 6) draws from a diversity of disciplines (especially theater history, art history, literature, and archaeology) to revisit the famous "hell mouth" motif that was prevalent in late Anglo-Saxon iconography and widely popular in medieval manuscript art and stage performances. Contrary to prior treatments which have generally localized the origin of the motif to early iterations in the *Utrecht Psalter* and its Anglo-Saxon descendants in tenth and eleventh century Canterbury and Winchester, and which have interpreted it largely as a product of the Benedictine Reformation, Warrick argues that a wider variety of precursors in ritual celebration, graveyard stonework, and Scandinavian folklore/poetry jointly contributed to the popularity and significance of the hell-mouth at the intersection of cultures between Danes and Anglo-Saxons. Furthermore, Warrick claims, the motif did not disappear wholesale with the Protestant Reformation in England, but was sublimated into less obvious theatrical motifs, such as the cauldron in *Macbeth* and the stage trap in *Faustus*. Regarding Anglo-Saxon England, Warrick draws attention to the Lighting of the New Fire rite (from the Holy Week offices found in the *Regularis Concordia*), which involves a processional staff with a serpent's mouth; to

apocryphal narratives of the Harrowing of Hell circulating widely in the early Middle Ages (especially the *Gospel of Nicodemus* and the lesser-known *Questions of Bartholomew*); and to the "hogback," a funerary carving motif associated with mid-tenth century Scandinavian tombs that depicts decorative, zoomorphic heads. Warrick traces these motifs particularly as they may suggest dramatic uses of the hell-mouth (perhaps in quasi-dramatic ritual contexts, not unlike the *Visitatio Sepulchrum*), well in advance of the more widely attested stage performances of the cycle plays in the later Middle Ages. He observes that the various possible influences on the hell-mouth motif came together during a specific period (the late tenth century), and can be understood as a product of the inter-culturation between Anglo-Saxons and Scandinavian settlers.

Paula Frances Tarratt Warrington, in "Memory and Remembering: Anglo-Saxon Literary Representations and Current Interpretations of the Phenomena Considered" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Leicester, 2005; *Index to Theses* 56, 189), provides a detailed study of the literal and figurative uses of memory in Anglo-Saxon poetry and homiletics. Old English shared a number of metaphorical constructs for "remembering" and related concepts with Modern English, such as the pervasive spatial model of "memory-as-storage-box," while differing in others: there is no Modern English counterpart for the horticultural images of memory common in OE, for instance (e.g., memories are planted in the heart, and can be nourished to yield fruit). Warrington focuses especially on uses of the verb *gemunan* and the noun *gemynd*, while also touching on a wide range of idiomatic analogues. In Old English literature, memory is often portrayed as an active, ongoing program rather than a passive process: the individual must actively "bear in mind" good teachings, while protecting against subversive thoughts or impulses, and must then guide behavior according to those good teachings. Warrington's study draws attention to potential ways in which memory constructs are employed to forge and reinforce notions of identity, both in the individual as remembering subject and in the community as societal "memories" are handed down.

Susan E. Wilson makes an important cycle of materials relating to St. John of Beverley available in modern English, in *The Life and After-Life of St. John of Beverley: The Evolution of the Cult of an Anglo-Saxon Saint* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate). Although the late-seventh and eighth-century bishop of Hexham and York is already eulogized by Bede in the *Ecclesiastical History*, the sources here translated are from significantly later: the *Vita S. Johannis* by the monk Folcard (mid-eleventh

century), the *Miracula S. Johannis* by William Ketell (late-eleventh or early-twelfth century), and a small handful of anonymous miracle collections and other excerpted passages associated with the saint (composed from the twelfth through the fourteenth centuries, though many of the materials draw from other sources and are difficult to date precisely). The introductory discussion and analysis situate the ongoing hagiographic program in the context of the growth and evolution of the saint's shrine at Beverley, an important cult which drew pilgrims throughout the Middle Ages from across England as well as from the continent. The changing shape of the miracles associated with the saint, Wilson demonstrates, can be used to track broader religious trends. John's appeal was similar to that of his near-contemporary Cuthbert, a monk-saint posthumously crafted by his hagiographers to serve at once as an ascetic and pastoral role model (their lives were instructive examples). Unlike the broad pattern usually discernible in hagiography according to several authorities, however, miracles associated with John do not trend from an early focus on acts of power (in the establishment of a saint's legitimacy) to a later focus on cures: John was attributed a wide range of non-healing miracles right up to the fourteenth century (102–3). There are interesting political overtones to John's cult as well: for instance, the tradition that King Athelstan maintained close connections with Beverley (with its implication that John of Beverley was thus a powerful protector of the English nation) may have had some basis in fact, but is more obviously a facet of the emerging nationalism of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and an instance of a saint's cult being deployed for political ends. Kings and chroniclers drew from the myth of Athelstan as a strong king of a unified England (an England which included Scotland), and hearkened back to the tradition that Athelstan carried John of Beverley's banner into battle against the Scottish. Wilson's work thus draws welcome attention to a little-discussed Anglo-Saxon saint, and clearly elucidates some important historical trends exemplified in her source material.

Harold C. Zimmerman treats the complex dimensions of ethno-political identity in his Indiana University Ph.D. dissertation "Angles in Britannia: Ethnic Identity and Its Textual Dissemination in Anglo-Saxon England," *DAI* 67A: 4. In his introduction ("Chapter 1: Ethnicity, the Nation, and the Middle Ages") Zimmerman provides a careful discussion of the scholarship on "nationalism" in the Middle Ages and in Anglo-Saxon England. He finds that the term "ethnicity," rather than "nation" or "nationalism," best fits the

Anglo-Saxon evidence, but the term can nonetheless incorporate theories of nationalism: "Thus ethnicity must be viewed as a complex construction that in many ways overlaps with our understanding of the nation and nationality" (48). The dissertation tracks the varied uses of the term *Angli* over the centuries of Anglo-Saxon England. In the earliest evidence, the term had a variety of meanings; these accumulated meanings were then appropriated and modified by Alfred and underwent other transformations in the immediate post-conquest period. Among other things, Zimmerman seeks to complicate and deepen the entire notion of the "migration myth." Chapter 2 ("Bede's 'Jutes' and Ethnic Identification in Anglo-Saxon England") thus begins to deconstruct the "standard" picture of the Germanic migration to England by investigating the depiction of the Jutes in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*. This group traditionally assigned to Kent and environs had in fact various names, "Jutes" being only one: "[t]he identity of 'Bede's Jutes' was continually recreated throughout the period" (56). Zimmerman shows that ethnicity is not a stable concept in the period; it is characterized by "negotiation and change through time" (104), and is further transformed with the impact of literacy and texts. Chapter 3 ("Britain, the Continent, and the 'Saxons across the Sea'") complicates the narrative of the *adventus Saxonum* by tracking the use of the terms *Angli* and *Saxones* in various contexts. The use of the terms is complex: "the textual record evidences contradictory usage of the terms *Angli* and *Saxones* that makes the migration and post-migration narratives presented in later histories seem impossibly simplistic and unlikely" (56). He uses the letters of Boniface and the *Life of St. Wilfrid* as evidence to argue that "*Angli*" as a collective term was used mainly from a continental perspective to describe the Germanic inhabitants of Britain in the context of the continent" (110–11). Chapter 4 ("Bede's Triple Vision in the *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*") returns to Bede's influential origin story of the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes migrating from the continent to England. Here again Zimmerman finds conflicting uses of the term *Angli*; he argues "that these explanations of ethnic identity presented in the *Historia ecclesiastica* stem from conflicting needs and desires—textual, political, and spiritual" (172).

In Chapter 5 ("King Alfred and the Angles, Saxons and *Angelcynn*") Zimmerman tracks Alfred's development of the term *Angelcynn*. Alfredian texts "draw on the textual tradition of Anglian identity in their use of the term *Angelcynn*. Alfred thus creates a way of discussing a shared Germanic identity in Britain without contradicting other understandings of "Angle" and

“Saxon,” and he thus lays the groundwork for the formation of a unified English identity later in the tenth century” (57). Zimmerman argues that for Alfred “the conception of kingdoms was not one of externalized abstracted administrative units but rather one that was based on a perceived consanguinity between the ruler and ruled as a distinct people” (262–3). For Alfred, it was useful to have a concept of universal English (i.e., *Angelcynn*) identity as well as a notion of diverse ethnic peoples in his kingdom: “Yet, at the same time that [Alfred] retained these ethnic divisions politically, he promoted a vision of shared culture that superseded these categories through the texts of his ‘program of learning’” (263). Ethnicity is thus in the service of politics: “In effect, while Alfred is undoubtedly expanding his kingdom at the expense of others, his political strategies attempt to minimize his aggression while his social program attempts to erase the differences among all his subjects” (263). In Chapter 6 (“Rationalization and Accommodation in Early Medieval Ethnicity”) Zimmerman takes his story of shifting ethno-political identity into the immediate post Conquest period through a reading of the *Life of St. Birinus* and other texts. This is a well-researched dissertation, at times too metacritical (as most dissertations are), but nevertheless the foundation for a good book. It is essential reading for anyone interested in the terms *Angli* or *Angelcynn* or working on “nationalism” in Anglo-Saxon England.

A collection of previously published essays by Hideki Watanabe, revised and linked with a brief introduction in a 2005 monograph entitled *Metaphorical and Formulaic Expressions in Old English Reconsidered, with Special Reference to Poetic Compounds and their Modern English Counterparts* (Tokyo: Eihōsha), was reviewed in *YWOES* 2005.

TB, GD, PD, AS, DPAS

[TB reviewed Dockray-Miller, Donoghue “Tremulous,” Drout, Foot, Mann, Lapidge “Versifying,” Orchard, Sopolova, Stafford, Swan “Textual Activity,” Treharne, “D’Escure,” Treharne “Swithun,” Yorke; GD reviewed Clarke, MacLeod & Mees, Galloway, Thornbury, Treharne “Categorization,” Tyler *Poetics*; PD reviewed Jolly, Lapidge, Leech, Miles, Reeve, Roberts, Sutton, Warwick, Warrington, Wilson; AS reviewed Anlezark, Klein *Ruling*, Liuzza, McGeachy, Michelet, Niles, Stanton, Zimmerman; DPAS reviewed Barrow, Battles, Cowen, Dendle “Cryptozoology,” Dendle “Textual,” Derolez, Discenza, Eldevik, Fikkert *et al.*, Frank, Griffith, Higley, Klein “Gender,” Kramer, Lionarons, Milfull, Minkova, Muir *Electronic*, Muir “Issues,” Nash, Orton, Ruggerini,

Shaw, Shippey “Revolution,” Shippey “Alias,” Stodnick, Tyler “Poetics,” van Houts]

Works not seen

- Alamichel, Marie-Françoise. “Le pouvoir des mots dans la littérature vieil-anglaise.” *Paroles et silences dans la littérature anglaise au Moyen Age*. Ed. Carruthers and Papahagi. pp. 73–94.
- Battaglia, Marco. “Brunanburh nella *Saga di Egill Skallagrímsson*? Quando la letteratura registra la storia.” *Linguistica e Filologia* 23: 151–85.*
- Baxter, Ian L. “Eagles in Anglo-Saxon and Norse Poems.” *Circaea: Bull. of the Assoc. for Environmental Archaeology* 10.2 (1993 for 1992): 78–81.*
- Carruthers, Leo, and Adrian Papahagi, eds. *Paroles et silences dans la littérature anglaise au Moyen Age*. Publications de l’Association des Médiévistes Anglicistes de l’Enseignement Supérieur, Hors Série 10. Paris: AMAES, 2003. 257 pp.
- Dyas, Dee. “Wilderness is Anlich lif of Ancre Wununge’: The Wilderness and Medieval Anchoritic Spirituality.” *Approaching Medieval English Anchoritic and Mystical Texts*. Ed. Dee Dyas, Valerie Edden and Roger Ellis. Christianity and Culture: Issues in Teaching and Research. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2005. pp. 19–33.
- Oswald, Dana Morgan, “Indecent Bodies: Gender and the Monstrous in Medieval English Literature.” Ph.D. Diss., The Ohio State Univ., *DAI* 66A: 2940.
- Risden, Edward L. “Old English Heroic Poet-Prophets and Their (Un)stable Histories.” *Prophet Margins: The Medieval Vatic Impulse and Social Stability*. Ed. E.L. Risden, Karen Moranski, and Stephen Yandell. Studies in the Humanities: Literature–Politics–Society 67. New York: Peter Lang, 2004. pp. 13–28.
- Spiegel, F.E. “Creator and Creation in Anglo-Saxon Literary Traditions.” Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Cambridge, 2006. *Index to Theses* 55: 15244.
- Tutt, Thomas A. “The Hall of Elegies: The Old English Elegiac Genre as Museum and Ruin.” M.A. Thesis, U of Texas at Arlington, 2005. *MAI* 44: 83.

4b Individual Poems

The Battle of Brunanburh

In “Ealde Uðwitan’ in *The Battle of Brunanburh*,” *The Power of Words*, ed. Magennis and Wilcox [see sec. 2], 318–36, Kathryn Powell carries forward the two-fold claim Donald Scragg makes in his 2003 study of *Brunanburh*: first, that the poem was intended to support the successors of Edward the Elder; and second,

that the author of the corresponding chronicle entry is also the poet of *Brunanburh*, based in part on the presence in the poem of the word *uðwitan*, 'scholar, thinker', which is more common in prose than verse, and therefore "a natural choice for a prose chronicle author" (318–19). In her development of these ideas, Powell first undertakes a close study of *uðwita*, which she has determined refers exclusively to foreign scholars, and, in its pre-Ælfrician usage, "is strongly associated with pagan philosophers and thinkers" (329). In the writings of Ælfric and of those who came after him, *uðwita* denotes Christian scholars as well, though still only those who are not English. In other words, "[s]omewhere between Alfred and Ælfric, the *uðwitan* seem to gain access to Christian wisdom as well as pagan philosophy" (331). So what does the *Brunanburh* poet intend when he uses the phrase *ealde uðwitan* (69a) to refer to the "old wise men" who documented the violence that attended the Germanic migrations in the fifth and sixth centuries? Powell presents two viable options. First, that the *ealde uðwitan* refers to Gildas, whose work was plausibly known by the Anglo-Saxon chronicler/poet. This would support one of Scragg's original arguments: "If, as Scragg suggests, *The Battle of Brunanburh* is, along with the rest of the chronicle entries for this period, written with an agenda of promoting the successors of Edward as kings of all the English, then, like Gildas, the chronicle poet does so by providing a highly rhetorical account of a battle in which Christianity and empire triumph" (334). The other option is that this use of *ealde uðwitan* in *Brunanburh* is an innovation that specifically refers to English chroniclers (336), an idea that also supports Scragg's interpretation: "If *uðwita* is a word that could be connected with Alfred's court and if, as Scragg suggests, this chronicler had a particular interest in Alfred and his reign, then he might use this word to claim for himself and for other writers in English a place in a tradition of learned—and traditionally Latin—authorship" (336).

The focus of Andrew Wawn's "Anglo-Saxon Poetry in Iceland: The Case of *Brúnaborgar Bardaga Quida*," *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed. Swan [see sec. 2], 473–90, is the style of Jón Jónsson Espólin's *Brúnaborgar Bardaga Quida*, an early nineteenth-century Icelandic translation of *The Battle of Brunanburh*. After providing information about its manuscript context and likely provenance, Wawn moves to a comparison of Espólin's translation with Benedikt Gröndal Sveinbjarnarson's, who, working toward the end of the nineteenth century, had the benefit of access to more accurate sources. Yet Wawn identifies one important difference between Espólin's and Gröndal's translations of *Brunanburh*

that cannot be accounted for by the divergent materials the two men used. Where Gröndal's "borders on transliteration [of the OE original], not out of insecurity or lack of imagination, but as a display of linguistic ingenuity," Espólin's displays a different set of priorities (480). While Wawn explains that Espólin is aware of the linguistic connection between OE and Icelandic, his choices seem governed by a desire to allude to eddic and skaldic verse. By doing so, Espólin acknowledges that, while "[t]he Norsemen may have come in second at the real Battle of Brunanburh ... [his] energies seem devoted here to ensuring that old northern poetic tradition wins the replay nine centuries later" (481). Wawn concludes his study with a discussion of the cultural and political contexts of the *Brúnaborgar Bardaga Quida*. Of Espólin's own political leanings, Wawn notes that "[f]or all his interest in British literature ... Jón was certainly not motivated by the pro-English political preoccupations of several of his scholarly fellow countrymen" (484). Instead, he was a strong supporter of the Danish government and "an energetic functionary of the Danish crown," a factor that needs to be brought to bear in any analysis of his work (485).

GD

The Battle of Maldon

The three articles published on *The Battle of Maldon* in 2006 were, without exception, interesting and illuminating. In "Pær wearð hream ahafen: A Note on Old English Spelling and the Sound of *The Battle of Maldon*," *The Power of Words*, ed. Magennis and Wilcox [see sec. 2], 278–317, with disclaimers aplenty, Richard Dance speculates that <hremmas> in line 106b is an authorial spelling, "with *-m(n)* assimilation in its medial consonant cluster" (287). According to Dance, "The insistence and combinative force of the aural devices in the causeway scene, and in particular the consistent paronomastic/rhyming play with the names of the beasts of battle ... constitute the best evidence that the specific wordplay of *hremmas* upon *hream* [in line 106a] is indeed intentional" (307). The passage at the heart of Dance's intriguing argument is lines 89–110, especially lines 106–7, but he offers full analysis of the types of paronomasia used throughout *The Battle of Maldon*, complete with appendices that classify and list examples of rhyme, etymological wordplay, and stem-based wordplay in this poem, as well as examples of wordplay in the beasts of battle motif from across the Old English poetic corpus (313–7). "The fact of the matter is that such wordplay is not randomly distributed in *Maldon*, as we might expect if it were purely accidental, but can be found concentrated in key stretches such

that, when the poet cranks up the volume, his verse positively drips with sound effects,” as in lines 89–110 (302). “The *pièce de résistance* comes in lines 106–07, where the raven and the eagle seem to be frozen in a sort of ominous symbolic tableau” with “the names of both birds ... played upon through paronomasia/rhyme (*hream: hremmas, earn: georn*)” (305). Along with *wælwulfas* in line 96, “the names of all three of the beasts are displayed here linked through wordplay to an attribute of theirs, or of the battlefield” (305). Dance modestly notes that “what I think has not been remarked upon is the frequently paronomastic nature of these collocations” (308). Furthermore, he points out, “What makes *Maldon* stand out from these other beasts passages ... is that only it adds the wordplay on ‘raven,’ and ... it does this through a variant spelling (*hremm-*) otherwise not recorded in poetry” (312). In conclusion, Dance states that “we can be about as confident here as we ever could that this particular spelling must represent very closely the form that the poet intended” (312).

With “Exchanging Battle: Subjective and Objective Conflicts in *The Battle of Maldon*,” *ES* 87: 266–76, Bradley D. Ryner argues that within the poem, lives, weapons, and possessions are exchanged “in the context of a larger economic relationship explicitly negotiated between the combatants,” a negotiation that takes place as Byrhtnoth and the Viking messenger establish “the rules of a game that will be played on the battlefield” (266). One contribution of this article is Ryner’s emphasis on the previously overlooked symmetry between the two alternative models of exchange: to join in peace or join in battle, to exchange gold or exchange blows (268). He also insists on the ambiguity of *dælon* ‘divide/share’ in line 33b; both senses must be maintained in order to “clearly understand the model of exchange agreed to by Byrhtnoth and the Viking messenger” (267). Ultimately, Ryner argues that “what is at stake in the battle is not specific objects, such as land or treasure, but the ability to remain an agentive subject,” capable of participating in exchange rather than becoming its object (271). According to the rhetoric of the poem, “The warrior’s death marks the triumph of his subjective mastery as his dead body becomes the last object he is able to control” (272). For example, Byrhtnoth’s “inability to control his weapon” is symptomatic of “his ultimate transformation from powerful subject to passive object” (273). Yet he prays in order to maintain agency over his soul, which will continue to struggle against enemies in hell (274). Likewise, “each of the warriors who vows to avenge Byrhtnoth’s death is afforded the chance to articulate his own subjectivity” (274). Thus, Ryner argues “that the idealization of these warriors’

deaths does more than monumentalize individual men; it serves as the culmination of the poet’s imaginative conceptualization of a process of subject formation achieved in battle against both subjective and objective opponents” (275).

William Sayers wrote “*Æschere* in *The Battle of Maldon*: Fleet, Warships’ Crews, Spearmen, or Oarsmen?” *NM* 107: 199–205, in response to a 2003 article by Marijane Osborn. The correct answer is *a) fleet*. While *æsc* “was in general currency,” the word “is never used of English ships” (204), and the less common compound *æschere* refers exclusively “to Scandinavian raiders” (204). But why use *æsc* to refer to Scandinavian ships, and not English ones? “As Osborn notes, oak, not ash, was the preferred material for ship construction”; however, “ash was a principal material for shaping oars” (200). “Thus *æscman* ‘ash-man’ could as easily mean ‘oarsman’ as ‘spearman’ and *æschere* an assembly of rowers as well as fighters,” Sayers reasons (200), but neither phenomenon is exclusive to the raiders. Meanwhile, Old Norse *askr* was “apparently used ... as the name of a ship type” (201), as mentioned in *Heiðreks saga* (201) and *Örvar-Odds saga* (202). Snorri uses *askr* “in a kenning for ‘shield’” in his *Edda* (202). But Sayers also notes “hitherto unrecognized evidence” from the conclusion of Snorri’s *Skáldskaparmál* (202), which implies that “in Old Norse—at least—*askr* was the name of a ship type, one sufficiently well known to figure in poetic composition” (203). The salient meaning of Old Norse *askr* is actually “a wooden bowl or vessel, typically broad at the top and narrower below” (203). Thus, Sayers explains, “It is possible that *askr* as ship’s name is a hypochoristic extension of *askr* ‘bowl’ not on the basis of material but rather general shape,” pointing to “a ship of relatively shallow draft” (203). Sayers further speculates that since *askr* ‘vessel’ “was also used as a unit of liquid measure,” equal to sixteen *justur* (203), *askr* could by analogy connote “a craft with (about) sixteen ‘rooms’ for thirty-two oarsmen, approximately the size of crew that some believe plausible for the *askr*” (204). Ultimately, Sayers concludes that Old English *æsc* and Old Norse *askr* both refer to “a Norse ship type” (204). “I propose that the latter is a familiar term echoing *askr* in the sense of wooden bowl,” he concludes, and thus *æschere* refers to a fleet of fast, compact, oaken ships with a shallow draft (204).

RN

Cædmon’s Hymn

Dennis Cronan’s “Cædmon and Hesiod,” *ES* 87: 379–401 acknowledges that, while Bede may not have been influenced directly by the *Theogony*, the depictions of

Cædmon and Hesiod share enough similarities to be considered analogous. Cronan identifies ten specific similarities between the two poets, a sampling of which is listed here: both are herdsman; both are visited by a divine figure; both are given the gift of poetry by that figure; both are instructed to sing about the creation; both are identified as superior to other poets; and both “inspire others to turn from earthly concerns” (387). Perhaps the most significant of the similarities is the last Cronan considers: “Both stories reflect important transitions in the content and the nature of their poetic traditions” (389). In the second half of his essay, Cronan, having now identified the elements of what he calls “a deep or archetypal structure of these inspiration narratives” (390), discusses poets in other literary traditions who might also be considered transitional poetic figures, including the Icelandic Hallbjorn, the Arabic Abid, and Mohammad.

Like Cronan, John D. Niles (“Bede’s Cædmon, ‘The Man Who Had No Story’ [Irish Tale-Type 2412B],” *Folklore* 117: 141–55) also examines a possible analogue of the story of Cædmon: the tale-type noted in the title, which was first recorded in 1820s Ireland, and then identified in both Ireland and Scotland numerous times over the next two centuries. In Bede’s story of Cædmon, Niles recognizes what is possibly the earliest record of “The Man Who Had No Story” tale-type. He provides an encapsulated version of this tale-type as originally printed in Ó Súilleabháin and Christiansen’s book on Irish folktales: “A man gets lodgings at a house one night. After a meal, he is asked to tell a story or to sing a song. When he replies that he can do neither, he is asked to go outside on some errand, and for several hours he has fantastic experiences. When he returns to the house, exhausted, next morning and tells the people there about what he has suffered, they tell him that he will always have that, as a story, to tell in future” (143). Niles acknowledges that there are at least two major differences between Bede’s story and the Irish tale-type: the “religious tenor” of Bede’s version and the extended coda that describes Cædmon’s reception by the monastic community. These additions, which would have been kindly received by Bede’s clerical audience, are a testament to his story-telling abilities, Niles suggests. Niles concludes his study with a disclaimer: it is not his intent to label Bede’s story of Cædmon as a source for the Irish tale-type, or even necessarily “an early specimen of that narrative type” (150–51). Instead, Niles explains that “a given story not only can be perceived as standing alone as a unique statement pertaining to its own time and place, but also, in all its individuality, can be seen to participate in an ongoing, collective

process by which reality itself is perceived (and, even, experienced) according to certain recurrent narrative patterns” (151).

GD

Christ I

In “Architectural Metaphors and Christological Imagery in the Advent Lyrics: Benedictine Propaganda in the Exeter Book?” *Conversion and Colonization in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Karkov and Howe (Tempe: ACMRS), 169–211, Mercedes Salvador suggests that like Lantfred’s *Translatio* and Æthelwold’s *Benedictional*, the Advent Lyrics or *Christ I* may be “permeated with Benedictine influence” (171). Through notions of unity within the Church achieved through Christ’s authority as a kingly figure, the Advent sequence bolsters the power of both the Church and the monarchy, especially King Edgar. Salvador’s study refers to Robert Deshman’s work on the *Benedictional*, which identifies a reformist bias in Æthelwold’s text, but she is the first to locate such a bias in the Advent Lyrics and to contend that “contemporary readers of the poems might have viewed these metaphors and images—together with the concept of Advent—as characteristic of Benedictine iconography and propaganda” (173). The architectural images of the cornerstone, the two walls, and the ruinous building are biblical in origin; Salvador reads them as employed here as propaganda for the Benedictine Reform, especially in their emphasis on restoration, unification, and building. While Christ is the primary referent, “that traditional allegorical reading does not explain the full significance that these images might have had in the cultural milieu of the Exeter manuscript” (175). The unification and strengthening of the walls by the cornerstone may point beyond the traditional association with Christ and extend to his Church; further, it may also echo Edgar’s achievement in bringing together a divided kingdom after Mercia and Northumbria separated from Wessex in his predecessor’s reign (176). Salvador finds parallel use of architectural imagery in other pro-Reform texts, including saints’ lives (186) and other texts, such as charters and diplomata (181). Other Christological images in the Advent sequence also relate to the Reform, specifically the shepherd, the king, and the priest (188). Although such pastoral imagery as the shepherd was a common medieval topos, it was especially popular during the Benedictine revival (191); indeed, in Anglo-Saxon England it was something of a cliché to refer thus to an abbot or bishop before the Reform (192). However, the image of shepherd may also refer to Edgar’s role as monarch (196). Christ’s role as king has obvious royal echoes, and other Christological

images from the Advent sequence also appear in “King Edgar’s Coronation,” the panegyric from the A-version of the Chronicle (AD 973). The priestly order is added to the royal image with the mention of Melchisedech, who was both king and priest before God, and may have “enjoyed a prominent position in Benedictine mythology” (204). All of these images, architectural and Christological, “highlight essential concepts related to the Reform movement—such as the urgency of communal unity, peace, and church restoration—that find echo in late tenth- and eleventh-century texts and pictures” (210); for this reason, the Advent Lyrics may be read as something akin to Reformist propaganda, but certainly should be read with the Reform agenda in mind, as it almost surely would have been in the mind of the Anglo-Saxon audience.

MKR

Christ III

In “Visualizing Judgment in Anglo-Saxon England: Illumination, Metaphor, and *Christ III*,” chapter 1 of her *Odd Bodies and Visible Ends in Medieval Literature* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), 13–38, Sachi Shimomura suggests that “[t]he Old English homilies and the poem *Christ III* reshape Doomsday’s dichotomous metaphors and sense of closure in ways that particularly expose concerns about the capacity of language to express those attributes vividly” (13). Shimomura discusses the commonplace connection of images of light with clarity, visibility, understanding, and honor, and the connection of darkness with obscurity, ignorance, and shame, demonstrating that the Germanic roots of Anglo-Saxon culture add further richness to the Latin Christian imagery (15). But the brightness associated with Christ goes beyond signifying these qualities, or his “qualitative superlativeness”: the light of Christ literally enables sight (16), thereby bringing the metaphor full circle, from the concrete notion of light to its metaphorical qualities, then back to the literal in scenes of Doomsday, wherein the believers who are blessed with the light of Christ are literally clothed in light and able to see beyond their mortal capacity: “[a]s metaphor begins to concretize in these ways into more complex systems of meaning, where metaphorical imagery approximates visible, physical presence and rejects abstraction, it extends in function. Indeed, such metaphors challenge the bounds of figurative imagery, as though to suggest that representation (figural understanding) and physical reality (literal understanding) converge visually at Doomsday” (21). Light in *Christ III* (and in Doomsday homilies from a variety of sources) is both more and less than metaphorical, describing the

original light of creation, “whose metaphoric quality draws entirely from God, rather than from human language” (24). The blessed derive their light from God in proportion to their virtue, setting up a hierarchy among them which Dante later also describes in concrete terms; that vision depends on their relation to God: “[n]othing in creation is concealed from those blessed who see the brightness of their Creator (and therefore share in his knowledge)” (31); in this way, they are able to see the damned and understand their plight, for they can see their sins upon them. In their turn, the damned see the blessed because they literally and metaphorically shine; this reciprocal sight is important because of the significance Anglo-Saxon culture placed on the concept of shame (32). Shimomura provides examples of this Germanic emphasis on praise and shame, concluding that “the Germanic praise ethos views a person in relation to both present and future, the period of his or her lifetime and the time after death. Praise must be won by the living; praise alone may outlast death” (33). Such values bear similarities to Christian concerns with the Last Judgment, which may have encouraged “juxtaposition or even conflation.” Finally, Shimomura suggests that the quality of light as both literal and metaphorical in *Christ III* and other texts—its ability to blur distinctions and move easily between two usually distinct types of meaning—recalls the riddles of the Exeter Book, the codex in which the poem also appears. “Like a riddle, it reifies the impetus to create that moment of paradoxical certainty out of chaos, illumination out of doubt and darkness—and direct vision out of metaphor” (38).

MKR

Christ and Satan

Though the first scribe of the poem has left us with maddening textual puzzles, some without ready solution, Emily V. Thornbury offers a compelling resolution to one such crux in “*Christ and Satan*: ‘Healing’ Line 7” *ES* 87.5: 505–510. Because the first section of the poem (ll. 1–124) is so problematic and because a contemporary or near-contemporary corrector devoted much energy to repairing what he saw as the poem’s faults, Thornbury suggests, especially within those first 124 lines, “it seems reasonable to assume that when the text of *Christ and Satan* seems faulty, that authorial error is possible, but scribal error is likely” (505). The line with which she is concerned is clear and unaltered in the manuscript, and reads *deopne ybmlyt clene ymbhaldeð*. As she points out, *ybmlyt* is a nonsense word and therefore the most obvious choice for emendation; all modern editions read *ybmlyt*, though this is little

help in determining what the word means. While there is a verb *ymbliðan*, Thornbury notes that it means “to sail around” rather than “to surround,” which does not fit the sense of the lines; it occurs only once in the corpus as a calque on *circumnavigate*, making this occurrence of *ymblyt* unlikely to be a form of *ymbliðan* (506). The word could be a form of *ymblicgan*, which does mean to surround, but it would more likely have been spelled **ymbliġð* or *ymbliġeð*; for these reasons, the word is “almost certainly a ghost word” (506). Further, the line presents a metrical difficulty, as it does not alliterate normally. “Most suggestions for producing a more orthodox metre have involved emending MS *clene* to something beginning with a *d*, such as *dere* or *dene*” (507), though these emendations are not widely accepted. Thornbury proposes that the confusion arises not from a scribe’s misreading of *clene* for a word beginning in *d*, but that the word *deopne* may have been a misreading of *cleopne*, or more probably, *cleowne*, a word meaning “sphere” or “ball” and found in several manuscripts as a gloss for the Latin *globus*. Significantly for this argument, a form of *cleowen* alliterates with *clæne* in *The Phoenix*. Returning to *ymblyt*, Thornbury reasons that construing the word as an error for *ymb lyfte* would bring the passage into line with the theory, common in Classical and patristic literature, “that the heavens were structured in a series of concentric spheres surrounding the earth, the lowest of which was the air breathed by living creatures” (508). Lines 7–8 would therefore read: “the Creator in his might entirely supports the sphere around the air, and all middle-earth” (508). Thornbury suggests that two copies would have been required to account for such an error, which includes loss of both an inflectional ending and a medial letter, and the transposition of two letters; she notes, however, that “none of these errors are beyond the capacity of the first scribe of *Christ and Satan*” (509). She also notes that the half line *cleowne ymb lyfte* may have been deliberately altered by a scribe who was unfamiliar with patristic cosmology and assumed error in his copy text. Recognizing that hers is likely not the last word on this crux, Thornbury urges us at the least to construe *ymblyt* as a ghost word and exclude it from dictionaries.

MKR

Daniel

John Bugge’s “Virginité and Prophecy in the Old English *Daniel*,” *ES* 87.2: 127–147, begins with the assumption that the poem reflects the values of a monastic audience, one committed to asceticism as offering a more intimate union with God that is essentially

noetic; Bugge then asserts that the earthly perfection of that union is to be found in the gift of prophecy: “*Daniel* celebrates prophecy as a diagnostic feature of the monastic life by linking the special intercourse *Daniel* and his companions enjoy with divine wisdom to their practice of virginity, the essential monastic virtue” (127). The essay seeks to “1) explore the connection between prophecy and virginity in the Fathers and in early monasticism; 2) show how the *Daniel* poet forges that link in the diction of the poem; and 3) demonstrate that the lyrical portions, when seen in relation to their place in the baptismal liturgy of Holy Saturday, help to locate purity and prophecy in a central position in the Church’s view of the spiritually regenerative effect of that sacrament” (127). Ancient tradition honored *Daniel* and his companions for their purity, and Bugge demonstrates the link between *Daniel*’s purity and his gift of prophecy, which is less concerned with prediction in this period than in the revelation or interpretation of hidden things. “The important corollary is that Adam’s entitative lapse from virginal status involved a loss of knowledge” (130); this in part explains the Western eremitic ideal of purity and its association with spiritual insight, leading to “a special veneration of the prophets, who were seen as the precursors, even the founders, of the cloistered life” (131). “In honoring prophecy *Daniel* states the most fundamental of themes, that through chosen spokesmen God manifests Himself to human beings who, in their wanton sensuality, have lost sight of the elementary truths of his existence, His unique hegemony over all other gods, and the pre-eminent power he displays in the generative-existential act by which He sustains all creatures in being” (131). The rite of baptism is related to these notions of purity and generation because baptism was thought to free the soul from “the contaminating influence of the body, restoring it to the innocence of the *vita angelica*” (141). When baptism restored the soul’s purity, the soul was then able to enter into the kind of intimacy Adam shared with God before the Fall and thereby shared in God’s knowledge, resulting in the gift of prophecy (142). In closing, Bugge suggests that *Cædmon*’s gift may also be linked to the monastic life of celibacy he chooses to adopt as a result, and prompts scholars to consider that the culture of “monastic Anglo-Saxon Christianity must play a larger role in our assessment of the religious poetry that remains to us” (144).

MKR

Deor

Andrew James Johnston’s goal in “The Riddle of *Deor* and the Performance of Fiction,” *Language*

and *Text*, ed. Johnston *et al.* [see sec. 2, 133–50 is “to explore how the poem’s performativity and its literary self-consciousness create a combined effect” (135). The essay’s second section discusses the syntactic and lexical ambiguity of the refrain. Johnston suggests that “[it is] possible to read the refrain’s first five occurrences in the traditional sense—‘that passed; this will pass too’—and the poem’s final line, or to be more precise, its final *b* half-line, in the first person singular” (138), creating an “autobiographical twist” that “retroactively introduces a note of ambiguity into the previous occurrences of the refrain” (139). “If we accept that *Deor* is strongly informed by a poetics of ambiguity ... then the poem’s historical *exempla* might actually themselves be understood in a more complex fashion” (144), Johnston argues in section three, which focuses on the fourth stanza, the identity of Theodoric, and how he would have been known to the Anglo-Saxons. Even the narrator is fictionalized in *Deor*, leading Johnston to conclude, “Ambiguity itself is doubly employed in the service of fiction. On the one hand, the text’s ambiguities point to the potential presence of many other stories looming behind the one ostensibly being told. On the other, the poem’s ambiguities draw attention to the fictionality of the narrative situation itself” (148).

RN

Descent into Hell

M. R. Rambaran-Olm asks, “Is the Title of the Old English Poem *The Descent into Hell* Suitable?” *SELIM* 13: 73–85. The answer is no; a more accurate title would be “John the Baptist’s Prayer” (82). “All too often we unquestioningly accept the titles of Old English poetry that were given by an early editor, and such a title might well color our interpretation of a poem,” the author begins (73). This is in fact the case for *The Descent into Hell*, otherwise known as *The Harrowing of Hell*, both titles that are “unsuitable and might not clearly represent the poem as a whole, since past editors seem to have misread the poem’s central theme” (73). These past editors unjustly compared the poem to the *Gospel of Nicodemus* (75–78), and thus overlooked deliberate differences from that tradition; for example, in this poem, “John the Baptist is the sole and central speaker ... on behalf of the saints,” which marks “a complete departure from Harrowing narratives both in literature and artistic depictions” (79). Rambaran-Olm also considers the manuscript context of the poem: “It is no coincidence that the text is nestled in between two other poems that deal with prayer and Salvation,” *Resignation* and *Alms-giving* (82). “While Christ’s descent ...

provides the setting for the narrative, the only speaker in the poem is John the Baptist ... so it is really John’s message that is at the core of the text” (82). Thus, the poem “should be viewed on its own merits as an innovative approach in dealing with the Salvation message, and should simply not be viewed as a failed attempt to describe Christ’s descent into Hell” (81).

RN

Dream of the Rood

Although Thomas Duncan’s “Quid Hinieldus cum Christo?: The Secular Expression of the Sacred in Old and Middle English Lyrics,” *Sacred and Secular in Medieval and Early Modern Cultures*, ed. Lawrence Besserman (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), 29–46, begins with a brief discussion of the heroic Germanic qualities of Christ and the lord/thane relationship between him and the cross. This depiction of Christ, which resonates with pagan heroic values, serves in this essay mainly as a foil to later Middle English focus on the suffering and humanity of Christ and of the Virgin Mary. Duncan points out that, unlike in the later lyrics, the Christ of *The Dream of the Rood* is a remote figure; oddly, it is the personified cross that is depicted as suffering, pierced, drenched with blood (30). Moving from a cosmic battle between Christ and the Devil in earlier portrayals of incarnation, following the Anglo-Saxon period, the focus shifts to the love of Christ, who becomes incarnate in order to suffer and thereby redeem sinful humans (31). The humanity thus revealed is celebrated in the ME lyrics, wherein poets describe the poverty and humility of Christ, and the tender love of Christ and of the Virgin Mary. Interestingly, “when Christian devotion focused in ever more detail on Christ’s humanity, Mary, the human mother of lullaby and crucifixion lyrics, is raised to quasi-divine status in lyrics celebrating her Coronation”—Christ becomes more human and his mother more exalted (39). At the same time, the idea of love as both noble and ennobling was becoming popular in the secular literature (40–41). Eventually, distinction between human and divine blurred, as Christ the Lover-Knight becomes a common figure, with the human soul as the beloved, whether faithful or faithless (44–45).

In “From Sign to Vision: The Ruthwell Cross and *The Dream of the Rood*,” *The Place of the Cross in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Karkov *et al.* [see sec. 1], 129–44, Calvin B. Kendall looks at both the standing stone cross and the poem as ‘things,’ to better understand the relationship between them. He begins his discussion by defining the terms “sacred signs” and “allegories” for the purposes of this essay, limiting “allegory” to “sacred

signs explicitly designated as such in the bible ... or by universal Christian custom" (129). Signs such as the cross by their essence "are not arbitrary human interpretations, but derive from God" (130). Further, Kendall explains that while he is discussing the Ruthwell cross in this essay, his remarks could apply equally to other standing crosses of the period. "The purpose of this paper is to propose that the distinction between sign ... and vision is analogous to the distinction between text and interpretation" (130). This distinction "may help elucidate the difference for an Anglo-Saxon Christian of encountering the cross as an object and of experiencing, or hearing of, a vision of the cross" such as the one recounted in the poem (130). Kendall discusses the account of Constantine's vision, suggesting that "the sign of the cross in the sky stimulated Constantine's dream vision—that the visionary experience was the outgrowth of meditation on the sacred emblem" (136)—and draws a parallel between the Ruthwell cross and *The Dream of the Rood*. He also points to other physical objects given "voice," as when a statue speaks to identify Christ as the Son of God in *Andreas* or by inscriptions, such as those found over portals; Kendall cites Dante here, as well as an early twelfth-century tympanum over the west portal of the basilica of Ste-Foy of Conques (138). "The letters inscribed on these portals, like the runic letters inscribed on the Ruthwell cross and the reported speech of the cross in *The Dream of the Rood*, make visible the meaning or message of the material object, the sign, to which they belong" (138). The poem can be thought of as a record of visionary experience, amplifying the meanings it contains and relating them to the dreamer's situation (141–42); while it interprets the sign the dreamer sees, "it is not an allegory in the same sense as the sign itself" (144).

In her doctoral dissertation "I. Oral Tradition, Performance, and Ritual in Two Medieval Dream-Visions: *The Dream of the Rood* and *Pearl*. II Water Margins" (DAI 67A [2005], 2), Heather Maring builds on the foundation of previous work in oral tradition and performance studies by proposing a methodology for investigating the ritual characteristics of *The Dream of the Rood* and *Pearl*, especially their use of "the Voyage Theme, the riddle genre, cross adoration, homily, alliterative verse, the debate-contest, gift-exchange, internal pilgrimage, and the Messenger Theme" (iii). "Christian and Germanic Syncretism in *The Dream of the Rood*" (ch. 2) examines the riddling features of the poem, and "The Messenger Theme, King Oswald, and Christian Royalty" (ch. 4) discusses the oral-traditional theme of the Messenger in both poems and links it to notions of traditional wisdom and ritual.

After providing a general discussion of its manuscript context in "*The Dream of the Rood* and the Practice of Penitential Meditation," *Faith & Reason* 30.3–4 (2005): 297–334, Robert C. Rice examines the poem with an eye to the cultural context of the poem, specifically its associations with penitential meditations and most especially the contemplation of the cross, or cross vigil, in Lent [see also Treharne, below]. Citing Robert B. Burlin's assertion that the iconography of the Ruthwell Cross, whose runic inscription contains lines also found in the poem, reflects an eremitic tradition and that the *Dream of the Rood* is a literary expression of monastic contemplation, Rice demonstrates connections between the poem, meditations on last things, and penitential prayers from sources such as the *Rule of St. Benedict*, British Museum MS Arundel 155, and the *Book of Cerne*. Some of the Arundel MS prayers indicate that they were to be prayed in the presence of a cross: "Each of these prayers is penitential and perhaps reflects an Anglo-Saxon version of the Irish practice of cross-vigil, a form of penance which required one to stand, kneel, or lie prostrate with arms extended in the form of a cross, sometimes for hours, while reciting a number of prayers" (303). This practice would seem a reasonable answer to the questions scholars like Constance B. Hieatt have raised about the psychological context of the dream vision, including the identity of the dreamer. Further, these prayers regard the cross almost as a person, which would render the prosopoeia of the poem less surprising (305). Rice concludes that the dreamer must be a monk, and may be best understood as engaged in a meditational vigil (314). At the end the essay includes both the Old English poem and Rice's translation in facing-page format.

"Further Observations Concerning the Translation of Anglo-Saxon Verse" by Louis J. Rodrigues, *Babel* 52: 280–87, reproduces and compares translations of ll. 28–56 of *The Dream of the Rood*. He finds all four "academic," directed at audiences familiar with the Old English text, though his evaluations of each differ significantly. R.K. Gordon's alternating use of archaic and modern lexis, and his unusual syntax are criticized less than his inconsistency in using such devices. By comparison, S.A.J. Bradley's lexis is consistent and faithful to the original while remaining free from archaisms, but Rodrigues finds some of his choices "reprehensible" (284). The translation by C.W. Kennedy fares rather better: "in its close, or reasonably close, approximation to the alliterative patterns, rhythms, diction, and curtness of style of Anglo-Saxon verse, he succeeds in re-creating the atmosphere of the original" (285). However, Rodrigues finds him guilty of occasional lapses in

poetic judgment, but no major transgressions. Hamer's translation is ruled dull, with heavily plodding iambic pentameters and undistinguished lexis and style, though most of the infelicities are attributed to the verse form.

Elaine Treharne's "Hiht wæs geniwad: Rebirth in *The Dream of the Rood*," *The Place of the Cross*, ed. Karkov *et al.* [see sec. 1], 145–157, explores the baptismal resonances in the poem, building on Sarah Larratt Keefer's assertions that *The Dream of the Rood* is linked with the Good Friday Liturgy for the Veneration of the Cross and may be situated in the context of the Benedictine Reform. "The present reading—relating to baptism and penitence—ultimately complements Keefer's interpretation, since both the services of baptism and Good Friday of course fall in the latter part of Holy Week" (146). Treharne moves from a discussion of the baptismal and penitential resonances of the text to its "reception at the hands of the compiler and subsequent potential users of the poem" (146). She remarks that in a sense, the poem focuses less on the cross than on the experiences of the visionary, the poet, and the audience; the manuscript context of the poem within the Vercelli Book, with its emphasis on better Christian living through repentance and devotion, supports such a reading (147). The medieval understanding of baptism is central to Treharne's discussion: "[t]he transformation achieved through baptism is, then, more than the transformation from sorrow-laden consciousness of sin to hopeful penitent, or even from repentance to absolution. It is the transformation from death into life" and is fundamental to everything found in the Old English poem (148). Significantly, Treharne locates a potential new source for the vision of the cross seen in the poem, the *Letter to Constantine* written by Cyril of Jerusalem in the mid fourth century and telling of the vision of a wondrous cross that appeared in Jerusalem; incorporated into numerous histories, this account appears in Sozomen's and Rufinus's additions to Eusebius's fifth-century *Ecclesiastical History*, whence it may have come to Anglo-Saxon England (149). Treharne briefly discusses Constantine's vision of the cross and the vision of a cross of light in the second-century Apocryphal Acts of John, noting that such a portent "is itself a catalyst initially for the human responses of fear and confusion, giving way to a consciousness of the need for prayer and repentance, to a voluntary and eager awareness for conversion, followed by wisdom, and finally the hope of salvation" (150). With its vision of the cross, the poem may be read as an inspirational tool designed to lead to the salvation promised in baptism, especially in its references to blood and water, the blood of Christ

and the water of baptism and perhaps also the tears of the penitent (152–3). "Seen within this context, *The Dream of the Rood* becomes a vehicle for the edification of the catechuminate or the penitent: a means to effect the necessary transformation prior to their acceptance or reintegration into the communion of the church" (156).

MKR

Elene

At the beginning of "Colonization and Conversion in Cynewulf's *Elene*," *Conversion and Colonization*, ed. Karkov and Howe [see sec. 1], 133–51, Heide Estes details recent scholarship concerning the dating of Cynewulf's poems, especially the argument elucidated by Patrick W. Conner in "On Dating Cynewulf," *Cynewulf: Basic Readings*, ed. Robert Bjork (New York: Garland, 1996), 23–56, which supports a tenth-century date. Estes also demonstrates thematic links in the poem to historical events of the late ninth and early tenth centuries, strengthening Conner's argument. Of particular interest is her suggestion that "[t]he clear message in *Elene* that Christian faith itself is sole justification for martial conquest and cultural imperialism justifies the conquest of Danish-held areas of England in the tenth century under the children and grandsons of Alfred" (137). She offers a brief comparison of the poem with Ælfric's homily on the discovery of the true cross, asserting that the authors "chose different Latin traditions upon which to base their works, reflecting different contemporary, historical, and literary concerns" (139). In the Latin sources proposed for *Elene*, Constantine contends, not with a rival Roman general, but with a large army of foreigners [*gens multa barbarorum*] (139), a situation faced by the Anglo-Saxons, who contended with their own *hæðene* throughout the ninth century: "In their status as pagans, those who attack Constantine are analogous to the pagans who attacked England" (140). Estes parses the language of the poem to demonstrate how Cynewulf associates Constantine, and thereby Christianity, with victory against incursion by pagan foreigners; further, through language and image he aligns the emperor with Anglo-Saxon traditions (141–42). Estes reads *Elene* herself as somewhat less empowered than do other authors reviewed here, but she does not suggest that this relative lack of power is necessary to understanding *Elene* within the Anglo-Saxon tradition. She functions as an agent of her son, but her ability to preach to the Jews and effect the conversion of Judas testifies to her abilities, though Estes points out that once Judas converts, linguistic authority transfers to him (149). Estes focuses on Cynewulf's use

of the Jews as “other” to Christianity in order “to signal that Danes and Anglo-Saxons could become a single community as Christians, transcending their history as members of opposing armies” (146); the poem chiefly concerns the education and conversion, not of the Jews specifically, but of non-Christians, or, in this context, the Danes (147). Indeed, such conversion could be legitimately compelled through force: “In its intertwined narratives of conversion and battle, *Elene* suggests that difference in religious affiliation legitimates the attack of a neighboring people protected by treaty” (150). According to Estes’s reading, the poem both justifies force used against pagan peoples by Christian kings and requires them to support the Church. “Cynewulf suggests to English kings that if faith should support them in battle against Danish warriors, they should in turn give financial and legal support to the Church in its appeal for the conversion of the Danish pagans” (151).

David F. Johnson’s “Hagiographical Demons or Liturgical Devils? Demonology and Baptismal Imagery in Cynewulf’s *Elene*,” *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed. Swan [see sec. 2], 9–29 reminds us that according to Gregory the Great, Satan’s history falls into three distinct periods: in the first, he has dominion over humankind until the harrowing of hell; once he is bound by Christ, he remains so until he is loosed at the end of the world to return as Antichrist (9). Early medieval authors generally adhere to this history, so that when a demon is seen tempting a saint or otherwise acting in this world, it is not Satan himself but a minion who appears. Johnson argues first that while Cynewulf makes it clear that the devil who appears in *Elene* is indeed Satan himself, the poet is thereby demonstrating that the action of the poem, especially Judas’s conversion, is meant to be read spiritually and figuratively more than literally, which also allows us to read the narrative more spiritually and symbolically than literally (12–13). One such allusion may be to the baptismal rite, for it is clear that *Elene* is preparing Judas for baptism as she instructs him as one would a catechumen. Further, “the finding of the true Cross is not the discovery of a mere relic, but more importantly the unveiling of a spiritual truth” (15). This emphasis on the spiritual rather than the literal is echoed in the miracle of the resurrection of the boy: whereas relics were traditionally efficacious through physical touch, in *Elene* the cross does not touch the young man but is raised over him, spiritual symbol more than physical object (16). Johnson finds numerous indications that Cynewulf may have been influenced “by the liturgy for Holy Saturday, not least of which is the baptismal imagery [of the poem]...

for certainly in the early Church Holy Saturday was (together with Pentecost) the day set aside for baptism” (21). Even though the devil is literally bound until Doomsday, each catechumen re-enacts Christ’s struggles with the devil in preparation for baptism; in this way, the devil is symbolically freed from his bonds to affect the affairs of humankind. Johnson suggests that it is this symbolic diabolical presence that Cynewulf exploits in *Elene*.

MKR

Exodus

In “Old English *Exodus* 39ob: *witgan larum*,” *N&Q* n.s. 53: 17–21, J.R. Hall traces the various interpretations of the phrase *witgan larum* from George Hickes’s 1703 Latin translations meaning ‘by the prophet’s exhortation’ and ‘by the prophet’s admonitions,’ where Hickes reads *witgan* as a genitive singular of *wit(e)ga*, ‘prophet,’ an interpretation followed by later scholars, among them Edward B. Irving (18). In 1977, Peter J. Lucas challenged this reading, suggesting *witgan* as the dative plural of *witig*, ‘wise.’ In a subsequent publication, Irving assented to Lucas’s reading, but Hall argues that Irving’s reading is more likely to be correct for four reasons. First, the only other occurrence of the phrase is better construed “in accord with a prophet’s counsels” than “in accord with wise counsels” (18). Second, understanding *witgan* as modifying the dative plural noun *larum* requires the *-an* to be construed as a reduced form of the expected dative plural adjectival ending *-um* (19); Lucas provides examples to bolster his argument, but here Hall demonstrates that the examples given are in many cases doubtful themselves. Third, Hall notes that “taking the phrase as ‘in accord with wise counsels’ cannot be paralleled elsewhere in Old English verse” (20). Fourth, the sole reason Lucas gives for resisting *witgan* as ‘prophet’ is that David is not a prophet, but Hall argues that David is repeatedly described in scripture and elsewhere as one who speaks under divine inspiration: Bede refers to him as *rex et propheta*. In this description of the building of the temple, “[i]t is fitting that Solomon should have constructed the temple in accord with the counsels of his prophetic father” (21).

Michael Lapidge’s “Hypallage in the Old English *Exodus*,” *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed. Swan [see sec. 2], 31–39, argues that hypallage, or ‘transferred epithet,’ which “occurs when an adjective whose meaning relates primarily to one noun is transferred grammatically to another,” is a common Latin poetic device, likely learned by Anglo-Saxon authors from authors such as Vergil, Lucan, and others (32–33). Two such students,

Bede and Wulfstan of Winchester, were skilled Anglo-Latin poets who used hypallage (34). The author of *Exodus* may be another, as the device appears several times in this highly allusive and metaphorical poem. Lapidge suggests that perhaps the instances of hypallage may not have been created independently by the poet, but perhaps suggested by similar Latin usages. For example, Alcimus Avitus's *Carmina de spiritualis historiae gestis* may have influenced the Anglo-Saxon poet's use of specific instances of hypallage, which occur also in the *Caramina* (35). "In a word, the metaphorical diction of the Old English *Exodus* can best be understood in the context of the Latin verse which literate Anglo-Saxons studied as part of their school curriculum" (36).

Lapidge addresses *Exodus* in somewhat greater detail in "Versifying the Bible in the Middle Ages," *The Text in the Community*, ed. Mann and Nolan [see sec. 4a], 11-40. Here, Lapidge is concerned with the relationship between the curriculum of medieval schools and the effect that study might have had on pupils. He points out that such curriculum "consisted not in study of the Bible per se, nor in meditation on patristic commentary, but in the meticulous word-by-word parsing and interpretation of various poetic versions of the Bible (paraphrases, as they are often called)" (11). He begins his discussion with the four most important Christian-Latin poets of late antiquity, whose works became the cornerstone of medieval curriculum: Juvencus, Sedulius, Avitus, and Arator (12). Juvencus was a pioneer: Lapidge reminds us that there was no Christian-Latin poetry before *Evangelia* (13) and demonstrates that he "forged a diction which would be imitated and adopted by all subsequent Christian-Latin poets," including metaphors of light, appropriations of Vergilian terminology, and "the creation of neologisms to heighten the expression of crucial moments in Christian time" (14). Juvencus's influence is evident in the diction of Sedulius's *Carmen paschale*, which tells the miracles performed by Christ in the New Testament (15). "Unlike Juvencus, who concerned himself solely with New Testament events, Sedulius attempted to understand these events in terms of Old Testament events, and to see in the Old Testament a prefiguring of the New," as where the crossing of the Red Sea prefigures baptism (16). Avitus also treats this subject, greatly expanding the biblical account with descriptions of the drowning of the Egyptians: "Yet in spite of the graphic martial imagery we should not forget the figural significance of the Crossing that for Avitus, as for Sedulius before him, unambiguously represents purification through baptism" (19). Arator develops the figural significance of the Crossing even further, resulting in a text Lapidge

identifies as extremely dense, complex, and in some passages virtually untranslatable (20). Despite the difficulties, he explains that "[f]or Arator ... the Crossing of the Red Sea is a significant event in salvation history precisely because it adumbrates at a stroke the crucifixion, baptism, and the eucharist" (22). Given that without doubt, it was these four poets who were studied and imitated in Anglo-Saxon schools by the likes of Bede, Alcuin, Wulfstan of Winchester, and others (24), Lapidge wonders what would have been the effect of such study; he concludes that scholars would have been "deeply aware of the possibilities of figural interpretation of biblical and historical events, and would understand biblical narrative in light of such awareness, instinctively seeing Old Testament events as *figurae* of those in the New Testament" (25). In the second half of the essay, Lapidge turns to the Old English *Exodus* to demonstrate the influence of studying these Latin poets on the poem, which treats the Crossing of the Red Sea with references to Noah's flood, the binding of Isaac, and the Last Judgment, all subjects of the readings for the Holy Saturday liturgy, wherein the Crossing narrative prefigured the baptism of the catechumens following the service. "The choice of these readings by the author of the Old English *Exodus* indicates per se that the real subject of the poem is baptism, in all its figural and allegorical ramifications" (25). Lapidge then demonstrates similarities between the Old English version and those of the Latin authors discussed, reminding us that "we will better understand the ways in which Anglo-Saxon poets worked when we understand better the school curriculum in which they were trained" (28).

In her M.A. thesis, "*Wordriht: The Right of Translation in Genesis B and Exodus*" (Univ. of Manitoba, 2005, MAI 44, 3), Diana Patzer argues that poetic interpretations and recreations of biblical and patristic literature in the Old English vernacular "is not only a *right*, but a *duty*," and that the poets of *Genesis B* and *Exodus* alter their source texts "not only to guide the reader with their respective pens to an appropriate interpretation, but to teach the reader how to forge his own interpretive path and steer his way through the *machine* of the text," creating a new interpretive challenge, one that, perhaps like scripture itself, originates with the divine.

MKR

Genesis A and B

In "A Note on *Genesis B*, line 456a," *N&Q* 53.2: 135-136, Alfred Bammesberger demonstrates that while *geworht*, past participle of OE *wyrcan* 'work, create', may be

construed as a neuter accusative referring to *wif*, it is also possible that *geworht* be construed as a neuter plural, because Old English uses the nom./acc. plural to refer to a group consisting of a masculine and a feminine noun. In this way, *geworht* would refer to both Adam and Eve, just as it does in line 418b, where Satan contrasts the situation of the first couple with that of himself and his fellow devils.

MKR

Gifts of Men

Michael D. C. Drou't's essay "A Meme-Based Approach to Oral Traditional Theory," *Oral Tradition* 21: 269–94, demonstrates how memes—"the simplest unity of cultural replication"—and meme-theory can account for "the workings of several well-known and much discussed aspects of oral traditions: traditional referentiality, anaphora, and the use of repeated metrical patterns" (269). OE poetry is just one focus of Drou't's article, which draws on a wide range of oral traditions in its exposition. Perhaps of greatest relevance to scholars of OE literature and culture is Drou't's discussion of anaphora, one of whose functions is to provide "a means by which a parasitic meme that is contradictory to something elsewhere in the meme complex may nevertheless get itself incorporated into that complex" (284). Using a culturally recognized style in this effort is critical, "[b]ecause an existing style is, by definition, sufficiently fit to have spread through a culture via tradition and repetition.... Using a traditional style creates an anaphoric environment that reduces cognitive demands (that is, the reader knows what to expect next) and it is an effective strategy for a meme to get itself copied" (284–5). As an example of how this mechanism works, Drou't turns to *The Gifts of Men*. He notes how, while the majority of poem celebrates what are apparently Germanic values "such as swimming, fighting, and horsemanship," the closing lines of the poem observe a set of decidedly Christian values, though in a way that is structurally similar to the earlier portion: both sections use the "*sum x*" formula (286). In this way, "we see how anaphora enables one very elaborate complex of memes (Benedictine Reformed monasticism) to incorporate itself into another tradition (the Germanic catalogue of aristocratic gifts and talents)" using a recognized, traditional element of oral poetry (285–6).

GD

Grave

Eve Siebert's "A Possible Source for the Addition to *The Grave*," *ANQ* 19.4: 8–16, acknowledges the controversy

surrounding the final three verses of *The Grave*, a late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century body-soul poem, and, while she argues in passing that these lines are not original to the poem, is ultimately more interested in determining their source than their authenticity. The three disputed lines read as follows:

For some bid þin hæfet faxes bireued
 Al bid des faxes feirnes forworden
 Næle hit mit fingres feire stracien (8).

The mention of the head without hair and the absence of caressing fingers marks a stark departure from the rest of the poem, which nowhere mentions specific parts of the body. Siebert notes an affinity between these additional lines and Vercelli Homily IX, which describes the physical ravages of old age. She also identifies two other poems, one in Latin found in London, BL, MS Royal 7 A III and the other, titled *Un Samedi par nuit*, in Old French or Anglo-Norman, that, like the addition to *The Grave*, also collocate the loss of hair and the lack of someone to touch it.

GD

Judith

The dissertation "Battle-Brave beyond Women-Kin: Women Warriors in Medieval English Literature" (Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Connecticut, *DAI* 67A, 5) by M. Wendy Hennequin contains three sections that will be of particular interest to Anglo-Saxonists. Chapter five on the virago contains a section entitled "Orosius's Sameramis: Warrior Wife Gone Wild." There is also an epilogue, "The Strange Case of Grendel's Mother." Offered here is a synopsis of "A Courage-Brave Lady: Judith and the Spiritual Warrior Trope," from the first chapter on spiritual warriors. Here, Hennequin also compares *Judith* to *Ælfric's Life of Oswald*, which depicts Oswald as a *miles Christi* (55–7). Hennequin's definition of "spiritual warrior" states that they "do not generally bear weapons or participate in actual battles; Christian codes of conduct bar them from such activities" (18). Furthermore, "Judith's use of the sword is even more unusual in that she does not use it as a warrior in battle ... but rather, as a murder weapon" (49). Yet Hennequin rationalizes these contradictions when she writes, "Although Judith uses weapons, commits murder, and ranks among Jewish heroines, the Old English poem reconstructs her as a spiritual warrior through her redefinition as a Christian, the representation of Judith as a warrior with masculine heroic traits, her masculine performance as a war leader, and her public speech. The poem's failure ... to give her the name of warrior, its insistence on her

femininity, the emphasis on her looks, and her subordinate and submissive position relative to God, also include Judith in the ranks of spiritual warriors, whose femininity is emphasized despite their masculine performances" (51).

In "Feminine Heroism in the Old English *Judith*," *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed. Swan [see sec. 2], 41–62, Christine Thijs ponders seemingly unanswerable questions, such as whether *Judith* is an allegory and whether Judith is a hero. Regarding the first question, Thijs reviews previous strategies for reading *Judith* and concludes that "her sacred attributes allow the audience to associate her with allegorical representations, while her secular side roots her in the realm of convincing human characters. It is, however, impossible to state confidently that a poem with human and monstrous protagonists cannot, next to a literal narrative meaning, contain an allegorical level or 'allegorical moments'" (45). Thijs also asks, "Did an Anglo-Saxon audience find it acceptable that a lady of [Judith's] social status should behave in such a way?" (46). It is rare to find a sword-wielding woman or a hero without a comitatus in Old English literature (46), not to mention that "[Judith] is not boastful or self-important," which seems equally unusual (54). Moreover, Holofernes "is not an acceptable lord," "is slain in his sleep," and "[h]is heroic slayer is a woman" (48). Likewise, when comparing *Judith* to the Vulgate, Thijs finds that "the Anglo-Saxon Judith has too much emotional sensitivity to be a warrior" (51). Yet Thijs also recalls that "[a]t Beowulf's funeral not only the women but the Geatish men too were crying and mourning openly" (52). On the micro level, when Thijs interrogates the "crucial phrase" *ides ælfscinu*, she asks an interesting question: "Was the act of killing a man felt as such a transgression of the boundaries of femininity that Judith temporarily also needed to transgress the boundary of humanity and take on elvish qualities?" (49) But she concludes that "one could not go further than acknowledge both the positive elements and the scope for uncomfortable 'elvish' layers of meaning" (50). Towards the end of her essay, Thijs catalogues some of the poem's many contradictions when she writes, "Judith is brave and heroic in an active, almost masculine way, taking military action, carrying out an attack on the enemy, yet simultaneously the poet emphasises her fragility which she acknowledges in her prayer, her passivity ..., her feminine waiting for an opportunity ..., and her manoeuvring the body to allow for an easy kill" (53). Ultimately, Thijs concludes, "Christianising the figure of Judith is an important part of securing approval for her unusual features, both as a heroic figure and as a lady" (54).

Despite these many unanswered questions about *Judith*, we now know that the *Judith*-poet had read *Elene*. In "Computing Cynewulf: The *Judith*-Connection," *The Text in the Community*, ed. Mann and Nolan [see sec. 4a], 75–106, Andy Orchard takes *Judith* and *Elene* as a test-case for the use of a computer-generated concordance in assessing "the possibility of the direct influence of one Old English poem or poet on another" (76). After charting the parallels and analyzing the evidence, Orchard argues that "Cynewulf embellished his Latin source, and that the poet of *Judith* then employed a number of Cynewulf's distinctive formulations in *Elene* in embellishing his own" (98). Orchard lists the thirty-three examples of parallel phrasing between *Judith* and *Elene* (77–80). He also illustrates the distribution of these parallels through two charts to reveal that the parallels detected here between *Judith* and *Elene* occur in three clusters (81–2). "The densest passage of overlapping diction" occurs in lines 80b–86 of *Judith*, Judith's prayer to the Trinity (83). The second cluster occurs in *Judith*, lines 37b–64a, in which "there are no fewer than four half-lines shared with *Elene*, three of them uniquely ... and the fourth found elsewhere only in another of Cynewulf's signed poems" (84). Moreover, the three half lines found here and in *Elene* at lines 326–49 "occur in precisely the same order in each" (87). Finally, Orchard compares the battle sequences in *Judith* 199–241a and *Elene* 99–152; here, "the four parallels appear in the same order in each" (95), but "when one factors in the non-unique parallels ... there are no fewer than twenty-one elements common to both passages, again appearing in substantially the same order" (96). This finding extends the work of Cynewulf and his influence "to three of the four surviving major Old English poetic codices" (98), and Orchard concludes by asserting the high priority of "the careful collection and analysis of formulaic phrasing in extant Old English verse" (98), by suggesting that "the notion that vast screeds of Old English poetry composed in the 'classical' style have been lost is surely suspect," and by calling for a re-examination of "the assumptions of comparative chronology and the direct influence of one poem or poet on another that comprised so much of Anglo-Saxon scholarship for a century or so prior to 1953" (99).

RN

Juliana

The title of Peter Dendle's "How Naked is Juliana?" (*PQ* 83.4 [2004]: 355–370) raises the question of "whether or not we are envisioning precisely the same thing that the original authors and audience were when they mention

that saints are 'naked'" (355). He reminds us that notions of propriety and shame shift markedly over time and space, so that, for example, while in early Christian practice baptismal candidates seem to have been completely naked, later practice involved the wearing of symbolic white robes (357). Dendle shows how words translated as 'naked' from Latin and Old English are often ambiguous, unlike the modern assumption that *nude* or *naked* must mean completely bare; this may have been especially true for early Germanic readers and writers, whose customs seem not to have allowed public exhibition of the female body (358). Further, the ideal of celibacy meant that clerics (should have) had little experience with a bare female body (359-60); whether or no, Dendle suggests that the Church would hardly have encouraged meditation on the details of the female form, even in the context of hagiography. Also, the relative gender ambiguity of figures depicted in Anglo-Saxon religious art prompts the question: "[d]id any of these writers even know what an adult naked woman looks like?" (360). In the end, Dendle concludes that "[m]aybe we are to understand that [Juliana] really is naked, and maybe we aren't" (363), and he remarks that his observations "merely serve to confirm, in a sense, what most critics have known all along: that a hermeneutics of reading imagery of female genitals or of sexual intercourse in Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical literature is safest when left at a fairly abstract level" (364), validating and reinforcing the need for further research in the exploration of multiple readerships (365).

MKR

Maxims

Carl Berkhout's "The Old English *Maxims I* 190: *bacum tobreden*," *N&Q* n.s. 53: 21-22, challenges the established interpretation of the line mentioned in the title of his article: *ær hy bacum tobreden*. This line is generally translated as something like 'before they turned their backs,' and presumed to be a commentary on two maxims that appear earlier in the poem, which deal with conflict and resolution. Berkhout, however, argues for the reconsideration of two words in the line: *tobrædan* and *bac*. *Tobrædan*, he suggests, should be translated as 'to open,' based on evidence that includes its occasional use as a gloss for the Latin *dilatare*. *Bacum* poses more of a difficulty, since nowhere in the extant literature is this spelling of the dative plural found. Berkhout thus proposes an emendation: *bocum* for *bacum*. He justifies this reading in two ways. First, evidence for *bacum* "must rest entirely on the reliability of its spelling in Francis Junius' seventeenth-century transcript

of British Library MS. Cotton Otho A.VI," which was damaged in the Cotton Library fire (22). Second, *Solomon and Saturn II* identifies the opening of books, and presumably the accessing of the knowledge contained within, as a means of resolving conflict. The resulting interpretation of the line therefore moves away from conflict and toward resolution: people in debate will open their books.

GD

Phoenix, Physiologus, Panther, Whale

E. K. C. Gorst's analysis of *The Phoenix*, "Latin Sources of the Old English *Phoenix*," *N&Q* n.s. 53: 136-42, takes as its starting point a number of apparent expansions that the *Phoenix*-poet has made beyond his one known source, the *Carmen de aue phoenice* of Lactantius. For Gorst, these expansions are calls to action for "a further search for Latin sources for the poem's detailed account of Eden" (137). Gorst focuses on three such sources in this study: Blossius Aemilus Dracontius's *De laudibus dei*, Alcinus Ecdicius Avitus's *De origine mundi*, and Flavius Cresconius Corippus's *In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris*. In these three texts, Gorst finds evidence for several of the expansions in the *Phoenix*, including its detailed description of the flora of Eden, and in particular its setting in a land free of foul weather; the restricted access to Eden after the fall; and the image of birds flying in from far-flung regions to pay homage to their leader. In the end, Gorst explains that "the *Phoenix*-poet's use of several Latin poems suggests that what [N. F.] Blake sees as verbosity is instead the integration of elements from diverse sources, which adds to our estimation of the *Phoenix*-poet's craft and learning" (142).

The goal of Brian McFadden's essay, "Sweet Odors and Interpretive Authority in the Exeter Book *Physiologus* and *Phoenix*," *Papers on Language and Literature* 42: 181-209, is to put into historical and manuscript context *The Phoenix* and the two *Physiologus* poems, *The Panther* and *The Whale*. These three poems, McFadden argues, each of which makes regular use of the image of the sweet odor, represent a response to a variety of anxieties and uncertainties England faced in the last part of the tenth century, including the continuing threat of Viking incursions, the contested succession following the death of Edgar, and the influence of Continental reformers on the Benedictine Reform in England. McFadden highlights the importance of interpretation in these poems, which he identifies as a key feature in navigating these anxieties and concerns: "The ability to interpret suggests the ability to control, implying that the image of sweet smells, along with the accompanying

interpretations that appear in *The Panther*, *The Phoenix*, and *The Whale*, functions for the manuscript's compiler and/or scribe as a symbol not just of correct textual interpretation but also the containment of disruptive social elements" (182).

One important feature that McFadden notes about the description of the marvelous creatures in these poems is that, in contrast to the riddles found in the same manuscript, which often reject stable interpretations, human knowledge alone "can make the creature present and known to the reader" (190). As such, the three poems support authority and express a desire for control over knowledge. The description of the creature in *The Panther* reinforces this idea: "*The Panther* begins and ends with similar wording and shows that the words come from Scripture; the reader is meant to see what wonders, when properly contained in a spiritual narrative context by authoritative interpreters, are true symbols of divinity and not false signs" (192).

A related lesson about interpretation is continued in *The Whale*, which describes that creature as issuing a sweet smell (*sweta stenc*) from its innards as a means of attracting and then trapping unsuspecting victims: "Just because something is strange, wondrous, intricate, or artful is no guarantee that it is good for the soul, and it should be treated carefully lest it divert a time-bound being from eternal life" (194). It deceives where the panther sanctifies. In his analysis of the last of the three poems, *The Phoenix*, McFadden shows how this poet also makes extensive use of the sweet odor motif, though in a way more similar to *The Panther* than to *The Whale*: it is once more recognized as an unequivocal symbol of sanctity. Taken together these three poems can be read "as revelations of the desires that the English should accept reformed clerics as authoritative interpreters of wonders and as resolution of the strife caused by the Benedictine Reform" (204).

GD

Riddles and Charms

"The boundaries that surround the erotic riddles—artificial boundaries established by modern critics because of those riddles' perceived obscenity—have obscured important connections among Old English texts," writes Glenn Davis in his astute article "The Exeter Book Riddles and the Place of Sexual Idiom in Old English Literature," *Medieval Obscenities*, ed. Nicola McDonald (York: York Medieval Press), 39–54, at 54. The first section of the essay explains how these boundaries were erected, with the result that the erotic riddles "are, even today, viewed as exceptional texts that must be kept separate from Old English literature. Consequently, they

have rarely been put into conversation with other literary products of Anglo-Saxon England" (40). Instead, in section two, Davis uses the riddles as "valuable tools for understanding ways Anglo-Saxon poets had available to them to express erotic material" (43). Although the riddles avoid the overt mention of genitalia, other body parts, especially hands, appear frequently, and Davis analyzes the proliferation of hands and the language of touching in Riddle 12 (oxhide, esp. the masturbatory device in the second half of the poem), Riddle 45 (dough/penis), Riddle 25 (onion/penis), and Riddle 44 (key/penis). Nor is this sexual idiom unique to the riddles, as Davis demonstrates by citing examples from penitential and hagiographic texts. In the third and final part of the essay, Davis "us[es] the hands and actions associated with them as an index of sexual potential [to] offer a new lens for reading poetry" (49), including *Beowulf* (lines 720–4a, 1501–5, 1541–2, 1563–9). Here, the fight between Beowulf and Grendel's mother "can be read as a lengthy erotic double entendre riddle fused into a longer narrative poem" (50). Finally, the poet of *Genesis B* employs a strategy similar to that of the riddles in lines 720–4a; as the fruit enters Adam's body, "The poet describes a visceral act of penetration in these lines, of the movement of the apple from without to within. And he describes the culmination of that penetrative act with a verb of touching" (53). As Davis convincingly argues, rather than setting the riddles apart, sexuality "is actually a point of contact" between these texts and the rest of the extant corpus (54).

RN

In "The Riders of the Celestial Wain in Exeter Book Riddle 22," *N&Q* n.s. 53: 401–07, Patrick Murphy identifies several problems with L. Blakeley's proposed solution, "The Circling Stars." While Murphy admits that achieving a definitive solution is unlikely, he argues that addressing the inconsistencies found in Blakeley's answer might help us gain "a more lucid understanding of an elegant Anglo-Saxon vision of the night sky" (402). The primary problem that Murphy finds in Blakeley's interpretation concerns the three numbers that appear prominently in the body of the riddle: four, eleven, and sixty. Murphy accounts for them by identifying a constellation that, as the riddle suggests, is located above the *wæn* and below the celestial pole (*hrung*): *Draco*. Four stars comprise its head; fifteen stars make up the constellation as a whole; and a total of sixty stars can be found in the four constellations that surround it, which correspond to the *sixtig monna* that are seen to "ride" the figure in the opening lines of the riddle

(406). Murphy suggests that this fine-tuned solution is especially appropriate for the riddle, which plays with the inversion of sky and sea. Charles's Wain, he notes, is "the one constellation never to be submerged in the oceanic horizon," and as such, "becomes the means of crossing the open waters of the sky" (407).

Marijane Osborn's "Anglo-Saxon Tame Bees: Some Evidence for Beekeeping from Riddles and Charms," *NM* 107: 271–83, looks to vernacular verse to add to our understanding of bees and their care in Anglo-Saxon England. After identifying several references to mead drinking in the verse corpus, notably in *Beowulf*, Osborn turns her attention to Exeter Book *Riddles* 17 and 27 and Aldhelm's *Apis* riddle. The Exeter Book *Riddles* provide information about hives and mead, while the *Apis* riddle plays with the idea of the bee as "a craftsman, a warrior, and a clever smith" (275). The final section of the essay examines the "Swarm" charm, whose recitation was intended to prevent bee theft, a crime that appears in several Old English law codes. The charm aims to protect the swarm from both physical and magical tampering, and one of its components—throwing a handful of dirt into the midst of the bees—is a means of getting them to settle down that is described in Vergil's *Georgics*, one of Aldhelm's most influential sources.

"Anglo-Saxon Tame Bees" is not Marijane Osborn's first article on the subject of apiculture. In 2005, she wrote a short piece that proposed "skep" ("beehive") as an answer for Exeter Book *Riddle* 17, an idea she follows up in her 2006 essay. William Sayers expands on Osborn's 2005 theory in "Exeter Book Riddle 17 and the L-Rune: British **lester* 'Vessel, Oat-Straw Hive?'" *ANQ* 19.2: 5–9, whose purpose is to "[broaden] the frame of reference beyond the Anglo-Saxon world by considering bee-keeping elsewhere in the British Isles, both in the Celtic realms and in the Danelaw" (5). In particular, Sayers is interested in the state of beekeeping in the British Isles before the Anglo-Saxon invasion. One important text for his study is an Irish law tract called *Bechbretha* ("Bee Laws") that, though it was probably composed in the seventh century, likely reflects a set of practices that predate the fifth. While terms for hives are difficult to identify in Celtic sources, Sayers suggests that Old Irish *lester* "basket," which appears once in the *Bechbretha*, is one good option. There is no OE cognate, nor any other word that unequivocally denotes a beehive (Osborn's favored term *skep* comes from ON, whose speakers, because of the climate in which they lived, were not likely authorities on beekeeping), the L-rune that appears in *Riddle* 17 "points to the currency of a substratum British term *lester* in OE in the sense of

'coiled-straw hive.' The juxtaposition of the two 'initials' [The B- and L-runes found in the riddle] would then be congruent with other binomialisms, oppositions, and complementarities in the poem—British hive, Anglo-Saxon bee" (8).

Rune Poem

Angel Millar's essay, "The Old English Rune Poem—Semantics, Structure, and Symmetry," *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 34: 419–36, argues that each of the first seven stanzas of the OE *Rune Poem* should be paired with its opposite in the final seven stanzas: 1/29, 2/28, 3/27, and so on. These pairs, he suggests, represent ideas that are semantically linked. Some of the pairs, however, explore topics that are "contrary to each other," and thus mirror an overall feature of the poem, which Millar claims explores oppositions throughout (421). Millar is unable to account for the reason that only these fourteen stanzas appear to be structured in this way, but offers that, since they contain all of the runes added that were added to the OE *futhorc*, that "[i]t is possible ... that the author either had a freer hand because of the introduction of newer runes, or that he turned to the structure of the poem in order to establish a more definite set of associations for the newer, and perhaps still somewhat connotatively ambiguous, runes" (422). The remainder of Millar's study examines each of the seven pairs closely, and ends with the plea that the stanzas of the OE *Rune Poem* not be read in isolation, but according to the symmetrical structure outlined in his argument.

GD

The Wanderer

The initial focus of Susan Irvine's "Speaking One's Mind in *The Wanderer*," *Inside Old English*, ed. Walmsley [see sec. 2], 117–33 is "the implications of the syntax of *The Wanderer* lines 50b–57" (117). After reviewing prior analyses of the grammar here, Irvine offers her own analysis: that *ferð* in line 54a stands in apposition to *mod* in line 51b, both subjects of the verb *bringeð* in 54b, which "would imply that *fleotendra* could refer to solitary travellers such as the Wanderer" (120). "The speaker in this passage, then, envisages how the lonely seafarer, like the Wanderer himself, focuses his mind on the memories from his past, and imagines them recreated in his surroundings. But the mind, when it is sent out over the sea (as in lines 56–7), does not bring back familiar utterances, whether from the memories of kinsmen or from the sea-birds or from both," resulting in an "inability to bring any intelligible utterances"

that “intensif[ies] the self’s sorrow” (121). In the next section of the article, “Thinking and Speech in the Poem as a Whole,” Irvine considers “the role of words in providing comfort,” their transience, and the relationship between thought and speech throughout the poem (121). “The second half of the poem suggests that speaking out when understanding has been attained is justifiable. Simultaneously the poem is justifying its own utterances; it parallels the wise man’s and Wanderer’s own speeches in that it is itself a speaking out, self-consciously reflecting its own message about the right to express one’s feelings. Its freedom of speech, it implies, has been earned,” she concludes (128). In the final section, “*The Wanderer* and the Fiction of Orality,” Irvine compares this poem to the first four lines of *Maxims I*; *Beowulf*, lines 867–74; and Riddle 47 (book-moth). Returning to *The Wanderer*, Irvine concludes that “it is appropriate that a poet whose overriding theme is earthly transience should choose to focus on this aspect [i.e., the inherent ephemerality] of human communication” (131). “Like the spoken word, the poet shows, the mind and its memories are ultimately transient and unreliable” (132).

In fact, Mary Agnes Edsall believes that “the work of the poem is ... to lead the reader through the process of changing the response ... toward the memory so that it is no longer a place of mourning and desire for recuperation, but a place of education and conversion” (44). In “Se þonne þisne wealsteal wise geþohte’: An Augustinian Reading of the Early English Meditation the *Wanderer*,” *Augustine and Literature*, ed. Robert P. Kennedy, Kim Paffenroth, and John Doody (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books), 37–62, Edsall argues that *The Wanderer* “is fundamentally Augustinian in ways that have not yet been addressed” (37). Edsall’s purpose in the first section, “Sometimes a Goldfriend Is Just a Goldfriend,” is to critique the exegetical reading strategies of D.W. Robertson and James H. Wilson, aligning her approach more closely to that of Bernard Huppé (38–41). After all, “the *Wanderer* is full of terms that point both to the past of heroic literature and to the present of Christian teaching. Part of the challenge of the poem is to learn when to take a word as past/heroic, when as present/Christian, or when to keep both meanings in play” (47). Edsall reads *The Wanderer* as “a *Confessions* writ small: a meditation on wayward desire and the turn to right love” (38). For example, Edsall points out that “the fact that it is unlikely that the *Wanderer*’s readers (or, perhaps, its composer) would have had even indirect experience of the *comitatus* life evoked in the opening of the poem suggests that it is also training its readers in a set of attitudes toward a collective past” (45). Thus, “the

world of the *comitatus* in this poem (and elsewhere in early English poetry) is invoked more intentionally as part of an Augustinian meditation on the cultural past in all its flaws and glories, with special attention to the aspects of that past that gesture toward their fulfillment in the goods of Christianity” (51).

S. Pollack’s goal in “Engendering *Wyrð*: Notional Gender Encoded in the Old English Poetic and Philosophical Vocabulary,” *Neophilologus* 90: 643–61, “is not to resurrect a pagan goddess, but rather to explore the connotations of gender that are active in the term *wyrð* in ... King Alfred’s translation of the *Consolation of Philosophy*” and *The Wanderer* (646). To do so, Pollack offers “selected gloss evidence” for *wyrð* “in the English-Latin glossaries from the middle ages” (from *circa* 725 to the late fifteenth century) to demonstrate that “the term *wyrð* apparently had a long semantic association” with “conventional female icons of fortune” such as *Fortuna* and the *Parcae* (646). Thus, he surmises that “*Wyrð* appears to have been, at least by association, if not inherently, notionally feminine in some Old English texts” (646). Turning to the *Consolation*, Pollack asks: “does *Fortuna*, here called *Wyrð*, retain her gendered qualities in Alfred’s text?” (649). He answers, “In highlighting its femininity, Alfred’s text creates a gendered opposition between the feminine *seo Wyrð* and the masculine *se Wisdom*, apparently linking both grammatical and notional gender” (650). As for *The Wanderer*, Pollack writes, “The association of *Wyrð* with the language of exile from a patriarchal and male-homosocial *eðele* reminds us of Alfred’s Boethian translation: the *mod* has wandered far from its ‘father’s homeland,’ that is, the teachings of Wisdom and its stoic virtues” (655). Finally, Pollack concludes, “I stress that I do not think that Alfred, the scribe of the Exeter Book manuscript, or anyone living in the ninth and tenth centuries actually ‘believed in’ a goddess by the name of *Wyrð* ... I think the long semantic association of *Wyrð* with *Fortuna* in the glossary and some of the literary evidence points to the availability of a similarly gendered meaning for certain occurrences [of] the Old English term, especially in the somewhat archaic, formulaic discourse of Old English poetry” (655).

RN

The Wife’s Lament

In “The Ethical Agency of the Female Lyric Voice: *The Wife’s Lament* and Catullus 64,” *SP* 103: 121–52, Ashby Kinch draws a compelling comparison between *The Wife’s Lament* and “Ariadne’s Lament,” the rhetorical centerpiece of Catullus 64” (129). Kinch argues

convincingly that “*The Wife’s Lament*, by giving full voice to the woman within the language of male warrior culture, radically re-reads the Anglo-Saxon tradition, and it does so by drawing on a tradition fully available to Anglo-Saxon readers,” the Latin elegiac tradition (126). With their shared focus on exile, abandonment, duplicity, and isolation in a stark landscape, “*The Wife’s Lament* shares a deeper generic affinity with Latin female-voiced elegy than any relevant Germanic analogue” (130). Although the Catullus parallel works nicely, Kinch moderates her claim by stating, “Whether through Catullus or an alternate Roman source, the poet of *The Wife’s Lament* seems to have recognized the critical potential of adapting the female-voiced elegy of the Latin literary tradition to the male-voiced elegiac tradition in which she or he worked” (152). “By focusing attention on specific formal features in the poem, particularly the use of ironic repetition” (125), Kinch elucidates the poems’ shared themes by “argu[ing] that the ethics of warrior culture ought rightly to apply to male-female interpersonal relationships as well: violating an oath is a fundamental abrogation of ethical norms, regardless of the gender of the oath-takers” (126). “My reading details the way that [*The Wife’s Lament*] appropriates the language of ‘social ritual’, particularly the exchange of oaths, to examine the dissonance between personal and social relations. In doing so, the poem positions the speaker polemically against a tradition of exclusively male-male intimacy in Anglo-Saxon poetry,” she explains (125). Kinch also briefly analyzes the Freawaru episode in *Beowulf* (137–40) as “a provocative analogue to *The Wife’s Lament*, which supplies a female perspective on a similar conflict” (140).

RN

Wulf and Eadwacer

The basic premise of “*Wulf, min Wulf: An Eclectic Analysis of the Wolf-Man*,” *Neophilologus* 90: 135–54, is that *Wulf* “is the most important figure of the poem” because “the name of *Wulf* is mentioned five times” (135). In this essay, Sonja Daniëlli asks “what or who is *Wulf*” (136); she answers by considering connections between *Wulf and Eadwacer* and Old Norse mythology and literature—for example, the origin of the beasts of battle motif (136), Schofield’s 1902 proposal that the source of the poem is “*Signy’s Lament*,” and the work of Pulsiano and Wolf, who “found legal as well as mythical evidence to strengthen the idea that *Wulf* is an outlaw and an evil man” (138). Regarding the manuscript context of the poem, Daniëlli notes that *Wulf and Eadwacer* follows *Deor* in the Exeter Book, and points out that their shared “stanzaic structure ... is an unusual feature

and the links with the Old Norse tradition are obvious” (140). After citing many additional appearances of wolves in Old Norse literature, Daniëlli concludes that “the wolf [is] a kenning well known to the audience that would be used to indicate the cruelty and destruction that was an integral part of the heroic times” (145). In the second half of the article, Daniëlli bases her analysis on Baring-Gould’s 1865 *Book of WEREWOLVES*, citing examples of the phenomenon from Scandinavia to Gilgamesh. “Although the symbol of the wolf-man is universal, the renewed knowledge of the Northern wolf-man can be used for a reading of *Wulf and Eadwacer*” (150), a reading which Daniëlli provides, line by line (151–2). In conclusion, Daniëlli writes, “It stands to reason that the priest who wrote *Wulf and Eadwacer* in the Exeter Book vaguely remembered fragments of the *Edda* and ‘*Signy’s Lament*’ ... the *Edda*, the *Völsungasaga* and other Old Norse myths, combined with the terms from ancient Norse and Anglo-Saxon legal texts make it very clear that the kenning *Wulf* stands for war, violence, treason, crime, cruelty, blood revenge, shape shifting, and bestial behaviour” (153).

RN

Works Not Seen

- Bammesberger, Alfred. “Sechs Anmerkungen zum Text von *Genesis B*” *Language and Text*. Ed. Johnston *et al.* (See sect. 2.). 17–31.
- Johansen, J. G., ed. *The Worcester Fragments*. Middle English Texts. Heidelberg: Winter. Not yet published.
- Montague, Tara Bookataub. “Narrating Battle in the Early Medieval Germanic Poetic Tradition.” Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Oregon, 2006. *DAI* 67A (2006), 3.
- Molinari, Alessandra. “Alcuni calchi dell’epos biblico anglosassone *Genesis A*.” *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. 129–90.
- Silver, Diane L. “Making the Good Christian Journey: The Poetics of Wisdom in *Widsith* and Its Manuscript Context.” Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Louisiana at Lafayette, 2006. *DAI* 67A (2006): 5.

c. *Beowulf*

Text, Language, Meter

R. D. Fulk considers “The Origin of the Numbered Sections in *Beowulf* and in Other Old English Poems,” *ASE* 35: 91–109, by asking whether the fitt divisions of the poem in London, BL, Cotton Vitellius A.xv, are the

products of the poet's own choice or whether his text was so divided by scribes during the course of its subsequent copying and transmission. In support of the first possibility, Fulk finds "sufficient" narratological logic to the divisions presented during the first scribe's stint through line 1939, in which changes of fitt correspond roughly to transitions in the story, though other choices often seem possible or even preferable. For instance, the Finnsburh lay begins in line 1063, even though "the actual place of division, thirteen lines earlier at line 1050, is not inappropriate, coming at the close of the account of the treasures given Beowulf for his defeat of Grendel—a motif that marks the end of several fitts" (104). The fitt divisions during the second scribe's stint are much more random and often "make little narrative sense" (91). For example, Fitt XXXI "begins several lines short of the close of Beowulf's speech to King Hygelac and the Geatish court" (96), while the next one Fitt XXXII "starts in the middle of the account of the theft of the cup from the dragon's hoard" (97), and the next one after that, Fitt XXXIII, "in the middle of the account of the dragon's revenge for the theft" (98). Fulk then compares the sectional divisions of manuscripts of other Old English poems, in particular *Genesis*, *Exodus*, and *Daniel* in Bodleian Library, Junius 11, which "are divided into fitts that are numbered consecutively, as if the three were one composition," even though they retell different books of the Bible and are very unlikely to have been the work of a single poet (105). Fulk concludes, then, that the numbered sections of *Beowulf* are not authorial, but scribal, and "that the two scribes of the *Beowulf* manuscript are themselves responsible for the sectional divisions—not just the fitt numbers, but the decision where to divide—and that the first scribe was considerably better attuned to the structure of the narrative" (105). Following Lapidge (2000), Fulk suggests "that the poem was copied from an archaic exemplar," one from an earlier period when "not all poetic texts were divided into fitts" (109), even though this term might originally have had a structural implication for the performance of oral narrative, meaning an "episode" or "strand," interwoven by the poet with many others to create the larger fabric of his story. Following Pokorny (1959) and Holthausen (1974), Fulk associates the term *fitt* with the Old High German noun *fizza* 'skein, hank (of thread)', as well as with the Middle High German and Old Icelandic verbs *vitzen* and *fitja* 'to weave', respectively.

In "Meditating on Men and Monsters: A Reconsideration of the Thematic Unity of the *Beowulf* Manuscript," *RES* n.s. 57: 1–15, Kathryn Powell follows Sisam's 1953 judgment that the Nowell Codex could aptly be

described as a *Liber de diversis monstris, anglice* 'Book of various monsters, in English'. This description is particularly appropriate to the three middle texts in the MS—the *Wonders of the East*, the *Letter of Alexander to Aristotle*, and *Beowulf*—but neither the *Passion of Saint Christopher* nor *Judith* really qualify as monster stories *per se*, Powell points out, despite that very tall saint's presumptive cynocephaly or "dog-headedness" in the former (based on certain allusions to his fearsome appearance, described more explicitly in other texts) and Holofernus's very bad (one might even say, monstrous) behavior in the latter. Powell sees these two technically monster-free texts as later additions to an original compilation dominated by the theme of strange beings—*Christopher* to the beginning, *Judith* to the end—probably when the surviving MS was copied ca. 1000 in the midst of various attacks and extortions by Danish vikings. These new framing texts appositely shift the focus of the collection from the threat of alien creatures in general to that of human predators in particular, stressing further the need for religious faith to overcome all manner of ungodly foes.

J. R. Hall contributes "Three Studies on the Manuscript Text of *Beowulf*: Lines 47B, 747B, and 2232A," in the memorial volume honoring Phillip Pulsiano, *Beatus Vir*, ed. Doane and Wolf [see sec. 2], 441–70. In the first case, Hall scrutinizes the assumption that a partially missing word in the MS at verse 47b, *segen g ... denne*, is correctly to be restored as the masculine singular accusative adjective *g[yl]denne* 'golden', based upon the six other appearances of the word with this root spelling in the poem. Hall estimates that Thorkelin allows us to supply over two thousand letters that have since been lost from the edges of the brittle Cotton Vitellius A.xv MS in the Transcripts A and B, both of which in this case "record the first two letters of the defective form as *ge*," which would yield a spelling of the restored word as *g[el]denne*. This is a Kentish form of the same adjective, but one that "would give striking—and unexpected—support to the claim that *Beowulf* at some point passed through Kentish hands" (444). Yet, a closer examination of the two transcripts, plus Thorkelin's 1815 edition of the poem, leads Hall to conclude that, in this particular instance, Thorkelin is not a good authority for a letter that has since been lost from the *Beowulf* MS. Thorkelin did not see an *e* after *g* at this line, he suspects. Instead, that scholar overconfidently added the *e* himself in his desire to supply an "intelligible text," supposing the *g* to begin the familiar prefix *ge-* and incorrectly taking the word to be restored as *gedenne* 'extended, stretched out' (450), apparently imagining the *segen* 'standard' thus unfurled to be a cloth banner

or flag. Hall says we should thus confidently keep the current emendation of the adjective *g[yl]denne* 'golden' in this line to describe the stiff metal standard above Scyld's head.

In Hall's second example, he evaluates the relative strength of two proposed restorations of line 747b: *[him] ræhte ongear* '[Grendel] reached toward him'—offered by Trautmann (1904), Swanton (1978), and Robinson (1997)—and *[him swa] ræhte ongear* 'he reached toward him so', as per Pope (1966). Hall twice examined under different lighting conditions in March 1998 and July 1999 "the few ink traces left in the virtually illegible manuscript" right before the word *ræhte* 'reached' (441). He finds Robinson's explanation of the lacuna to be the most compelling, that is, that the word *handa* was written to begin verse 747b as a dittography from line 746a—*nam þa mid handa* 'then with a hand he grabbed'—after which the scribe erased all but the initial *h* of *handa*, expecting but then failing to restore the remaining letters of the correct word *him* at a later time. In his final example, Hall hopes again to adjudicate between competing restorations, this time in line 2232a: *eorð[hu]se* 'earth-house'—offered by Zuptiza (1882) and Dobbie (1953)—and *eorðse[le]* 'earth-hall', suggested by Kluge to Holder (1899) and followed by Trautmann (1904). Hall believes the latter interpretation to be correct. The *se* of this word is absent in the current state of the *Beowulf* MS, but it clearly appears in Thorkelin B as *eorð se ...* (that is, with two subsequent illegible letters), which would find a comfortable and obvious parallel in the term *eorðsele* 'earth-hall' that appears again in lines 2410a and 2515a. The word *eorðhus*, on the other hand, appears nowhere else in *Beowulf* or Old English poetry at all. Hall traces the concatenation of ambiguities in Thorkelin, errors by Zupitza, subsequent deference to authority and "editorial inertia" (466) that has "long obscured what is otherwise a fairly evident restoration" to *eorðsele* in line 2232a (441).

Alexandra H. Olsen argues for a very conservative approach to textual emendation in "The Nowell Codex, Editorial Practice, and the Cruces of *Beowulf*," *In Geardagum* 26: 73–80, insisting that the problematic passages "are only cruces if we do not pay proper attention to the manuscript text ... and read the poem that we think we know, usually in what is considered the authorized edition, that of Friedrich Klaeber [1950]" (74). Olsen selects several emendations and punctuation choices made by Klaeber and other editors that she feels have obscured perfectly intelligible, even preferable, readings, sometimes for no better reason than to supply alliteration on the assumption that "every line of Old English poetry" must include this prosodic device

(74). Olsen cites line 1073b as an example, which reads *æt þam hild plegan* 'at the war play' in the MS, gratuitously emended by Klaeber (in her opinion) to *æt þam lindplegan* 'at the shield play' to provide alliteration with *leofum* 'loved ones' in line 1073a. This emendation does not create a "crux," however. Nor is it clear how many scholars would agree with Olsen that Klaeber's punctuation of lines 703b–05a creates the "seeming crux that Beowulf and Beowulf alone remains awake" (75) among the fifteen visiting Geats who have undertaken to guard Heorot during their first night in Denmark: *Sceotend swæfon, / þa þæt hornreced healdan scoldon, / ealle buton anum* 'The warriors slept, those who were supposed to guard the horned building, all but one'. Beowulf's wakefulness may merely reflect the comparative strength of his confidence and determination, his powers of resistance to the evil spell that the sorcerous Grendel may be seen to have cast upon his men. Yet, Olsen criticizes Klaeber for inserting "a comma after *swæfon* and another after *scoldon* so that *þa þæt hornreced healdan scoldon* becomes an appositive to *Sceotend*" (75). She observes that the manuscript has no punctuation before *sceotend* to set this unit off as a separate sentence, but does have a punctum or raised point (·) after *scoldon*, which indicates that the "scribe thought that *ealle buton anum* did not belong in the same sentence as *Sceotend swæfon*" (75).

However, in "A Point Well Taken: Manuscript Punctuation and Old English Poems," in the festschrift for Bruce Mitchell, ed. Walmsley [see sec. 2], 38–58, Daniel Donoghue argues that Old English scribes did not use the punctum to mark off completed sentences like the Modern English period. Rather, the graph had several functions, including sometimes (as Klaeber interpreted it in lines 704b–05a) as a comma, though he might have used a dash or colon instead. Donoghue shows that this raised point is far more often anticipatory than conclusive, frequently flagging a following "metrical dip" or "run of metrically unstressed syllables at the beginning of a clause," the exact start of which might not be easily recognizable to a first-time reader of the manuscript. These clause-initial dips usually contain several "semantically light words such as conjunctions, personal pronouns, adverbs and auxiliaries" (52). In addition, about 70% of the points precede the principal clause of the whole sentence, sometimes even marking the beginning of what modern editors see as a new verse paragraph. The rest are used "to signal elements in apposition," as in line 705a discussed above: *ealle buton anum*. They are also used "to break up alliterative runs, before the formula *X mæpelode* ['X spoke']" to mark the start of a formal speech, and as ordinary

graphical notations to set off the Roman numerals of fitt divisions or runic characters substituted for common nouns (56). The purpose of a few points remains unclear, Donoghue finds, but the majority help the reader to find the main clause of a verse sentence when potentially obscured by a busy clause-initial dip in the meter.

Alfred Bammesberger follows Spamer (1981), in “The Syntactic Analysis of the Opening Verses in *Beowulf*,” ANQ 19.4: 3–7, taking the sequence in the first line *Gardena / in geardagum* “as an adverbial of time meaning ‘in the ancient times of the Spear-Danes’” (4), after which there is a punctum in the MS, separating it from the genitive compound *þeodcýninga* ‘of the tribal kings’, with which *Gardena* is often understood as parallel (an interpretation which would be supported by Donoghue’s finding that the punctum can sometimes signal a following item in apposition). However, this same adverbial syntactic sequence, genitive-preposition-substantive, also appears in the poem at lines 224a, 1021b, 1654a, 2895b, 2790a, and 2823b, though never where the genitive (here, *Gardena*) is separated from its head noun (*geardagum*) across the cæsura. Nonetheless, Bammesberger does find one case in which the same sequence crosses a cæsura in line 615 of the Old English biblical poem *Daniel*: *wera / on gewindagum* ‘in men’s days of trouble’, which lends support to his reading of the prepositional phrase in line 1 of *Beowulf* as similarly adverbial in semantic force. He also understands the opening word of the poem *hwæt* to function as an adverb meaning ‘truly’, rather than as it is normally taken, as an interjection meaning ‘what, lo, so, indeed, yes’. He suggests that this adverbial *hwæt* “may well be homophonous with the interrogative pronoun for ‘what’ by phonological merger and not by origin” (5). Bammesberger further points out that the first person plural preterite of *gefrignan* at the end of line 2b—*gefrunon* ‘we (have) heard (by asking), we (have) heard (tell)’—sometimes can virtually mean “we know” in the present, as in lines 575b–76b, *No ic on niht gefrægn ... heardran feohtan* ‘I have not heard/don’t know of any stronger fighting at night’ (5). Another punctum appears in the MS at the end of line 3, thus marking off the first three lines of the poem “as one carefully constructed syntactic unit” (6), meaning: “We truly know about the might of the nation-kings in the ancient times of the Spear-Danes how princes then performed deeds of valour” (6). Bammesberger prefers to take *ða* in line 3a as a temporal adverb “then” rather than as a masculine plural demonstrative pronoun “those” modifying *æþelingas* ‘princes’, since the poet intends to contrast the past glory of the Danes *then* with their present misery *now*.

In the collection honoring Bruce Mitchell, *Inside Old English*, ed. Walmsley [see sec. 2], 19–37, Bammesberger offers “Eight Notes on the *Beowulf* Text.” (1) Following Holtzmann (1863) and Sievers (1904), Bammesberger insists that *meodosetla* ‘mead-benches’ in line 5b is “certainly a genitive of the plural” (20). The following word *ofteah* is normally interpreted as preterite third singular of *oftean* ‘to pull away’, but this verb governs the accusative rather than the genitive. Bammesberger says it “must be interpreted instead as the preterite of *oftion* ‘to refuse’, with the preceding phrase *sceaþena þreatum* ‘troops of enemies’ (line 4b) not being taken as it usually is in apposition to *monegum mægþum* ‘many tribes’ (line 5a), but rather as an instrumental describing the means by which Scyld withheld from many peoples the right to their own mead-halls (20). Bammesberger would thus translate lines 4–5 of *Beowulf*: “Often Scyld Scefing, together with his troops of warriors, refused mead-benches to many tribes,” a synecdoche for denying them their political independence. (2) Bammesberger follows Bugge (1887), in suggesting that *feond on helle*, literally “enemy in hell,” normally translated “hellish enemy” (line 101b), may have read *feond on halle* ‘enemy in the hall’ in “an Anglian version of the epic text ... with retraction of *æ* before *l* + consonant”: Anglian *halle* < **hælle* (21). The West Saxon scribe misspelled *healle* (the phonologically correct form in his own dialect) as *helle*, postulates Bammesberger. Similarly, *helle gast* ‘creature from hell’ in line 1274a might similarly be a West Saxon misspelling of Anglian *halle gast* ‘creature in the hall’ (3). Bammesberger affirms Liuzza’s translation (1999/2000) of lines 291b–300 in which the Danish coastguard promises Beowulf that he will order his men to guard the Geatish hero’s ship until it takes him back home to his own country along with *godfremmen-dra / swylcum gifeþe bið* ‘such of these good men as will be granted’ (line 299) to survive the fight with Grendel (4). Since the term *sibbedriht* ‘troop of kinsmen’ refers to the band of sleeping Geats in line 729a, Bammesberger wonders whether it might not also refer to them in line 387a, when Hrothgar instructs his herald Wulfgar: *hat in gan / seon sibbedriht samod ætgædere* ‘bid [Beowulf’s] band of kinsmen all together to come in in order to be seen (= in order to appear before the king and his entourage)’ (lines 386b–87), taking the infinitive *seon* ‘to see, be seen’ in the passive sense it also displays in line 1365: *þær mæg nihta gehwæm niðwundor seon* ‘there can be seen every night a fearful wonder’. (5) Following Alex Nicholls (1991), Bammesberger interprets the weak substantive adjective or noun *ahlæcan* in line 646b as a plural meaning the “formidable, awe-inspiring ones,” in which the inflectional ending *-an* can

represent the dative plural *-um* in late West Saxon. The nominative plural form of this noun, spelled *aglæcean* in line 2592a, refers there to both Beowulf and the dragon, so that Bammesberger would similarly translate *þæm ahlæcan* in lines 646b as an indirect object referring to both Beowulf and Grendel: *wiste þæm ahlæcan / to þæm heahsele hilde geþinged* ‘[Hrothgar] knew that a battle was appointed for the [two] formidable assailants in the high hall’ (lines 646b–47). (6) In line 870b, Bammesberger takes the adjective or ordinal numeral *oþer* ‘other, second’ to have adverbial force, meaning “furthermore, moreover.” On their way back from Grendel’s mere, Hrothgar’s men sometimes let their horses gallop in celebration; at other times, one of the king’s thegns *word oþer fand* ‘found words as well’ to celebrate the hero’s victory with poetry. (7) Bammesberger follows Elder (2002) in taking *se broga* ‘the terror’ in line 1291b as a reference to Grendel’s mother, suggesting that it is Æschere himself who is the implied subject in line 1290b who *ne gemunde* ‘did not remember’ his helmet or mailshirt *þa hine se broga angeat* ‘when the terrifying one seized him’ (line 1291b). (8) Bammesberger elaborates the thrust of Beowulf’s request to Hrothgar that he be *on fæder stæle* ‘in the place of a father’ to him should he perish in the mere (line 1479b): the king “is requested to assume legal functions that are Beowulf’s as long as the Geatish hero is alive: Hrothgar is asked [as his adoptive son’s next-of-kin] to adopt Beowulf’s companions into his household and to pass on to Higelac the gifts that were bestowed on Beowulf in recognition of his victorious fight against Grendel” (36).

Bammesberger considers the apparent lacuna in the text at lines 389b–390a, which occurs just after “Hrothgar’s Speech Welcoming Beowulf,” *N&Q* n.s. 53.3: 269–72. This speech is normally understood to end in line 389a with Hrothgar’s command to his herald Wulfgar: *gesaga him eac wordum þæt hie sint wilcuman / Deniga leodum* ‘tell them [the Geatish visitors] also in words that they are welcome to the people of the Danes’ (lines 388–89a). The following half-line 389b *word inne abead* ‘he [Wulfgar] announced from within’ does not alliterate on *d* or *l* as expected, so most editors offer to fill the following gap with two presumed missing half-lines of their own composition that alliterate regularly with the preceding and following verses. However, following Handelman (1988) and Orchard (2003), Bammesberger notes an anomaly: no other speech of the forty in the poem ends in the a-line. He thus suggests that Hrothgar finishes speaking at line 388b rather than 389a and that the scribe mistakenly “corrected” to MS *Deniga leodum* ‘to the people of the Danes’ what was intended as the beginning of a new sentence *Wedera leodum*

‘to the people of the Weather[-Geat]s’, misconstruing that dative phrase with the nominative plural predicate adjective *wilcuman* ‘welcome’ in the preceding line 388b. Bammesberger’s emended half-line *Wedera leodum* in line 389a alliterates regularly with the following b-verse *word inne abead*, yielding for the whole of line 389: “[Wulfgar] from inside announced the words to the people of the Weders” (272).

In “Hildeburh’s Son,” *N&Q* n.s. 53.1: 14–17, Bammesberger rejects Orchard’s 2003 proposal to emend accusative singular *sunu* ‘son’ in line 1115a of the Finnsburh episode to accusative plural *suna* ‘sons’ to make it consistent with the two prior plural references to the offspring of Finn and Hildeburh: *Finnes eaferum* ‘Finn’s heirs’ in line 1068a and Hildeburh’s *bearnum ond broðrum* ‘sons and brothers’ in line 1074a. Bammesberger takes these two latter phrases as “elliptic duals,” a usage illustrated by *Grendeles mægum* in line 2353b, not “Grendel’s relatives,” but “the two Grendel-relatives” or “Grendel and his relative,” that is, his mother (15). *Finnes eaferum* similarly specifies only two people, “Finn and his heir,” or son, using the dative case as an instrumental of agency. Hrothgar’s *scop* begins his narrative of Finnsburh in direct discourse, according to Bammesberger, with this very phrase, yielding for lines 1068–70: “At the hands of Finn and his heir, when the sudden attack came upon them, Hnæf, the champion of the Half-Danes, was doomed to fall on the Frisian battle-field” (16, adapting Malone [1926]). In like manner, the phrase *bearnum ond broðrum* refers not to an unspecified number of sons and brothers, but only to two individuals, yielding for lines 1072b–74a: “[Hildeburh] was deprived . . . of a dear son and a dear brother neither of whom could be avenged,” taking the otherwise unattested *unsynnum* (line 1072b) as a dative dual adjective meaning “unable to be avenged,” rather than as it usually is, as an adverb meaning “guiltlessly,” referring to Hildeburh’s innocence of the plot to ambush her brother in which her son was also killed. This mother thus orders only one son to be placed on one brother’s funeral pyre in lines 1114–15.

With regard to this cremation in particular, Bammesberger also wishes to correct “Old English *guðrinc* in *Beowulf*, 1118b,” *NM* 107.1: 87–90. The term means “battle-man, warrior,” a familiar compound used four other times in the poem, as well as twice in *Andreas* and once in *The Battle of Maldon*. The whole half-line, *guðrinc astah*, is usually translated, “the warrior ascended” or “rose up,” referring to the smoke and ashes of Hnæf’s burning body, or, as Jack has suggested (1994), “the warrior was raised aloft [onto the pyre],” taking the intransitive verb *astigan* ‘to ascend, rise up’

in an unattested passive sense. Following Grimm (1849), Rieger (1871), Tolkien (1982), and Orchard (2003), Bammesberger prefers to emend *guðrinc* to *guðrec* ‘battle-smoke’, which, though a *hapax legomenon*, makes much better sense in context and is paralleled by twenty-one similar cases where a compound beginning with *guð-* ‘battle-’ forms a word otherwise unattested in Old English. Bammesberger notes further that *rec* ‘smoke’ from Germanic **rauk-i-* only appears in the Anglian dialect of Old English: “Therefore a later West Saxon scribe may not have understood the authorial compound *guðrec* in the Anglian text of *Beowulf*” and thus replaced it with the familiar *guðrinc*. Line 1118b of *Beowulf* should thus be emended to *guðrec astah* ‘battle-smoke arose’.

Bammesberger also asks, “Who Does *lapum* Refer to at *Beowulf*, line 1257A?” *N&Q* n.s. 53.4: 398–401. This substantive adjective in the dative means “the loathed” or “hateful one(s),” normally understood to indicate Grendel in this passage. Bammesberger suggests that the term must refer instead to Grendel’s father, since the poet says Grendel’s mother lived *lange þrage* ‘a long time’ after this loathed one in line 1257b, rather than just one day: “Furthermore *lapum* may function as the antecedent for the relative clause introduced by *se þe* [‘he who’] at line 1260a” (401). Lines 1255b–63a would thus be translated: “That became visible and widely known to men that an avenger still lived after the hostile foe (= Grendel senior). Grendel’s mother, a woman, the wife of the terrible one (= Grendel senior) remembered the misery for a long time (= forever) after the battle sorrow, who (= Grendel senior) was to inhabit the cold streams of the water terror [the great Flood of Genesis 6], after Cain had become the murderer of his only brother, his paternal kinsman” (401).

Bammesberger seeks to correct the anomalous instrumental use of the genitive in “Old English *wæteres weorpan* in *Beowulf*, 2791a,” *ANQ* 19.1: 3–6. Rather than accepting “to sprinkle with water” as a possible rendering of the half-line, Bammesberger follows Rieger (1871) in suggesting that the authorial version correctly, even formulaically, used the dative/instrumental *wætere* ‘with water’ with a different infinitive *sweorfan* ‘to rub, wipe’ (4). This usage is paralleled by *wætere gelafede* ‘bathed with water’ in line 2722b and *wehte hyne wætre* ‘wished to rouse him with water’ in line 2854a. The misreading in line 2791a could have occurred in two steps: (1) a copyist incorrectly analyzed *wætere sweorfan* as the alliterative phrase *wæteres weorfan*; (2) the unintelligible *weorfan* was wrongly corrected by the same or a different copyist to the familiar *weorpan* ‘to throw, cast’. Bammesberger would thus emend line 2791a to *wætere sweor[f]an* ‘wipe with water’, translating lines 2788–92a:

“he [Wiglaf] found the famous lord, his master, there at the end of his life stained with blood among the treasures: again he undertook to wipe him with water until the point of the word broke through his (Beowulf’s) breast” (6).

Giovanna Princi Braccini asks: “*Alfwalda* (‘signore degli Elfi’) non epiteto ma vero nome di Beowulf [Is *Alfwalda* (‘Lord of the Elves’) No Epithet but the Real Name of Beowulf]?” *Studi Medievali* 3rd ser. 47: 253–66. The MS reading *alf walda* in line 1314a is usually emended to *A[l]walda* ‘Almighty’ and taken to mean that Hrothgar, after the death of Æschere, was waiting once again to see whether God Almighty would ever give him relief from bad news. Princi Braccini follows Taylor and Salus (1982) in preferring to understand the term as a compound meaning “elf-ruler,” but she rejects their suggestion that it is an epithet for a pagan divinity, like Freyr, as well as Tripp’s suggestion (1988) that it refers to the hero Beowulf in his capacity as “ruler” of uncanny creatures in general. Instead, she suggests that *Alfwalda* is Beowulf’s actual given name on the model of the attested Anglo-Saxon names *Alfwald*, *Ælfwald*, and *Ælfweald*. In addition, she suggests that the *Ælfhere* of line 2604a, of whom Wiglaf is said to be the kinsman, should be understood as the true given name of Beowulf’s father, Ecgtheow, revealing a naming pattern of *Ælf*-compounds among the Wægmundings. Princi Braccini does not explain why ‘*Alfwalda*’ and ‘*Ælfhere*’ are called Beowulf and Ecgtheow in other parts of the poem.

Hideki Watanabe discusses terms for “Sword, Fire and Dragon: Polysemous Compounds in *Beowulf* Reconsidered with Special Reference to *nacod nið draca* (2273) and *þæt wæs modig secg* (1812),” in *Textual and Contextual Studies in Medieval English*, ed. Ogura (see sect. 3b), 193–204. Following Caroline Brady (1979), Watanabe insists that poetic figures be analyzed not only with reference to their immediate context in the poem, but also in comparison with related constructions elsewhere in it. For instance, the phrase *nacod nið draca* (line 2273a), most often rendered as “naked” or “smooth battle-dragon,” should be compared to other appearances of the adjective *nacod* in lines 539a and 2585a where it defines swords as “unsheathed.” The dragon can also be imagined to wield its *hilde-leoman* ‘battle-flames’ in line 2583a like a drawn sword, since the same compound *hilde-leoma* ‘battle-flame’ is used figuratively to indicate a sword ready for battle in line 1143b of the Finnsburh episode. Watanabe would thus render *nacod nið draca* as a simile in which a living being is compared to an inanimate object: “a warlike dragon like a naked sword” (199). A reverse figure of speech is used

of Unferth's sword Hrunting that failed Beowulf against Grendel's mother. Here, the hero returns that weapon to its owner with thanks and praise, personifying it as *guðwine godne ... wigcræftigne* 'a good war-companion, skilled in battle' (lines 1810–11a). Line 1812b *þæt wæs modig secg* is normally taken to be the poet's comment on the hero's generosity and thoughtfulness in this exchange, meaning something like "that was a magnanimous man." Watanabe, however, prefers to understand the adjective *modig* in its more usual sense of "brave, aggressive," yielding for the half-line "that was a bold man," intended to indicate that Beowulf's compliment to Unferth was sarcastic and implying an unflattering association of that warrior's inadequate weapon with Unferth's own less-than-heroic behavior. In support of this suggestion, Watanabe adduces the similar syntactic construction of line 863b, *ac þæt was god cyning* 'but he was a good king', after the Danes are said not to blame Hrothgar for his failure to protect them against Grendel. In both cases, Watanabe believes, context implies that we see these apparent tributes as cynical, even bitter "utterances of the characters" themselves—Beowulf in line 1812b, the Danes in line 863b—"disguised as lines of the poet's narrative part" (202).

Yasuhiro Miki also writes on "Compounds in *Beowulf*: *Hordweard* and a Theme of the Poem," *Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature* (The Japan Society for Medieval English Studies) 21: 83–95. The term *hordweard hæleþa* "treasure-guardian of warriors," appears in lines 1047a and 1852a of the first part of the poem (lines 1–2199), where it is used both times to designate a king: Hrothgar in the first instance and a hypothetical future king of the Geats. Hrothgar says that Beowulf's people could choose no better ruler than the hero should their current monarch pass away. To be a successful "guardian of a hoard" is thus established as the heroic ideal in the traditional world of the poem, one in which the treasure thus guarded is extended metaphorically to include the ruler's people, his kingdom, and his reputation for protecting them well. In the second half of the poem (lines 2200–3182), *hordweard* is used four times without genitive qualification to refer to the dragon at lines 2293b, 2303b, 2554b, and 2593a. This creature is depicted as "equal" to the old king Beowulf in its treasure-guarding ferocity and thus as his symbolic alter ego (88). By killing the dragon and claiming its hoard for his people, Beowulf becomes a true *hordweard hæleþa*, protecting his people from an enemy and thus his real treasure in the process, that is, his honor as their guardian. The ideal of guarding one's precious honor is thus a key theme of the poem of which the epithet *hordweard* serves as a "microcosm" (90).

Michael D. Drout supplies "A Note on the Style of *Beowulf* Line 1864," *MP* 104.2: 224–28, observing that the construction *ge wið feond, ge wið freond* 'both against enemy and toward friend' in line 1864a appears nowhere else in Old English poetry, but twenty-two times in prose texts, where it is sometimes used to render similarly balanced antitheses in a Latin source, like *inimicus/amicus* 'enemy/friend' or the reverse. Applying the prosodic models of Sievers (1898) and Russom (1998), Drout finds the line metrically acceptable but awkward. He concludes that the poet has imperfectly adapted this Latinate rhetorical pattern, familiar from formal prose speeches and sermons, to the traditional alliterative measure of his poetic tradition in order to enhance the verbal dignity of "the speech in which Hrothgar praises Beowulf's wisdom and strength and states that the Geatas would do well to select Beowulf as king if Hygelac were to die" (228).

Following Alistair Campbell (1962), Rory McTurk catalogues instances of "The Balanced Parallel in *Beowulf*," in *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed. Swan [see sec. 2], 63–73, which term he defines "as the use in poetry of two or more equivalent expressions, the second and any subsequent ones of which could be removed without detriment to the syntax or the essential meaning of the passage in which they occur" (63). McTurk finds thirty types of balanced parallel in the poem, which he categorizes by part of speech—e.g. as simplex noun or pronoun, compound noun, two nouns linked by *and*, transitive finite verb with subject, transitive finite verb with object, etc.—adding more refined distinctions within these categories: e.g. nominative as subject, vocative nominative, partitive genitive, possessive genitive, dative as indirect object, adverbial dative, etc. He plans "to search the remainder of the Old English poetic corpus" in order to find out whether the thirty types of balanced parallel he has found in *Beowulf* "exhaust the various kinds of syntactic context in which this type of parallel may occur" (72).

Sources and Analogues

In "Grendel and the Book of Wisdom," *N&Q* n.s. 53.3: 262–69, Daniel Anlezark reports his discovery of a new analogue to the *leoht unfaeger* 'unlovely light' (line 727b) which leaps from the monster's eyes as he enters Heorot. The Vulgate Book of Wisdom (11:18–19) describes among punishments that God inflicts upon the backsliding Hebrews for their idolatry *ira plenas et ignotas bestias ... horrendas ab oculis scintillas emittentes* 'unknown beasts full of ire ... sending out terrible sparks from their eyes' (quoted 263). According to Wisdom,

God sends these mute beasts as a kind of poetic justice upon those who worship graven images of dumb animals to show the counter-productivity of turning to such empty sources of deliverance. In the poem the Danes are similarly afflicted by “the mute beast Grendel, enraged and of unknown generation” (265). Their situation reflects that of pagans in general as described in Wisdom: *infelices autem sunt et inter mortuos spes illorum est* ‘they are then unhappy and their hope is among the dead’ (13:10), recalling what the poet says of the Danes and their idolatry: *helle gemundon / in modsefan* ‘they remembered hell in their hearts’ (lines 179a–80a) and *Wa bið þæm ðe sceal / þurh sliðne nið sawle bescufan / in fyres fæþm, frofre ne wenan / wihte gewendan* ‘Woe to them who in terrible distress must shove their souls into the fire’s embrace, expect no comfort, any change at all’ (lines 183b–86a). Anlezark thus concludes that the reference to Grendel’s fiery eyes “does not represent a random borrowing, but is a concrete detail pointing to the influence of the extended discussion of idolatry in the Book of Wisdom on the presentation of the predicament of the Danes in *Beowulf*” (268).

Philip Cardew tries to define the ontological identity of the quintessential *sceadugenga* ‘shadow-walker’ (line 703a) or liminal creature of Germanic tradition in “Grendel: Bordering the Human,” in *The Shadow-Walkers*, ed. Shippey (2005; see sect. 4a), 189–205, noting that this being is discussed more fully than any other non-human besides the old gods in Jacob Grimm’s *Deutsche Mythologie* (4th ed., 1875–78). Tolkien lists around fifty individual epithets for Grendel in an appendix to his 1936 British Academy lecture on the poem, but as a common noun, a *grendel* in England or Germany was a cannibalistic humanoid creature of folk belief who occupied fresh water—rivers, pools, or fens—like the Old English *þyrs* or the German *wasserkarl* ‘mere-man’. Grendels could be male or female, however, and were thought to attack man-made structures like mills near their habitat. They are related to, but distinct from the *draugar* ‘walking dead’ or the trolls of Scandinavian tradition, so Cardew avers, the latter of whom are characteristically associated with mountainous or rocky rather than marshy or boggy country.

In the same volume, Jonathan Evans studies the nineteenth-century scholarly compilation of information on an even more complexly manifested and dangerous monster in “As Rare as They Are Dire’: Old Norse Dragons, *Beowulf*, and the *Deutsche Mythologie*,” 207–69. Evans notes Grimm’s reluctance to organize the many references to this creature gleaned from his sources and to generalize on its nature and significance in a coherent formulation: “The final version of

[*Deutsche Mythologie*] presents dragon-lore in six main passages embedded in chapters on the ‘Gods,’ ‘Heroes,’ ‘Reptiles & Snakes,’ ‘Treasure-hoards,’ ‘Time and the World,’ and ‘the Devil.’ Additional, incidental allusions are scattered through the three volumes, including a supplement compiled posthumously from marginal notes and insertions in Grimm’s own copy of the previous edition. The only two dragon-slayers Grimm discusses at any length are Thor and Siegfried; though *Beowulf* is cited often, Grimm uses the poem primarily for support and corroboration, and the poem’s literary and cultural importance—capitalized by Tolkien sixty years later—is unexplored ... The principal motifs discussed by Grimm are these: dragons *breathe fire*; they *wear golden crowns*; there are special properties of the dragon’s *heart and blood*; dragons are *old*; the dragon’s *hoard* originates with dwarfs; its image on *weapons* is a sign of potency; they *guard treasures*; and sometimes the *transformation* of a human into a dragon is given as a result of this function. Finally, the possession of a dragon’s treasure sometimes spells *doom*” (Evans’s italics, 215).

In “Myth and Meaning in the Rök Inscription,” *Viking and Medieval Scandinavia* 2: 45–109, Joseph Harris explicates the allusions and general purport of this Swedish father’s runic memorial to his dead son by adducing literary instances of similar bereavement, in particular, Óðinn’s loss of Baldr at the hands of his brother Höðr in Norse mythology (a “cultural model of paternal grief” [99]), Egill Skallagrímsson’s “loss of sons” lamented in *Sonatorrek*, and King Hrethel’s “frustration and decline” at the slaying of his son Herebeald by another son Hæthcyn in lines 2435–71 of *Beowulf*, illustrated by “an almost Homeric simile” in which an old man contemplates a hanged son for whom is he unable to take vengeance or wait for another son to replace him (lines 2444–62a). Harris sees in these and other elegiac analogues a final stress on the continuity of life in the midst of death, noting that Óðinn begets an avenger Váli/Bous upon the giantess Rindr, Egill comes to find a satisfactory compensation for his sons in Óðinn’s gift of poetry, and Hæthcyn is quickly slain in battle against the Swedes, almost as a kind of “impersonal justice even though no logical connection to Herebeald’s death is expressed” (80). In this last example, Harris points out, a third brother (as in Norse myth) soon arrives on the scene, though here merely to witness his bad brother’s death rather than to cause it. We note, however, that Hygelac does go on to fulfill the type-role of brother’s avenger by killing Hæthcyn’s slayer Ongentheow (cf. line 1968a) rather than Hæthcyn himself.

In the same volume, Russell Poole describes "Some Southern Perspectives on Starcatherus," *Viking and Medieval Scandinavia* 2: 141–66, a hero whose adventures are recounted in *Gautreks Saga*, *Orkneyinga Saga*, and the *Gesta Danorum* of Saxo Grammaticus, including his visit to "the hall of Ingjaldr/Ingellus so as to incite him to avenge his father Fróði/ Frotho" (154). This incident is parallel to Beowulf's report to his uncle Hygelac of the impending marriage of Hrothgar's daughter Freawaru to Froda's son Ingeld (lines 2024–69). The Geatish ætheling can just imagine what Saxo describes: an old warrior egging on a younger to avenge his father in Ingeld's hall (lines 2041–46). Poole admits that the old man in *Beowulf* "incites not Ingeld himself but an unnamed Heaðobearð retainer," pointing to a sword carried by one of the queen's men, "not to a bundle of charcoal that he has brought himself" (156), hoping that it will symbolically "light a fire" under the dilatory king. In addition, of course, Freawaru is a Danish princess married to a Heathobard, rather than a Saxon one married to a Dane. Even so, Poole follows de Vries (1955) and others in concluding that the old warrior of Beowulf's projected scenario "represents not merely a closely similar Proppian 'plot function' to Starcatherus in the Ingellus story, but in fact ... the same legendary personage" (156), whose "essential characterization," he believes, "goes back to the Anglo-Saxon period and early Viking Age" (159). In this earlier tradition, Poole speculates, the character of the king Ingeld/Hiniældus was "an object of moral censure," "an exemplum of an ill-guided heir to the throne" (160), who had been seduced into a shameful marriage alliance with his father's slayers and whose rule was marked by luxurious feasting, feminine comfort, and carnal pleasures. It is partly the decadence of this legendary king, Poole hypothesizes, to which Alcuin alludes in his famous letter of 796 to Bishop Speratus/Higbaldus, since the Northumbrian cleric castigates in this and other correspondence faults that find direct parallels in the list of criticisms that Starcatherus offers to Ingellus as recounted by Saxo. Poole concludes that the figure of this vengeful old-fashioned warrior must have been "far more familiar and well-loved" (142) than his partially obscured appearance in the Old English poem would indicate and that he enjoyed "a central and iconic importance" (162) in "southern" tradition that is not revealed until his appearance in Scandinavian texts of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

In "*Beowulf* as Fairy-story: Enchanting the Elegiac in *The Two Towers*," *Tolkien Studies* 3: 101–15, Richard W. Fehrenbacher extends Tom Shippey's analysis (2000) of parallels between the Rohan episode in the

second volume of Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings* (1954–55) and the poem. In addition to noting features in Tolkien's work inspired by Anglo-Saxon linguistic and cultural forms as represented by *Beowulf* and other Old English sources, Fehrenbacher notes that in the plot of both works "an elderly king barely manages a precarious grip upon his throne; in both, the king is possessed of a nephew perceived (at least by some) as treacherous and potentially usurping; in both, a close female relative of the king's is married to a neighboring lord; in both, the kingdom's borders are troubled by threats of war the king cannot adequately address" (101). However, Fehrenbacher also finds a crucial difference between the two works in the modern author's use of an implied supernatural agency or "enchantment" to overturn the grim pattern of inevitable defeat so often evinced in the poem. In his essay "On Fairy-stories" (1964), Tolkien calls this counter-principle *eucatastrophe*, by which he means the unexpected reversal of dire expectation, "a sudden and miraculous grace: never to be counted on to recur" (quoted by Fehrenbacher, 104). Instances of this positive peripeteia in the *Two Towers*, as well as more generally in *The Lord of the Rings* as a whole, reflect the scholar Tolkien's effort to charge the melancholy poignancy he found in the poem's "heroic but doom-ridden" world (112) with the more hopeful moral and emotional force of the fairy tale. Fehrenbacher does not discuss the several instances of what might be called *eucatastrophe* in *Beowulf* itself, according to Tolkien's own definition of the term, such as the desperate moment in the hero's fight with Grendel's mother below the bottom of the mere, when the Christian God is shown to play an active but unanticipated role in overturning an otherwise hopeless course of events (cf. lines 1550–56).

Leigh Smith sees Tolkien's trilogy as far more consistent with the "heroic-elegiac" themes that Tolkien derived from the Old English poem in "I Have Looked the Last on That Which Is Fairest": Elegy in *Beowulf* and Tolkien's *Lothlórien*," *Mallorn: The Jnl of the Tolkien Soc.* 44: 43–46. In particular, Smith finds deeply reminiscent of the poem the episode where the fellowship of the Ring, after the loss of Gandalf against the Balrog in Moria, visits the Golden Wood of Lothlórien. Though more Celtic in cultural style than the "Anglo-Saxon" people of Rohan, the elf-queen and -king Galadriel and Celeborn are shown to have "fought the long defeat" in defending their arboreal realm (quoted 43), just as the last king of the Geats has spent fifty years protecting his people against their enemies with no good prognosis for their safety after he dies. Upon his departure from Lothlórien, Gimli the dwarf declares: "I have

looked the last upon that which was fairest” (quoted 43) to enunciate his sense of impending and inevitable loss which Tolkien has created in this episode, using the past tense in the relative clause (which Smith inexplicably changes to the present in the title of his essay: “That Which *is* Fairest” [our italics]). Smith notes many other parallels to the poem in this section of Tolkien’s work, especially in the rhetorical forms of greetings and laments. He sees in the disappearance of the high elves from Middle-earth the same “doomed heroism of *Beowulf*, who knows before he attacks the dragon that he is going to his last battle” (46).

Criticism

Richard North traces *The Origins of ‘Beowulf’: From Vergil to Wiglaf* (Oxford: Oxford UP) by suggesting that the poem “was composed in the winter of 826–7 by Eanmund, abbot of the minster of Breedon on the Hill in north-west Leicestershire, not only as a requiem for King Beornwulf of Mercia who was killed in battle earlier that year, but also as a recommendation for Wiglaf, an ealdorman who was plotting to succeed him” (vii). North discusses the poet’s creative adaptation of Germanic sources by comparing several episodes to their Norse analogues, versions of which he surmises the poet may have heard at a hostage-redemption exchange with Danish Vikings possibly sponsored by the monastery in 809. The monastery at Breedon seems also to have had connections with Corbie and other houses in Francia, from which may have come information about the Scylding dynasty with news of the baptism of the Danish king Heriold in 826. In addition, North sees allusions to four episodes in Virgil’s *Aeneid*, which might have been available with certain other Latin texts in Breedon’s library, the contents of which are now lost, but can be postulated to some extent from the works of Tatwine who was there a century earlier, as well as from the monastery’s apparent association with continental houses for whose library collections we have better information. The most telling Virgilian parallel (or more accurately, counterpoint) between *Beowulf* and the *Aeneid* is the threat that the Trojan hero poses in Books VII and XI to the proposed marriage between Lavinia and Turnus, which North sees as informing an implication of the part of the *Beowulf* poet that the noble Geatish ætheling would have made a better match for Hrothgar’s daughter Freawaru than the fierce but unreliable Heathobeardish king Ingeld. Unlike Virgil, however, the *Beowulf* poet never mentions this potential match or even notes the existence of the Danish king’s daughter while the hero is still in Denmark,

whereas Aeneas ultimately kills his rival Turnus and marries Lavinia himself. Even so, North imagines that Abbot Eanmund had before him a lost poem about Ingeld, none other than the famous *carmen* on *Hiniel-dus*, whose performance at mealtimes Alcuin castigates so vehemently in his letter of 797 to Speratus. North accepts the identification of the letter’s recipient with Unwona, bishop of Leicester (r. ca. 785–ca. 800), whose see was only 20 miles to the south of Breedon, suggesting that Wigmund, a pupil of Unwona, brought a written version of the poem to the library there.

North’s key argument, however, is simply that the temporal succession of Beornwulf and Wiglaf as kings of Mercia is just too close to the sequence of Beowulf and Wiglaf in the poem to be ignored as mere coincidence. He sees this pattern as confirmed by other parallels between historical events and the poem: (1) the murder in 794 of the East Anglian king St. Æthelberht by Cynethryth, Offa of Mercia’s queen, is replicated in the cruel execution of suitors by the proud princess “Thryth,” later wife of the Anglian king Offa in the poem; and (2) that nine episodes in the careers of the Mercian kings Cenwulf and Beornwulf are reflected in the lives of the Geatish kings Hygelac and Beowulf, ending with the appearance of the non-royal figure Wiglaf, a young retainer whom North sees as “all but crowned at the end” (332). North recognizes that this last analogy, too, is imperfect, but can still make it work: “Far from becoming king of Geatland, ... in legend Wiglaf seems ready to migrate. Allegorically, through his descendant [the historical Wiglaf], it looks as if he has arrived in Mercia. The poet heralds Wiglaf as the fourth great king after Offa,” making “the poem *Beowulf* ... a sword at the service of the king in waiting” (332). North also sees, however, in Beowulf’s ruinous ambition to gain the dragon’s hoard, a more sober, even saddened critique of the late Beornwulf’s aggressive behavior that led to his downfall. And as the *pièce de résistance* to his argument, North finds that the poet’s signature may be encrypted in his account of the ancient struggles of the Swedish royal family—*þæt was mid eldum Eanmundes laf* ‘that was Eanmund’s legacy among men’ (line 2611)—a modestly sly allusion to the abbot’s own poetic gift to posterity.

Craig R. Davis (one of the present reviewers) offers a different approach to finding the historical context of the poem’s original composition in “An Ethnic Dating of *Beowulf*,” *ASE* 35: 111–29, by asking when its view of the relations between the northern peoples of the past would have had the most appeal to an Anglo-Saxon audience, especially the friendship the poet imagines between a Geatish ætheling and a Danish monarch.

The first record of any Anglo-Saxon interest in the legendary history of Denmark appears at the West Saxon court in the early 890s when King Alfred constructed an extended genealogy for his father Æthelwulf back to the Scyld Scefring celebrated in the opening lines of the poem. Æthelwulf's genealogy is the earliest surviving reference to the founder of the Danish monarchy. With it Alfred asserts the authority of his house over his new Viking clients and rivals in East Anglia by claiming direct descent from their own royal ancestors. On his mother Osburh's side, King Alfred traced his lineage through the Jutish kings of Wight to the Goths, who after Jordanes's *Getica* of the mid-sixth century were thought to have originated in southern Scandinavia, where they were associated with an ancestral people there known as *Geatas* in Old English and *Gautar* in Old Norse. In the Old English translation of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, which Davis believes should be associated with Alfred's translation project of "books most needful for men to know," the term *Iuti* 'Jutes' of Bede's Latin—one of the "three very great tribes" of ancient Germania whom that writer says came to Britain in the fifth century—was rendered not as *Eote* 'Jutes', the normal vernacular form of the name of this people, but as *Geatas* 'Geats'. This ethnic conflation suggests an Alfredian context for the friendly association of Danes and Geats depicted in the poem, since that king so proudly traced his ancestry to both peoples, including the eponymous ethnic ancestor Geat in the genealogy of his father Æthelwulf. Even the characterization of Alaric the Visigoth which concludes Alfred's translation of Orosius's *History against the Pagans* has been changed from that of a barbarian heretic to *se cristena cyning ond se mildesta* 'the mildest Christian king', a phrase that recalls what the Geats are made to say of Beowulf in the closing lines of the poem, that he was *wyruldcyninga manna mildest* 'of kings in the world the mildest of men' (lines 3180b–81a).

In addition, Davis accepts Lapidge's argument (2000) that the scribes of the unique Cotton Vitellius text of the poem ca. 1000 worked from an early West Saxon exemplar written before ca. 900, though he does not agree that the poem's ultimate archetype must be dated 150 years earlier than that on the basis of a single anomalous criterion, the crossing of ð, which was never consistently observed by scribes. Davis also follows Townend (2002) in concluding that Old English and Old Norse were mutually intelligible in simple sentences during this period, in which communication Scandinavian names were regularly Anglicized, as was that of a Norwegian visitor to Alfred's court, *Ohthere* in Old English from *Óttarr* in Old Norse. The name

Ohthere or *Ohtere* appears five times in *Beowulf* with just this spelling, again suggesting an Alfredian context for the acquisition of Scandinavian lore by an English-speaking interlocutor. Davis argues that we thus have at least three kinds of evidence—onomastic, paleographic, and genealogical—for placing the composition of the poem in its current form within the cultural orbit of the West Saxon court during the last decade of the ninth century. In the language of forensic science, he concludes "that, among known Anglo-Saxons, the mature King Alfred had the interest, motive, means and opportunity to encourage the particular view of the ethnic past we find in *Beowulf*, even though it is one which never achieved a broader cultural authority or enduring political appeal in Anglo-Saxon England" (129).

Susanne Kries finds such an appeal in "Linking Past and Present: *Beowulf* and the House of Wessex," in *Germanisches Altertum und christliches Mittelalter*, ed. Brogyanyi [see sec. 2], 137–58. She sees *Beowulf* as part of a successful "cultural offensive initiated by King Alfred" (155), which was designed to assimilate immigrant Danish communities more deeply into Anglo-Saxon England by constructing a common heroic past for both peoples in the Scylding world of the poem. To this end, Kries argues, the Christian poet adapts several story patterns from pre-Christian Germanic eschatology, each of which is used to imply the "failure" of the old pagan gods (155): (1) Thor's close but abortive encounter with the Midgard serpent during his rowing match against the giant Hymir is reflected in Beowulf's impressive but inconclusive confrontation with sea-monsters during his swimming match with Breca (lines 506–28); (2) the slaying of the Norse god *Baldr* by his brother *Höðr* is repeated in that of the suggestively named *Herebeald* by his brother *Hæthcyn* in the Hrethel episode (lines 2428–71); and (3) Thor's disastrous fight against the Midgard serpent at Ragnarök is reenacted on a terrestrial scale in the hero's pyrrhic victory over the dragon. These allusions, Kries contends, are meant to signify "the end of a way of life" (154), one which was once shared by the pagan forebears of both Anglo-Saxons and Danes, but who are now united again in the more hopeful world of their "common present" (155) under the Christian West Saxon kings.

Francis Lenegham takes a rather contrary view in "Making Sense of Ker's Dates: The Origins of *Beowulf* and the Paleographers," *Proc. of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies Postgraduate Conference 1* (2005): 1–13 (online). Lenegham begins by reviewing the paleographical evidence for the date of the original composition of *Beowulf*, but, noting the wide range of scholarly disagreement on this point, insists that "the

date of the manuscript itself must be established before we can begin the search for a literary and historical context for the poem" (5). To this end, Lenegham accepts Ker's conclusions (1957) that the extant manuscript was copied at the end of the tenth or in the early eleventh century (985–1015), supplying a table which translates Ker's somewhat ambiguous dating system into calendar years. Lenegham takes particular issue with Kevin Kiernan's proposal that *Beowulf* was both composed and copied during the reign of Cnut (1016–35), first arguing that Kiernan has misinterpreted Ker to give a date for the manuscript decades later than is justified by the paleographical evidence, then suggesting that cultural arguments for an eleventh-century *Beowulf* are lacking as well, as they are based on the assumption that *Beowulf* was composed to honor the Danish royal house, a conclusion that is not justified by the ultimately less-than-flattering depiction of Danes in the poem. Lenegham comes to no conclusion on the date of the composition of *Beowulf*, warning only that "we should be wary of attempts to attach the poem to any particular Anglo-Saxon or indeed Anglo-Danish royal house" (13).

"In "Relaunching the Hero: The Case of Scyld and Beowulf Re-Opened," *Neophilologus* 90.4: 621–42, David Clark alludes to Judy King's similarly titled article in the same journal, "Launching the Hero: The Case of Scyld and Beowulf" (2003), agreeing that the poem offers a critique of the model of kingship depicted by Scyld Scefing in the opening section of *Beowulf*. Clark focuses in particular on how Scyld takes treasure from neighboring peoples in order to build support among his followers by redistributing it among them. The poet later shows, however, that such generosity does not necessarily buy the loyalty of one's retainers, as the hero Beowulf discovers to his cost against the dragon. Nor does the possession of great wealth ensure a noble character, as illustrated in the cases of the avaricious Heremod or the predatory Hygelac, who lost a neck-ring said to be as precious as the fabulous *Brosinga mene* (line 1199b), along with his life, on his ill-considered raid upon the Franks. The poet shows that Wealth-theow's gift of this famous treasure to Beowulf, bought at such risk by that hero in his fight against the Grendels, quickly disappears again into the hands of less worthy people, first those of his uncle, then those of the Franks who plunder Hygelac's corpse (lines 1212–13a). Treasured weapons, like Unferth's sword Hrunting or that of the giants in Grendel's cave, come to symbolize fratricide and endemic violence. The dragon's precious hoard similarly proves *unmyt* 'useless' (line 3168a) or worse, both to that creature and to Beowulf himself, and certainly to the Geats who pay for it with the life

of their king and then abandon it forever in his burial mound. The implication, Clark believes, is that "treasure is a poor thing on which to build a society" (638), its violent acquisition ironically ensuring that society's ultimate impoverishment and decline through the continuing hostility of those from whom it has been taken. Unlike Judy King, then, Clark sees Scyld and Beowulf as figures not contrasted by the poet in their ethical values—the last Geatish king providing a positive foil to the founding Danish monarch—but rather as parallels, Beowulf supplying a further example of how poorly Scyld's values work in practice. At the beginning of the poem, the once destitute Scyld is launched to sea in a ship laden with treasure he has acquired during his time as king, the very prototype of the pagan heroic ethos. In a similar way, Beowulf is "relaunched" at the end of his career as king in a funeral designed as a warning against the treasure-hungry ways of pagan kings like himself and Scyld. Beowulf's body, surrounded by the worthless treasure in his mound, is now made to serve "as a beacon for ships," a sign of how "his own society has run aground" (639).

Patricia Dailey discusses "Dwelling in *Beowulf*: Remains and Remaining in Beowulf's Body" (203–13), which forms a section in her longer essay, "Questions of Dwelling in Anglo-Saxon Poetry and Medieval Mysticism: Inhabiting Landscape, Body, and Mind," *New Medieval Literatures* 8: 175–214 [see also sec. 4a]. Dailey offers the concept of "in-subjectivity" to describe a condition of "insignificance within the subject that partakes in its life and in its death," a quality which represents "the inhuman in the human," and one which in Old English poetry is "relentlessly exposed to *wyrd*," the very principle of death and nonentity which inhabits the subjectivity of individuals as it does all else in the world (213). This in-subjectivity of Beowulf's life is symbolized by his cremated remains buried in his mound at the end of the poem, which are intended to memorialize his life on earth, but ironically signify instead his absence from it forever, a double-meaning also reflected in the Old English word *lichama* 'body-home' of a person's soul while alive, but the opposite, 'a corpse,' an empty fossil of departed life, when that person has died. In a similar way, the fictional character Beowulf inhabits but dies in a poem about the ephemeral nature of human dwelling upon earth and thus serves to figure the alien component of subjective being ever the more profoundly through his own poetic personification as an imaginary construct, the dead verbal shell of a life that never existed.

Eileen A. Joy and Mary K. Ramsey, with the assistance of Bruce D. Gilchrist, have collected a number

of recent approaches to the poem in *The Postmodern 'Beowulf': A Critical Casebook* (Morgantown, WV: West Virginia UP), which opens with Joy's own "Preface: After Everything, the Postmodern *Beowulf*" (xiii–xxvi) and, by both editors, an "Introduction: Liquid *Beowulf*" (xxix–lxvii), in which they celebrate the thematic fluidity of this elusive poem, so suggestive of the multiple possible perspectives that compete and conjoin in our own era of theoretical ferment. They organize their volume into four sections, each containing two essays illustrating a general field of contemporary criticism with three more focused studies of *Beowulf* itself. Nineteen of the essays are reprinted from earlier versions, but two will be described in more detail: Janet Thormann's, published here for the first time, and Shari Horner's, missed in YWOES 2001.

The first section on "History/Historicism" offers essays by Edward Said, "The World, the Text, and the Critic" (1983) and Claire Sponsler, "In Transit: Theorizing Cultural Appropriation in Medieval Europe" (2002). The essays on the poem are by Nicholas Howe, "*Beowulf* and the Ancestral Homeland" (1989), Allen J. Frantzen, "Writing the Unreadable *Beowulf*" (1990), and John D. Niles, "Locating *Beowulf* in Literary History" (1993).

The second field is described as "Ethnography/Psychoanalysis," and includes essays by John Moreland, "Ethnicity, Power and the English" (2000), and Alfred K. Siewers, "Landscapes of Conversion: Guthlac's Mound and Grendel's Mere as Expressions of Anglo-Saxon Nation-Building" (2003). On the poem more particularly are James W. Earl's "*Beowulf* and the Origins of Civilization" (1994), Janet Thormann's "Enjoyment of Violence and Desire for History in *Beowulf*," and John M. Hill's "The Ethnopsychology of In-Law Feud and the Remaking of Group Identity in *Beowulf*: The Cases of Hengest and Ingeld" (1999). Thormann argues (287–318) that the poem dramatizes feud as the governing principle of human history, "a system of social exchange supported by an enjoyment of violence" (289). In such a system, authority is vested in the person rather than the office of the king and succession to the throne is thus often marked by violent competition among various pretenders. The hero *Beowulf* eschews such violence, however, and introduces a new system of legal primogeniture when he defers to his younger cousin Heardred after the fall of Hygelac. *Beowulf*'s own term of office as king is marked by a half-century of domestic tranquility and freedom from enemy attack. The poet thus imagines a new pattern of historical process, where strong national kings administer justice and protect their people from foreign enemies, putting an end to the cycle of reciprocal violence and adumbrating the

kind of government pursued by King Alfred and his successors.

The third critical category of *The Postmodern 'Beowulf'*, "Gender/Identity," offers pieces by Jeffrey J. Cohen, "The Ruins of Identity" (1999), and Carol J. Clover, "Regardless of Sex: Men, Women, and Power in Early Northern Europe" (1993). The essays on the poem are "Men and *Beowulf*" by Clare A. Lees (1994), "*Beowulf*'s Tears of Fatherhood" by Mary Dockray-Miller (1998), and "Voices from the Margins: Women and Textual Enclosure in *Beowulf*" by Shari Horner, which appeared as a chapter in her book, *The Discourse of Enclosure* (2001). Horner considers *Beowulf* as a product of late Anglo-Saxon monastic culture around the time its sole surviving MS was copied ca. 1000, reflecting in its depiction of women the kind of control sought over female sexuality and authority in that society. This control takes the form of containment or enclosure of female characters into a precisely regulated role, variously repeated in different ways throughout the poem: "[1] the women of *Beowulf* are enclosed literally (within physical space), [2] textually (within the poem's narrative structures), and [3] symbolically (within the poem's conceptions of femininity and within kinship structures)," resulting in a distinctively "*Beowulfian* concept of conventional femininity" (469). The function of a woman as *freoðuwebbe* 'peace-weaver' in intertribal relations (line 1942a; cf. line 2017a) is offered as their essential, "natural," and "normal" identity. Not all female characters in the poem conform to this ideal, of course, because it also offers examples of transgressive female behavior, "from *Wealhtheow*'s appropriation of masculinist discourse to the death-producing acts of Grendel's Mother and Modthryth" (492). The "unnatural" and thus "unfeminine" acts of these female characters (492–93) thus serve only to define more sharply the ideal identity of women prescribed in the poem.

The last area of criticism, focusing on "Text/Textuality," contains representative pieces by Michel Foucault, "What is an Author?" (1979), and Carol Braun Pasternack, "The Textuality of Old English Poetry" (1995). The more specific studies of the poem are by Gillian R. Overing, "Swords and Signs: Dynamic Semeiosis in *Beowulf*" (1990); Seth Lehrer, "Hrothgar's Hilt and the Reader in *Beowulf*" (1991); and Susan M. Kim, "As I Once Did with Grendel': Boasting and Nostalgia in *Beowulf*" (2005).

The volume concludes with a Postscript on historical linguistics and postcolonial theory in "Post-Philology" by Michelle R. Warren (2003), and an Afterword by James W. Earl, "Reading *Beowulf* with Original Eyes" (687–704), where he encourages the "radical

defamiliarization of a far-too-familiar text,” now made easier by “the postmodern project of stripping away” the traditional assumptions we bring to reading the poem (688). This liberation “from centuries of encrusted ideologies” means, however, that “inevitably we find ourselves reading *Beowulf* in one of two new ways, and sometimes both at once: more personally than ever before, in idiosyncratic, largely unshareable terms; or more impersonally than ever before, in relatively ahistorical theoretical ones” (689). The result is such a dizzying multiplicity of possible interpretations that Earl suggests we simply take a deep breath and then calmly proceed in two simultaneous ways: (1) “with as much line-by-line precision as possible” in our analysis of individual passages and (2) with the freedom to respond to this careful parsing in whatever ways might make the poem meaningful to our own individual needs and interests (703).

Stacy S. Klein includes a chapter on “*Beowulf* and the Gendering of Heroism,” in her *Ruling Women: Queenship and Gender in Anglo-Saxon Literature* (87–123), arguing that the poet uses his legendary queens to challenge the traditional cultural expectation that success in warfare offers “the most direct route to securing long-standing remembrance” (122). For instance, the poet focuses in the Finnsburh lay upon the grief of Hildeburh, rather than on the valor of her menfolk, in order to stress, at least “temporarily” (122), the high cost of heroic violence in the eyes of those who have been excluded from its ethos. This illustration prepares for the poet’s depiction of a hero who is gentle and benign in his personal disposition, who follows the counsel of an old man Hrothgar and his wife queen Wealhtheow in pursuing a different kind of glory in battles that are fought as much against the self as against other people. “Through the thicket of different viewpoints, digressions, and flashbacks,” Klein concludes, “the poem’s feminine voices allow us to discern a thin but strong line of argument that critiques the old and gestures toward the new. In this, *Beowulf* is typical of Old English poetry, whose great power resides in its ability to suggest things without really saying them” (123).

Jessica Hope Jordan discusses “Women Refusing the Gaze: Theorizing Thryth’s ‘Unqueenly Custom’ in *Beowulf* and The Bride’s Revenge in Quentin Tarantino’s *Kill Bill, Volume I*,” *Heroic Age* 9 (October), n.p. (online). She argues that the description of the character Thryth in lines 1925–62, who executes her retainers “for openly daring to stare at her” (line 1935b), briefly “disrupts” the dominant “patriarchal narrative” of poem (§2), which is quickly reinstated by the poet’s comment: *Ne bið swylc cwenlic þeaw / idese to efnanne, þeah ðe*

hio ænlicu sy, / þætte freoðuwebbe feores onsæce / æfter ligetorne leofne mannan ‘this is no queenly custom for a lady to practice, however beautiful she may be, that a peace-weaver should take the life of a beloved man after a contrived offense’ (lines 1940b–43). Following Overing (1990), Jordan argues that the nervous Christian poet is here recasting an older version of the story, an “originary narrative,” in which an admirably proud princess refuses to accept the “appropriating gaze” of men (§3), thus turning back upon them their attempt to dominate her with their eyes by making them a public spectacle in death. Such poetic justice, Jordan avers, is just the kind of prompt retaliation for injuries normally celebrated elsewhere in the poem as part of the masculine warrior ethos. It represents the sudden eruption in the poem of a archaic binary of behavioral identities, not masculine and feminine, but *hvatr* ‘hard’ and *blauðr* or *blautr* ‘soft,’ to use the Old Norse terms offered by Clover (1993) to describe this generic social distinction that subtends conventional gender boundaries. Jordan compares the character of The Bride, played by Uma Thurman in the film *Kill Bill, Volume I* (Miramax 2003), who takes violent revenge upon a former lover and his associates for killing her groom, wedding party and unborn baby. To the untheorized eye this bride’s vengeance for the cold-blooded murder of her loved ones and friends may seem better justified than the overreaction of an Anglian princess to the visual attention of her male retainers, behavior explicitly contrasted with the mature thoughtfulness of the Geatish queen Hygd. Jordan, however, insists that the main value of analyzing these characters through “male gaze” theory is that it “deconstructs traditional representations of women as passive objects or ‘unbalanced’ or ‘terrible,’ revealing instead representations of *hvatr* women who, through their refusal to be passive objects, bring forth much-needed examples of strong women who quite often attempt, and more often achieve, heroic control over their own destiny” (§36).

In “Horror and the Maternal in *Beowulf*,” *PMLA* 121.3: 702–16, Paul Acker argues that the poet represents through the figure of Grendel’s mother a cultural anxiety that the traditional system of vengeance, designed to forestall violence between groups through an institutionalized threat of retaliation, actually perpetuates the bloodshed it is intended to prevent. This revenge imperative is embodied in maternal form because it gives birth to and nurtures an endless cycle of reciprocal hostilities between competing kindreds. In addition, Norse analogues suggest that, while women could be depicted as inciters of men to revenge, they did not normally kill others themselves, thus rendering the image

of a murderous mother even more horrifying to the audience of the poem. In contrast, the protective male hero Beowulf restores the system of royal justice using “a *gladius ex machina*” (708) that he finds on the wall of Grendel’s cave, a miraculously supplied weapon which depicts God’s “abjection” of this maternal principle, represented more generally by the clan of giants destroyed by the Flood of Genesis 6, of which she is apparently the sole survivor. Acker employs Julia Kristeva’s special use of this term (1980/1982) to describe the symbolic function of this weapon, the surviving hilt of which Beowulf appropriately offers to Hrothgar, thereby signaling that king’s resumption of patriarchal authority over the forces of maternal violence.

Alaric Hall considers the role of an understudied female character in the poem, “Hygelac’s Only Daughter: A Present, a Potentate and a Peaceweaver in *Beowulf*,” *SN* 78: 81–87. The Geatish king offers this unnamed woman to Eofor for having killed the Swedish king Ongentheow on his behalf: she is part of the *ofermadmas* ‘exceedingly great treasures’ with which Hygelac rewards the retainer and his brother (line 2993b). Hall argues that we should understand the term in a pejorative sense to mean “excessive treasures,” because in giving his daughter to one of his own men, Hygelac thus loses the power to use her, like wiser kings in the poem, as a *freoðuwebbe* ‘peace-weaver’ (line 1942a) to bring about a settlement with his most dangerous enemies. In this case, these are the Swedes, who become so deeply entrenched in their antagonism toward his people that it is prophesied they will destroy the Geats after the death of Hrothgar’s nephew Beowulf.

Cynthia Whissell studies “The Flow of Emotion Through *Beowulf*,” *Psychological Reports* 99.3: 835–50, using her “Dictionary of Affect in Language” (1994), in which the emotional connotations of 9,000 Modern English words have been classified and quantified in an attempt to provide an objective measurement of emotion in speech. Whissell analyzes three versions of the Old English poem in Modern English—those of Gummere (1909), Breeden (1999), and Heaney (2000)—in order to measure “readers’ likely emotional reactions to the words” chosen, with a “strong inference” that these will reflect the original audience’s response to the same parts of the poem (848). She finds that, although “the three translations differed from one another in several respects, the data ... strongly support the conclusion that their treatment of emotion in *Beowulf* was similar” (842). She charts the poem by 100-line segments and finds that there is a significant but regular rise and fall of emotion according to two registers that she characterizes as Pleasantness (the amount of positive

or negative emotion expressed by a word) and Activation (how active or passive it is understood to be). The three most Unpleasant points in the narrative occur during the three monster fights, as might be expected, but with special intensity during Beowulf’s confrontation with Grendel’s mother at the bottom of the mere, which “is both Active and Unpleasant” in the extreme and “stands out in comparison to the two secondary climaxes” (844) during the fights with Grendel and the dragon. The Pleasant high points occur when the Geats arrive in Denmark, when Wealhtheow speaks after the Finnsburh lay, when the Geats are welcomed home to Hygelac’s hall, and just after the dragon has been killed. Whissell concludes: “The entire saga presents with a distinct meta-pattern built around the central story (the victory over Grendel’s mother) which is bracketed by two other adventures (Grendel, the dragon) and further embellished by a short prologue and a rather longer wind-down” (844).

Stephen O. Glosecki writes on “Beowulf and the Queen’s Cup: Determining the Danish Succession” in the festschrift for Donald Scragg, *The Power of Words*, ed. Magennis and Wilcox [see sec. 2], 368–96. Following John Hill (1982 and 1995), Glosecki agrees that Hrothgar’s “adoption” of Beowulf as a son in lines 946b–49a is tantamount to offering him the throne of Denmark upon his death, displacing both his own sons and the senior ætheling of his house, Hrothulf, from the succession. Whatever Wealhtheow’s feelings as a mother toward this new political development, Glosecki argues, it is in her duty as queen to confirm the king’s choice of successor and “ordain the new heir with the cup-passing ritual” (387). After she first offers the cup to the king himself, she then retrieves it, holding it significantly in her hands as she speaks sternly (so Glosecki imagines) to Hrothulf sitting next to him, reminding the king’s nephew of the many favors and honors she and her husband have shown him since he was a youth. Wealhtheow then withholds the cup from Hrothulf, to whom she had presumably offered it next after the king earlier in the poem when Beowulf had first arrived at the court and as a foreign guest without rank in the hall’s social hierarchy was served last (lines 612b–28a). She now “strides imperiously past [Hrothulf] to present the cup to Beowulf” in his place (390), honoring the new heir apparent and thereby demoting the former. Later, after Beowulf kills Grendel’s mother, Wealhtheow “upstages Hrothgar” (394) by bestowing upon the Geatish warrior the greatest gift of all, the fabulous neck-ring (line 1199b), blessing him and calling him “ætheling,” promising yet further rewards in the future, and asking him in particular to

be kind to her sons, the junior æthelings (lines 1224b–27). Glosecki reads this neck-ring as an emblem of kingship, which he imagines the dying Beowulf himself passing on to his kinsman Wiglaf many years later, even though the text states explicitly that this treasure had long since fallen into the hands of the Franks during Hygelac's raid (lines 1202–14a). Nor does Glosecki explain how and why Beowulf rejects the kingship of the Danes which he has just putatively been offered, simply stressing that the cup-bearing queen in this poem is the most magnificent king-maker and “ring-giver” of all (394).

Stefan Jurasinski has published a revised version of his 2003 doctoral dissertation under the same title, *Ancient Privileges: 'Beowulf', Law, and the Making of Germanic Antiquity*, Medieval European Studies 6 (Morgantown: West Virginia UP). Jurasinski describes how nineteenth-century scholars like Jacob Grimm (1828) and John Mitchell Kemble (1849) promoted a view of ancient Germanic society that they hoped would bear favorable comparison with that of the Greco-Roman world. The “most damaging habit of Germanist legal history” was to ignore the dynamic half-millennium development of Anglo-Saxon law before 1066, conflating “its literate remains with those of Scandinavia in order to establish an abstract, timeless system of archaic Germanic law that dwelt in the national spirit of all Germanic-speaking peoples” (153). Klaeber accepted much of this model in his influential edition of *Beowulf*, which first appeared in 1922, ignoring the work of more recent legal historians like Pollock and Maitland (1898), Brunner (1906), and Vinogradoff (1893/1906–07), who had challenged earlier assumptions. For instance, the “Ancient Privileges,” which Thomas Andrews claimed in 1738 to include the rights of rural poor to graze their animals on common land, was seen to be confirmed by Klaeber in the *folcscaru* ‘folk-share’ of line 73a which Hrothgar reserves in his generosity along with the lives of men, according to an ideal of ancient Germanic communalism which that scholar had derived from Kemble's reading of Tacitus. Instead, Jurasinski argues, the term refers to “ancestral lands” that were reserved for the king himself as part of his *epel* or patrimony as a member of the Scylding ruling clan. Another misconception, Jurasinski believes, can be found in interpretations of the Hrethel episode, where the Geatish king is supposedly restrained by a prohibition against vengeance upon a close kinsman, in this case his son Hæthcyn, who has killed another son Herebeald. Jurasinski insists that it was rather the status of the homicide as an “accident” that rendered further action impossible and thus frustrating to the old king “in a social environment

where vengeance and settlement were the predominant modes of dispute resolution” (148). Jurasinski finds that vengeance is “a peculiar fetish of early Germanist scholarship,” which privileged “primitivism and paganism,” often bringing preconceived notions to the interpretation of such episodes as that of Finn, which passages may yet have much to teach us about the institution of feud with the aid of more sophisticated models like that of Alan Kennedy (2001).

William Perry Marvin writes on “Heorot and the Ethos of the Kill,” the first chapter of his *Hunting Law and Ritual in Medieval English Literature* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer), 17–45, which earlier appeared as “Heorot, Grendel, and the Ethos of the Kill,” *In Geardagum* 24 (2003): 1–39, summarized in YWOES for that year. Marvin argues that Hrothgar's naming of his hall after the game animal *Heort* ‘Stag’ (line 78b) is intended to recall an earlier age when the meat of the hunter's kill was shared out among all members of the hunting band, just as the king promises to distribute in this new building the wealth that God has given him to *geongum ond ealdum* ‘to young and old’ (line 72a).

Matthew A. Fisher considers the other spiritual company the poet of *Beowulf* can be imagined to keep in “Working at the Crossroads: Tolkien, St. Augustine, and the *Beowulf*-Poet,” in *The Lord of the Rings 1954–2004*, ed. Hammond and Scull [see sec. 2], 217–30. The “crossroads” to which Fisher refers is the “intersection” in the poem between “two similar views of human conduct” (227): (1) the Christian Augustinian, where the results of even the best-intended behavior will always be vitiated by the inherent corruption of our will, and (2) the “northern” *Beowulfian*, where the efforts of even the noblest of heroes are doomed to failure in a world governed by the devastations of *wyrd*. Fisher asks whether Tolkien, a traditional Catholic believer and a deeply sympathetic *Beowulf* scholar, brings any further “insight” in his *Lord of the Rings* to this moral conundrum, in which the effort of good behavior is demanded for its own sake without any promise of success or reward for deeds of sacrifice and courage. Drawing upon Tolkien's correspondence, Fisher isolates two points of special interest in this regard, both of which are key tenets of Tolkien's fundamentally New Testament value system and view of history: (1) adducing The Lord's Prayer (“lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil”), though Fisher might also have mentioned 1 Corinthians 10:13 (“but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able”), Tolkien believed the desired but beleaguered goodness of an inherently fallible creature activates the protection of divine grace, so that we are shielded from

temptations beyond our capacity to resist; and (2) Tolkien thought that humility and mercy, especially when “contrary to prudence” (quoted 228), have the potent counter-effect of overturning the designs of the proud and cruel, a principle expressed in many of the Beatitudes (Matthew 5:3–12, Luke 6:20–23).

In the same volume, Michael D.C. Drout studies “The Rhetorical Evolution of ‘*Beowulf*: The Monsters and the Critics,’” *The Lord of the Rings 1954–2004*, ed. Hammond and Scull [see sec. 2], 183–215. Drout appends a long table of three columns (193–213) charting the “structural evolution” of this essay by comparing brief summaries of the various arguments presented in three succeeding versions: (1) the A-Text representing a set of Oxford lectures probably begun in 1934; (2) the B-Text, comprising carbon typescripts revised after the delivery of Tolkien’s British Academy lecture on 25 November 1936; and (3) the published version of that lecture, reprinted in 1971. Drout includes various omissions from, additions to, and substitutions in Tolkien’s arguments through time and concludes that “at each step [he] becomes more efficient and more accurate—he communicates the same idea with fewer words, and the argument is more closely tailored to the minds who will be receiving it—in this case Tolkien’s audience for the British Academy lecture” (191). In particular, Tolkien is concerned to counteract the poor opinion of the poem promulgated by W. P. Ker in *The Dark Ages* (1904) and to make his *apologia* for it “not only logically sound but also rhetorically persuasive” (184). To this end, in Drout’s estimation, Tolkien’s published version achieves a “soaring rhetorical conclusion [that] reaches beyond scholarship and encompasses ... a wider view of the importance of *Beowulf* in the world” (191).

‘Beowulf’ and Material Culture

In “*Beowulf*’s Great Hall,” *History Today* 56 (October): 40–44, John D. Niles asks whether an actual building “corresponding to the poet’s imagined [Heorot] ever existed” (42). He reports that postholes of three large halls have been found near Gammel Lejre near the end of Roskilde Fjord on the island of Zealand, traditional seat of the legendary Skjöldung or Scylding kings of ancient Denmark. The oldest of these halls has been radiocarbon dated to the middle of the sixth century, very close to the period of time in which Niles believes the *Beowulf* poet sets Hrothgar’s reign. In addition, to the west of these sites is a rough hummocky landscape of post-glacial debris and melt pockets—a “dead ice” zone—perforated with tarns or pools reminiscent of Grendel’s mere. There are also many ancient barrows in

the area, including Øm Jættestue, a megalithic chamber just over a mile from Gammel Lejre with “a spacious enough interior to accommodate any fifty-foot-long dragon” (44). A memorial stone ship-setting also stands nearby (one among many now lost) that recalls the ship funeral of Scyld Scefing in the opening portion of the poem. Niles is not suggesting that the characters of *Beowulf* are historical figures who occupied or visited this hall, however, but rather that later rulers of Zealand, who used the more recent two hall sites during the Viking period (ca. 700–1000 AD), “wished to shore up their prestige through stories of predecessors whom they imagine[d] to have lived at or near that earlier hall site during a fabled Age of Gold” (44).

Jennifer Neville asks a question concerning “Hrothgar’s Horses: Feral or Thoroughbred?” *ASE* 35: 131–57, referring in particular to the animals on which the king’s thegns race back from the mere in lines 864–67a and 916–17a. Hrothgar gives eight of these horses to the hero in lines 1035–49, seven of which Beowulf in turn gives to his own king and queen, Hygelac in lines 2163–66a and Hygd in lines 2172–75a, apparently keeping only one for himself. Neville believes these horses are “relatively small, dun animals [*fealu* (line 865b), *æppel-fealu* (line 2165a)], perhaps with dappled markings, which derive from a herd of horses bred without the advantage of foreign blood but nevertheless considered to be objects of prestige. Equivalent to—and perhaps identifiable as—Fjord ponies, they possess the status of treasured thoroughbreds, despite their superficial similarities with feral horses like the *equae silvestrae* [‘forest-mares’ of the Domesday Book] and present-day Exmoor ponies. They are thus worthy gifts from a king to a hero and from a hero to a king and queen. The description of Hrothgar’s horses thus not only locates the world of the poem in a generalized distant past ... but also accurately reveals one aspect of the material culture of Scandinavian Denmark. This image could not be derived from what we know about Anglo-Saxon horses [from archaeology, historical narratives, wills, law codes, and glossaries] and contrasts strongly with them” (157). Even though Hrothgar’s horses would have seemed in size and color more like their own mustangs rather than regal gifts, an Anglo-Saxon audience would have recognized them as a fine exotic breed similar to what they knew of Norse ponies in their own day.

Dissertations

Frances B. Auld writes on “The Body of the Monster: Fear and Fascination,” Ph.D. Diss., U of South Florida, 2005, *DAI* 66A: 2572, in which he scrutinizes the

corporeal form of several monsters in literature and film, including Grendel in *Beowulf*, Robert Louis Stevenson's Mr. Hyde, Ishiro Honda's and Roland Emmerich's two different Godzillas, and Thomas Harris's Hannibal Lecter. These monsters, Auld argues, embody contemporary social fears through the reflex of some ancient evil, in which the monster's physical presence, particularly its use of hands and mouth, is used to communicate specific kinds of symbolic threat that the monster hunter must learn to read and interpret to overcome it.

In "N. F. S. Grundtvig's Interpretation of *Beowulf* as a Living Heroic Poem for the People," Ph.D. Diss., U of California, Davis, 2005, *DAI* 66A, no. 10: 3638, Mark Bradshaw Busbee reviews this Danish scholar's contribution to the study and appreciation of the poem during his long life (1783–1872). Grundtvig offered the first complete translation of *Beowulf* into a modern language and first identified the only confirmed historical reference in it: the raid of Hygelac upon the Franks in the earlier sixth century. The Lutheran priest and Danish patriot saw the poem as *det levende Ord* 'the living word' of *Folket* 'the People', which he felt to be of particular interest and importance to his fellow-countrymen in its account of the founding of Denmark, but also which he saw as an expression of the struggle of human beings in general against spiritual monsters toward a more universal enlightenment.

Joseph Edward Marshall includes the treasure of *Beowulf* in his study of "*Radix Malorum*: The Presence and Function of Money in Medieval Literature," Ph.D. Diss., Catholic U of America, 2006, *DAI* 67, no. 04A: 1351. He finds an ambiguous attitude toward wealth in these texts "because money can be used either as an expression of generosity or greed, or in Augustinian terms, *caritas* 'love of God and fellow humans' or *cupiditas* 'love of Mammon and the world'" With particular reference to *Beowulf*, Marshall distinguishes between treasure that is shared generously with others—good: "a metonymy for lordship and the Christian ideal"—and hoarded treasure that is *unmyt* 'useless' (line 3168a), that is, bad, a perversion of effective leadership and Christian values.

Translations, Performances, Adaptations

Martin Puhvel has offered a poetic rendering in *Beowulf: A Verse Translation and Introduction* (Lanham, MD: UP of America), with the opening lines (1-11):

Listen! We have heard of the glory
of the Spear-Danes' kings in bygone days—

how those princes did deeds of prowess.
Often Scyld Scefing bereft bands of foes,
many a tribe, of their mead-hall seats,
stuck [sic] terror into the hearts of heroes—
he who at first was found a waif.
He lived to find relief from that plight,
grew great under heaven, prospered in glory,
until each of neighboring nations
over the whale-road had to obey him,
grant him tribute. That was a good king!

Actors from the American Players Theatre and the Guthrie Theatre orally perform with singing, instrumental and sound effects a new translation by Richard N. Ringler, *Beowulf: The Complete Story—A Drama*, 3-CD set (Madison, WI: Nemo Productions). The part of the poet-narrator is spoken by Dick Ringler himself, with Nathan Sorseth as the Danish coastguard, Stephen Pelinski as Beowulf, Karl Schmidt as Hrothgar, Craig Johnson as Unferth, and Susan Sweeney as Wealhtheow. The program notes fill 27 pages and include a synopsis of the poem by fitt number and audio track, background information, genealogical charts, and a glossary of personal names and places. The first track opens with the sound of waves, seagulls and distant horns; the poem itself is presented briskly in fluent alliterative verses:

We have heard tell of the high doings
of Danish kings in days gone by,
how the great war-chiefs gained their renown,
how Scyld Scefing shattered his foes,
mastered the mead-halls of many peoples,
conquered their kings. He came to Denmark
as a lone foundling, but later he thrived;
his name was renowned beneath the skies
and kings and kingdoms across the whale-road,
the surging sea, swore him allegiance,
paid him tribute. He was a peerless king! (lines 1–11)

Howell D. Chickering, Jr., reprints his 1977 edition and translation of *Beowulf: A Dual-Language Edition* (New York: Anchor Books), xiv, 446 pp., with a new Afterword suggesting how he would render selected passages now (380–403).

Robert A. Albano compares "Norton's *Beowulf* in Verse vs. Norton's *Beowulf* in Prose," *Taiwan Jnl of English Literature* 3: 37–52, more specifically, Seamus Heaney's poetic rendering (1999) which was commissioned to replace E. Talbot Donaldson's prose version (1966) in the Seventh Edition of *The Norton Anthology of English Literature* (2000). Albano finds the Norton editors' decision to replace Donaldson's work with

an unseen substitute “startling” (37), even though he admits that students might find the earlier prose rendering a bit stilted and repetitious when presented in the form of dense prose paragraphs. His comparison of the two versions to discover which retains most effectively the direct meaning and stylistic force of the original poem reveals serious weaknesses in Heaney’s translation in almost every category of analysis. With regard to the formal features of Old English poetry, Albano’s complaints are that Heaney scants the alliteration, sharply diminishes verbal compounding, supplies only a very “informal and irregular meter,” makes idiosyncratic and distracting word choices (in particular, the controversial Ulsterisms and Hibernicisms), but otherwise smoothes and homogenizes the “roughness” of the diction that Kemble so prized in a way that softens and distorts “the grim and fatalistic mood of the epic” (41). In short, Albano argues that Heaney’s undistinguished, sometimes even banal verses ironically offer a poetic rendering of *Beowulf* which is far flatter, less evocative, less accurate, and more “prosaic” than Donaldson’s precise but resonant prose. As one example among others, Albano notes the two renderings of the line on the legendary dragon-slayer with whom Beowulf is compared after he kills Grendel: *Sigumunde gesprong / æfter deað-dæge dom unlytel* (lines 884b-85). Donaldson retains the stark litotes—“For Sigemund there sprang up after his death day no little glory”—a device which Heaney ignores in “After his death Sigemund’s glory grew and grew,” which rendering Albano finds singularly lame and uninspired. He concludes that “Heaney, at best, is inconsistent; at worst, he is unsuccessful” (48); his “is not the translation one should read if one is encountering *Beowulf* for the first time” (51). Although he examines none of the other verse renderings that have been published in recent years—Liuzza (1999/2000), Alexander (1973/2001), Rodrigues (2002), Sullivan and Murphy (2004), Rebsamen (1971/1991/2004), McNamara (2005), Gummere (1909/2005), Chickering (1977/2006), Puhvel (2006, excerpted above), and Ringler (DVD 2006, excerpted above)—Albano remains staunchly loyal to Donaldson’s Norton prose classic: “A superior translation, either in prose or verse, does not yet exist” (51).

Hideki Watanabe reviews “Beowulfiana in Japan: A Brief Survey of the Past 75 Years with Special Focus on the Japanese Translations and Interpretive Studies,” *Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature* (The Japan Society for Medieval English Studies) 21: 45–54. Watanabe notes a Japanese precursor to virtually all of the twentieth-century studies of *Beowulf* in Japan. This is Nagase Kiyoko’s verse anthology *Gurenderu-no-hahaoya* [*Grendel’s Mother*] (1930), whose title piece

dramatizes this woman poet’s perspective on the world “as a ‘sublime’ young mother, lurking in a dark cave and protecting her child” (46). Watanabe then proceeds to note the various translations of the poem into Japanese, studies of its syntax, meter, themes, Japanese analogues, vocabulary, and style, as well as more particular interpretations of individual lines of *Beowulf*.

Thomas McGuire explores the link between “Violence and the Vernacular in Seamus Heaney’s *Beowulf*,” *New Hibernia Rev. / Iris Éireannach Nua* 10.1: 79–99. He invokes the postcolonial theorists Asad (1988), Venuti (1993), and Dingwaney (1995), to approve the necessary “violence” of the Northern Irish poet’s use of various Hibernicisms and Ulsterisms to render the Anglo-Saxon poem into modern English. These lexical choices and other more subtle ways of voicing the cadences of Ulster English are “deliciously subversive” (79), according to McGuire, ironically appropriating from an oppressive English nation its own early poem about the tragedy of ethnic hostility in order to create the translator’s own political statement about the violence of colonialism and its continuing bloody aftermath. McGuire insists that the English used by Heaney is that of a distinctly Ulster idiom and belongs to both the Protestant and Catholic people of Northern Ireland, creating what Homi Bhabha (1994) calls a “Third Space” of discourse in which the polarities of political separatism are brought together in “a kind of demilitarized zone of the imagination and spirit” (99). This shared vernacular is one where the griefs and grievances of both sides can be simultaneously acknowledged and deplored. Heaney has thus transformed “the song of suffering that is *Beowulf* into a keen for his own people’s troubles” (82).

In a poem published in *OEN* 39.3: 20–21, Marijane Osborn “gives Grendel’s mother a voice, though she has no voice at this point in her story” (20), that is, when she and her son hear the sounds of laughter and song of the *scop* emanating from Heorot. Osborn imagines these characters as displaced human survivors of the (*H*)*eruli*, following Sewell’s suggestion (1914) that the *eorl[e]* terrorized by Scyld in line 6a refers to this people, called in the *Getica* of Jordanes “the tallest of the tall people of Scandinavia,” who “fought with the cruelty of wild beasts” (quoted 20). Grendel’s mother takes on the role of many women depicted in the Icelandic sagas who urge their sons or other relatives to seek vengeance for slain kinsmen, though her plight is particularly poignant since she is imagined as literally voiceless, having had her tongue cut out by Scyld’s son Halfdane after he raped and impregnated her with Grendel. This is the reason Grendel himself cannot talk, of course,

since he has had no one to learn from. The poem is thus an interior monologue, in which Grendel's mother painfully and voicelessly urges her son Grendel to take vengeance upon his half-brother Hrothgar.

The monsters' point of view was also expressed by Elliot Goldenthal in *Grendel, the Transcendence of the Great Big Bad*, which was performed at the Los Angeles Opera in June, conducted by Steven Sloane and directed by Julie Taymor, who co-wrote the libretto with J. D. McClatchy after John Gardner's 1971 novella *Grendel*. Desmond Richardson danced as Beowulf, whose part is sung by a chorus in Old English. Bass Eric Owen voiced Grendel's side of the story in modern English. Mezzo-soprano Denyce Graves supplied the perspective of the dragon. The protagonist Grendel wonders why these hypocritical humans are picking on him, since they are no strangers to violence themselves. He is thus the archetypal Outsider, the misunderstood pariah or scapegoat, onto whom "normal" people project all their own fears and repressed hostilities—the evil within themselves. Summer performances of the opera followed on the opposite coast at the Lincoln Center Festival in New York City, at which Benjamin Bagby also offered oral performances of the poem to the accompaniment of a lyre. He recorded the first 1,062 lines of the poem on a DVD issued by Charles Morrow Productions LLC and Jon Aaron.

Francesco Giusti writes on the reception of "Il *Beowulf* nel Novecento: il fumetto e il romanzo [*Beowulf* since the Nineteenth Century: The Comic Strip and the Novel]," *Linguistica e Filologia* 23: 211–29, in which he discusses adaptations of the story of the hero in the graphic art of Enrico Basari, *Beowulf: Leggenda cristiana dell'antica Danimarca* [A Christian Legend of Ancient Denmark] (1940–41), and John Gardner's 1971 *Grendel*, translated into Italian as *L'Orco* in 1991. Basari's work was created under the strong influence of conservative Catholic theology and Fascist propaganda, while Gardner's novel represents a postmodern deconstruction of ideological coherence and confident narratives of identity. Even so, a comparison of the two rewritings reveals the ways in which the old plot and characters are still being used to reflect contemporary cultural concerns and yields further insight into the ways in which the *Beowulf* poet similarly dramatized and reflected on the key issues of his cultural moment.

CRD/EM

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

4c. Prose

Legal Documents

In "Rewarding Informers in *Cáin Domnaig* and the Laws of Wíhtred," *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 52: 1–11, Charlene M. Eska reviews a provision found only in the Laws of Wíhtred (a late seventh-century Old English legal text preserved in the twelfth-century *Textus Roffensis*), and *Cáin Domnaig* (an eighth- or ninth-century Irish law text). Each text awards half the fine for working on Sunday to the informant. Neither text translates the other, and each has ties to other legal texts in its own vernacular. Both also differ from penitentials' treatments of informers, though penitentials did inform vernacular laws. Eska concludes that the shared provision descends from a common source, now lost, probably a Latin text on Sunday laws.

Christine Rauer presents a new edition of the Old English text of "Pope Sergius I's Privilege for Malmesbury," *Essays for Joyce Hill on Her Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Mary Swan, Leeds Studies in English n.s. 37 (Leeds: Univ. of Leeds, School of English), 261–81. Aldhelm reportedly traveled to Rome and returned with a papal privilege for Malmesbury. A Latin text appears, with minor variations, in three late medieval cartularies, William of Malmesbury's *Liber pontificalis* and *Gesta pontificum*, and John Joscelyn's early modern transcript. An Old English version in British Library, Cotton Otho C.i. has the same overall structure but some differences, including a witness list absent from all extant Latin versions. Heather Edwards edited both texts; she suggested that the Latin is a retranslation of the OE text, perhaps made after an authentic Latin text had been lost. Rauer argues for a simpler transmission: a Latin tradition now represented only by later copies and an English translation from an earlier copy. Hans Hubert Anton found the style of Sergius's privilege consonant with that of contemporary papal documents; a retranslator in England would not have access to other papal texts to imitate them. Furthermore, William of Malmesbury appears to have worked from a Latin copy no longer extant. More importantly, Rauer argues, the OE text presents several passages that are at best awkward and at worst corrupt; someone retranslating it into Latin would be hard put to produce clear sense *and* papal style from such a source, while it is easy to see how an Old English translator could have introduced errors. The OE text also adds some explanatory phrases not present in the Latin while omitting a few that are. Some additions reveal an interest in eschatology, while others include doublets, alliteration, and rhyme—giving the OE privilege a

homiletic style not unlike that of many other OE translations from Latin. OE texts were sometimes back-translated into Latin; William of Malmesbury himself rendered a privilege by Leo III into Latin, but he explicitly noted that he had done so, and his style there does not match that of real papal documents. While Rauer cannot prove the text authentic, the preponderance of evidence seems to indicate a wholly or mostly authentic Latin text later translated into Old English. She offers a new critical edition with notes and suggestions to fill lacunae caused by the Ashburnham House fire. Rauer also provides the URL for her modern English translation of the OE privilege online; it is a shame the translation itself could not be included in the volume.

Mary Louise Fellows begins "Æthelgifu's Will as Spiritual Practice," Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Minnesota, 2005; *DAI* 66A, 10, by rejecting conventional dichotomies: between spiritual and economic, temporal and eternal, written and oral. Æthelgifu seems to have had close ties to Queen Ælfthryth and to St. Alban's, and she probably took vows and began a religious community within her household as a widow. Her late-tenth-century will represents less personal intent than social and religious expectations. In her second chapter, Fellows argues that Benedictine Reform depictions of the Crucifixion with John and Mary reflect Ambrose's understanding of Jesus's words to the two as a will serving both familial and spiritual interests. Similarly, Æthelgifu's will leaves property to relations for life and then to minsters after her relations die. Temporal and eternal spaces impinge upon each other in Anglo-Saxon art, and both art and the will convert physical property to spiritual good. Chapter Three argues that Æthelgifu's manumission of slaves to sing for her soul and her husband's puts Æthelgifu squarely within monastic reform conservatism: reformers embraced neumes, troping, the organ, and early polyphony not as innovation, but to enhance an ancient tradition of orderly sacred song. Chapter Four argues that the will's meticulous descriptions, listings, and successive dispositions of land align it with orderliness, associated with salvation in Anglo-Saxon art. Chapter Five reads the three times Beowulf tells others what to do with his possessions after he dies as wills, comparing the memories ensured by his bequests to the memories Æthelgifu ensures by donations to those who sing for her. Her successive gifts of estates to kin and then the church extend her will, and thus her memory, forward through time. In Chapter Six, Fellows notes the Eve/Mary dichotomy evident in *Mary of Egypt*, stories of Queen Ælfthryth, and the *Regularis concordia*: male authority always circumscribes women's roles, and women's sexuality presents constant

danger. By appealing to the Virgin Mary and giving gifts not only for her own soul but for her husband's, Æthelgifu constructs herself as a virtuous widow. She manumits some slaves to pray and sing but bequeaths others as part of estates. Thus Æthelgifu upholds a masculine institution based on sexual violence: female slaves are subject to owners' sexual demands, and male slaves are impotent in that they cannot protect their families. The dissertation concludes with a brief account of Fellows's own visit to the areas Æthelgifu would have known, and a longer, fictionalized account of Æthelgifu's journey to make the will. After the conclusion come twenty-three illustrations, though the .pdf of the dissertation reproduces some of them poorly. Fellows's appendix reproduces Dorothy Whitelock's edition and translation of the will.

See also Carella's "The Source of the Prologue to the Laws of Alfred," under *Alfredian Literature*.

NGD

Linda Tollerton Hall examines "Wills and Will-Making in Late Anglo-Saxon England" in her 2005 PhD dissertation completed at the University of York (*DAI* 67C: 552). An introduction and conclusion bracket six chapters. Chapter One, "The corpus of Anglo-Saxon vernacular wills and the problem of interpretation," is a useful survey of the extant corpus of Old English wills from the eighth to eleventh centuries, highlighting issues such as problems of interpretation, transmission, language, distribution, and so forth. This corpus is also summarized in a handy appendix ("Appendix 1: Corpus of Anglo-Saxon vernacular wills," 305–21); p. 33 also contains a helpful table, "Distribution of vernacular wills by archive." Chapter Two, "The emergence and development of the written vernacular will: the focus on transmission of land," argues that "written will making was closely linked firstly to the transmission of bookland [OE *bōcland*], secondly to developing royal power and administration in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and thirdly to the cultural changes associated with the religious reforms of the tenth century" (59). Chapter Three, "Donors and their decisions: the bequest of land," focuses primarily on donors and their motives, concluding that "wills reflect the complex social networks to which donors belonged" (110). In this chapter she also compares the bequests of men and women, something she does quite a bit in the dissertation: the work is thus relevant to anyone working on women or gender in Anglo-Saxon England. Chapter Four, "Evidence for bequests in two twelfth-century chronicles," reconstructs narratives of will-making and bequests in the *Liber Eliensis* and the *Chronicon Abbatiae Ramesiensis* (supporting

evidence is also presented in tabular form in “Appendix 2” [322–8]). Tollerton Hall shows the complex associations between local lay and monastic communities that can be revealed by multiple overlapping evidence of bequests. Chapter Five, “Bequest of movable wealth,” focuses on the tenth and eleventh centuries and covers a variety of portable goods: stock, horses, slaves, coins and jewelry, cups, household goods, clothing and religious vestments, swords and war gear, books. Chapter Six, “Pious bequests: lay donors and the church,” provides evidence again for the close connection between lay and monastic communities in the form of pious giving. Throughout the dissertation, she analyzes the wills against “political, administrative, and religious changes” in Anglo-Saxon England (108).

AS

Alfredian Literature

Bryan Carella reopens the vexing question of “The Source of the Prologue to the Laws of Alfred,” *Peritia* 19: 91–118. Regardless of whether Alfred himself wrote it, the Prologue is unique in Anglo-Saxon legal history: lengthy translations from Exodus segue into a “bridge” explaining the relation of Mosaic to Christian law. In 1909, Paul Fournier showed similarities between the Prologue’s renderings from Exodus and the Hiberno-Latin *Liber ex lege Moysi(s)*. More recently, Patrick Wormald concluded that Alfred, influenced by Hincmar of Rheims, used the late antique *Collatio legum romanarum et mosaicarum*, borrowings particularly evident in the treatment of Exodus 22:2–3. Breaking into or undermining a house merits death (22:2)—unless the deed occurs in daylight (22:3). The *Collatio* and Alfred both add “night” to 22:2. Alfred also adds that the homeowner may kill in self-defense; Wormald takes this to be an extension of an addition in the *Collatio* to 22:2 that the thief defending himself with a weapon may be killed. Yet “night” is implied by daylight in Vulgate 22:3, and Alfred’s other alteration is not paralleled in the *Collatio*. Carella then compares the *Collatio*’s non-Vulgate text with the Vulgate, the *Liber Moysi*, and eight of the Prologue’s Scriptural quotations. He finds no definite followings of the *Collatio*, a few places where the Prologue seems closer to the Vulgate, and divergences between the Prologue and the other three texts. The *Collatio* begins each of its sixteen *tituli* with brief quotations from the Pentateuch, then gives lengthy passages from Roman law; it offers no theory relating the two kinds of law. By contrast, the Prologue uses more Scriptural quotation and theorizes the relation between Old Testament and Christian law.

Carella cannot find verbal parallels with the *Collatio* or the *Liber Moysi*; both Alfred and the *Liber* reorder Exodus 22:1–4, but not in quite the same way. Strikingly, however, all the verses omitted by the *Liber*, except for Exodus 22:1, are omitted by the Prologue. In the four extant manuscripts, the *Liber* appears as prologue to an early Irish canon law collection, the *Hibernensis*; the Alfredian Prologue introduces the first extant Anglo-Saxon law collection. Carella concludes that the author most likely knew and used the *Liber ex lege Moysi* for his Prologue.

Jacqueline A. Stodnick surveys “Second-rate Stories? Changing Approaches to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,” *Literature Compass* 3: 1253–65, presenting a concise overview of the field with useful bibliography. Chronicles and annals were long regarded as objective recitations of facts untainted by political or literary interests; in reaction, later investigations pursued ideology within the Chronicle. Meanwhile, others pursued questions of textual history, paleography, and style separately (the latter often focusing solely on the poems and the Cynewulf and Cyneheard episode). More recently, as scholars have challenged distinctions between literature and non-literary writing, treatments of the Chronicle no longer consider it as a single, propagandistic text, or just in its most-anthologized portions. Newer work emphasizes how readers received and contributed to this “multiple text” over almost three centuries, not simply reproducing but creating English identity. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition* has now made all the major versions available; that and new databases have facilitated a surge in Chronicle scholarship over the last couple of decades. Scholarship long emphasized differences among versions; now Stodnick sees scholars increasingly examining what portions different scribes chose to copy in multiple manuscripts, what formulas recur, and the strategies enabling “the construction of information as historical” (1260). She anticipates further study of the purpose and function of lists, the influence of Frankish annals, and the local contexts of individual Chronicle manuscripts. She concludes that “Chronicle scholars are uniquely privileged” in literary and cultural studies today, for “The Chronicle text(s) make it impossible to forget that culture is iterative and requires constant performance, and that it must repeatedly come to terms with its own past” (1261).

Stodnick also treats “The Interests of Compounding: *Angelcynn* to *Engla land* in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,” *The Power of Words: Anglo-Saxon Studies Presented to Donald Scragg on His Seventieth Birthday*, eds. Hugh Magennis and Jonathan Wilcox, Medieval European

Studies 8 (Morgantown, WV: West Virginia UP), 337–67. As several recent studies of the construction of nation and race have noted, the nomenclature used for people and land helps construct identity and present it as natural. Scholars have tended to focus on innovation in terminology; Stodnick instead looks to versions of the *Chronicle* to understand the conventional formation of nomenclature over a long span. People- and place-names for the early kingdoms generally refer to relative direction (*norðanhymbre*, *westseaxe*), border (*mierce*), or Continental origins (*-seaxe*, *-engle*). Semantically, they function sometimes as people-names, describing movements or other actions, and sometimes as place-names. They can mark territories with or without an added *-land* or *-rice*. Whether they name people or places cannot be determined for many occurrences, especially those involving *on* (meaning 'on,' 'at,' or 'among,' among other possibilities): "It seems that these names are functioning dialogically, oscillating between reference to the land and its people in a way that is not amenable to translation into modern English" (355). *Angelcynn* too can refer to people or place, but with a difference: where other names use the plural, the *-cynn* compound is singular, "inscribing grammatically their imagined unity and simultaneity" (359). In entries from 1016 and 1017, variation among the manuscripts suggests that *Angelcynn* has come to be read as a place-name. Then the *Chronicle* introduces the term *Engla land*, again using a conventional formation (people-name plus *-land*) to mark place. (A printing problem obscures a point on p. 362: *Engla land* as two words appears twenty-six times in the Old English Corpus, while the single word appears 113 times; the unfortunate insertion of a hyphen in both destroys the distinction.) The genitive ending of *Engla lond* weakens in the twelfth century, sometimes reduced to *Engleland*. The term no longer marks both a people and a place, but a place "separate from but connected to the people occupying it, and with its own name" (364). Later scribes sometimes projected later terminology back into earlier entries, showing how naturalized the terms had become. The land and its people seem to have a natural, necessary connection, even when the same term no longer defines both.

Francisco José Álvarez López's "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 755: An Annotated Bibliography of the Cynewulf and Cyneheard Episode from Plummer to Bremer," *SELIM* 13: 99–117, covers more than a century of scholarship, from Plummer's 1892–9 edition through 2005. He divides his entries into three sections: "Editions and Translations" (the latter into modern English), "Commentary," and "Other Useful References,"

broader works with portions treating the Cynewulf episode. Within each section, items ordered by the date of the first edition. Álvarez López's summaries note major themes, whether items respond to others he covers, and often how full the item's notes and bibliography are; several entries offer evaluative comments. For the *Collaborative Edition*, he gives information only for Bately's edition of A; he missed a 1986 essay by Karen Ferro, "The King in the Doorway," and there are a few errors (mostly minor). This bibliography provides a useful resource for those interested in scholarship on the 755 annal.

Ignacio Murillo López's "Cynewulf and Cyneheard: A Different Style for a Different Story," *SELIM* 13: 87–98, suggests that the Cynewulf and Cyneheard story was inserted into the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* because Cynewulf, Cyneheard, and Sigebirht were forebears of Alfred the Great. Murillo López writes that the story came from oral tradition and resembles Icelandic sagas, but he relies on previous scholarship rather than doing his own analysis of the text or sagas. The essay makes heavy use of dated scholarship and general reference works instead of several excellent recent studies of the *Chronicle*'s style and of the Cynewulf and Cyneheard episode; he also quotes Plummer and Earle's nineteenth-century edition of the *Chronicle* rather than the *Collaborative Edition*. Aside from printing the entry for 755 as it might have appeared before the later addition of the episode, this piece offers nothing new.

Ferdinand von Mengden studies number words in "Modern English Numerals in the Old English *Orosius*," *Language and Text: Current Perspectives on English and Germanic Historical Linguistics and Philology*, ed. Andrew James Johnston, Ferdinand von Mengden, and Stefan Thim, *Anglistische Forschungen* 359 (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag), 225–39. Old English words for seventy to 120 use a circumfix (*hund-__-tig*) rather than a simple suffix (*-tig*). Other languages, including French and Welsh, have more than one form for certain numbers, but their distribution is complementary, dependent on regional dialect, sociolect, or context (such as English "dozen"). Von Mengden finds that Middle English works with Old English sources keep the circumfix form as late as the thirteenth century; the suffix form occurs even in early ME texts with no OE model. However, in the OE *Orosius* only circumfixed forms are used through Book 3, Chap. 6; from 3.7 on, suffixed forms dominate, with only a few circumfixed appearing. Occurrences of suffixed forms in other texts are disputed. The two surviving nearly complete manuscripts of the *Orosius* show a little scribal divergence, but their general consistency in handling

number words suggests that the change occurs in their exemplar, placing the alternation of forms early. Elizabeth Liggins noted fifteen stylistic features that vary within the *Orosius*, changing around 3.7 or 3.8; while Janet Bately argues that particular features are not significant, von Mengden argues that cumulatively, the differences are significant, though whether the change is one of translator or scribe cannot be determined. In conclusion, he cites Hildegard Tristram's theory that extant OE writing employs a high-class dialect, not a spoken "low" variety; ME dialects reflect a wider range of language use. The *Orosius* provides evidence both for a change during the translation's own writing history and for the coexistence of dialects using two different formations for number words. The dialects must have been mutually comprehensible, or later copyists would not have kept the unusual suffixed forms. The *Orosius* thus provides rare evidence for spoken OE.

Christine Thijs begins "Wærferth's Treatment of the Miraculous in His Old English Translation of Gregory's *Dialogi*," *N&Q* n.s. 53: 272–86, with a quick run-down of the OE manuscripts before turning to the tangled history of the much-copied Latin text. Concluding that no Latin edition matches the OE well, she relies primarily on Migne's edition, but she also employs those by Morrica and Vogüé, using "whichever Latin version is closest to Hecht's O-text" and putting significant variants in her notes (274). Asser wrote that Alfred the Great commissioned a translation of Gregory's accessible miracle stories; she adds that "It only became part of the official translation program in the 990s, by the prefixing of a prose preface in Alfred's name" (275). Following Sisam, she credits the metrical preface to Wulfsig. Wærferth may only have had interlinear glosses as models for translating Latin, leading to a highly literal, not necessarily literary, translation. Thijs then closely compares four brief OE passages with their Latin counterparts, concluding first "that Wærferth is not a slavish translator": his translation is close enough for students to use as a trot for the Latin, yet he also simplified some grammar, added information, and produced a more oral style suitable to a listening audience (285). The oral style includes clearer chronology, shorter and simpler clauses with less embedding, more emphasis, and greater visual detail. Wærferth stayed fairly close to his source text but originated an OE style that later homilists would use.

David F. Johnson asks "Who Read Gregory's *Dialogues* in Old English?" *The Power of Words*, ed. Magennis and Wilcox, 171–204. Though the *Dialogues* seem to fit Alfred's program to translate and teach "those books most necessary for all men to know," there is no clear

evidence it was ever taught to the laity. Instead, the most likely early readers seem to be Alfred, Asser, the Mercians whom Asser mentions (Plegmund, Æthelstan, and Werwulf), and Bishop Wulfsig of Sherborne. Wulfstan of York and the anonymous composer of Vercelli Homily 15 appear to have used a *different* OE translation, and Ælfric mentioned an OE translation without specifying the version. The text remained important to readers in the Benedictine Reform and beyond, but those readers were ecclesiastics, as evidenced by the four extant copies of Wærferth's translation, all post-dating Alfred by a century or more. In Cotton Otho C.i, the name "Wulfsig" has been changed to "Wulfstan"; Johnson concludes that this means Wulfstan II, for the manuscript also contains excerpts and homilies matching Wulfstan II's interests, and the edges of some leaves contain traces of running headers similar to those in Wulfstan's homiliary. Two post-Conquest readers also left traces. Rubrics in Cotton Otho C.i, some in frames, match those of Coleman, a scribe who marked up manuscripts to make them more accessible to other users. The Tremulous Hand of Worcester appears in both Otho C.i and Hatton 76. A layer of lexical glosses may well mark his efforts to master OE. Later, however, he returned to repunctuate the text, perhaps in preparation for a Middle English version (he made one of Ælfric's OE Nicene Creed). Johnson argues further that the repunctuation may have been designed for oral delivery: the account of Florentius, excellent sermon fodder, has a high degree of repunctuation. By contrast, the Tremulous Hand annotates a medical recipe in Hatton 76 that would presumably never be delivered orally, but without repunctuating it. Johnson concludes that churchmen mined the OE *Dialogues* for *exempla*; lay knowledge of the text would have been indirect, through sermons and homilies that used it as a source.

In the introduction to "The Reconstructed MS Cotton Otho A.vi, King Alfred's Anglo-Saxon Edition of Boethius's *De Consolatione Philosophiae*: A Critical Edition," Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Houston, 2005; *DAI* 66A, 11, Laurel A. Lacroix writes, "Editors have found various means of coping with different sections of MS Cotton Otho A vi, but none have set out to actually reconstruct the manuscript itself, a first stage in producing a complete, scholarly edition of Alfred's *Boethius*" (5). That assertion would have been true ten years ago, but the *Boethius* Project, launched in 2002, has now edited each of the two Anglo-Saxon manuscripts and consulted Junius's pre-fire transcript (Junius 12), for an edition expected in early 2009. Lacroix holds up Kevin Kieran's work on the *Beowulf* manuscript as exemplary without mentioning his *Electronic Boethius*, launched in

conjunction with the *Boethius* Project. After briefly laying out the history of the *Boethius* manuscripts, Lacroix offers a theoretically informed discussion of editorial principles. She makes very little editorial intervention, aside from lineating the poetry into verses, does not show caesuras in verse nor use any punctuation in prose or verse, follows manuscript capitalization, and retains all abbreviations. Her edition thus follows Cotton Otho A.vi closely, with damaged portions supplied from Junius 12 and Bodley 18o (the prose-only version of the *Boethius*). Roman, italic, and bold font respectively indicate the three sources. The apparatus appears as endnotes, all but one from the Bodley manuscript. While her editorial methods hold real interest, several important recent items have not been consulted.

In "Alfred's Epistemological Metaphors: *eagan modes* and *scip modes*," ASE 35: 179–217, Miranda Wilcox argues, "The cumulative logic that emerges from the frequency and repetition of the metaphors *eagan modes* and *scip modes* in the Old English *Pastoral Care*, *Consolations of Philosophy* (prose and metres), *Prose Psalter* and *Soliloquies* provides evidence for Alfred's collective authorship of these translations, suggests a chronological scheme for his translations, and offers a tantalizing glimpse into his developing conception of psychology, especially epistemology" (179). Gregory the Great's works incorporate both Platonic understandings of sight and cognition and Christian metaphors of life as a sea journey. Alfred probably first encountered these metaphors in Wærferth's translation of Gregory's *Dialogi*, which provides the vocabulary of *eagan modes* and *scip modes* that Alfred uses as well as a model for interpreting unspecified reference to the eye as applying to the mind's eye. Alfred then uses these images in his own rendering of Gregory's *Regula pastoralis*; towards the end of his translation, he sometimes introduces or elaborates these images where Gregory does not. Gregory's terminology of *oculi mentis* does not appear in the *De consolatione*, but Boethius does employ imagery of sight and blindness, and Alfred reuses his own terminology for Boethius's ocular metaphors. Neither Boethius nor Alfred explicitly uses the mind's ship metaphor in the prose, but marine imagery appears in both Latin and Old English, and the *Meters* introduces the term *ceolum modes*—evidence, Wilcox argues, that Alfred at least supervised the transformation of the Old English prose into verse. Alfred introduces the images independently of the source text more often in his Boethian translations than the *Pastoral Care*. Finally, Augustine's *Soliloquia* offer a complicated model of epistemology that again deploys both eye and ship as metaphors; Alfred connects these two domains

to emphasize not the motion between eye and object but the connection, a bond between eye and object or mind and idea visualized as an anchor. Alfred also does not follow Augustine's hierarchy of physical, intellectual, and then spiritual vision, but emphasizes the "active spiritual effort" necessary as the different levels work together (209–10). Wilcox concludes, "These metaphorical models are not just rhetorical flourish or stylistic ornament but actually constitute Alfred's individual understanding of epistemology and influence his acts of inference about epistemological phenomena" (210). Four tables set forth evidence supporting her rich argument: occurrences of the mind's eye image, the mind's ship image, and Alfred and Augustine's respective epistemologies.

NGD

Nicole Guenther Discenza offers a succinct introduction to "Alfred the Great's *Boethius*" in *Literature Compass* 3: 736–49. She provides a summary of the Latin *Consolation of Philosophy* before moving to a quick sketch of the Alfredian program of translation. She surveys the question of authorship, incorporating the recent arguments of Malcolm Godden against Alfredian authorship of the text. Discenza presents all the positions, but notes that "authorship" is itself a difficult concept in this situation: "To call the translator 'Alfred' must always be to speak of a construction, to some extent; whether this voice belonged to the historical king at all, or how much of the writing is truly his, are questions we will never be able to answer fully" (739). She considers the problems of the extant manuscripts and details the inadequacy of the standard editions; new editions of the text by Malcolm Godden and Kevin Kiernan are on the horizon and will facilitate a new phase of study of this important work. Discenza posits a lay audience of young elites for the translation, perhaps a personal circle of retainers at the Alfredian court. The *Boethius* was possibly intended as a teaching tool: "Boethius's dense, allusive *Consolation* becomes in Alfred's hands something of a reference book. . . . The [Old English] *Boethius* serves as a sort of encyclopedia sketching out information on a variety of learned topics." (740–741). Yet the text also retains its primarily philosophical character, adapted and modified by Alfred in a variety of ways: "Alfred made the *Boethius* not only a manual for the individual seeking transcendent truth but also a guide to life and social responsibilities" (742). In her view, the text is designed to educate promising young lay leaders in both the philosophy and pragmatic matters of rule and social life: "Alfred's *Boethius* presents difficult theological and philosophical content, but

it incorporates more practical ideas whose application to life should be immediately evident to his readers, young men currently at leisure but preparing to assume the responsibilities that go with rank” (744). She ends by briefly discussing the afterlife of Alfred’s translation, citing evidence for use of the work in later periods, directly and indirectly.

Apollonius of Tyre

Daniel Anlezark provides an organizing interpretation of the *Apollonius of Tyre*’s manuscript in “Reading ‘The Story of Joseph’ in MS Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201,” *The Power of Words*, ed. Magennis and Wilcox, 61–94. The varied contents of the manuscript in question—containing (*inter alia*) laws and sermons of Wulfstan, poetic texts (*Judgement Day II, Exhortation to Christian Living, Summons to Prayer*), a fragment of the OE Benedictine Rule and the OE translation of *Apollonius of Tyre*—have provoked a number of theories as to the codex’s purpose, as Anlezark clearly summarizes on 70–3. Anlezark’s entry into the manuscript is through one of the lesser-known items, “The Story of Joseph,” a short Old English translation based on Genesis that circulated as an independent excerpt in the eleventh century. He shows how the “Story of Joseph” can be re-read when apposed to the other texts in its eleventh-century manuscript context; the biblical story provides a key to interpreting the design of the manuscript’s contents. Anlezark notes the conventional figurative understanding of Joseph as a type of Christ and the more surprising early medieval understanding of Joseph as the “inventor of taxation” (76); traditionally, Joseph is an administrator and a “model of good government” (73). Anlezark draws connections between this understanding of Joseph and the similar emphasis in the manuscript’s Wulfstanian texts (i.e., laws and homilies concerned with the social polity). However, Anlezark moves beyond this connection to a deeper, more satisfying level. Examining the literary structure of the “Story of Joseph,” he compares that structure to *Apollonius of Tyre* and finds a number of similarities, “some ... superficial, some more complex,” e.g.: “Both heroes are in and out of cloaks, marking shifts in status; both shed copious tears; both benefit from dreams; both feed the hungry and win favor; both live in exile; both live by their wits (and in both cases their special powers, and telling the truth, cause them great danger)” (82). And further: “Both stories include false reports of deaths and contain typical romance elements such as disguised identity, and family separation and reunion, with true worth shining through social displacement”

(82–3). He observes, however, that the conclusions of the stories are different: Joseph (as a type of Christ) forgives his brothers and demonstrates mercy, while the ending of *Apollonius of Tyre* does not display such a virtue. Anlezark concludes that “whoever added Joseph to the collection intended it to recall, incorporate, and modify the reading of the legalistic Wulfstanian material earlier in the book... ‘Joseph’ continues the Wulfstanian interest in social cohesion, but shows how forgiveness, as opposed to punishment, can restore this” (88, 89). *Apollonius of Tyre* thus fits into the logic of the manuscript compilation based on its congruence with the themes of the various texts, including the “Story of Joseph.” Anlezark concludes: “I would suggest that the inclusion of ‘Joseph’—a text in which the mid-eleventh-century compiler found ready modifications to the Vulgate nuancing the theme of sin, fidelity, and forgiveness—reveals the essential unity of CCC 201 in the intention of this compiler” (88). Following Patrick Wormald, he targets New Minster in Winchester as a possible milieu; further, he notes that “Both the *Regularis Concordia* fragment that begins [the manuscript] and the prayers of confession and absolution that end it contain feminine grammatical forms and suggest the usage of a female religious community” (93). He thus concludes: “This manuscript book is no guide for anchoresses, but with its mixture of admonition, penance, prayer, and liturgical guidance, and the imaginative juxtaposition of secular romance and biblical narrative, it may well have a place in the history of books made for religious women” (94).

A team of researchers—Antonio Miranda Garcia, Javier Calle Martin, David Moreno Olalla, and Gustavo Muñoz González—describe and demonstrate the uses of a computer program, the *Old English Concordancer* (OEC), in “The Old English *Apollonius of Tyre* in the Light of the Old English Concordancer,” *The Changing Face of Corpus Linguistics*, ed. Renouf and Kehoe, 81–98 [see section 3b]. The OEC can search a database of Old English textual materials in a more sophisticated and precise fashion than other programs: it can, for example, search for and list all strong verbs (in any tense, person or number), or all adverbs, or other categories. To utilize the capabilities of the software, the database must be suitably annotated: “[OEC] can handle a corpus only on condition that the annotations comply with the three prerequisites of (1) *vowel length mark-up*, (2) *lemmatizing* and (3) *morphological tagging*” (83; italics in original). This annotation can in part be accomplished through use of another program developed by the team, the *Morphological Analyser of Old English Texts* (MAOET); even so “the annotating process of a

corpus remains yet an admittedly toilsome task" (89). The article explains the technical side of all this in a fashion somewhat resistant to the summarizing capabilities of this reviewer; it would seem best to read this article in conjunction with actually using the program itself. Once all is set up, the *OEC* can apparently analyze texts with a high degree of specificity: "The data retrieved through *OEC* can shed light on any aspect of the text, not only on its morphology: spelling customs, regularity trends, simple syntactical patterns, etc., can easily be detected as well, due to the presentation of the items by words/lemmas and the several combinatorial possibilities, while detailed word and lemma percentages are equally easy to obtain" (88).

Wulfstan

Andrew Rabin examines the construction of "late Anglo-Saxon legal consciousness" (389) in "The Wolf's Testimony to the English: Law and the Witness in the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*," *JEGP* 105: 388–414. By examining the "juxtaposition of traditional legal and homiletic rhetoric" (389) in the *Sermo Lupi* and elsewhere, he maintains that "Wulfstan deploys Old English notions of witnessing and testimony to frame a new concept of the mind before the law" (389). Throughout the essay, Rabin emphasizes the term *gewitnes* (witness) as a concept that connects psychology (or subjectivity) and the demands of law: legal testimony is an important site for the interaction of the self and the state, and this notion of legal witnessing underwrites the *Sermo Lupi*. Rabin first considers Wulfstan's law-codes and the *Institutes of Polity* and argues that Wulfstan mingles legal and theological discourse in his writings; this is all in service to Wulfstan's particular vision of Christian society and English identity. The permanence of written law is connected to the stability of a Christian political state; further, this legal fixity is also linked to Wulfstan's "concept of the knowable self," i.e., the "legal subject" (392). Rabin asserts that the concept of legal subjectivity is given increasing emphasis through the sequence of Wulfstan's drafts of the *Sermo Lupi* and adduces evidence to argue that the homily is thoroughly influenced by legal rhetoric. For example, he argues that Wulfstan's appeal to *soð* at the beginning of the *Sermo Lupi* signals the text's legal dimension, as do elements such as the enumeration of sinful behaviors/crimes. He also draws various analogies between the homily and the law codes and argues that details such as the title and clear attribution to Wulfstan himself validate the text as a quasi-legal document: "In bearing witness to its own legitimacy, the *Sermo Lupi* legitimizes itself as

a witness against the sins of the English as well" (406). Further, Wulfstan's inclusion of Gildas in the final versions of the *Sermo Lupi* enables Gildas to function rhetorically as a legal "witness" within the text. Even the narrator himself is a kind of "witness." This "escalating reliance on the language of legal testimony" (398) in the successive versions of the *Sermo Lupi* "increasingly emphasize[s] testimony's capacity to structure both society and psychological interiority" (398). In the final section of the essay Rabin plays off the idea of the "Manuscript as Witness"; he posits that Cotton Nero A.i, "produced under Wulfstan's direct supervision, suggests an attempt to utilize the manuscript form to evoke the recognizable presence of an absent authority" (409); that is, the manuscript "appropriates many of the characteristics of the human witness in order to perpetuate the immediate presence and moral urgency of the testimonial scene" (409). The mixed "homiletic, penitential, and legal material" (410) in this small manuscript condenses the authority of Wulfstan into a portable mode: "The manuscript thus perpetuates the presence of the archbishop even in his physical absence" (410).

AS

Ælfric

Frederick M. Biggs returns to the question of Ælfric's attitude towards the apocrypha in "Righteous People According to the Old Law': Ælfric on Anne and Joachim," *Apocrypha* 17: 151–77. Ælfric eschewed extrabiblical accounts of Mary's parents, Anne and Joachim, censuring such material both in the *Catholic Homilies* and in his later sermon for Mary's nativity. In her work on the latter for *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici*, Mary Clayton suggested that despite these protestations, Ælfric used the apocryphal *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew* as a "certain, direct source" for his comments on Mary's parents. Biggs, however, argues not only that Ælfric conveys only such information as he believes to be historically accurate—the date of Mary's birth, the ordinary nature of her conception, the names of her parents, and their obedience to Old Testament law—but that these details he may have encountered in less suspicious contexts: Anglo-Saxon liturgy, returning pilgrims telling of Roman depictions of Mary's parents, references in Augustine's *Contra Faustum* (related in turn by Bede), and the account of Anne's three marriages from Haymo's *Epitome*, which circulated independently as the *Trinubium Annae*. While Anne's matrimonial past might have proved troubling to Ælfric given ecclesiastical discouragement of remarriage and prohibition against marrying thrice, both the earliest form of the *Trinubium* and a later Old English translation

underscore that Anne's choice was licit under Mosaic law. Indeed, the fact that these versions of the *Trinubium* echo one of Ælfric's concerns—Anne's obedience to the Law—combined with the presence of the translation in London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D.xiv, a collection of largely Ælfrician material, leads Biggs to posit that the *Trinubium* was “a work which [Ælfric] might well have played a role in disseminating” (154). Biggs concludes by contrasting Ælfric's stance with the roughly contemporary work of Hrotsvit of Gandersheim, who relates details from the *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew* despite recognizing its apocryphal nature: where Hrotsvit might hope that “what appears to be false today may perhaps be proven true another day,” the man from Eynsham strove to impart what was both spiritually and historically true (176; see also 153).

Carmen Acevedo Butcher provides a translation of seventeen items from John Pope's 1967–1968 *Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection* (I.1–12 and II.13–17, excluding I.11a) in *God of Mercy: Ælfric's Sermons and Theology* (Macon, GA: Mercer UP). Her introduction briefly sketches Ælfric's life, notes his historical importance, surveys major works from his corpus, contrasts his homiletic approach to that of Wulfstan, and offers glimpses of his teaching on such subjects as grace, works, and mercy. Prefaces to each translation then offer notes on theological and literary details in the homilies, while the translations themselves strive to be stylistically palatable to the modern reader while preserving as best as possible the sense of the original (25–26). Students using Butcher's work alongside Pope's edition should be warned that the former at times omits minor Anglo-Saxon words, adds words in modern English, and gives far less indication than Pope of lacunae caused by damage to the manuscripts, but the result is a smooth, readable collection that does much to make these homilies accessible to a wider audience.

Gabriella Corona examines Anglo-Saxon perspectives of one of the major figures of the Eastern Church in *Ælfric's Life of Saint Basil the Great: Background and Context* (Cambridge: Brewer). Beginning with the seventh-century Greek life of Basil by Pseudo-Amphilochius, she traces the development of the hagiographic tradition in three ninth-century Latin translations. The earliest of these (*BHL* 1023), on which Ælfric's version is based, is a text whose faithfulness to the Greek at points compromises its clarity (9); in Appendix 1, Corona offers a “working edition” of the Latin using three English manuscripts from the tenth or eleventh century (5; see also 139). Next, she outlines knowledge and veneration of Basil among Anglo-Saxon authors such as Theodore, Aldhelm, Bede, and particularly Ælfric, without whose

“strong and multi-fold interest” the saint's hagiography “would hardly have been known [in England] before the Norman Conquest” (50 and 38). Comparing passages drawn from *BHL* 1023 in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* I.30 and his later *Life of Basil* (*Lives of Saints* I.3), Corona then shows how Ælfric “consciously adjusted his early prose in order to obtain the level of sophistication of his rhythmical style” (73). Turning of the *Life of Basil* proper, Corona examines textual departures from *BHL* 1023, Ælfric's rhetoric and style, and ways in which his rhythm and alliteration strengthen the structure of the text by creating “a tightly interlaced sequence of episodes with many echoes throughout the text” (125). Furthermore, she discusses the manuscripts, previous editions, and her own editorial approach to the *Life of Basil* and *BHL* 1023: in contrast to Skeat's standard, deficient edition of Ælfric's *Life*, for example, she follows Michael Lapidge's method in *The Cult of St Swithun* of emending spellings peculiar to London, British Library, Cotton Julius E.vii (the only complete copy of the *Life*) in accordance with Godden's glossary and the “Ælfrician” spelling of London, British Library, Royal 7.C. xii (133–34). Together with the analysis above, the edition, translation, and commentary that follow not only make a key Ælfrician work accessible in a critical format, but serve as a model for future studies of selections from his *Lives of Saints*.

Having reviewed the diverse nature of Ælfric's audience, and the monk's concern to help his audience recognize both the spiritual and literal significance of his expository material, Karolyn Kinane's study of “The Cross as Interpretive Guide for Ælfric's Homilies and Saints' Lives,” *The Place of the Cross in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Catherine E. Karkov, Sarah Larratt Keefer, and Karen Louise Jolly, Publ. of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 4 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press), 96–110, suggests that the cross may have been a key tool in helping him achieve his pedagogical ends. In Ælfric's accounts, individuals offer practical models of piety as they use the cross as a focal point for prayer; as Ælfric underscores that prayers are answered by God's power in response to human faith, moreover, such use of the cross points the audience past the physical to what is unseen. As a material object with spiritual import, Kinane argues, and one constituting “perhaps the only common interpretive figure available to Ælfric's intellectually diverse audience,” the cross taught Ælfric's audience not only how other aspects of his narratives should be understood, but how to understand God's “books” of Scripture and Nature—indeed, all of life (110; see also 105). The multiple layers of divine revelation have temporal ramifications as

well: just as present meditation on the cross leads one to contemplate Christ's past work and future coming, so believers should come to think of their present state in the broader historical and eschatological context of God's dealings with human beings. Ælfric thus uses the cross "as a hermeneutic tool to train his audiences ... to understand saints, texts, and finally salvation history as likewise having their final significance in God" (96).

In an important study of "Ælfric and Heroic Literature," *The Power of Words*, ed. Magennis and Wilcox, 31–60, Hugh Magennis explores not only Ælfric's rejection of heroic values in his works but his creation of formulaic diction to serve in place of traditional poetic patterns. Viewing the heroic pursuit of worldly glory as antithetical to godly devotion to spiritual ideals, Ælfric "strikingly avoids any hint of the kind of accommodation of Christian content to Germanic expression that had been a key strategy of vernacular Christian writers throughout the Anglo-Saxon period" (35). Rather, Ælfric's saints embody a new model of heroism, steadfastly facing trial while rejecting earthly pleasures and taking (even in the case of his soldier saints) no delight in martial strife. Even when treating the Maccabees, a narrative focusing directly on war, he conveys the ferocity of the pseudepigraphal account without translating it into Germanic terms. On the contrary, throughout his hagiography, Ælfric uses various techniques to evoke the world (and thus values) of the early Church rather than of Germanic heroism: toning down depictions of violence, distancing his saints from ordinary human concerns, stripping out historical detail to render the geo-temporal setting vague, and employing novel elements of style to tell readers they are entering a literary but non-heroic realm (38–40). By the last, Magennis refers not simply to Ælfric's oft-studied rhythmical prose, but his equally-innovative formulaic diction, "a topic ripe for a full-scale study" (50)—recurring patterns of phrases (lines ending, for example, with *and* + an alliterating preterite verb + *þa hæþenan*), "affective qualifiers" (descriptive epithets that guide the audience's attitude towards characters in a narrative), and terms shorn of heroic connotations (such as [*godes*] *þegn*, indicating the faithful believer). In short, Magennis concludes, Ælfric does not simply seek to replace heroic values with an alternate worldview, but works to achieve this goal by constructing "an appropriate formulaic diction for the resolutely ungermanic form of heroic literature he has invented" (41).

A wealth of Ælfrician studies appears in the valuable collection of *Essays for Joyce Hill on Her Sixtieth Birthday*, Leeds Studies in English n.s. 37 (Leeds: Univ. of Leeds, School of English), edited by Mary Swan.

Tadao Kubouchi examines changes of language in the Anglo-Saxon and early Middle English periods in "A Note on Modernity and Archaism in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* and Earlier Texts of *Ancrene Wisse*," *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed. Swan, 379–90. On the one hand, he compares two copies of the *Catholic Homilies* close to Ælfric himself—those in London, British Library, Royal 7 C.xii and Cambridge, University Library, Gg.3.28—noting that the latter's faithful incorporation of (largely authorial) revisions in the former testifies to a common understanding of the *Scriptsprache* or language appropriate for general, widespread use. On the other hand, Kubouchi compares the thirteenth-century versions of the *Ancrene Wisse* present in London, British Library, Cotton Cleopatra C.vi and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 402—the latter again incorporating authorial revisions present in the former, but also manifesting a decidedly different linguistic approach. Where Cleopatra C.vi evinces a tendency to modernize the language to reflect contemporary spoken practice, CCC 402 reveals a preference for formality and archaisms—seen, for example, in its arrangement of elements in imperative clauses and its use of relative pronouns—indicatory of a thirteenth-century "literary standard" harkening back to an earlier age (383).

Hugh Magennis's "Hagiographical Imagery of Light and Ælfric's 'Passion of St Dionysius,'" *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed. Swan, 209–28, considers the unusually prominent role played by light in Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* II.29. While light is a common image in both the Christian and pre-Christian world and appears widely in Ælfrician hagiography, the particular emphasis on light here reflects Ælfric's source, the ninth-century *Passio Sanctissimi Dionysii* of Hilduin of Saint-Denis. Hilduin conflates the biblical Dionysius ("the Areopagite") with a ?third-century missionary to Gaul and a ?sixth-century Neoplatonic writer of that name, noting the last's philosophical interest in "inaccessible light as an image of God's unknowableness" (214). Ælfric shows little interest in the philosophy of "Dionysius" but incorporates Hilduinian light-imagery at a series of points that serve to mark key stages in the narrative. Magennis notes, moreover, that while Ælfric's hagiographic works typically depict "unchanging 'iconic' figures, who convert others but are themselves in a state of achieved sanctity" (223), in this text light-imagery underscores the theme of conversion running throughout—the illumination both of Dionysius and of those to whom he ministers. The result, suggests Magennis, is a work in which "the potential of the traditional image of light expressing sanctity and conversion is most purposefully fulfilled among early medieval hagiographic writings" (224).

Richard Marsden assesses mistranslations of the Vulgate in Ælfric's portion of the *Old English Hexateuch* (or *Heptateuch*) in "Ælfric's Errors: The Evidence," *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed. Swan, 135–60. Attempting to distinguish translation from transmission errors, Marsden notes, is a matter of considerable difficulty: not only do surviving copies of the Old English work differ at points from one another, suggesting textual corruption, but the Latin tradition from which Ælfric worked may also have included variant readings. Marsden examines sixteen apparent errors all told: six errors from Ælfric's portion of Genesis (1–24.26), which occur only in certain manuscripts and which are of a sort Ælfric himself was "most unlikely" to have made (138); eight from Genesis occurring in all manuscripts under examination, which were thus original to Ælfric or introduced early into the manuscript tradition; and two from Ælfric's translation of Joshua, of possibly Ælfrician but ultimately uncertain origin. Previous scholars have treated such errors with caution, recognizing Ælfric's erudition and linguistic skill, and Marsden is no exception. Clear misunderstanding of the biblical context he largely attributes to errors in transmission, subtle shifts from the Vulgate text he often puts down to variant Latin readings, and in one case he even finds Ælfric possibly correcting an error by Jerome—drawing, perhaps, on patristic discussions of the passage. At the same time, however, he leaves open the possibility that fault must lay with the monk of Cerne: working at speed or with less familiar details, "Perhaps, on occasions, even Ælfric nodded" (155).

In "The Invisible Woman: Ælfric and His Subject Female," *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed. Swan, 191–208, Elaine Treharne poses a firm challenge to scholarly assumptions that Ælfric addressed his homilies to men and women alike. Beginning with the *Catholic Homilies* and moving to the *Lives of Saints*, Treharne shows Ælfric suppressing female subjectivity through the use of masculine or ostensibly gender-neutral language ("brothers," "men," "the faithful," and so on, used at times to describe exclusively male experience); silencing female characters by altering his sources (giving them reported rather than direct speech, for example, or eliminating female figures from his narratives); devaluing female sanctity by listing "holy women" as a category separate from and following after apostles, martyrs, and confessors; propagating stereotypes of female failings (such as licentious behavior and undisciplined tongues); and limiting female virtue to such traits as virginity, obedience, and quiet devotion to prayer. In short, Treharne says, "In almost all cases ... from widows to holy women, virgins to married women, Ælfric either

implicitly condemns his imagined audience of contemporary Anglo-Saxon women, or effectively disinvests his texts of explicit relevance for them" (198). In consequence, she concludes that "Women seem to have had little place in Ælfric's scheme of salvation ... and one can but wonder ... if women were genuinely intended by Ælfric to hear his message at all" (200).

In "Rewriting Ælfric: An Alternative Ending of a Rogationtide Homily," *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed. Swan, 229–39, Jonathan Wilcox draws our attention to a marginal entry to *CH* I.18 in Cambridge, Trinity College, B.15.34. Wilcox discusses Anglo-Saxon liturgical and preaching practices for Rogationtide, the content of *CH* I.18 and its relation to Rogationtide themes, and witnesses to *CH* I.18 in the wider context of the *Catholic Homilies'* dissemination, before offering a transcription, edition, and translation of the alternative ending to the homily present in Trinity B.15.34. He identifies the passage which the marginal entry likely is intended to replace, and observes that while it elegantly echoes themes in the homily, it omits Ælfric's strong condemnation of avaricious wealthy persons in favor of a general prayer of submission to God's will—possibly reflecting "a desire not to upset an audience that incorporated precisely such wealthy people" (234). Moreover, while the folio in question has been cropped, not only have lost words from the note been recopied onto the page, but the folio itself has been left some 5mm wider than the rest of the volume. The result suggests that the alternate ending was "as valued as the main text in the transmission of the homily," and thus testifies to "the textual eventfulness or *mouvance* of Ælfric's homiletic texts" (235).

Loredana Teresi's "A Possible Source for the *seofonfealdan Godes gifa*," *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed. Swan, 101–10, addresses three texts concerning the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit: a Latin summary cautiously attributed to Ælfric (the first part of Napier 7), a short Old English version by Ælfric likely written for Wulfstan (Napier 8), and an expanded Old English version by Wulfstan (the latter part of Napier 7). Teresi lists the manuscripts in which the texts appear, discusses the differences between the texts, touches on the question of the Latin text's authorship, and then shows the Latin to be a largely verbatim series of extracts (taken directly or through an intermediate source) from Ambrosius Autpertus's *Expositio in Apocalypsin*. Where the Latin summary associates good gifts with the Spirit and evil ones with the devil, however, Wulfstan's version goes on to discuss the Antichrist and hypocrisy, both central concerns of Autpertus's work. Teresi thus concludes by adding the *Expositio* to our list of works known in

Anglo-Saxon England, and to Ælfric and Wulfstan in particular.

A thorough and highly insightful examination of the historical and manuscript context of a possibly Ælfrician text is found in Winfried Rudolf's "The Source and Textual Identity of 'Homily' Napier XXXI—Ælfric & the *munuccild* of Saint-Maurice d'Agaune," *RES* n.s. 57: 607–22. Rudolf identifies the Latin source for Napier 31 as a legend from the *Libri miraculorum* of Gregory of Tours, posited elsewhere as a source for Chaucer's *Prioress's Tale*: all three texts concern the death of a pious boy whose mother thereafter miraculously hears him sing. Napier 31, which is much closer to Gregory than is the *Prioress's Tale*, nonetheless departs from it in significant ways—depicting the boy's song not as the work of St. Maurice but as a divine response to an abbot's intercession, for example—suggesting either that Gregory was an antecedent source or that the vernacular homilist deliberately adapted Gregory's text. While previous scholars have tentatively attributed Napier 31 to Ælfric, pointing to the possible presence of his rhythmical prose, Rudolf notes that the whole cannot satisfactorily be thus parsed; indeed, he notes, contemporary interlinear and marginal additions not only disrupt the rhythmical flow but hint at ongoing stages of revision (611). At the same time, however, the narrative changes to Napier 31 are in keeping with Ælfric's habits, as Ælfric's belief that men no longer performed miracles led him to portray contemporary miracles as the work of God rather than living saints. Consequently, Rudolf concludes that "the state of Napier XXXI as preserved in [Oxford, Bodleian Library,] Hatton 113 appears to represent a reworking of an originally Ælfrician version" (613). Turning to Hatton 113 itself, he notes that visual cues in the manuscript do not necessarily divorce Napier 31 (which begins "We willað nu secgan sume bysne to þisum" ["We will now recount an example to this end"]) from Napier 30, which precedes it; instead, the account echoes Napier 30's concern with the attitude believers should have regarding death. As capitals and running titles in Hatton 113 and its companion volumes Hatton 114 and Junius 121 serve to indicate textual units which preachers might omit or substitute during delivery, Napier 31 might well form an optional example or ending for the preceding homily (617). Because these markers also link textual units at some remove from each other, however, either in a single manuscript or in different ones, manifold options exist as to which text(s) Napier 31 might complement. Next, turning to the setting in which Hatton 113 was produced, Rudolf offers two reasons why Napier 31 might be included in this private homiliary of St. Wulfstan of Worcester: not

only was St. Wulfstan known for his care for children, but one of his supporters was Ermenfrid, the likely head of the abbey of St. Maurice, at which the events of Napier 31 occur. Concluding with a transcription of the text in Hatton 113 and a reproduction of the legend from Gregory of Tours, Rudolf's study thus draws attention to "continental influences on post-Conquest English manuscript production and revision" even as it "raises fundamental questions about the textual demarcation, manifestation and delivery of composite homilies in manuscripts of the later eleventh century" (620).

Hans Sauer considers "Ælfric and Emotion," *Poetica* [Tokyo] 66: 37–52, from a philological standpoint. While the word "emotion" is fairly new, he notes, entering the English language only in the sixteenth century, the concept certainly appears in Old English as well. Indeed, while certain modern thesauri treat "emotions" as a subcategory of "affections," the 1995 *Thesaurus of Old English* lists it as one of its main classifications. In Ælfric's *Grammar*, emotions appear both in the ubiquitous example of *amo / ic lufige* ("I love") and in his treatment of interjections—a grouping regarded as marginal in recent times (emotion apparently having "no place in a proper grammar" [42]), but historically analyzed as a word class in its own right. Ælfric says that interjections are words thrown in between others (*intericere*), that they are phonologically irregular (varying in length of pronunciation, for example) but clear in their meaning, that Latin and Old English share some but not all interjections in common, and that these words signify agitation of the mind—whether of grief, bliss, astonishment, or whatever. Next, he lists and comments on the interjections included in the *Grammar*, estimating the degree to which Ælfric's vernacular expositions may actually reflect the spoken language by noting the frequency with which they occur elsewhere in the (written) Old English corpus. Finally, having briefly compared the *Grammar* with its main source, the *Excerptiones de Prisciano*, he turns to another genre in which Ælfric depicts emotion: his saints' lives. While moral lessons here come into play—evil persecutors displaying culpable qualities such as pride or anger, and saints remaining patient and long-suffering (seemingly emotionless)—on the whole, Sauer concludes, "apparently [Ælfric] sees nothing wrong with emotions, not even within a grammar" (42).

Where students of Ælfric may normally be accustomed to associate references to *clænnes* with moral purity, Sebastian Sobocki offers a more physical explanation of "Muddy Waters: *Unclæne* Fish in Ælfric's *Colloquy*," *NM* 107: 285–89. Treating the trade of the fisherman, Ælfric's work notes that *unclæne* or *inmundi*

fish are thrown out—words evocative for past scholars of the prohibitions against eating “unclean” animals in ceremonial Mosaic law. Sobecki points out, however, that the range of creatures caught (that is, intentionally sought out) by the fisherman include a number of varieties of shellfish, which the Mosaic diet would have forbidden because they lacked fins and scales (Lev. 11.10, Deut. 14.10). While some might suggest that Ælfric included (ostensibly undesirable) crustaceans and mollusks in his list simply to broaden his students’ vocabulary, research on the *Colloquy* has confirmed the accuracy of other details therein; evidence has been found, moreover, to show that Anglo-Saxons not only ate shellfish, but did so in cases to the point of overfishing. The *unclæne fixas* discarded by the fisherman, therefore, may be rejected not on moral grounds but simply for practical reasons, as the fisherman’s practiced eye determines if any look diseased or otherwise physically unfit for consumption.

In “Ælfric’s Account of St Swithun: Literature of Reform and Reward,” *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West*, ed. Elizabeth M. Tyler and Ross Balzaretti, *Studies in the Early Middle Ages* 16 (Turnhout: Brepols), 167–88, Elaine Treharne considers how hagiography as “historical narrative” may provide valuable evidence regarding the concerns of the period in which it was composed. Ælfric’s vernacular treatment of Swithun, unusual in recounting the posthumous miracles of the saint rather than his deeds in life, shows the saint affirming Æthelwold’s work at Winchester (such as his expulsion of secular canons) and Benedictine values (requiring obedience to instruction, for example), thus testifying to God’s approval of the Benedictine reform and rewarding through miracles their meritorious endeavor. In keeping with his approach to hagiography as a whole, with its emphasis on the trustworthy nature of the orthodox accounts he conveys, and particularly in the case of these local, contemporary events, Ælfric uses personal names, direct speech, and even personal testimony to offer “the rhetoric of verisimilitude, of purposeful historicity” (175). The result is “both a chronicle and a persuasive document,” one which authenticates the movement of which its author was a part even as it provides for its audience models of right action and belief.

Jonathan Wilcox offers a valuable study both of manuscript detail and the broader use of Anglo-Saxon texts in “The Audience of Ælfric’s *Lives of Saints* and the Face of Cotton Caligula A.xiv, fols. 93–130,” *Beatus vir: Studies in Early English and Norse Manuscripts in Memory of Phillip Pulsiano* (Tempe, AZ: ACMRS), 228–63. The face in question is a small ink drawing resting between

Ælfric’s *Lives of Thomas and Martin*, a detail easily overlooked but possibly shedding insight into one aspect of the *Lives*’ audience. Wilcox surveys a range of heads inscribed in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, some clearly related to the narrative at hand and many others seemingly doodled at random, before shrewdly observing that in other copies of Ælfric’s *Lives* the account of Edmund (featuring the saint’s bodyless head) falls between those of Thomas and Martin. Were the head placed as a reflection or reminder of this larger liturgical flow, it would imply a reader (not listener) familiar with English monastic observance. Drawing back to consider the dissemination of the *Lives* as a whole, Wilcox then methodically examines the possible contexts for their use. Unlike the *Catholic Homilies*, principally employed as preaching texts in church, the *Lives* treat saints honored by monks rather than laity, and do so through extended narratives largely lacking homiletic exhortation—texts more suited to contemplative reading or recital at length over a meal than delivery within the confines of a church service. Ælfric’s prefaces to the *Lives* indicate, however, that they were commissioned not for monks but for his lay patrons Æthelweard and Æthelmær. The vernacular nature of the *Lives*, moreover, the size of many of the surviving copies (portable rather than larger and suitable for a lectern), and the unknown origin of most (suggesting circulation in less well-known centers) likewise raise the possibility of employment outside of major monastic houses. Wilcox posits, in fact, a wide range of potential audiences who might have used these works for private reading or public recital: the patrons, secular nobles, and bishops with whom Ælfric corresponded, along with their less-educated households; houses of monks, nuns, and secular priests not fully literate in Latin; and isolated priests and the village communities around them—audiences, in short, which may have appreciated Ælfric’s works not just for their edifying content but also for the sheer pleasure born of listening to well-crafted stories.

AK

Other Homilies

Erika Corradini offers a useful survey and suggestions for future work in “Preaching in Old English: Tradition and New Directions,” *Literature Compass* 3: 1266–77. Corradini observes that in the study of medieval preaching, scholars of later medieval texts and scholars of earlier texts have not interacted much, to the detriment of both camps. She calls for an integrated study of the homiletic and preaching traditions, with greater attention to the continuity of these traditions across the Middle Ages. Corradini points to the importance

of recent work on English sermons of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, particularly the welcome trend to see these texts as snapshots of cultural and reading history at a particular moment and thus texts that should be analyzed on their own terms rather than simply viewed as late corrupt witnesses to earlier original versions. She surveys various scholarly approaches and topics, including the work of source study (with its increased sensitivity to continental connections), style and rhetoric (including the influence of orality), philology and editing, the influence of legal discourse, the liturgy, and so forth. While the homily had been seen as rather stuffy, as (at best) pseudo-literature, the scholarly view is now different and more productive: "[T]he conviction has been growing that the homily should be studied in relation to other genres in view of evidence that points to connections with the political speech, legal writings, poetry, saints' lives as well as theatre and treatises in particular for sermons written in the late Middle Ages when these literary types developed" (1271).

In her continuing work on the fluid boundary between Old English and Middle English, Elaine Treharne tracks "The Life and Times of Old English Homilies for the First Sunday in Lent," *The Power of Words*, ed. Magennis and Wilcox, 205–40, from their period of composition in the later tenth century to their latest textual manifestations in twelfth- and early thirteenth-century manuscript copies. She argues that, as a genre, homilies are particularly fruitful for this sort of analysis, because of the free re-casting and reuse of formulaic elements in subsequent copies. Her intent is to show that scribes/authors (for Treharne the distinction is almost meaningless) are "reutilizing material produced much earlier in the period for varying purposes and audiences" (206) and that "twelfth-century English texts were dynamic, usable, and current" (207). In fact, the copying of English texts in the immediate post-Conquest period is an "ideological statement" in its own right (205). Treharne scrutinizes the progressive transformation of a group of texts: homilies for the First Sunday in Lent, "an important day for preaching" on which "the meaning of Lent as a period of fasting would be explained to an audience" (208). Her set includes eight homilies—Vercelli 3; Blickling 3; Ælfric CH I, 11 and CH II, 7; Wulfstan 14; Bodley 343, 5; Trinity Homily 12; and Lambeth Homily 3—extant in a variety of manuscript copies (full details on 210–11). Although these texts find a continually renewed audience due to their theological utility, there are differences between the pre-Conquest copies and later copies, differences that "demonstrate the homilists' shifting concerns reflecting social and religious developments within

their own periods" (213). In the Bodley Homily, for example, the twelfth-century adaptor has provided an introduction and conclusion that situates the homily in a twelfth-century context. This later version of the homily, far from being a corrupt witness to an earlier text, is really a new text responding to a new cultural context: the homily's overall emphasis is on "the individual's relationship to Christ," part of "established and emergent twelfth-century spirituality" (224). In a series of close case studies for each homily, Treharne demonstrates the complex use, re-use, and adaptation of OE materials in the twelfth century: "This homiletic evolution reflects contemporary concerns, many of which were the same in Anglo-Saxon England, and some of which seem particular to the later twelfth century, such as confession, the practical role of the priest, and the sinfulness and social behavior of the individual" (235).

Treharne comes to similar conclusions through similar methods in "The Life of English in the Mid-Twelfth Century: Ralph D'Escures's Homily on the Virgin Mary," *Writers of the Reign of Henry II: Twelve Essays*, ed. Ruth Kennedy and Simon Meecham-Jones, *The New Middle Ages* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), 169–86. In this case she focuses again on twelfth-century English in its manuscript context, particularly London, BL MS Cotton Vespasian D.xiv. Compiled at Christ Church, Canterbury, the manuscript "contains fifty-two English texts, including homilies written by the Old English author Ælfric, a unique *Life* of St. Neot, a version of the *Dicts of Cato*, and two twelfth-century translations—excerpts from Honorius Augustodunensis's *Elucidarium* and a homily on the Virgin Mary by Ralph D'Escures" (169). These last two items have been previously classified as some of the earliest specimens of Middle English, but Treharne explains that such a distinction between the twelfth-century material and the earlier texts did not exist in the mind of the compiler—he or she saw it all as English, in various forms: "the rigid chronology we assign nowadays to language evolution simply has no relevance within the context of the twelfth century"; there is a "tolerance of linguistic variability" in the period (170). Treharne explores the possible audience and use of such a manuscript and concludes that the texts have been "adapted and manipulated" for a monastic context (171); but she also notes that "monastic" should have a broad definition, with individuals of different abilities and needs: "from *conversi*, to lay brothers, to members of the confraternity" (172). She argues that D'Escures's homily demonstrates the contemporary vitality and significance of the manuscript and its mix of texts old and new. His homily was first delivered orally in French, then translated by

D'Escures into Latin ca. 1100, and then translated into English. Treharne compares the English translation to the Latin source, finding that details of the homily such the emphasis on the perfection and humanity of Mary and the allegorical explication of the Virgin “as unifying the active and the contemplative” aspects of the Christian life all reveal the engagement of both homily and manuscript with the currents of twelfth-century theology and exegesis. There are several other Marian pieces in the collection; the codex was part of the “emerging Marian cultus in the twelfth century” (172). Also, Treharne gives evidence that in adapting the Marian theology in the translation, the writer borrows from the Ælfric homily in the same codex on the same subject; thus we have an example of the complex cross-fertilization going on in the period, a “praxis of tradition and innovation” (180) typical of the period’s English religious writings.

In a close reading replete with a fine attention to syntax and rhetorical structures, Hiroshi Ogawa explores the “Language and Style in Two Anonymous Old English Easter Homilies,” *Inside Old English: Essays in Honour of Bruce Mitchell*, ed. John Walmsley (Oxford: Blackwell), 203–21. The two homilies in question are (using DOE short titles) *HomS 27* (found in CCC 162) and *HomS 28* (found in Junius 121). These are “composite homilies,” works composed by more or less a cut-and-paste method, and thus have not received much critical attention. Ogawa uses them to explore questions of style and attitude toward sources. The homilies incorporate Ælfrician and non-Ælfrician material, exhibiting the eclectic use of source material characteristic of the late Anglo-Saxon homily. Ogawa describes *HomS 27* as a looser, freer form of translation and style, with little attention (at times) to “grammatical and logical consistenc[y]” (204). In comparison to Ælfric’s more controlled prose style, this homily displays a casual, “colloquial” style, possibly the result of the author working from memory (209). *HomS 28* displays a contrasting style: more controlled, careful, unified, and consistent in its control of the source material.

Claudia Di Sciacca offers a detailed study of two related homiletic motifs in “The *Ubi Sunt* Motif and the Soul-and-Body Legend in Old English Homilies: Sources and Relationships,” *JEGP* 105: 365–87. This essential study investigates the sources of the soul and body legend and the related *ubi sunt* motif by concentrating on four homilies that combine the two in penitential and eschatological contexts: Vercelli IV, the “Macarius” Homily (CCC 201), Assmann XIV (CCC 302), and *Sermo Augustini* (Luiselli Fadda VII) in Cambridge, University Library Ii.1.33. Di Sciacca provides a

short history of both motifs and notes that the earliest vernacular witnesses to the soul and body legend are in Old English. She provides a nuanced exploration of the rhetoric of both subjects, explaining that the *ubi sunt* motif both constructs an “evocative nostalgia at the passing of life’s beauties and joys” (366) and “lends itself readily to the *contemptus mundi* theme” (366). In combination, the two elements interact in complex ways: the *ubi sunt* motif looks “backwards to the past of the individual (or indeed humanity as a whole), and the soul-and-body legend look[s] forward to what waits one immediately after death or after Doomsday” (372–373). This “productive tension between the topos and legend ... allowed Anglo-Saxon homilists to exploit their affective and didactic power more effectively” (366). Di Sciacca then carefully tracks the changing rhetorical uses of the motifs in the homilies, noting changes in the impact of the topoi depending upon their local deployment. In Vercelli IV, for example, the use of the motif creates a more personalized feel with an emphasis on the individual. Di Sciacca untangles the complex web of associations among the homilies, their Latin sources and other intertextual borrowings. She demonstrates that the main sources of the paired legend and motif are Isidore’s *Synonyma* and the works of (Pseudo-) Ephraim the Syrian; the influence of these works can account for the connection of soul-and-body legend with the *ubi sunt* motif. St. Augustine’s, Canterbury, with its library’s connection to continental manuscripts and Anglo-Saxon missionaries, seems the likely source of this material. This archive helps define “the literary and theological milieu from which the frequently imaginative eschatology of Anglo-Saxon vernacular homilists developed” (365). As she summarizes: “In the case of the *Synonyma*, the evidence suggests that, whatever its route of transmission, the work was often associated in Anglo-Saxon England with a corpus of texts, mostly of Eastern origin, that was transmitted by the Irish, and that contributed to a rich stock of eschatological, penitential, and devotional motifs in Anglo-Saxon homiletic and devotional literature. This corpus, which included *Synonyma* as well as a number of Ephraim’s (or Ephraimic) texts, may well have been housed at Canterbury, and constituted a kind of archive for Old English anonymous homilists, thereby contributing significantly to the distinctive character of the soul-and-body tradition in Anglo-Saxon England” (387).

Jill A. Frederick asserts the importance of speeches in hagiography in “Confessional Discourse in an Old English Life of St. Margaret,” *The Power of Words*, ed. Magennis and Wilcox, 115–31. By looking particularly at scenes of interrogation, she argues that these scenes

in the *Life of St. Margaret* found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College manuscript 303 “bear a remarkable resemblance to the rite of confession” (117). Departures from the Latin source—various details in wording, cadence, and rhetoric in the encounters between Margaret and the devil—appear to be indebted to the discourse of the penitentials and the *ordo confessionis*. Structurally, then, Margaret would occupy the role of a confessor and the devil would be the castigated sinner. Frederick then further argues that there is historical evidence for female confessors, and she observes that while the depiction of Margaret as a confessor was not impossible, it perhaps felt a bit unorthodox to authors such as Ælfric. Margaret’s confessional aspect was perhaps highlighted by the author “to emphasize her sanctity” (130–131), and this “pattern of confession ... helps shape and unify the Old English prose text” (119).

Kazutomo Karasawa re-evaluates the meaning of the word *dream* in “OE *dream* for Horrible Noise in the Vercelli Homilies,” *SN* 78: 46–58. *Drēam* occurs in eschatological contexts once in Vercelli II and twice in Vercelli XXI. Editors have been skeptical of these words in context, since they seem to refer to the “joyful sound” made by the inhabitants of hell. Editors therefore have tended to emend to *hrēam* (“outcry, shouting”). Kazutomo argues that the word is not a scribal error for *hrēam*, emendation is unnecessary, and that the word in these Vercelli homilies follows sense 3c. of the *DOE*: “clamour, noise of loud wailing, lamentation (of the damned at Doomsday)” (s.v. *drēam*). Kazutomo concludes: “Although the fact remains the same that it is attested to represent some joyous noise much more frequently, it is not surprising that *dream* represents tumultuous, dreadful, sorrowful, lamenting noise made by dwellers in hell in the Vercelli Homilies” (52).

Paul E. Szarmach revisits some of his earlier work in “Vercelli Homily XIV and the Homiliary of Paul the Deacon,” *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed. Swan, 75–87. He reviews the place of Vercelli XIV and closely related homilies in the Vercelli codex and returns to the question of the homily’s source. The ultimate source for the homily is Gregory the Great’s *Dialogues*; in earlier work Szarmach had postulated that the author of Vercelli XIV worked from Gregory’s Latin or perhaps from an Old English translation of the same. However, Szarmach now demonstrates that the Vercelli author was in fact working from a section of the *Dialogues* included in the Homiliary of Paul the Deacon. He gives corresponding evidence that a Latin item in Cambridge, Pembroke College 23, fols. 289r1–89v2 represents such an “intermediate text between Gregory’s *Dialogues* and Vercelli Homily XIV” (78), and concludes that “[t]he existence

of a partial correspondence must now point the direction of research toward homiliaries of the Paul the Deacon type” (80). Szarmach provides an edition of the Latin excerpt, including plates of the manuscript pages.

Other Religious Texts

Teresa Marqués Aguado uses computer resources to analyze manuscript punctuation in “Old English Punctuation Revisited: The Case of the Gospel According to Saint Matthew,” *SELIM* 13: 51–72. Using the *Old English Concordancer*, a program developed to analyze annotated corpora and retrieve information about punctuation marks in context, she crunches the punctuation data for the OE Gospel of Matthew. The essay argues for systematic use of punctuation on the part of medieval scribes and offers suggestions for equivalent modern punctuation. She looks at four marks: the *punctus*, *punctus versus*, *punctus elevatus*, and the “section marker.” The article reports the results of the searches in four categories: at the “macro-textual level” (i.e. “chapters, paragraphs, and sense units,” 56), at the level of the sentence (independent sentences, juxtaposed sentences; marking coordinate clauses and subordinate clauses), the clause (marking vocative expressions or elements belonging to the same clause), and the phrase (grouping the elements belonging to a noun phrase or the enumeration of a series; marking coordinate phrases). According to the statistical results, certain general trends can be observed, but in all cases there are exceptions and overlapping use of punctuation in the results. In the face of sometimes uncooperative results, she concludes the data reveals “[p]articular and consistent uses” of punctuation and that therefore medieval punctuation is “far from haphazard” (67). However, there are exceptions and overlap in almost all the categories, so her ultimate conclusion perhaps argues for general trends rather than hard and fast rules: as she notes, there is a general sense of “consistency ... in the function and uses of punctuation symbols” rather than specific uses of particular marks. A table on p. 69 sets out suggested modern equivalent punctuations for each of her categories of medieval punctuation.

AS

William H. Smith studies “The Tradition of Vernacular Prayer in Anglo-Saxon England,” Ph.D. Diss., U of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2005; *DAI* 67A, 1. He catalogues the twenty-eight known Old English private prose prayers, giving full manuscript information, *DOE* and Cameron numbers, editions, sources and analogues, and comments. He excludes liturgical prayers

and glosses on Latin prayers but includes prayers that are complete translations from Latin. In his second chapter, Smith sketches the development of private devotional books from eighth-century Latin books to the extant private Old English prayers, starting in the mid-tenth century. In Chapter Three, Smith classifies prayers according to type, manuscript grouping, or author; Smith proposes source relationships, constructs stemmae for some texts, and offers editions and translations of two prayers. Chapter Four analyzes formulaic phrases and other stylistic markers and argues that while OE prayer relies on Latin, it develops its own repertoire to form a tradition of its own. His final chapter examines manuscript context: like their Latin contemporaries, OE prayers are added to a variety of manuscripts, ranging from the liturgical to books for private devotion. Some manuscripts have connections to the Benedictine Reform, while other prayers were clearly written earlier. He identifies a tradition beginning in the tenth century and strengthened by the Reform, a tradition by no means homogeneous but drawing upon a common trove of terms and phrases.

Medical Texts

James T. McIlwain examines the relation between “Brain and Mind in Anglo-Saxon Medicine,” *Viator* 37: 103–12. Antonina Harbus and Malcolm Godden have both found the mind linked to the heart or breast in literary texts; McIlwain examines instead medical texts, including *Bald’s Leechbook*, the OE *Herbarium*, *Lacnunga*, and *Peri Didaxeon*. Vertigo is, unsurprisingly, associated with the brain or top of the head. *Leechbook II* also declares that the stomach is connected to the brain, and imbalanced humors there can affect the brain (*brægen*), leading to depression, mania, or other illnesses. Mental diseases are frequently called *deofolseoc(nes)* and occasionally *feondseoc* or *feonda adl*, but even these have medical treatments, including herbs and potions, and some Latin sources describe the ailments as brain-related. *Fylleseoc* and *bræcseoc* gloss Greek and Latin words for epilepsy, which is described in Latin texts as a disorder of the brain. Regardless of cause, these various disorders were described as illnesses of the brain. McIlwain concludes that Anglo-Saxon medical texts followed the “encephalocentric tradition of Hippocrates and Galen” (112), emphasizing the brain, while the more literary texts studied by Harbus and Godden seem to follow a more cardiocentric tradition. The two were not irreconcilable, particularly if the connections to the heart are understood figuratively rather than purely literally.

McIlwain next investigates “The Condition Called *Neurisn* in *Leechbook I*,” *N&Q* n.s. 53: 142–44. *Leechbook I*, Chap. 59, begins with *lyftadl* (paralysis) and then turns to *neurisn*. No extant glossary includes this term, but Funke and Feulner have established its relation to Greek *aneurusma*. Why aneurisms should appear with paralysis, however, is unclear; the remedies differ, with paralysis treated by (among others) bloodletting and emetics, and *neurisn* by a salve or with crushed earthworms. Earthworms are otherwise recommended for vein and nerve problems. Both the Latin *Synopsis* and the *Practica Petrocelli* note certain risks of bloodletting, and McIlwain suggests that Cwenburh suffered pain and swelling in an arm because the wrong vein had been cut (Bede, *HE*). Aneurism is the dilation of a blood vessel, which can be caused by phlebotomists’ work; McIlwain concludes that the term may have been coined by analogy with *paralisin* and included in the chapter on paralysis or *lyftadl* because *neurisn* was a known complication of blood-letting, a treatment for paralysis.

NGD

In a brief overview essay Stephanie Hollis envisions a monastic context for medical treatment in “The Social Milieu of Bald’s *Leechbook*,” *AVISTA Forum Journal* 14.1 (2004): 11–16. She surveys the facts of the extant OE medical treatises in their manuscript contexts, noting the growing scholarly consensus that they were “practical working manuals” (11). Hollis explores who these practitioners might be and what kind of patients they might be treating, noting various scholarly assumptions about the practice of medicine in the period. She maintains “that Bald’s *Leechbook* substantially consists of a compilation made for a paid professional, presumably a monk, and pretty certainly a court physician” and speculates that this man might have been “Ælfheah the Bald, Bishop of Winchester, ca. 934–51” (12). Hollis discusses what the use of various ingredients might tell us about this social milieu: these ingredients point to an upper-class audience, one able to afford more expensive remedies. The later textual tradition of Bald’s *Leechbook* “is a sign of the monasteries continued engagement in a traditional (and lucrative) practice of treating the laity, despite canonical prohibitions” (13).

AS

Not Seen

Kozuka, Yoshitaka. *A Linguistic Study of the Authorship of the West Saxon Gospels*. Osaka: Osaka Univ. Press.

5. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works

John Bequette, "Bede's Advent Homily on the Gospel of Mark: An Exercise in Rhetorical Theology," *American Benedictine Rev.* 57: 249–66, points out that the rhetorical nature of Christian theology is most in view in the homily and proceeds to discuss Bede's homilies generally and the rhetorical tradition which may underpin them. Because of the "emotive nature of the Advent liturgical season," homilies from that season are particularly suited for further investigation, and Bequette then focuses on Bede's first Advent homily on Mark 1.4–8. In his comparison between John the Baptist and Christ, "Bede uses various rhetorical *topica* to develop his theological ideas," including the topics of place and comparison, and the figures of *effictio*, parallelism and *epanaphora*. In conclusion, Bequette emphasizes that the effort of Christian rhetoric is to demonstrate harmony between *res* and *uerbum*, but notes that Bede does not do so in this homily. Instead, Bede directs his audience to Christ, the *uerbum* made flesh, the site of "final resolution."

In "The Venerable Bede and Saint John Damascene," *Sourozh* 88 (2002): 35–39, Andrew Louth offers a slightly revised version of the epilogue to his book on St. John Damascene (*St John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology* [Oxford, 2002]) in which he compares and contrasts the lives and interests of these two contemporaries. Louth notes that both may mark the end of the patristic period (in the Latin and Greek traditions, respectively) and that both, as monks and teachers, struggled with similar sorts of problems. There are also, however, extreme contrasts in their backgrounds and their writings, especially in the centrality of and approach to exegesis in Bede's *oeuvre*.

Eric Jay Del Giacco, "Exegesis and Sermon: A Comparison of Bede's Commentary and Homilies on Luke," *Medieval Sermon Studies* 50: 9–29, does what his title suggests: he compares Bede's fourteen homilies with pericopes from Luke with the commentary on the same book in order to ascertain what we might discover about Bede's methods of composition and notions of what defined these separate "genres." Del Giacco looks at specific passages in common and points out how Bede distinguishes homily from commentary stylistically, recognizing the difference between oral and literary works: the homilies are "consciously oral" (13). Commentary is sometimes more complex than homily, as in the case of the discussion of Luke 1.26–27, and this leads into a discussion of the respective audiences of each and how these are "most clearly delineated by

each work's treatment of the figure of the nativity shepherd" (19). Del Giacco also examines Bede's original passages and his relationship to his patristic sources before returning to questions of audience to conclude.

Edited by Claudio Leonardi and Giovanni Orlandi, *Biblical Studies in the Early Middle Ages* (Florence, 2005) collects some of the papers from a similarly named conference at Gargnano on Lake Garda in 2001. The volume contains seventeen papers in four sections ("Early Medieval Exegesis"; "Bede"; "Exegesis in the Carolingian Period"; and "Questions of Method"), but only five of these qualify for inclusion here.

First of all, Glenn W. Olsen, "The *Ecclesia primitiua* in John Cassian, the Ps. Jerome Commentary on Mark and Bede," 5–27 summarizes all that we know (and do not know) about the Ps.-Jerome commentary on Mark (printed in *CCSL* 82) before looking at views of the early church in Cassian and Bede and how each relates to the Ps. Jerome *Expositio*. Views found in Bede are closer to Ps. Jerome than those in Cassian, though Bede is more inclined to pause over "historical detail and reconstruction" than Ps.-Jerome is.

The section on Bede contains three papers of interest. In discussing "Bede's Commentary on I Samuel" (77–90), George Hardin Brown notes that it is one of Bede's "finest hermeneutic tracts" and one on which he expended much effort. It is also Bede's longest Old Testament commentary. Nevertheless, it survives in only eight manuscripts, far less than many of his other exegetical works. Laistner's explanation—that the strongly allegorical nature of the commentary discouraged readers—cannot be accepted. Instead, Brown posits that the solution lies in the "vagaries of textual transmission," and considers that the commentary was apparently not known to Claudius of Turin and Hrabanus Maurus, appeared in a poor first edition, and was not perfectly treated even in the *CCSL* edition of David Hurst: the commentary deserves better treatment. Next, Arthur Holder, "The Anti-Pelagian Character of Bede's Commentary on the Song of Songs" (91–103), examines another rather allegorical work in order to address some misconceptions and pursue the idea that the anti-Pelagian nature of the text "provides the clue necessary for solving a number of its riddles." The misconceptions include the composition of the work in stages, the nature of Julian of Eclanum's approach to the Song, Bede's rejection of Mariological interpretation and the notion that the commentary cannot be precisely dated. It may be an earlier commentary

than previously supposed, and was perhaps occasioned by Bede's knowledge of Julian's work on the same text: Bede's career as Old Testament exegete may have begun because of his "anti-Pelagian convictions." W. Trent Foley's "Bede's Exegesis of Passages Unique to the Gospel of Mark" (105–24) rounds out the section on Bede. Foley suggests that, at least so far as Bede was aware, no one had completed a commentary on Mark when he set out to write his own. Parallels between the Ps.-Jerome commentary (mentioned above) and Bede seem to derive from shared reliance on Gregory. Foley considers the relative lack of interest in Mark, and suggests that it contains perhaps forty unique passages (or fifty-eight modern verses), passages which Foley then considers. As might be expected, Bede sometimes says nothing, sometimes offers original literal interpretation and sometimes original moral or figurative interpretation. Foley concludes that Bede is not at all unwilling to comment on passages for which he has no patristic precedent, but observes that Bede's exegesis nevertheless almost always accords with "the well-worn footpath of his own theological agenda and that of the earlier Fathers."

Finally, in the section on exegesis in the Carolingian period, Rossana Guglielmetti, "Il commento al Cantico dei Cantici di Alcuino di York: appunti per un'edizione" (143–53), makes some preliminary remarks toward an edition of Alcuin's commentary on the Song of Songs. Guglielmetti's edition (*Alcuino, Commento al Cantico dei Cantici con i commenti anonimi Vox ecclesie, Vox antique ecclesie*, Millennio medievale 53, testi 13 [Florence: SISMEL Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2004]), though it appeared prior to this essay, is in fact the later work. Here, Guglielmetti considers the problem of the two recensions of the commentary, their manuscript traditions and the relationship to Angelomus of Luxeuil.

2006 was the second year in a row to see a full-length collection of essays on Bede. *Innovation and Tradition in the Writings of the Venerable Bede*, edited by Scott DeGregorio, contains ten essays, with introduction and bibliography. DeGregorio introduces the collection by noting the latest developments in the study of Bede. Roger Ray, in "Who Did Bede Think He Was?" (11–35), examines Bede's presentation of his career against the reality of what Bede accomplished, and concludes that Bede in fact had a much grander view of his own place in literary history than his autobiographical comments might suggest. Bede not only felt comfortable walking where there were no footprints, but also seems to have thought that "the footsteps of the Fathers were too few and sometimes too faint." He was original and innovative and most likely believed he was taking and would

take his place among the *patres*. Next, Alan Thacker, "Bede and the Ordering of Understanding" (37–63), restates the idea that "Bede was not a humble or a modest figure," and goes on to explore Bede's conception of himself as *doctor* within the context of his "educative program." Thacker suggests that Bede, seeing himself as the Augustine of his age, forged "a remarkably ordered and interconnected program of writing" linking exegesis, history, and computus. Though exactly what constitutes "science" has historically been problematic, Bede's contributions to it are the focus of Faith Wallis's "*Si naturam quaeras: Reframing Bede's Science*" (65–99). Wallis attempts a new approach via an understanding of Bede's use of the word *natura* in cosmological and computistical contexts. Ultimately, "what defines *natura* and underpins *ratio* is the trustworthiness and faithfulness of the Creator, manifested as the *stabilitas, regula, and ordo* 'programmed' into the constitutive properties of creatures and the calculable patterns of time." Calvin B. Kendall, "The Responsibility of *auctoritas: Method and Meaning in Bede's Commentary on Genesis*" (101–19), looks at Bede's dual focus on the historical and spiritual understanding of scripture in *In Genesim*. An exegete, in Bede's estimation, had a responsibility first to explain the biblical narrative itself then to unearth any divine meaning or message therein (*mysterium, allegoria, arcanum* and *sacramentum*). Kendall examines Bede's approach to exegesis with particular focus on the vocabulary involved. George Hardin Brown repeats remarks made elsewhere (see above, in Leonardi and Orlandi) about Bede's commentary on Samuel, "Bede's Neglected Commentary on Samuel" (121–42), with a few other notes on the particular style of the commentary. Bede's exegesis continues to be the focus in Scott DeGregorio's "Footsteps of His Own: Bede's Commentary on Ezra-Nehemiah" (143–68). After pointing out that Bede's commentary is the only one to survive from the patristic or medieval era (he was not following any tradition of commentary in this instance, which makes his mention of Jerome in the prologue an act of "authorial positioning"), DeGregorio traces a little of the history of the book and describes Bede's approach to it in both the mystical and the literal sense. Interestingly, Bede relates Ezra-Nehemiah also to "concerns that he had about the repentance and reform of his own native Northumbrian church." Further, Bede's conclusion to the commentary, in which he suggests that he has contributed new things to the exegesis of the book, "repudiat[es] ... the compiler's role so often hung upon him." The final paper on Bede's biblical commentaries is Arthur G. Holder's "Christ as Incarnate Wisdom in Bede's Commentary on the Song

of Songs" (169–88). Holder notes (as above, in Leonardi and Orlandi) that Bede refutes Julian of Eclanum's opinion that the text is a "celebration of human sexuality," but his main source is Apponius on the Song of Songs rather than Origen or Gregory. Holder's main suggestion, though, is that the commentary, which must be interpreted in concert with the "great narrative of salvation history," may help us better read the *Historia ecclesiastica* and hagiographical works. Themes and images—such as the balance between contemplation and action (Cuthbert) and apostolic motherhood—from the *HE* are much better understood if read in the context of exegetical remarks on the same topics. Further, Holder concludes, "while Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* is indeed the story of a chosen people coming to a promised land, and a blueprint for constructing a holy temple, and the extension of the apostolic mission to the ends of the earth, it is at the same time a song of love in which a bridegroom calls and a bride answers, in which a mother feeds and children are nourished, in which Divine Wisdom takes flesh and human souls sigh with longing for a vision of their God." Lawrence T. Martin, in "Bede's Originality in his Use of the Book of Wisdom in his Homilies on the Gospels" (189–202), finds that Bede's homilies, unlike his exegetical works, contain virtually no patristic quotations. However, the homilies do contain many scriptural citations, as if Bede were engaged in "concordance exegesis," or bringing forward whatever other passages the passage under discussion recalled to him. While the so-called "Wisdom books" appear often in these contexts, Martin focuses on Wisdom proper, and notes that there are perhaps seventeen "echoes" in Bede's homilies, echoes which may have offered particular edification and enjoyment for the more learned, or for those who had heard the homilies multiple times. Walter Goffart, "Bede's History in a Harsher Climate" (203–26), provides a different kind of reevaluation of Bede from the perspective of his "intentionalist approach" to the writing of the *Historia ecclesiastica*. The England that emerges from Bede's pen is unlikely to bear much resemblance to its historical reality, and Bede, according to Goffart, knew that very well, despite the fact that many earlier scholars could not attribute anything but innocence to Bede. Goffart suggests that we should look to contemporary issues, such as "the archbishopric of Canterbury and the elevation of Northumbria to the status of an independent ecclesiastical province," to help understand Bede's depiction. Goffart returns to and elaborates upon previous comments of his about Wilfrid and Bede's censuring of Acca—mainly in his *The Narrators of Barbarian History*—and reiterates that "the context in which Bede

wrote the *Historia ecclesiastica* was different from the one portrayed in its pages." Finally, and appropriately, Joyce Hill's "Carolingian Perspectives on the Authority of Bede" (227–49) sifts through the evidence for Bede's status as *auctoritas* in the Carolingian period. Anglo-Saxon connections to the continent were important, but Bede's status must also have been growing independently, as an early Carolingian work such as Paul the Deacon's homiliary uses Bede more than any other author. Hill also brings the evidence of conciliar texts into the discussion, noting that Bede's authority is invoked in five councils from the first half of the ninth century, and Hill shows why each work cited might have been chosen.

Raeleen Chai-Elsholz is also concerned with how Bede is remembered, but this time specifically within the context of Symeon of Durham and the *Libellus de exordio* ("Symeon of Durham and the *memoria* of Bede," in *Reliques et sainteté dans l'espace médiéval*, ed. Deuffic [see section 7], 425–38). Symeon "adopts" Bede for Durham, and adapts Bede's method of historiography as set out in the *Historia ecclesiastica*. In fact, Bede is also, along with the Bible, by far the major source for the *Libellus*, and is more prominent than Cuthbert in the work overall. Chai-Elsholz examines how Bede's life is portrayed in the *Libellus*, and then looks at two later stories which involve Bede, the removal of his relics to Durham by Elfred, and how his *HE* inspires Aldwin and others to visit deserted monastic sites. These stories demonstrate "the concentration of spiritual celebrity at Durham in the form of incoming relics" and how the *Libellus* highly values continuity. For Symeon, Bede is the "most influential source" and Cuthbert is the "most important saint" in the history of Durham.

N.J. Higham also produced a full length-study of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica: (Re-)Reading Bede: The Ecclesiastical History in Context* (London: Routledge). Higham's approach narrows from a general assessment of Bede's reputation in later generations to the purpose of the *HE*, its structure, organization and context, and just how Bede expected his audience to respond. Higham first stresses the need for a sensitivity to the differing perspectives of a modern audience and Bede, particularly within the discipline of history, before moving on to the *HE*: "What was Bede thinking as he was writing and then as he looked back over the work as he brought it to completion?" Contemporary issues are the focus of the second chapter of the book, including Bede's perception of the need for reform and Walter Goffart's suggestion that Bede wrote against the view of history in Stephen's *Life of Wilfrid* (but see Goffart above). The preface and the recapitulation are

particularly examined for what they tell us about Bede's aims. From the parts written last, Higham moves to the structure of the work overall, a comparison of the *HE* and Bede's *Chronica maiora*, and a discussion of the role of Book III. The fourth chapter addresses "message and discourse," noting particularly that Bede was not as concerned about precise historical events as he was with an "underlying message," a message which is evident if one approaches the *HE* "less as a 'history' ... and more as a collection of moral fables." Higham concludes with a chapter on Ceowulf and immediate political context, and reminds us of the main point of the book overall, that "Bede's narration of the past was to a large extent subordinated to his concern with the present and immediate future," despite the difficulties we, as a modern audience, have in approaching the text.

Lutz E. von Padberg's monograph on the setting of religious confrontation, *Die Inszenierung religiöser Konfrontationen: Theorie und Praxis der Missionspredigt im frühen Mittelalter* (Stuttgart, 2003), ranges widely on just what the subtitle suggests: theory and praxis of the missionary sermon in the early Middle Ages. Of special interest here are sections on Bede, Daniel of Winchester, Boniface, and Alcuin. For Bede, the author treats both the *Epistola ad Ecgbertum* and the *Historia ecclesiastica* at some length, while there are also significant passages concerning the letters of Alcuin, Boniface, and Daniel of Winchester, mainly for their thinking about missionary activity and preaching in the section on the theory and policy of missionary preaching. However, given that the chronological span of the book reaches from the conversion of the English to twelfth-century Scandinavian events, there is much of interest here for those concerned with Anglo-Saxon England.

Another overdue monograph is that of Kerstin Springsfeld, who considers *Alkuins Einfluß auf die Komputistik zur Zeit Karls des Großen* (Stuttgart, 2002). Springsfeld's book is divided into five main sections, after which come conclusions, bibliography, appendices, and indices. Each section, in turn, treats (I) the importance of astronomy and computus in Alcuin; (II) the correspondence of Alcuin and Charlemagne on astronomy and computus; (III) the computistical treatises attributed to Alcuin, including *Ratio de luna*, *De saltu lunae*, *De bissexto*, and the *Calculatio Albini magistri*; (IV) Carolingian encyclopedias on the reckoning of time; and (V) special issues handled by Alcuin, such as Easter calculations or the *stellae errantes* (and in this final section the precedents of Bede's writings are often also considered).

Toby Levers, "The Construction of Subjectivity in the Cædmon Story," *Quaestio Insularis* 6: 98–119, examines

how Bede's account of Cædmon "works to construct a particular, altogether new concept of authorship in Anglo-Saxon poetry." For the first time, an author is attached to vernacular poetry, and this in turn occasions "Bede's formation of a new type of literary subjectivity, which functions through the dichotomies of reader-author, and individual-community." Levers further observes that in this shift from oral to written we move from an audience witnessing a singer to a written text which requires "the creation of a 'vicarious voice'; a fictional speaker who stands in for the absent singer." Levers considers the various aspects of the episode, including Bede's role in providing the prose context or "exegesis," and reminds us that we have here "a crafted representation of the emerging figure of the individual vernacular poetic subject in Anglo-Saxon culture."

Bill Friesen, "Answers and Echoes: the *Libellus responsionum* and the Hagiography of North-western European Mission," *Early Medieval Europe* 14.2: 153–72, examines the *Libellus responsionum* with three specific aims: (1) to address its "textual context"; (2) to consider how well known the text was to missionaries in England and on the continent; and (3) to look at how it may have influenced later biographies of Augustine and Boniface. Friesen explains the relationship between the three textual families of the *Libellus*, suggests that there is ample evidence by the ninth century for the circulation of the text in "the traditional sphere of Boniface's influence" and gives some examples of specific manuscripts, then considers Willibald's *Vita Bonifatii* and the *Altera uita Bonifatii* and the *Libellus* at some length.

Damian Bracken, "Virgil the Grammatian and Bede: a Preliminary Study," *ASE* 35: 7–21, demonstrates that some of the etymological material in Bede's *De temporum ratione* which has to date proven impossible to source in fact comes ultimately, though probably not directly, from Book XI of Virgil's *Epitomae*, *De cognationibus etymologiae aliorum nominum*. The so-called "Merovingian Computus" also betrays familiarity with Virgil, and working out the relationship of these early computistical works remains difficult. Bracken also notes that the use of Virgil has some bearing on the vexed question of the existence of a school of "Hiberno-Latin exegesis," particularly since the Ps-Bede commentary on the Pentateuch, in its Genesis portion, also shows Virgilian influence.

The nature of sacred buildings in ninth-century Carolingian circles is the subject of Samuel W. Collins's thesis, "*Domus domini patet figura mysterii: Architectural Imagination and the Politics of Place in the Carolingian Ninth Century*" (PhD dissertation, U of California, Berkeley; *DAI* 67A: 4). Examining a range of authors,

Collins shows how there was not one understanding, but rather a split between those who considered sacred buildings in every way to be continuations of historical sacred places and those who thought no earthly place could be all that holy. The first chapter examines the insular background, which includes Bede (*De templo* and *De tabernaculo*) and the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis*, and chapter four revolves largely around the infamous case of the fugitive cleric and Alcuin's monastery of St. Martin at Tours. Collins shows that these competing schools of thought, with Bede and Alcuin (and a minority of others) on one side ("resistance to the idea of sacred places"), and Theodulf and Amalarius on the other, were not resolved until long after the Carolingian period.

Gillian Bonney's "La storiografia del Venerabile Beda vista attraverso l'*Expositio actuum apostolorum* e la *Retractio*," in *Historiam perscrutari: Miscellanea di studi offerti al prof. Ottorino Pasquato*, ed. M. Maritano (Rome, 2002), 363–77, examines the historiography of Bede by looking at his historical works and Christian historiography preceding Bede before focusing on his commentary on Acts and the *Retractio*. Bonney situates the two works in their literary context, considers the evidence of the prefaces, subjects, external structure, internal testimony, and cultural context and the theology of their historical context. Bonney concludes that they are historical works which express a universal Christian vision of history.

Claude Carozzi, "Chroniques universelles et comput: d'Eusèbe de Césarée à Bède le Vénérable," in *Le médiéviste devant ses sources: Questions et méthodes*, ed. C. Carozzi and H. Taviani-Carozzi (Aix-en-Provence, 2004), 13–23, admits the difficulty of definition of the literary genre of the "chronicle" and, particularly, its distinction from annals and histories, but suggests that two elements are key: the chronological order from creation, and the choice of exemplary facts. Carozzi notes the development of the ages of the world from the creation sequence in Genesis and discusses attempts to fix the precise date of Christ's death, particularly in Eusebius. Bede's chronicle may be preparatory to his *Historia ecclesiastica*, and Carozzi suggests that the harmonizing of chronology and computus was central to Bede. Bede's own methods of calculation of the ages of the world are discussed: if Bede built his chronology around the ages of the world rather than upon the incarnation, it was because the former has a fundamental symbolic value, while the latter, on account of the uncertainties involved in dating, was ultimately more important for dating the events of the church.

Though Calvin B. Kendall was unable to identify any pre-Conquest English manuscripts of Bede's *De schematibus et tropis*, Carl Berkhout, "An Early Insular Fragment of Bede's *De schematibus et tropis*," *Notes and Queries* n.s. 53: 10–12, notes that there are in fact at least two fragments extant, Worcester Cathedral MS Q.5 and British Library, Harley MS 521. Berkhout gives a transcription of the fragment in the Harley manuscript and observes that the hand almost certainly makes it a product of St. Augustine's, Canterbury. Textual differences between Worcester Q.5 and the Harley manuscript suggest that these were not the only two manuscripts of the work in circulation in England before the Conquest.

Thomas D. Hill, "Non nisi uirgam tantum ... in manu': Sigeberht's Mosaic Aspirations, Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica* III.18," *N&Q*, n.s. 53: 391–95, explains why Sigeberht, in the otherwise highly laconic account of his death at the hands of Penda in Bede's *HE*, should have been carrying a *uirga* into battle. Hill notes that this is the staff or rod of Moses, and was, as Wallace-Hadrill has suggested, a sign of authority. Further, though, the *uirga* suggests that Sigeberht had deliberately styled himself as Moses as he led his people against a pagan enemy. The difference, of course, is that Sigeberht and his people are slaughtered: for Bede, perhaps, the value in preserving this detail lay in the tacit demonstration that this combination of religious and political authority was and should be a thing of the Old Testament past.

MF

Not Seen

Bergamin, Manuela, ed. and trans. *Aenigmata Symposii: La fondazione dell'enigmistica come genere poetico*. Per Verba: testi mediolatini con traduzione 22. Florence: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2005. cxx, 263 pp.

Biggs, Frederick M. "A Further Quotation of Columbanus in Alchfrid's Letter to Hyglac." *N&Q* n.s. 53: 12–14.

Clancy, Thomas Owen. "Adomnán and the Abbey of Clonmacnois: Historical Needs, Literary Narratives." *Innes Rev.* 57: 206–15.

Crowley, Joseph P. "Latin Prayers Added into the Margins of the Prayerbook British Library, Royal 2. A. XX at the Beginnings of the Monastic Reform in Worcester." *Sacris Erudiri* 45: 223–303 + plates.

Crumplin, Sally. "Modernizing St Cuthbert: Reginald of Durham's Miracle Collection." *Signs, Wonders, Miracles*. Ed. Cooper and Gregory. [see sec. 7] pp. 179–91.

Foxhall Forbes, Helen. "Book-Worm or Entomologist? Aldhelm's *Enigma* XXXVI." *Peritia* 19 (2005): 20–29.

- Gneuss, Helmut. "Zur Geschichte des Hymnars." *Der lateinische Hymnus im Mittelalter*. Ed. Haug et al. pp. 63–86.
- Gorman, Michael M. "Adomnán's *De locis sanctis*: The Diagrams and the Sources." *RB* 116: 5–41, ill.
- Gretsch, Mechthild. "Æthelthryth of Ely in a Lost Calendar from Munich." *ASE* 35: 159–77.
- Hall, Thomas N. "Latin Sermons and Lay Preaching: Four Latin Sermons from Post-Reform Canterbury." *The Power of Words*. Ed. Magennis and Wilcox. [see sec. 2] pp. 132–70.
- Haug, Andreas; Christoph März, and Lorenz Welker, eds. *Der lateinische Hymnus im Mittelalter: Überlieferung–Ästhetik–Ausstrahlung*. Monumenta Monodica Medii Aevi, Subsidia 4. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2004. x, 422 pp.
- Hill, Joyce. "Making Women Visible: An Adaptation of the *Regularis Concordia* in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS. 201." *Conversion and Colonization in Anglo-Saxon England*. Ed. Karkov and Howe. [see sec. 1] pp. 153–67.
- Hollis, Stephanie. "Strategies of Emplacement and Displacement: St. Edith and the Wilton Community in Goscelin's Legend of Edith and *Liber confortatorius*." *A Place to Believe in*. Ed. Lees and Overing. [see sec. 1] pp. 150–69.
- Howlett, David. "Collectanea Pseudo-Beda." *Peritia* 19 (2005): 30–43.
- _____. "Fredegisus *De substantia nihili et tenebrarum*." *Bulletin du Cange* 64: 123–43.
- _____. *Insular Inscriptions*. Dublin and Portland, OR: Four Courts Press, 2005. [v], 266 pp. [esp. ch. II.iii, "Anglo-Latin Inscriptions," pp. 82–136, and ch. VII, "Inscriptions in Old and Middle English," pp. 197–229]
- Jones, Christopher A. "The Irregular Life in Ælfric Bata's *Colloquies*." *Essays for Joyce Hill*. Ed. Swan. [see sec. 2] pp. 241–60.
- Lapidge, Michael. "Il secolo VIII." *Letteratura latina medievale (secoli VI–XV): un manuale*. Ed. Claudio Leonardi. Millennio Medievale 31, Strumenti 2. Florence: SISMEL Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2002. pp. 41–73.
- Lendinara, Patrizia. "A Difficult School Text in Anglo-Saxon England: The Third Book of Abbo's *Bella Parisiaca Urbis*." *Essays for Joyce Hill*. Ed. Swan. [see sec. 2] pp. 321–42.
- McKee, Helen, and James McKee. "Chance or Design? David Howlett's *Insular Inscriptions* and the Problem of Coincidence." *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 51: 83–101. [review of David Howlett, *Insular Inscriptions* (Dublin, 2005)]
- Milfull, Inge B. "Hymns to the Cross: Contexts for the Reception of *Vexilla regis prodeunt*." *The Place of the Cross*. Ed. Karkov et al. [see sec. 1] pp. 43–57, ill.
- _____. "Spuren kontinentaler Einflüsse in spätangelsächsischen Hymnaren." *Der lateinische Hymnus im Mittelalter*. Ed. Haug et al. pp. 173–98.
- O'Brien O'Keefe, Katherine. "Goscelin and the Consecration of Eve." *ASE* 35: 251–70.
- Pettit, Emma Joanne. "Aldhelm's *Opus Geminatum De virginitate* in Its Early Anglo-Saxon Context." Ph.D. Diss., U of York, 2005. *DAI* 67C: 855.
- Ruff, Carin. "The Perception of Difficulty in Aldhelm's Prose." *Insignis Sophiae Arcator*. Ed. Wieland et al. [see sec. 2] pp. 165–77.
- Swenson, Ericka Marie. "Gender, Transformation and the Body in Aldhelm's *De Virginitate* and the Anglo-Saxon Double Monastery." M.A. Thesis, California State U, Long Beach, 2006. *MAI* 44: 6.
- Turner, Andrew J., and Bernard J. Muir, eds. and trans. *Eadmer of Canterbury: Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan, and Oswald*. Oxford Medieval Texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press. cxxxiv, 333 pp.
- Wieland, Gernot. "A New Look at the Poem 'Archalis clamare triumuir.'" *Insignis Sophiae Arcator*. Ed. Wieland et al. [see sec. 2] pp. 178–92.
- Wright, Charles D. "The *Prouerbia Grecorum*, the Norman Anonymous, and the Early Medieval Ideology of Kingship: Some New Manuscript Evidence." *Insignis Sophiae Arcator*. Ed. Wieland et al. [see sec. 2] pp. 193–215.

6. Manuscripts, Illumination, Charters

K. D. Hartzell, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Written or Owned in England up to 1200 Containing Music* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press in association with the Plainsong and Medieval Music Society), aims to be the equivalent of Ker for manuscripts with music; the format is deliberately similar, and as with Ker's *Catalogue*, many hours can be happily spent discovering items of unexpected interest among its 364 records. This is in part because Hartzell records pen-trials and marginalia as well as more formally written music. Liturgists may find the most immediate benefit from the catalogue, though, owing to Hartzell's "decision to parade the contents of each pontifical or benedictional containing music in its entirety ... the contents of each book have been catalogued so that liturgical affinity with other sources, if it exists, can be determined easily" (xxv). Given the chronological scope of the catalogue, this should therefore be of use to scholars of French, German, and Scandinavian liturgy, as well as those who study Anglo-Saxon or Norman Britain. Besides the detailed description of the cataloguing method in the prefatory material, Hartzell includes an inventory of the various forms of Anglo-Saxon neums (xxi–xxiv). The eight black-and-white plates are helpful in conjunction with these descriptions and definitions, which, together, should enable even those with limited familiarity with early musical notation to decode the palaeographical commentary on the manuscripts.

Appropriately, Thomas N. Hall, "The Bibliography of Anglo-Saxon Sermon Manuscripts," *Old English Scholarship and Bibliography: Essays in Honor of Carl T. Berkhout*, Old English Newsletter Subsidia 32 (Kalamazoo, MI, 2004), 85–105, is extremely well-referenced, which is one reason it will be an excellent starting point for those interested in Latin homiliaries of the late eleventh and twelfth centuries. These books are still something of a frontier in Anglo-Saxon studies, despite the fact that (as Hall explains pp. 89–90) they often preserve unique records of the source-texts used by vernacular writers like Ælfric of Eynsham. Here, Hall examines a group of seven early Anglo-Norman manuscripts derived from the homiliary of Paul the Deacon, three of which transmit some authentic and otherwise unknown sermons of St. Augustine as, the author argues, a fortuitous result of the synergy between the eleventh-century propaganda drive and library-building campaign of St. Augustine's Canterbury (95–9). Hall provides a chart of the books' contents, keyed to the first fifty-seven items in London, British Library, Harley 652 (one of the St. Augustine's books containing the Augustinian items) at 100–5.

Several collections and *festschriften* with significant focuses on manuscript evidence appeared in 2006. Edited by Alexander R. Rumble, *Writing and Texts in Anglo-Saxon England*, Pub. of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 5 (Woodbridge: Brewer), presents the proceedings of the 2003 Manchester conference on "Writing in Anglo-Saxon England," and its nine papers examine the appearance and function of script in textiles and inscriptions as well as books and documents: the reader is in many cases assisted by good-quality black-and-white illustrations. As a collection, *Writing and Texts* will be of considerable interest to palaeographers, historians, and art historians, and most of the articles have cross-disciplinary implications—so Okasha's study of Roman and runic script-mixing in inscriptions, for instance, should be valuable to students of the Exeter Book riddles too, while Guimón's re-analysis of the difficult question of changes of scribal hands in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* manuscripts has implications for students of other complex books as well as for historians. Rumble's own contribution to the collection, "The Study of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts, Collections and Scribes: in the Footsteps of Wanley and Ker" (1–17), is an accessible introduction to the study of Anglo-Saxon books and texts, including the history of period-specific catalogues and facsimiles (2–9), and a brief description of Anglo-Saxon palaeographical studies (11–14) and concluding with a somewhat more detailed account of the contribution of the ongoing Manchester AHRC project on eleventh-century Old English texts to the study of palaeography (14–17). The article would be an exceedingly useful one for introducing students to the study of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts: despite its brevity, Rumble's discussion provides clear accounts of important terminology (e.g., on script grades, "Differences between grades relate both to the adoption of modified letter-forms and to the degree of either formality or cursivity," 13); while the footnotes supply bibliographical details with an emphasis on important survey and reference works.

Richard Emms, "Books and Writing in Seventh-Century Kent," in *Writing and Texts*, ed. Rumble (18–27), is somewhat unusual this year in focusing on the very earliest period in Anglo-Saxon literary history. Because so little material survives from Kent around the time of the conversion (Emms discusses possible reasons for this pattern—and its contrast with the situation in near-contemporary Northumbria—at 26–7), the author attempts to gain some insight through a form of triangulation. First, he gathers evidence to connect some

surviving volumes with a probable provenance in early Kent (18–21), particularly from the notes of Thomas of Elmham on St. Augustine’s ancient books, coming up with only one probable candidate (CCCC 286, the sixth-century ‘Gospels of St. Augustine’), as well as the hope that the *Textus Sancti Adriani*, a gospel-book mentioned by medieval writers at St. Augustine’s, having been “last mentioned by Wilkins in the early eighteenth century ... may still exist in a forgotten corner of a library” (21). The evidence for charter-writing in early Kent is indisputable, though, and with the aid of the charters for Reculver and Lyminge (or Lympe? see Kelly’s article in the 2005 bibliography), Emms is able to argue that the distinctively Insular half-uncial/ minuscule hybrid “implies that a good deal of writing must have been done in seventh-century Kent to enable a new kind of script to emerge” (22). Emms concurs with Chaplais that charter-writing was probably introduced by St. Augustine, and that the lack of surviving early charters might be explained by the use of papyrus rather than parchment. Finally, Emms argues that the Utrecht Gospel fragments are witnesses to a tradition of deluxe, classicizing book production parallel to Northumbria’s, which “in view of Canterbury’s strong links with Rome ... is to be expected” (24). Proof of this is hard to come by, but Emms is no doubt right to question the default attribution of all early books in uncial script to Monkwearmouth-Jarrow.

Carole Hough, “Numbers in Manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon Law,” in *Writing and Texts*, ed. Rumble (114–36), takes an innovative approach to the question of the sources of the collections of Anglo-Saxon laws. Many of the surviving manuscripts are very late, and the relations between them are complicated, so additional evidence for disambiguating the descent of the various law-texts is always useful. Hough’s method—comparing the ratios of words to numerals in the representation of numbers across texts and manuscripts—is simple and, as she notes (116, 120) hardly probative on its own, but it contributes another piece to the puzzle of the law-texts’ descent and relationships: the data is presented at 132–6. Where Hough’s method seems particularly useful is in corroborating hypotheses of “mini-collections”: lost exemplars containing a few texts only, whose common characteristics surface in two or more of the surviving manuscripts. It can also help to differentiate the transmission of texts which would normally have been assumed to have been circulated together—e.g., among the early Kentish laws in the *Textus Roffensis*, the laws of Hlothhere and Eadric have a markedly higher percentage of numbers written as words than do the codes of Æthelberht and of Wihtred, and indeed

even differ internally, leading Hough to suggest that “the laws of Hlothhere and Eadric were not intended as a self-contained code” and “may well have been issued piecemeal” (129). The consistency in the representation of numbers within texts shared by different manuscripts is frequently impressive, and Hough’s method, as she notes, “might usefully be extended to other manuscripts whose contents include numerical data” (131)—chronicles and charters being the logical first candidates.

Jane Roberts, “Aldred Signs off from Glossing the Lindisfarne Gospels,” *Writing and Texts*, ed. Rumble (28–43), wades back into the murky waters obscuring the history of London, British Library, Cotton Nero D.iv, and retrieves an interesting fragment possibly preserved by that patron saint of book-vandals, Aldred of Chester-le-Street. Roberts bases her argument on a close study of the lineation of the colophon on f. 259r (31–5; a facsimile of the page is given at p. 32) and a comparison with the testimony of Symeon of Durham regarding the writing and binding of the book. Roberts’s most interesting suggestion is that Aldred’s Old English colophon is a wordy dilution of what was originally an owner-maker inscription in alliterative verse (39–42). The exact wording of such an inscription cannot have been quite as Roberts “excavates” it—e.g. the line “mið svlfre of(er) gylde, faconleas feh” (40) is metrically not so much a stretch as a sprain—but the connections Roberts draws with a comment of Aldred’s and the poem *Durham* are intriguing, and might indeed support the possibility of a source in alliterative verse. If this is true, it would imply that (*contra* Nees’s recent *Speculum* article) Aldred himself did not invent the list of Eadfrið, Æthilwald and Billfrið as makers of the Lindisfarne Gospels, and would support (perhaps) their historicity, or (at very least) a tenth-century belief in their historicity.

Andrew Prescott, “What’s in a Number? The Physical Organization of the Manuscript Collections of the British Library,” in *Beatus Vir: Studies in Early English and Norse Manuscripts in Memory of Phillip Pulsiano*, ed. Doane and Wolf, [see sec. 2], 471–525, reveals some of the arcana of the British Library’s manuscript collection in its many previous incarnations and evolutions. Many questions that will have occurred to users of the BL’s books and manuscripts are here answered: why the book-stamps are in different colors (477–9), what on earth the “Z safe” is (500–1: no longer, alas, an actual safe); and who foliated the manuscripts and why (474–5, 479–83). As to the question of whether lost Anglo-Saxon manuscripts are lurking in the Library’s recesses, the answer, unfortunately, is almost certainly not (522–3);

nevertheless, this article provides an extremely detailed and often quite amusing insight into the way the Library's outer shell—its housing and distribution—has affected the growth and organization of the collection, and how traces of the personalities of its early keepers are still detectable in the books themselves.

Elaine Treharne, "Reading from the Margins: The Uses of Old English Homiletic Manuscripts in the Post-Conquest Period," *Beatus Vir*, ed. Doane and Wolf, 329–58, uses the copying and glossing of vernacular manuscripts as evidence for the contention that "Old English, usually used to refer to the language and texts written in that language from the eighth to the eleventh centuries, might more accurately be used to cover the vernacular language and texts from the twelfth century also, indeed incorporating a number of works composed as late as the thirteenth century" (332). Texts of the Old English period, she argues, were not copied during the twelfth century out of antiquarian interest, but rather from the pragmatic need by English-speaking monastics of the period for religious texts in their own language (347–56). Further, "glossing and annotation ... testify to the existence of twelfth- and thirteenth-century readers of English, who are also trained to write in the vernacular" (340). The behavior of scribes such as those of CCC 303 implies that standard late West Saxon was considered as intelligible as the scribes' own "transitional" dialect (335–6), and that a very high degree of linguistic variation among and within texts was acceptable to readers of the period. Treharne's contentions regarding the nature of the audience for these late Old English religious texts are particularly interesting, and certainly have major implications for both the boundaries of the Anglo-Saxon period and for our understanding of the nature of religious communities in early Norman England.

Kevin Kiernan, "Odd Couples in *Ælfric's Julian and Basilissa* in British Library Cotton MS. Otho B. x," *Beatus Vir*, ed. Doane and Wolf, 85–106, may be the first time that "a domestic disturbance involving a raised frying pan (or perhaps a pie)" has been mentioned in medieval scholarship (95): whether that be the case or not, Kiernan's article uses digital technology to analyze the burned and disordered fragments of Cotton Otho B. x, a manuscript of *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*. He provides transcripts of the surviving, presently readable portions of the *Lives of Julian and Basilissa*, which include many variants not noted by Skeat (89–92). With patience and the assistance of image manipulation, Kiernan is also able to demonstrate that the distorted fragments which now form fol. 67 (the pie-throwers aforementioned) were framed out of order, and in one portion upside-

down: He provides a reconstruction and transcription, together with close-ups of the problematic fragments, and is able to show *inter alia* that the Otho scribe accidentally skipped a couple of lines of the *vita* (96–105 at 103).

Joyce Hill, "Identifying 'Texts' in Cotton Julius E. vii: Medieval and Modern Perspectives," in *Beatus Vir*, ed. Doane and Wolf, 27–40, uses this important manuscript of *Ælfric's Lives of Saints* to examine larger questions about how individual elements within a larger collection are identified and defined. Skeat's edition, Hill shows, does not always identify individual elements which did certainly circulate separately, with confusing ramifications for the description of texts' distribution in other manuscripts (e.g., the Absalom and Ahitophel episode, edited as part of the *Life of St. Alban*: 30–1). Skeat depended heavily on the contents list in Julius E. vii in deciding what constituted an "item"; but the writer of this list, as Hill shows, was not concerned with identifying textual divisions so much as arranging items according to date, presumably for ease of reference when preparing readings: "for the scribe, at the moment when he was drawing up this list, the 'text' was all the material for one day" (34–9 at 39). A return to the manuscript, Hill concludes, has "the larger effect of releasing us from the tyranny of the standard edition, which sets particular kinds of limitations on the way we think about the material that has come down to us" (39).

To his credit, Gernot R. Wieland, "British Library, MS. Royal 15.A.v: One Manuscript or Three?" *Beatus Vir*, ed. Doane and Wolf, 1–25, records that his theory of the planned, unified origin of all parts of this small eleventh- or twelfth-century Arator manuscript received considerable opposition when he described it in 1985 (and later in 1995). I am not sure that it will, in present form, be altogether embraced this time around. Wieland's most interesting find is that the text of Arator's poem is not connected to the tradition attested in the surviving Anglo-Saxon manuscripts he has examined (which all, it should be noted, seem to stem from Canterbury) and that some phonological features indicate interference from spoken French (19–20, with a more detailed appendix at 23–4): here one would like to see some comparison with Norman and/or French manuscripts as well. The argument that the script of the poem itself, while plainly Caroline, is not *Anglo-* but *Norman Caroline* (16–19, with plates) is one I find persuasive—I had a look at the book while writing this, and the script is not only, as Wieland notes, somewhat more angular than normal Anglo-Caroline (19), but instead of the near-horizontal serifs expected in English

letters we find the downstrokes conclude with hairline strokes rising at a sharp angle, as is fairly characteristic of Norman script of the eleventh century. There seems no especial reason why Wieland's contention that the texts of Acts on fols. 1–29 and the commentary on Arator on fols. 86–147 were commissioned at the same time as the poem should be false; but the alternative—that the book was built up over a period of time with successive additions when these were acquired, perhaps copied from other manuscripts over a period of a few years—still seems within the bounds of possibility, as indeed Wieland seems to imply on p. 22. Also, given that he concludes by “conced[ing] all of it to the Normans” (23), we might well ask whether Royal 15.A.v was written in England at all—and if not, when and from where it eventually arrived in southern England.

As has been noted elsewhere, the 2006 volume of *Leeds Studies in English* constituted a festschrift for Joyce Hill, and a number of articles in it should be of interest to students of manuscripts and charters. Three fall within this section, and of these, two consider the afterlife of Old English homiletic texts from different angles. Donald Scragg, “Ælfric's Scribes,” *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed. Swan [see sec. 2], 179–89, uses some early results from the Manchester electronic database of script and spellings to consider the practices of the scribes of Ælfric's texts. Interestingly, while the early scribes at Cerne Abbas showed an impressive consistency in their choice of spellings, the evidence of Ælfric's own spelling of *ciriclice* in a marginal note may suggest “that the Cerne Abbas scribes were not faithful to Ælfric's own preferred spelling” of this word, at least (180–1). By highlighting the distributions of variant spellings of relatively common words (*þar*, *hwar*, *him/heom*, *þara/þæra*), Scragg is able to “identify those scribes like that of Corpus 188 who are faithful to their copy-text and those who, like the copyists of the manuscripts of the Canterbury group, are willing to impose their own forms or follow an archetype whose scribe has imposed his own forms” (182–3). Generally the consistency among Ælfric's scribes in the choice of what are often thought of as “free” variants, is very striking indeed, and Scragg does provide some thoughts on why this might be (185–6). His method, too, shows the value and potential utility of recording apparently trivial spelling variations, and suggests that the new database may indeed “open ... up a new route in the editorial process and in the study of scribes and their idiosyncrasies” (186). Meanwhile, Mary Swan, in “Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198 and the Blickling Manuscript,” 89–100, uses a theory developed by Michael Benskin and Margaret Laing to explain the practice of scribes

of Middle English in order to elucidate the relationship between Blickling X and Article 62 (a composite homily on penance) in CCCC 198. To a homily of Ælfric, the copyist of Article 62 adds an excerpt from the Blickling text, with minor variations which Swan argues are best accounted for by Benskin and Laing's idea of “copying via the ‘mind's ear’” (92). Further, this relation between the Blickling and CCCC 198 texts, together with what we know about the distribution of Old English composite homilies, “means that [Article 62's] scribe in CCCC 198 can therefore be assumed to be its compiler, and that in the first half of the eleventh century the scribe of CCCC 198 article 62 was therefore working in a centre where a copy of Blickling X was available” (92). Swan follows this up with some very striking evidence that an omission of part of Blickling X in Article 62 was due to eyeskip—and that the CCCC 198 scribe was therefore working from the Blickling manuscript itself (94–6), which renders Article 62 a valuable case-study of the working method of a scribe/compiler of Old English composite homilies.

In the same volume, Mary P. Richards, “The Rochester Cathedral Library: a Review of Scholarship 1987–2005, Including Annotations to the 1996 Edition of the Catalogues in *CBMLC*, v. 4,” 283–320, does, as the advert goes, what it says on the tin. Richards provides an overview of recent work on Rochester's medieval library as a whole (283–8), and on individual books, placing special emphasis on crucial works like the *Textus Roffensis* (289–91) and vernacular prose texts (291–6), and highlighting in particular work which demonstrates the connections between Rochester and other houses, such as Canterbury and Durham. On pp. 298–304, Richards provides annotations and corrections to the Rochester volume of the *Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues*, while pp. 305–20 give a select bibliography of works about Rochester or its books. The article will of course be invaluable for anyone dealing with Rochester's medieval library, but it should also prove useful to scholars of other English medieval foundations and particularly of the changing character of libraries in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Joshua Allen Westgard, “Dissemination and Reception of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* in Germany, ca. 731–1500: The Manuscript Evidence,” Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2005 (*DAI* 67A, 2), is both an impressive achievement in its own right, and a strong foundation for future work in the field. Twenty-first century textual scholarship is as often concerned with the *Nachleben* of texts as with the recovery of the authorial original, and Westgard's work is part of this trend. As he describes the project:

The examination of the *HE*'s transmission and reception will be organized on the basis of what I call the contextual layers surrounding the text. On the most basic level ... this involves examining the relation of the various copies of the text to one another. As has been indicated, this will be accomplished by means of a series of test collations and the application of the principles of textual criticism. The purpose of this part of the investigation is to establish the relationships between the manuscripts in the German branch of the tradition. The next contextual layer is manuscript context ... [that is,] the text in relation to other texts transmitted alongside it in manuscripts. This includes marginal and interlinear notations, which are perhaps the most direct evidence of the text's reception; supplementary texts, which may continue or elaborate on the *HE* ... and finally associated contents, which may or may not reflect the purposes for which the text was originally copied and the ways the text was understood and used from day to day by its later readers and owners (14).

He concludes the study by considering "library context." The textual portion of Westgard's study, focused on the German "textual province" described by Mynors, depends on the test collations of four passages particularly prone to alteration—Bede's preface; two chapters from book IV, on the life and miracles of St. Oswald; and Bede's autobiographical epilogue (V.24). The collations of thirty-three texts (including the fifteenth-century *editio princeps*) are given in Chapter 3, and the affiliations described in Chapter 2. *Inter alia*, Westgard has discovered a separate Austrian textual family with an abbreviated version of the preface (31–4); a late manuscript copied from the first printed edition (36–8); and two new manuscripts of the *Continuatio Bedae* (38–9, with transcripts in Appendix B). Westgard's Chapters 4 and 5 focus on the German readership of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, and are divided chronologically (the justification for this can be understood most clearly through the chart on p. 116, showing particular phases of copying before the tenth century, and again in the 11th–12th and 14th centuries). The *Historia Ecclesiastica*, it seemed, remained an important basic text for monastic libraries through the Middle Ages; and the increasing association of Bede's work with national histories, together with its readership's evident interest in visions and miracle stories, is a combination worth reflecting on for anyone interested in

medieval historiography. This is an extremely valuable dissertation, and even its apparatus—a clear and easily expandable system of manuscript sigla (xiv–xxii) and an updated handlist of *HE* manuscripts (Appendix A) will be of great use to scholars. Westgard's own "Evidence for the Presence of M-type Manuscripts of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* in Northern England after ca. 800," *RB* 116: 310–15 shows some of the immediate applications of his work. Although most insular manuscripts of the *HE* are descendants of London, BL, Cotton Tiberius C. ii ("C-type"), close study of those manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* which derive from the "Northern Recension" show that the compiler of that recension must have used an *HE* manuscript of the M-type (descendants of the archetype of the Moore Bede, CUL Kk.5.16, which are mainly known from the Continent). In this article Westgard is able to show that the archetype of three Continental M-type manuscripts which contain the later Northumbrian version of *Cædmon's Hymn* "only migrated to the Continent at a relatively late date, perhaps as late as the first half of the twelfth century" (312), and that this (lost) archetype may, therefore, be closely related to the manuscript used to compile the Northern Recension.

Shannon Ambrose, "The Codicology and Palaeography of London, BL, Royal 5 E. xiii and Its Abridgement of the *Collectio Canonum Hibernensis*," *Codices Manuscripti* 54/55: 1–26, provides an annotated transcription of the Royal 5.E.xiii of the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* on pp. 6–23, together with a second appendix collating the Royal text with Wasserschleben's edition of the *Hibernensis*. Ambrose also provides a detailed description of the physical makeup and script of this unusual and interesting book. As she sums up: "The text's palaeographical evidence, such as the presence of Breton-Latin marginal glosses, seems to argue for the manuscript's viability as a *living book* in the Breton center in which it was produced. Moreover, the proliferation of Latin interlinear and marginal comments in the rest of the codex, written in a later English script, seems to indicate that the book was re-edited in an Anglo-Saxon center after the manuscript was taken from Brittany. In essence, the London, BL, Royal 5 E.xiii manuscript as a whole, and the *Hibernensis* in particular, offers evidence of a tripartite Breton, Hiberno-Latin and Anglo-Saxon contact and further proof of intellectual commerce between the three communities" (2).

Matthew Thomas Hussey, "Ascetics and Aesthetics: The Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts of Isidore of Seville's *Synonyma*," Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison, 2005 (*DAI* 66A, 2925), is an attempt to examine the life-history of a text in the Anglo-Saxon period. The somewhat

genre-defying *Synonyma* evidently enjoyed some popularity at various moments: Boniface in particular, Hussey shows, was fond of the text, and instrumental in disseminating it in Germany, but it appears also to have been a teaching-text in tenth-century Canterbury. Adapted forms of the text in the Book of Cerne, Cotton Tiberius A.iii, and the Vercelli and (perhaps more tenuously) Exeter Books also receive extended consideration. The *Synonyma* has never been adequately edited, which makes tracing the descent of individual copies much more difficult: Hussey has clearly done some important work on textual affiliations among Insular copies of the *Synonyma* (see esp. pp. 347–50, but also parts of Chapter 3), but—somewhat frustratingly, from this reviewer’s point of view—tends to introduce this information parenthetically, instead of giving it the extended treatment it deserves.

Heinrich Tiefenbach, “Rückgewinnung eines zerstörten Codex: Die Handschrift der Glossaria Werthinensia,” in *Language and Text: Current Perspectives on English and Germanic Historical Linguistics and Philology*, ed. Johnston *et al.*, [see sec. 2], 307–15, is a nice exercise in forensic codicology. The Werden Glossary (or, more precisely, glossaries), once a large ninth-century codex belonging to the abbey of Werden an der Ruhr, is known only from *membra disiecta* taken from the bindings of various Werden books. These are scattered throughout various libraries, and several have been lost or destroyed (though fortunately after photographs were made); Tiefenbach describes the fragments and their fates on pp. 307–8. Fortunately, most of the fragments were bifolia, and a set of *ab*-order glossaries is a reasonably good candidate for reconstruction, once one knows what order they came in. Tiefenbach has discovered a key: the quire signature .X. on a complete quire once in the Universitätsbibliothek in Düsseldorf (309). This enables him to ascertain that the glossaries were ordered B, C, A (from his reconstruction, another full glossary might have been lost before B). A reconstruction of the codex is given pp. 314–15.

In a brief note, Christine Franzen, “On the Attribution of Additions in Oxford, Bodleian MS Bodley 343 to the Tremulous Hand of Worcester,” *ANQ* 19.1: 7–8, refutes Jennifer Ramsey’s recent suggestion that four additions to Bodley 343 were made by the tremulous hand (and that, therefore, the book was at Worcester); Franzen gives a detailed description of the ways in which the hands differ. She does go on to say that “Susan Irvine ... has argued that MS Bodley 343 was probably written near, but not at, Worcester.... The scribe (or scribes) who made these additions to MS Bodley 343 is certainly using a script and spellings that

are similar to those of the tremulous hand, but I do not believe that they are the same scribe nor that the similarity is close enough to argue that the additions were made in Worcester” (8).

Susan D. Thompson, *Anglo-Saxon Royal Diplomas: A Palaeography*, Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 6 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press), is a detailed survey of the 118 surviving single-sheet Latin royal diplomas. Thompson’s main questions can perhaps be summarized as a) what is the most meaningful way of classifying these documents? and b) did the Anglo-Saxons have a royal chancery? Her answers, tentatively, are “chronologically” and “some form of royal chancery must have existed during the tenth century, and its continuation to some extent into the eleventh century would account for the similarity between documents from many archives and the continuity and development of scribal practices” (148). The book’s great strength, however, is its unwillingness to elide these documents’ idiosyncrasies; scholars in search of peculiar sub-groups within this corpus will easily be able to find mavericks in terms of physical format (e.g. pricking, ruling, or treatment of parchment), script, and contents, and Thompson in fact counterbalances her section on “Representative Charters from Different Periods” (21–30) with one on “Problem Charters” (131–45). Both are illustrated with black-and-white plates. This book will be particularly useful for those just beginning the study of Anglo-Saxon charters: her section on layout, for instance, provides clear definitions of all relevant terminology. I would recommend it as well for seminars on Anglo-Saxon palaeography (especially given how important diplomatic evidence is for dating script); Thompson’s palaeographical descriptions are assisted by black-and-white drawings of the letter-forms and abbreviations under discussion, which, in combination with the plates, should make it very useful to beginners as well as interesting to experts.

S628—a grant of land at ‘Moreton’ in Derbyshire dating from 956—provides some onomastic interest in Andrew Breeze, “Mael Suthain and a Charter of King Eadwig,” *N&Q* n.s. 53: 23–4. The beneficiary’s name *Mæglsothen* has been identified as an anglicization of the name Mael Suthain, from Irish *mael* ‘crop-headed; slave or servant’ and *suthain* ‘long-lived’. As Breeze notes, “another and famous Mael Suthain was the scribe and confessor of Brian Ború, who in 1005 wrote his master’s claim to be *imperator Scotorum* into the ninth-century Book of Armagh. This Irish royal scribe hence shows the name was current in the tenth century, when his namesake (presumably of Norse-Irish descent) acquired land in Derbyshire” (24).

In *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West*, ed. Tyler and Balzaretto [see sec. 4a], Sarah Foot's "Reading Anglo-Saxon Charters: Memory, Record, or Story?" 39–65, presents a fascinating view of the nature of charters, and a method of reading them which may help scholars of Anglo-Saxon literature come to grips with a large body of prose which they have mostly preferred to leave to historians and palaeographers. Foot begins by interrogating the charters' frequent praise of the stability of written records; the documents seem to be as much a defense against memory, as a memorial technology: "Were these documents written not so much to preserve one version of events as an insurance against oblivion, as rather to deny the possibility that any different accounts might achieve currency...? On such a reading, the text would function not as an adjunct to recollection but as its replacement; the charter would tell one account in order that it become the accepted version, countermanding—overwriting—alternatives" (41). Foot explores the charters both as an active (if strictly delimited) mode of narrative in themselves, and as frames for other narratives: "I should like to suggest that charters that incorporate embedded narratives do so in order to reconcile discord and prevent future dispute.... These texts legislate for the future by recounting the past in such a way as to legitimize and make necessary the present act of giving. The telling of the narrative is essential precisely because it is not the only one available; its record in writing ... elevates its status above that of oral report" (62). Foot's striking reading renders charters an important mode of medieval historiography, while depicting historiography itself, not as a crystallization of memory, but as an aggressive means of displacing it.

EVT

A welcome and important development in the study of manuscripts and illustrations is the focus on manuscripts as coherent objects. To a greater or lesser degree, a manuscript can govern or at least organize its constituent parts—text, image, even its margins—in ways that reveal potential categories, intellectual or affective interrelationships and attitudes. The attention to the forms, aspects, and structures of the book pay important dividends in Thomas A. Bredehoft's "Filling the Margins of CCC 41: Textual Space and a Developing Archive," *RES* n.s. 57: 721–32. Bredehoft examines closely the mid-eleventh century "compendium" (721) of Latin liturgical material, Old English homilies, charms, and medical recipes that were copied into its margins. Bredehoft premises his approach on a concern for the structure and format of the book as well

as a close examination of the color of ink (lighter or darker brown), ruling size (whether following the main text or smaller or larger), and the use of the top, bottom, or side margins. From this evidence he identifies four separate campaigns, likely conducted by a single scribe. Stage 1 consists of OE and Latin charms. Stage 2 represents a collection of Latin liturgical texts. Stage 3 texts are primarily Old English homilies and include *Solomon and Saturn I*. In Stage 4 the scribe adds more Latin liturgical texts and an OE homily. This stage witnesses a pronounced change in attitude toward textual space—while at first the scribe attempts to respect spaces left for initials by Stage 4 he has given up on further work on initials and decided that the margins are best used for the extended texts. Another important observation emerges: the stages identified on the basis of the color of ink, ruling, and placement on the page largely correspond to groupings of different kind of texts. This indicates that the scribe may have had access to different sources at different times, and that the conception of the margins as a useful space changed over time. Bredehoft notes that the changing treatment of the marginal spaces in CCC 41 reveals some basic scribal attitudes toward the structure of the book: the perception of the opening as a basic unit of textual space and attempted to respect its basic visual units of the single page and single margin by creating balanced, even symmetrical arrangements of marginal additions. Attention to the arrangement and aspect of the marginalia open up new avenues for study, raising questions about sources (did all the Old English material in Stage 3 come from the same source?) and intention (was the conception of a "Latin liturgical compendium" a late development or inherent in the additions found as early as Stage 2?).

The idea of a manuscript as a unitary or uniting structure can lead to questions of intention and affect. Two very different studies approach the first quire of the Codex Amiatinus (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana MS Amiatinus I) in this fashion, focusing particular attention on the interpretation and role of the two-page diagram of the Tabernacle found on folio 2v–3r. In "The Tabernacle Illumination in the Codex Amiatinus Reconsidered," *Biblical Studies in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Leonardi and Orlandi [see sec. 5], 29–40, Barbara Apelian Beall notes that unlike the famous Ezra portrait, the double-page diagram lacks a titulus that unambiguously identifies what it depicts. While the audience at the time of its creation likely knew exactly what it was meant to convey, the modern viewer is left wondering: "does it represent the temple or tabernacle? And why was it included in the manuscript?" (29) This state of affairs is compounded,

Beall argues, by modern scholarship's "overwhelming emphasis on studying this illumination as a conduit to another lost source or sources" such as Cassiodorus's Codex Grandior or hypothetical Hebrew Bibles or portions thereof (30). Beall concentrates on how the image itself within its manuscript context orients the reader/viewer intellectually and physically. She describes the two-page spread as "somewhat cartographic with its careful organization of the architectural and visual elements coupled with the clear and precise labeling. The viewer actually has two separate vantage points from which to look at the image and they cannot be experienced simultaneously" (32). The first viewpoint, governed by the largest lettering on the folio, which lists the four cardinal points of the compass, situates the viewer in front of the open manuscript, verso on the left and recto on the right. Other labels identify the encampment of each of the named tribes of Israel and account for the number of their people (based on the text of chapter 2 of the Book of Numbers) locate the viewer "at the Tabernacle in the wilderness" (33). A second viewpoint arises from the orientation of labels and objects in the interior of the architectural space depicted on the page. To read these labels and view the objects the viewer must physically change places and "now needs to be positioned at the outer margin of the recto of the right-hand folio in order to look into the verso of the left-hand folio ... from this vantage point the viewer now looks into the inner courtyard as well as into the interior of the rectangular structure with that area" (33). The names and texts found here are similar to the description of the Tabernacle in the Wilderness found in Exodus 25 and 30. A small gold cross above the lintel of the Tabernacle transforms the image into a Christian one and broadens the range of textual references to the New Testament, especially the Book of Hebrews (chapter 9 with its discussion of the Tabernacle and the New Covenant) and Revelation (chapter 7 where the tribes of Israel are listed and the Tabernacle is described in terms of the redemption and salvation). With its reference to so many texts, Beall argues that the image "was not meant to be simply seen, identified, and readily interpreted ... the complexity of the organization, the sequencing of the visual experience and the references to multiple Biblical texts in the Old and New Testaments provide the viewer with an image for ongoing study, mediation, and contemplation" (35). Beall concludes, "within the codicological structure of the Codex Amiatinus the sequence of the Ezra portrait, the double-page illumination referencing the Tabernacle, Temple, Church and Heavenly City and the Christ in Majesty offer us a visual exegesis to contemplate

running parallel to the exegesis contained within the Biblical texts" (39).

Noting the many thematic parallels and interest between the illustrations in Amiatinus and the exegetical works of Bede, Beall writes "it is tantalizing to wonder if Bede himself contributed to the complex message within the double-page illumination" (40). Paul Meyvaert approaches the question of Bede's role from a different perspective in his "Dissension in Bede's Community Shown by a Quire of Codex Amiatinus," *RB* 116: 295–309. The Tabernacle/Temple illustration and its position within the quire once again provides key evidence. Meyvaert asserts that the bifolium had clearly not been part of the original planning of the quire (the original leaves were sewn with a pattern of ten holes; the bifolium does not show this pattern). Attributing this to "a disjuncture, a clash of human will," Meyvaert reevaluates his argument (advanced in an article in *Speculum*, reviewed in *YWOES* 2005) that Bede was in charge of planning the preparation of the first quire of the manuscript (and possibly designed visual features of the portrait of Ezra). He begins his reevaluation here with a diagrammatic account of the quire structure of the manuscript. He calls attention to the regularity of its organization and observes writing "was assigned simultaneously to a number of scribes, a fact that could by itself suggest some degree of urgency" (292). The regularity of the organization of the quires is interrupted only at the points where one scribe takes over for another: "When single leaves are found in a quire they represent an anomaly that demands a special explanation" (298). This state of affairs reflects the discipline of the scriptorium and "further indicates that there must have been someone very competent in charge" (298). Whereas in his *Speculum* article Meyvaert had suggested that Bede was that man, here he perceives another leader, whom he calls "brother X." Meyvaert believes that it was this anonymous monk who modeled the first quire after the organization of the Cassiodorus's Codex Grandior. As Meyvaert reconstructs it, this original plan for the quire followed this order: a blank folio (folio 1r and 1v), portrait of Ezra (folio 2r; 2v left blank), Cassiodorus's Preface and a list of the contents of Amiatinus (on purple leaves; folio 3r and 3v), followed by schematic representations of the three divisions of scripture on the rectos of the following three folios, each headed by roundels representing an aspect of the Trinity: the antiqua translation Division (Father; folio 4r) Jerome Division (Lamb; folio 5r) and Augustine Division (dove; 6r). That this was the original order of the quire is supported by evidence of offsets and the stitching (301).

The dissension that Meyvaert perceives “centered on whether the introductory quire prepared by brother X gave sufficient prominence to the role of Jerome.” He explains: “Amiatinus is not so much a ‘book’ in which this community has managed to assemble between two covers as a series of disparate codices containing Jerome’s translations, as a single pandect attributable to Jerome.... I sense a campaign was set in motion to see if Jerome’s role could not be better underlined in the gift pandect” (302–3). “To try and impress brother X with Jerome’s true importance Bede showed him a passage from Aldhelm’s *De virginitate* dealing with the virgin Eusthocium which specifically dwelt on Jerome as translator of the Bible” (303). To counter Bede’s argument, brother X (or a sympathizer) composes a couplet based on Aldhelm’s verse that was added above the dove on (the original folio) 6r, “the intention was to remind readers what they would find in all the biblical books that followed on the initial quire, namely God’s word (*elogium domini*) transmitted through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. In such a context too much emphasis on Jerome seemed out of place” (304). Bede was not satisfied with this state of affairs, Meyvaert asserts, and prevailed upon his abbot, Coelfrith, for permission to address the situation. At this point, brother X was compelled to turn the pandect over to Bede, who devised a strategy to address “the prominence given to the *antiqua translatio*.” The book was already bound and time was of the essence, so Bede had the central bifolium removed and created schematic “consisting of five circles shaped in the form of a cross, and chose five sentences from Jerome’s letter to Paulinus, each dealing with a book of the Pentateuch, to fill the circles” (305). The revised single leaf was then inserted at the end of the quire before the beginning of the Pentateuch. At this time Bede also had inserted verses pertaining to Jerome at the bottom of the other purple page, containing the contents of the Amiatinus as well as the two verses above the Ezra portrait. Needing a physical support on which to re-attach the (now) single leaves back into the quire, Bede (as argued by Meyvaert) conceived of adding a bifolium depicting the Tabernacle, copying an image found in the Codex Grandior (evidence for this lies in the depiction of the two altars in the Tabernacle image which, in Meyvaert’s view, reflects a passage from Bede’s *De tabernaculo*). The copying of the Tabernacle image, Meyvaert states, “fits in much better with Bede’s known propensities” namely his willingness to copy plans and his interest in “details in the two old images not vouched for by the text of Scripture” (306).

Art historians, too, are increasingly concentrating their studies on connections and interrelations created

by and within the structure of the manuscripts instead of focusing entirely on sources or puzzling through the conundra presented by isolated images taken from their contexts. The open manuscript, this time as an iconic representation that focuses disparate discourses of personal piety, is the focus of Catherine Karkov’s “Text as Image in Ælfwine’s Prayerbook,” *The Power of Words*, ed. Magennis and Wilcox [see sec. 2] 95–114. As Karkov points out, though “books, writing, and the word are central to all Christian cultures ... nowhere do they seem to carry such a variety of meanings, as in Anglo-Saxon art—and even in Anglo-Saxon culture in general” (95). The visual form of the book seems to have been a particularly resonant image for Ælfwine, monk, Dean and Abbot of New Minster. The New Minster Liber Vitae (BL Stowe 944), commissioned while Ælfwine was Abbot, contains eight depictions of books, with half of those representing the Liber Vitae itself, Karkov notes. The three illustrations in the Prayerbook once owned by Ælfwine (BL Cotton Titus D.xxvi and D.xxvii) contain prominent depictions of books: (in order of their original appearance in the manuscript) John holding an open book at the Crucifixion (f. 65v of D.xxvii), the books held by the Mary and the Trinity (known widely as the “Quintity,” f. 75v of D.xxvii), and those held by Ælfwine and St. Peter (f. 19v of D.xxvi). These images introduce the texts they precede (respectively, prayers to the Cross, Offices of the Trinity, Holy Cross, and Mary; and the Collectar) and, according to Karkov, “work intervisually and intertextually to map the reader’s progress into the meaning and function of the book, to locate him physically and spiritually in time and space, and to relate this manuscript, its meaning, and its reader, to a series of other books and readers (or witnesses)” (98).

The image of the Crucifixion has no precise visual parallel and presents several unusual elements. Karkov draws attention to two of these, the unique Latin inscription at the top of the page (*Hec crux consignet Ælfwinum corpore mente. In qua suspendens tra[xit] d[eu]s omnia secum*) and the depiction of John writing on a blank book. The inscription, Karkov explains, unites Ælfwine “in his devotions to the image of Christ and the cross,” and “more generally to saints ... such as Guthlac and John,” and “other figures on the page, all of whom are in the process of witnessing, indeed of finding joy in the Crucifixion” (100–101). The blank book held by John recalls that he is author of his Gospel, and according to Karkov, was “meant to call to mind other texts, specifically, the Prayerbook itself, the prayers contained within the Prayerbook, and the Apocalypse [are] ... part of iconic image toward which Ælfwine would

have directed his prayers" (103). "The blank book may be interpreted as a sign of eternal power, and eternal judgment, themes taken up in the Prayerbook's other two drawings" (104).

"The purpose of the Prayerbook," Karkov continues, "was to help Ælfwine toward salvation and union with God, and in the second of the manuscripts miniatures, the Trinity with Mary, he is granted a vision of the goal he seeks" (104). Again, books play an important, if "paradoxical" role in this illustration, and "may be interpreted as a representation of the inseparable nature of the Trinity and the eternal nature of the Word and ... nothing more than a symptom of the basic symmetry of the page" (106). They also may remind the viewer of the role of councils in the "condemnation of heresy and the binding and punishment of heretics" as well "the source of earthly law and judgment in God's eternal law and judgment" (107). The theme of judgment also informs the third illustration in the Prayerbook, showing Ælfwine before St. Peter. The latter holds an open book "certainly to be understood as the Book of Life" (108). Looking at the three illustrations as a program, Karkov argues that Peter (the *vita activa*) and John (*vita contemplativa*) "represent the two parts of the monastic life, and as such were models for Ælfwine himself ... text and image work together in all three to make the reading of the book and contemplation of its images metaphors for the union of contemplation and action, and the hoped-for rewards of that union" (110). The books in all three illustrations are blank and thus "provided him [Ælfwine] with the representation of the book in which text and image had yet to be inscribed, the still empty liminal space of future judgment through which his flesh would come to dwell with the Word in eternity" (111).

Jane Rosenthal and Patrick McGurk take this emphasis on the relationship of images within manuscripts a step further by showing the complex relationships and differences in emphasis in not one but three manuscripts. In "Author, Symbol, and Word: The Inspired Evangelists in Judith of Flanders' Anglo-Saxon Gospel Books," *Tributes to Jonathan J. G. Alexander: The Making and Meaning of Illuminated Medieval & Renaissance Manuscripts, Art & Architecture*, ed. Susan L'Engle and Gerald B. Guest (London: Harvey Miller), 185–202, examine the meaning and function of Evangelist portraits in three gospel books made for Judith, the wealthy and well-connected wife of Tostig, earl of Northumbria. Two of these books are currently in the Morgan Library in New York, M. 708 and M. 709; another is at Monte Cassino (Archivio della Badia Cod. 457; a fourth gospel book owned by Judith, now

in Fulda, Hessische Landesbibliothek, Cod. Aa.21 is not considered because its illustrations were added by a continental scribe after Judith and her husband Tostig Godwinson, Earl of Northumbria left England in 1065). The three volumes under consideration are joined not only by their patronage but also by their lavishness, evidenced by the large scale of the illustration, the use of gold and variety of colors. Rosenthal and McGurk show that they were carefully planned: "the illuminators of three of the books freely adapted and manipulated their sources to create an appropriately distinctive, original, and sophisticated program of illustration and decoration for each" (196).

M. 709 includes a frontispiece and encloses the portraits in an elaborate, Winchester-style frames while the initials on the page facing the evangelist portrait employ acanthus and gold-bordered panels that recall liturgical books; the evangelists themselves are nearly identical with the exception of John. All are shown dipping their pens, seated frontally, and inspired by their symbols. John turns to his left and writes the words of his gospel on an open manuscript. The portraits in M. 708 are decorative and impressive on the surface, yet more varied in their presentation. Two types of frame are used, rectangular and trefoil-arched. The initials of the gospels lack ornament, relying on variation of size and type for effect. The portraits clearly differentiate the evangelists using variations of the standard frontal pose and depicting John in profile. The symbols, too, are varied: "the lion and calf fly down from the upper right ... the angel ... stands on the ground ... the eagle flies down from directly overhead and speaks directly into his ear" (187). The Monte Cassino Gospels are even more distinctive. Portraits and initial pages are surrounded by arches painted in gold, which support a variety of plant and animal life. Initials are composed of animal motifs with dragons and eagles as well as zoomorphic forms (Wormald Type I). The arrangement of symbols and evangelists are distinctive; Evangelist symbols occupy the lunettes of arches in the folios facing the Evangelist portraits. Two of the symbols combine human bodies with animal heads (lion and ox). The portraits themselves are standard and display characteristics of those in the other two books (John repeats the profile pose found in M. 708 while the other three turn to their left similar to John in M. 709). The backgrounds, vibrantly covered, wavy "clouds" distinguish the portraits from those in the other two books.

Rosenthal and McGurk then carefully analyze the portraits in each of the three manuscripts, approaching the question in terms of the programmatic relationship of the images in each book. M. 709 is shown to

clearly group Matthew, Luke, and Mark through frontal pose action (dipping pens), yet Matthew and John are also linked through the common fact that words have already been entered on their books while the other two evangelists have yet to begin to write. Rosenthal and McGurk contend that the principle thematic content derives from two basic subjects. The first is the distinction between the first three evangelists (chiefly concerned with Christ's humanity) and John (concerned with his divinity). The second theme links Matthew and John, "who as disciples of Jesus, unlike Mark and Luke, personally witnessed that which they recorded, and whose Gospels, taken together, contained what needed to be written about Christ, Son of Man and Son of God" (188). These distinctions are communicated visually in the portraits through pose, gesture, and action. In M. 708, conversely, the program "depends less on the agreement of the three than on the distinctiveness of John," namely, the fact that only John is crowned with a filet ("identifying him "as the celestial evangelist who, in his efforts to set forth the divinity of Christ, flew to the highest heavens" and the direct inspiration of his symbol, which flies directly to his ear. M. 708 adds another layer, using visual markers such as the shape of the frame to pair Matthew with Luke (rectangular frame symbolizing the physical world) and Mark with John (arched frames). In the Monte Cassino gospels, the evangelists are separated from their symbols on the facing page and "appear to be listening to an inner voice as they move their pens across the page" (191). The Evangelist symbols appear "in the heavenly realm of the lunettes, above the opening words of the gospels" and this close association of the symbols with the written words of the gospel incipits "makes explicit that the works recorded by the Evangelists are those ordained by divine authority.... The Gospels are thus theophanies of Christ to be approached as such by the reader" (191).

They advance a thesis that rather than mere visual variety, the specific treatment of portrait, frame, and initial relates to the particular function of the three books and hints at the circumstances of their creation. M. 709, with its frontispiece depicting Judith embracing the Cross of the Crucifixion and "the only book with four complete Gospel texts and a frontispiece, would appear to be the principal chapel Gospels," accounting for the programmatic emphasis on "the harmony of the Gospels in the Evangelist portraits" (193) and its deluxe, gold paneled initials and Winchester-style frames. M.708 is akin to a lectionary, for it contains only selections from the gospels. This and the relative austerity of the book's decoration suggests

it would be appropriate in a Gospels used in the liturgy of Holy Week. The Monte Cassino Gospel book, they contend, "was designed for Judith's personal devotion," noting that only the texts of Matthew and John are complete (there are excerpts only of Luke and Mark). "The emphasis on the theophanic nature of the text as well as the less formal, livelier, more colorful decorative program would be appropriate in a volume intended for private devotional reading" (193). The complementarity of the design and function of this group of manuscripts is deliberate, in Rosenthal and McGurk's estimation. The scribe of the Monte Cassino Gospels, "who wrote most of the text in the volumes and may have illuminated one, provided the basic design for all four books, oversaw their execution, and dealt with the patron." A second scribe/artist completed the portraits in M. 708; a third, less competent scribe inserted the initials in M. 709 while another hand supplied the "assured, incisive drawing in the portraits as well as the text on the books held by Matthew and John. All twelve surviving Anglo-Saxon evangelist portraits derive, it is likely, from a model ultimately traced back to the Carolingian School of Rheims.

This was a particularly rich year for the study of Evangelist portraits. In "Writing and Having Written: Word and Image in the Eadwig Gospels," *Writing and Texts in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Rumble, 44–61, Karkov explores the visual interrelationships in a manuscript now in Hanover (Kestner Museum WM XX1a 36). Written (and likely illustrated) by Eadwig Basan at Christ Church, Canterbury ca. 1020, the book is beautifully and fully illustrated with fourteen canon tables and four Evangelist portraits. The canon tables are unusual in their decoration. The first two (folios 9v and 10r) contain in their arches facing images of Hand of God holding divider and scales and Christ as Logos; the other twelve contain depictions of evangelist symbols arranged in the tympana or adjoining architectural elements. The Hand of God/Logos together suggest "that creation was and is both a physical and an oral act—a matter of tools and words" while the evangelist while the evangelist symbols "might be seen as representing the divine inspiration that lies behind and helps unite the written words of the evangelists which they preface and to which, at least in theory, they offer a concordance" (46).

Likewise the portraits of the evangelists are "extremely innovative, relating to each other in a way that earlier series of writing evangelists do not. [They] create a visual narrative of textual production which helps establish a sense of unity between the four gospels and also between the gospels, the canon tables and

the colophon" (49). Seen together, the Evangelist portraits illustrate four sequential steps of writing: Mathew holds pen-knife and book as if he just opened it, Mark sharpens his pen, Luke places pen on manuscript, John displays a written text (on a scroll). The images in the manuscript, read from the canon tables through to the portrait of John, "presents us with a microcosm of biblical time that runs from the creation of the world to the resurrection testimony of John's Gospel, a chronology that is extended by Eadwig's famous colophon to the present time of the book's creation" (50). Karkov compares the activities of the evangelist/scribes to those of Eadwig himself in the creation of this gospel book, and argues that the analogy between evangelists and contemporary producers is similar to that professed in the Aldred's colophon to the Lindisfarne Gospels in that "both Aldred and Eadwig present themselves as types of evangelist-scribes" (55). Within this series of evangelist portraits, that of John is distinctly different—he looks out at the viewer, holds an inscribed scroll, and sits above the vanquished figure of the arch-heretic Arrius. Karkov explains that this signals the traditional understanding of John's Gospel as a form of oral teaching and the efficacious linkage of Christ Logos and Christ Incarnate made through the distinctive revelatory power of John's Gospel. Karkov also recalls that the complex exegesis of the opening words of John's Gospel is used by Augustine in his refutation of the heresies of both Jews and Arians; the topicality of this image for the Anglo-Saxon viewer may be found, Karkov argues, in the writings of Ælfric and Wulfstan, who share similar concerns with heresy. Karkov concludes by linking the visual program to Eadwig's colophon. Found at the end of John's Gospel, the colophon (like the portrait of the evangelist in the manuscript) "appeals directly to the reader ... and just like John, Eadwig will live on in his words and in the memories of his readers and just like John's text, Eadwig's text, with its miniatures, will have the power to refute heresies to come" (60). In a wider, historical context, Karkov asserts that "if Eadwig was also the artist of the manuscript his presentation of himself as embodying Christ-like powers of creation looks forward to a type of self-portraiture generally considered to have developed in the post-medieval period" (61).

The interest in the ways manuscripts structure the interrelationships of text and image is related to a renewed study of their material individuality. Some manuscripts have, of course, long been prized for their unique "personalities" and each mark and inscription they preserve are treasured. The Exeter book has one of the more well-known manuscript personalities;

Abdullah Alger adds to our understanding of its complexity in "Two Drypoint Etchings in the *Exeter Book*," *N&Q* n.s. 53: 153–54. Alger discusses drypoint marks at two different parts of the book, folios 47v and 60r. The existence of the drypoint on folio 47v has long been known; Alger observes that it is "a later hand practicing the alphabet using mixed forms of letters" (153). Earlier observers have missed that the etchings formed an alphabet and had described the starting points incorrectly: they run from opposite the eleventh line of the text to past the first. The marks on folio 60r have not been noticed before and Alger here announces their discovery. They are likely unknown because they are visible only when the original manuscript is seen under certain, ideal lighting conditions (and his description of those conditions will make anyone familiar with reading room practices chuckle). As he describes them, the marks "resemble small arches that run from one prick to the next" on the right side of the folio" and were "made by someone perhaps who did not want them to be seen or did not want them to last" (154).

Another trait seen in contributions this year is the willingness to move beyond the traditional boundaries of chronology, geography, and medium. Lloyd Laing's "The Roman Origins of Celtic Christian Art," *ArchJ* 162: 146–76, concentrates primarily on metalwork but his argument has many ramifications for manuscripts, indeed for decoration in many media. Working across the chronological, political, and cultural boundaries of Late Roman Britain and Anglo-Saxon England, Laing observes that "for the greater part of the twentieth century Celtic Christian art was seen to represent a resurgence of Insular La Tène art in the fifth century, after the severance of Britain from the Roman Empire." He challenges this view, relying on recent studies that show "elements of art derived from Roman Britain survived into the fifth century and beyond" (146). Laing catalogues and discusses several types of decorative devices and traces their Roman to post-Roman connections. He devotes sections to different ornamental patterns, including triskele designs, pelta patterns, confronted trumpet patterns, dodo head, and minor decorative designs such as ring and dot, trellis pattern, marigolds and rosettes (and many more) as well as penannular brooches and long stick pins. In each section he traces the history of each design through surviving examples, showing that many of them "were present in Roman Britain, and were not merely 'survivals' from the pre-Roman Iron Age which lingered in the early years following the Conquest, but were in use as late as the fourth century" (147). A concluding section discusses continuity in workshop traditions, pointing to the

Bristol Channel/Severn Estuary are as being particularly important in this regard (169–70).

Another study that works across the boundaries, this time between manuscript and metalwork, is “The *Lindisfarne Gospels* and the Aesthetics of Anglo-Saxon Art,” *ASSAH* 13: 105–17, by J. Alison Rosenblitt. She writes, “The beauty, detail, and perfection of Lindisfarne Gospels represents to some eyes the pinnacle of achievement in Insular manuscript illumination,” yet Rosenblitt notes that it has long been known that on some pages the artist has left parts unfinished, whether through oversight (gaps major and minor) or deliberate discrepancies (where details in one part of a composition do not match another). Robert Bruce-Mitford described the “gaps” as minor “oversights” while Janet Backhouse offered another perspective, suggesting that Eadfrith was “practicing the humility of avoiding absolute in the mammoth task he had undertaken” (105). Rosenblitt reevaluates the evidence and presents another conclusion: “What has been interpreted as imperfection is more plausibly interpreted as an aesthetic device: the introduction of an anomalous or asymmetrical element into an otherwise symmetrical pattern, with a resulting play on levels of symmetry and asymmetry that has wide resonance in Anglo-Saxon art” (106).

Rosenblitt lists five deliberate imperfections (which she defines as an “active addition or substitution of one design element for another”) found in the Lindisfarne Gospels (for example, a trumpet-spiral arranged at a 90° twist from its neighbors on the Mark Carpet page) which she argues are paralleled with similar alterations found in the Book of Durrow. These parallels make it unlikely that we are dealing with simple mistakes or oversights; at the same time, Rosenblitt argues, there is “a lack of contemporary evidence for the posited connections between humility, divine perfection, and human craft” (108). She reviews the salient portions of the Rule of St. Benedict (which calls for craftsmen to “practice their crafts with all humility and reverence”) and explains that the “danger foreseen by the Rule is a danger of social tensions” rather than “a sign of human presumptions vis-à-vis the divine” (108). Likewise, some previous scholars have suggested that notions of humility were borrowed from other artistic traditions, particularly, the makers of Persian or Eastern rugs. For Rosenblitt this is a “red-herring” since there is no firm evidence that rug makers introduced “deliberate errors” in their work. She also dismisses the influence of Roman mosaics (noting the use of a bird and diamond to “sign” mosaics preserved at Fishbourne) “because the artistic ideas under consideration in the mosaics and the manuscript pages differ in principle.

In the mosaics, the element ... appears not as part of any pattern, but as an external element imposed onto the design” whereas in the manuscripts it “is an integral part of the design (109).

Rosenblitt does find “an alteration of an established, symmetrical pattern by the introduction of an anomalous detail or small change” (110) in Germanic metalwork, for instance on the shoulder clasps from Sutton Hoo (Bruce-Mitford’s Inventory 4 and 5). What informs the introduction of anomalies in metalwork, she argues, was not a religious notion (the Christian virtue “humility”) but an aesthetic response. The anomalies are a visual “play” on the “sensitivity to symmetry and asymmetry” (112). Anglo-Saxon artists could create works that prize (for example, the Forest Gate bead now in the Ashmolean Museum) or asymmetry (Camerton pendant). Others combine the two approaches (the Sutton Hoo Purse Lid and the Hunterston Brooch). The latter category of work (the Lindisfarne Carpet pages and their metalwork analogues) “requires that viewer preserve two levels of viewing—i.e. perceive a symmetrical as well as an asymmetrical level—then experience the contrast as a play on that perception.” (113) Further evidence this “play” can be found in a wide variety of cultural productions, from style I square-headed brooches (which David Leigh has shown to contain animal masks that transform into human masks when seen from different angles) to Anglo-Saxon literary preferences (riddles, kennings, and metaphors). “The symmetry of cross-carpet pages is one of the many manifestations of the influence of native taste in the Insular adaptation of imported Christian art,” writes Rosenblitt (112). “In Bede’s sheer enjoyment of the aesthetics of allegory, we may glimpse something of the intellectual pull which Christianity might have had for an Anglo-Saxon audience” (113).

In “Every Picture Tells a Story: Cuthbert’s Vestments in the Benedictional of St Æthelwold,” *Essays for Joyce Hill*, ed. Swan [see sec. 2], 111–34, Sarah Larratt Keefer relies extensively on continental sources and comparative material in her examination of two “conundra presented by two tenth-century portraits of St Cuthbert.” These are illustrations of King Æthelstan presenting a book to Cuthbert (CCCC Ms. 183, f.1) and the Choir of Confessors from the Benedictional of Æthelwold (BL MS Add. 49598). Addressing the question, “What in fact might we expect an Anglo-Saxon monastic bishop to have worn?” Keefer rehearses evidence from the *Regularis Concordia* and continental copies of the *Ordines Romani*. In the Cambridge manuscript the puzzle is that Cuthbert is not depicted with a stole as might be expected for a bishop. Noting the ambiguity

of continental examples and the lack of “consistency in pre-Conquest English vestment representation” (116), Keefer suggests that because “he is a long-dead saint, no longer responsible for the immediate care of his particular pastoral flock” (117), in other words, not engaged in ritual, the absence of the stole may be understood. The Benedictional’s illustration is even more of a puzzle. It depicts part of the Choir of Confessors, with Gregory, Benedict, and Cuthbert positioned in the front row. Each of them is “vested in full Mass regalia—alb, stole, dalmatic, amice, and chasuble” as well as the pallium, a sign of archiepiscopal office, that neither Benedict nor Cuthbert ever held. Keefer cites Deshman’s earlier explanation that the creators of the manuscript, as Benedictine monks, surely would have known that Benedict had not been ordained and therefore deliberately chose to depict them as a way of pushing the case for monastic bishops. But, Keefer asks, why extend the same honor to Cuthbert? Looking again to continental sources, Keefer finds more ambiguity, concluding that “conflicting or insufficient evidence together with a variety of interpretations have therefore left the question of whether bishops wore the pallium in early years, with a change restricting it to archbishops thereafter, still unresolved” (121). Continental artists were also more lax than the *ordos* would seem to allow, as Keefer notes: “We therefore have continental examples of art [the Sainte Chappelle Gospels and the Uta Codex] both before and after the Benedictional of St Æthelwold that deviate perhaps as abruptly from historical vestment assignment as does the Cuthbert image with its pallium” (122). Keefer argues that the pallium worn by Cuthbert, and by Benedict, “[was] intended to make the visual statement ‘this saint accords in all things with the highest authority of Rome’. Cuthbert’s pallium, then, perhaps like that of Abbot Benedict, would be part of the inevitable Æthelwoldian agenda, clearly influenced by continental art and its politics, though with different intent from that of continental programmes” (123).

Martin K. Foys’ “An Unfinished *Mappa Mundi* from Late-Eleventh-Century Worcester,” *ASE* 35: 271–84, focuses on a puzzle presented by one page of a manuscript likely made some thirty years after the Conquest. The uncompleted map in question is found on page 210 in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 265 and is in the same family as the more well known maps found in Oxford, St. John’s College 17 and BL Harley 3667. The unfinished map, sketched on a folio originally left blank at the beginning of the manuscript’s second section, consists of a drypoint sketch of “a central circle, bordered by three bands, and two upper rimmed roundels, which intersect the top right and left of the

central circle respectively” (273). The two later roundels, Foys tells us, are not found in the later analogues and “probably point instead to a more elaborate exemplar than previously known, and also to a layout unique in medieval cartography” (274). Text and inscriptions have been added in the top quarter of the map, written in Rustic capitals and late Anglo-Saxon minuscule. “The awkward management of textual layout implies that this map was a hasty and/or casual copy of an exemplar” (273). While the Cambridge sketch and its analogues share cartographic commonplaces with other medieval maps (the closest relationship is with the “T-O maps of the Sallust family,” 275), they “possess a block of thematic content unattested elsewhere, in four inscriptions which identify the preaching zones of specific saints: Andreas in Achaia, Peter in Caesaria, Paul in Athens and John in Ephesus” (275). The emphasis on these four apostles and their mission fields, which leads Foys to label these maps “Mission T-O maps,” reveals a “degree of experimentation and adaption” not usually associated with medieval map-making (277). A single source cannot be identified, though to Foys it “suggests a more active and perhaps contemporary consultation with the writing of Isidore of Seville, particularly his *Chronicon* and *Quaestiones in Veterum Testamentum*” (276). Foys agrees with the traditional view that the manuscript was likely made in Worcester. He reviews the evidence of the script and, while noting that palaeographic evidence is “scant and compromised” (280), suggests that a dating in the last quarter of the eleventh century is probable (with a lot of interpretive weight resting on the presence of a looped e-caudata) and that perhaps a more specific range of 1085–95 might be acceptable due to stylistic connections to the Avelston Charter and Hemming’s Cartulary (BL Cotton Tiberius A.XIII). Foys draws several preliminary conclusions. Previous scholars have speculated that the maps from Thorney and Peterborough are a “relatively local cartographic phenomenon” arising perhaps from a connection with the work of Byrthferth of Ramsay. If the Worcester map is earlier than the Peterborough or Thorney versions, then the possibility arises that it represents a tradition stemming from another non-scientific source. “Thorney and Peterborough firmly set the map within a scientific, computational framework, but in its liturgical content, CCC 265 ... invites us to reconsider the spiritual, rather than scientific side of these maps” (283). Foys suggests that “the apostolic function of the map may connect to the ideological shift at Worcester that occurred under Wulfstan II (1065–95),” namely the “pastoral, vernacular context” (284) of manuscripts produced at

Worcester. "There is something poignant in the silence of this incomplete map, given that it was started, and then abandoned, at Worcester, a monastic center determined to carry on writing in the Anglo-Saxon vernacular for decades after the Conquest" (284).

As Jane Rosenthal shows us in her contribution, Anglo-Saxon manuscripts contributed vital and important roles long after the "death" of Anglo-Saxon England. She traces the historical travels of an eccentric manuscript "personality," the Arenberg Gospels, in her "The Peregrinations of a Thousand-Year-Old English Gospel Book (New York, Pierpont Morgan Library Ms. M.869)," *Between the Picture and the Word: Manuscript Studies from the Index of Christian Art*, ed. Colum Hourihane, *Index of Christian Art Occasional Papers 8* (University Park, MD: Index of Christian Art in association with Penn State UP), 169–79. The Arenberg Gospels contain several illustrations including the well-known frontispiece of the Crucifixion scene, canon tables with a singular cycle representing the history of redemption in its frames, and four evangelist portraits paired with ornamental initial pages. "One of the finest produced by the Christ Church scriptorium" (165), this Canterbury manuscript was likely made ca. 1000, perhaps for use during the liturgy by its putative patron, archbishop Æthelgar or Ælfric.

The first recorded stop in the manuscript's post Anglo-Saxon history was the monastery at Deutz, near Cologne. There, in the twelfth century, an anonymous scribe recorded a forged papal bull (allegedly published by Gregory the VII concerning canonization of St. Heribert) on an originally blank leaf of the manuscript. Rosenthal reviews several previous theories about how the manuscript arrived in Deutz (ownership by Heribert himself or by a subsequent bishop; use of the manuscript as a diplomatic gift by Æthelred, Cnut, or Edward the Confessor). All but one of these suppositions posit the arrival sometime between the first and fourth decades of the eleventh century; no evidence survives as to what use, if any, the manuscript was put but Rosenthal explains, "with the insertion of the bull, the Morgan Gospels took on a new role as an essential instrument of the cult that added significantly to the book's importance." Two later insertions, both liturgical and possibly related to the cult of St. Heribert, are dated paleographically to ca. 1160–70. By the late thirteenth century, the manuscript was in the possession of the abbey of St. Severin in Cologne. There several Latin oaths for the officers of the Church were added at various spots in the manuscript and, as Rosenthal states, the manuscript took on "a new and prestigious role" (169), "not only because it provided the authorized text

of the oath but was also the object on which the oath was sworn" (170). This may explain the smudging of the figure of Christ in the Crucifixion frontispiece (by the hands of the oath-takers, as Meta Harrsen has previously suggested). While it was held at St. Severin a fifteenth century scribe marked the Gospel readings for twenty feasts in a single campaign. Its use in the liturgy may provide another explanation for the defacement of the image: as William Voekle has suggested, the particular practice in Germany of liturgical osculation allowed for the substitution of a painted image for a sculpted crucifix on the altar as the object of the kiss. The next recorded stage in the manuscript's history was during the Napoleonic wars. With the consular decree of June 9, 1802 the laws of France were extended to incorporate the Rhineland, and the monastery of St. Severin and its possessions became property of the French State. However, a canon at St. Sevrin, Franz Pick, preserved the Morgan Gospels from possible destruction by taking it with him to Bonn, where it became the centerpiece of his renowned collection. Pick, whose collection was visited by illustrious guests such as Goethe, was "less motivated by personal acquisitiveness than by patriotic desire to rescue as many of these well-loved native works as possible" (172). After Pick's death in 1819, the gospels found their way into the collection of the Dukes of Arenberg, who built a small but very impressive collection. After 1914, the manuscript, along with the rest of the Arenberg Library, was secreted away in Brussels, first from the invading Germans and then from sequestration by Belgian officials (the Duke was considered a German citizen). The manuscript remained hidden until 1952, when the tenth Duke of Arenberg, who had decided to move the family to Monte Carlo, offered much of the ancestral library for sale. The exhibition of the manuscripts in New York "rocked the manuscript world," (174) since most of the manuscripts had not been seen in over two generations. In 1954, the manuscript was acquired for the Morgan Library for \$50,000. An appendix to the article describes the non-medieval binding of the manuscript at the time of the Morgan purchase (likely the result of Canon Pick's arrangement) and speculates as to the fate of its original cover and the individual items removed in 1954.

In *Maps and Monsters in Medieval England* (Studies in Medieval History and Culture. New York: Routledge) Asa Simon Mittman deliberately breaks traditional chronological and methodological (in his extensive use of critical theory) bounds of Anglo-Saxon studies in his examination of marginality and monstrosity. As Mittman explains, marginality and monstrosity "themselves frequently characterized by a refusal to obey just

such rules and boundaries” (7). His textual sources run from the late Roman (Gildas) and through the twelfth-century (Richard of Haldingham), though the majority of examples are culled from the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries. He interweaves analysis of historical and literary texts with manuscript illustrations, decorated initials, and maps, with primary attention given to mappaemundi (particularly the Hereford wall map), the Marvels of the East (BL Cotton Vitellius A.xv, BL Cotton Tiberius B.v, and Oxford, Bodley 614), and the initials to a late eleventh century copy of Priscian’s *Grammar* (Cambridge, Trinity College MS O.2.51). Mittman argues that monsters, marginality, and maps are integral to understanding the culture of medieval England because they form some of “a few cultural threads that run through the period, binding it together if only loosely” (5). He adds, “it must be noted that they [the Anglo-Saxons] were living, writing, and creating a culture far from Rome and Jerusalem, the sites that would have been considered most sacred and important to the spiritual well-being. This self-imposed exile from all that was central to Christian belief caused an anxiety to arise about their place on the earth, which was in turn viewed as a reflection of their place within God’s divine plan” (4). “These monsters, half-human hybrids and bristling dragons are just as essential as image of God and his heavenly hosts for the medieval viewer, whose universal spectrum was broad enough to contain at one end holy perfection and at the other the most wretched and abject” (5).

Mittman’s study is divided into three parts, each with three chapters. Part One, “Mapping the Outer Edges of the World,” deals primarily with maps and geographical texts with visual examples from the Hereford World Map with excursions into the Ebstorf map, Cotton Vitellius T-O Map, St. John’s College T-O Map, Wallingford Map. Part Two bears the title “The Marvels of the East over Three Centuries and a Millennium” and discusses the various sources of belief in monsters (Classical, Christian, Germanic; popular belief, medical texts, scientific texts, and heroic poetry) and describes the three manuscript copies of the Marvels of the East BL Cotton Vitellius A..xv, BL Cotton Tiberius B.v, and Oxford,

Bodley 614. Part Three (“Lexical Spaces as Battlegrounds”) is devoted the fluid boundaries between men and beasts as visualized in the hybrids and “monster-inhabited initials” of manuscripts such as Junius 27, the Winchcombe Psalter (CUL Ff.I.23), Priscian’s *Grammar* (Trinity College MS O.2.51) Trinity R.3.30 (Lucian’s *Pharsalia*), Cambridge CCC MS 4, and Arundel 16. A concluding chapter (“Dwelling in the Monster”) centers on the story of Noah’s Ark as depicted in the Old English Hexateuch (BL Cotton Claudius B.iv). Describing in detail how the Anglo-Saxon artist drew on traditions of the monstrous in his visual imagining of the ark, Mittman tells us, “Noah and his family sought refuge in the belly of the beast, in a monster great enough to survive the flood” (208). In this way, the illustration is emblematic for the arguments of his book: “For the Anglo-Saxon—a marginal hybrid society—and the medieval English cultures that followed them, maps and monsters were able to fill the most vital of roles. Together, they declared their creators to be peripheral yet normal people, and therefore worthy of salvation despite their damnable location” (209).

BW

Works not seen

- Bovey, A., ed. *Under the Influence: The Concept of Influence and the Study of Illuminated Manuscripts*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2005.
- Brown, Michelle P. “An Early Medieval Outbreak of ‘Influenza’? Concepts of ‘Influence’, Medieval and Modern.” *Under the Influence*. Ed. Bovey.
- Henderson, George. “Insular Art: Influence and Inference.” *Under the Influence*. Ed. Bovey.
- Dumville, David N. *A Palaeographer’s Review: The Insular System of Scripts in the Early Middle Ages: vol. II*. Suita, Osaka: Inst. of Oriental and Occidental Studies, Kansai Univ., 2004.
- Dumville, David N. “The Late Celtic Script,” *Jnl of Celtic Studies* 5 (2005).
- Dumville, David N. *St. Boniface as Scribe and Author: Problematic Evidence from St. Petersburg*, Aberdeen Studies in Palaeography and Codicology 2 (Aberdeen: 2005).

7. History and Culture

a. General Sources and Reference Works

The New Cambridge Medieval History, Volume I: c. 500–c. 700, edited by Paul Fouracre (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005), is the long-awaited first volume of *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, whose other volumes began to appear ten years earlier. The contents are divided into four sections. The first provides an introduction to the history of Europe during this period, as well as chapters about the later Roman Empire, the barbarian invasions, and the sources and their interpretation. The next two sections are organized chronologically and geographically. The first of these (“Part I”) deals with the sixth century and covers the Eastern empire, the Byzantines in the west, Ostrogothic Italy and the Lombard invasions, the formation of the Sueve and the Visigothic kingdoms in Spain, Merovingian Gaul and the Frankish conquests, the Celtic kingdoms, and the earliest Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. The second (“Part II”) deals with the seventh century and covers the Byzantine empire; Muhammed and the rise of Islam; the Catholic Visigothic kingdom; Francia; religion and society in Ireland; Christianity among the Britons, Dalriadan Irish, and Picts; England; Scandinavia; and the Slavs. The third (“Part III”) deals with themes and problems: the Jews in Europe from 500 to 1050, kings and kingship, the Mediterranean economy, the northern seas from the fifth to the eighth centuries, money and coinage, Church structure and organization, Christianization and the dissemination of Christian teaching, education and learning, the art and architecture of western Europe, and the art and architecture of the East. A number of the essays in Part III will be of interest to Anglo-Saxonists, but chief among them is Patrick Wormald’s contribution on kings and kingship, which gives considerable attention to the Germanic and Celtic forms of these institutions. The two essays on Anglo-Saxon England say a lot about their subjects simply in the way that they contrast so profoundly. Helena Hamerow’s essay on “The earliest Anglo-Saxon kingdoms” (263–88) offers a way of thinking about her topic as much as it describes it. This orientation is archaeological, and it is only after she has discussed the evidence of cemeteries, settlements, demographics, communities, identity formation, and the transition that seems to have taken place in the later sixth century that she addresses kingdom formation, which she sees as a process of competitive exclusion. Hamerow argues that the administrative infrastructure of late Roman Britain must have disintegrated rapidly into various more or

less independent units and that the resulting networks of trade and exchange would have had considerable potential to provide a framework for later integration. Rejecting the hypothesis that the kingdoms of southern and eastern England were constructed using the building blocks of Romano-British political structures, she also cautions that the kingdoms of seventh- and eighth-century England were not clearly rooted in the developments of the sixth century. Alan Thacker’s essay on “England in the Seventh Century” (462–95), in contrast, is almost entirely expository. He begins by addressing the problems of using Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica* as a source and then very ably describes the political landscape, ethnic identities, the relationship between the English and the Franks, the institution of kingship, government, lawmaking, the administration of justice, the impact of Christianity, the organization of the economy, the organization of society, and the cultural golden age that had begun by the end of the seventh century.

David Horspool’s *King Alfred: Burnt Cakes and Other Legends* (Cambridge: Harvard UP) and *Why Alfred Burned the Cakes: A King and His Eleven-Hundred-Year Afterlife* (London: Profile Books) are the same book published under different titles in the United Kingdom and the United States. The stated aim is to dissect the legends that have grown up around the figure of Alfred, but the biographical structure of the work means that even chapters of Alfred’s life that lack legends are still covered. Horspool does a good job of analyzing why some Alfredian legends (such as the story of the burned cakes) have endured when factual episodes (such as Alfred’s visits to Rome) were passed over by later enthusiasts. He is as deft at analyzing Alfred’s construction of his own reputation as he is at dissecting the truly bad 1969 movie *Alfred the Great*, “a combination of a ninth-century *Barbarella* with, in the battle scenes, *The Benny Hill Show*” (162). And even the Victorian promotion of Alfred was not without its unintentional humor: when twenty-eight pounds of sugar were used to settle the upper granite monolith on which Thornycroft’s immense statue of the king was to rest, a swarm of bees promptly halted the proceedings.

In *The Anglo-Saxons: The Verdict of History* (Stroud: Tempus, 2005), Paul Hill offers for a popular audience an analysis of the reception of the Anglo-Saxons throughout English history. Beginning with Bede, he methodically proceeds through the twelfth-century historians, the Tudors, the Civil War, seventeenth-century scholarship, the Elstobs’ scholarship, the Hanoverians, the Victorians, and the modern period. English history,

he asserts, far from beginning in 1066, began with the Anglo-Saxons, and in some sense, the Anglo-Saxon period is one that has lasted to this day.

At 404 pages, Geoffrey Hindley's *A Brief History of the Anglo-Saxons* (London: Robinson) belies its title. Intended for the general public, it is characterized by a casual—not to say careless—style. (My favorite typographical error is the missing period at the end of the sentence that follows the sentence describing Alcuin's passion for punctuation.) Hindley is constantly at pains to make the Anglo-Saxons comprehensible to modern readers, so they network a lot and get compared to Pope John Paul II (Theodore of Tarsus) and the Getty Museum (Æthelstan in relic-collecting mode). The first two chapters (about the arrival of the Anglo-Saxons and Northumbria) are quite haphazard, with readers most likely to come away only with the memory of King Osred's "fornicating rampage" (83), but the narrative settles down with "The Mercian Sphere" and continues in fairly sober fashion through "Apostles of Germany," "Alcuin of York," and political history from the first Viking Age on. Hindley spreads a commendably wide net, discussing not only Anglo-Saxon culture but also Anglo-Saxon coinage and queenship. *A Brief History* is surprisingly informative, in the sense that I was surprised to be told that "[i]n some US states the posse [comitatus] may still be deployed as a citizen police force, to patrol shopping malls, for instance" (54).

Steven Plunkett's *Suffolk in Anglo-Saxon Times* (Stroud: Tempus, 2005) is another work intended for the general public but in quite another vein. A museum curator and archeologist, Plunkett combines Roman, European, Anglo-Saxon, and ecclesiastical history with a substantial amount of archeology to produce an amply contextualized and illustrated narrative of East Anglian items and affairs from the first Anglo-Saxon migrations to the martyrdom of St. Edmund. The results are so solid that only the lack of notes and a full bibliography distinguishes it from an academic work, and indeed the ordinary Anglo-Saxon enthusiast or Suffolkphile might find it heavy going.

Charlemagne: Empire and Society (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2005), ed. Joanna Story, is a collection of papers that offers readers a snapshot of the current state of early Carolingian studies. Its constituent papers address a sequence of issues, ranging from Charlemagne's personality (Janet L. Nelson, "Charlemagne the Man"), the sources for his reign (David Ganz, "Einhard's Charlemagne: the characterization of greatness") through to concrete issues of politics, belief and learning (the papers of Matthew Innes, Mayke de Jong,

Rosamond McKitterick and Stuart Airlie, among others). Chapters are devoted to Frankish relations with the wider world—Rome, "the world beyond the Rhine" and Anglo-Saxon England. Material evidence is interrogated in contributions addressing urban change, rural settlement and Carolingian coinage. The number of single-author biographies of Charlemagne are steadily multiplying—as one suspects they will continue to do as we move ever closer to 2014, the 1200th anniversary of Charlemagne's death—and this volume offers a first-class guide to the key issues of Carolingian history. That said, certain contributions are of especial interest to YWOES's readers. Story's own piece, "Charlemagne and the Anglo-Saxons," (195–210) takes up the subject addressed in greater length in her 2003 monograph *Carolingian Connections: England and Francia c. 750–870*, *Studies in Early Medieval Britain* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003). Under a sequence of headings ("Chronicles and connections," "*pax et amicitia*: peace and friendship," "*Fidelitas*: fidelity," and "Exile and King Offa") she discusses the evidence for "a dynamic political and cultural relationship between the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms and Charlemagne's Francia," albeit one not always readily apparent in the sparse references to be found in contemporary annals. From notions of common Saxon identity to more concrete evidence for diplomatic exchange and cross-Channel liturgical remembrance (Alfred and Osgifu of Northumbria at Lul's Mainz, Charlemagne and his *camerarius* Meginfrid in the Durham *Liber Vitae*), Story traces the networks woven between England and the ever-expanding Carolingian realm. She gives particular attention to Offa and Charlemagne's relationship, the issues and implications of exile (offering valuable historical context for scholars primarily interested in its OE poetic treatment), and Alcuin's central involvement in cross-Channel relations. The image Story ultimately offers is one that is, in some senses, reminiscent of Ian Wood's view of Merovingian claims to hegemony over southern England, of Charlemagne as a figure happy to order English bishops to pray for the Frankish armies, intervene on behalf of Anglo-Saxon exiles, and force their return and, in certain key matters, to control Anglo-Saxon relations with Rome; "the road from England to Rome," she concludes, "very definitely led via Aachen."

Donald Bullough's death in 2002 robbed early medieval studies of a scholar whose work had, since the later 1950s, set a benchmark for scholarship in the field. In "Charlemagne's 'Men of God': Alcuin, Hildebald and Arn" (136–50), Bullough presented accessible and highly illuminating sketches of three Carolingian figures: Alcuin, Hildebald of Cologne, and Arn of Salzburg. Alcuin can

often be an intractable figure for students to understand. Bullough's treatment of him here, perhaps supported by his entry on Alcuin in the new *Dictionary of National Biography* [Alcuin (c. 740–804), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2004] offers an ideal and accessible overview to his career, key works and centrality as a link between Northumbria and Francia.

Regional study remains the dominant mode for younger scholars publishing book-length studies in early medieval history, while recent years have seen the revival of the wide-ranging *opus* among the profession's *seniores*. Chris Wickham's *Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean, 400–800* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005) is an appropriately magisterial attempt by Oxford's Chichele Professor of Medieval History and founding "Bucknell Group" member to provide a comparative history of western Europe in the period 400–800. At nearly one thousand pages, and with a geographic range that spans Ireland and Scandinavia to post-Roman North Roman Africa, Wickham offers Anglo-Saxon historians a sophisticated matrix of comparative material within which they might mount their own vision of the early Middle Ages. High among Wickham's stated targets in this book is the teleology often implicit in historical discourses of the nation state, a teleological element he sees as particularly prevalent within Anglo-Saxon studies, both past and present. "[O]nly a comparative approach," he writes in the closing pages of the book, "will allow the setting-out of how societies did develop differently, and what those differences tell us." Organized into four major sections ("States," "Aristocratic Power-structures," "Peasantries," "Networks") Wickham exhaustively examines a series of key fields of the post-Roman Europe. A study of this breadth is not easily summarized but among the themes of direct interest to readers of this journal are Wickham's treatment of the early Anglo-Saxon settlements and the survival, around them, of the surrounding "dark matter" of a surviving sub-Roman population; social stratification and developing attitudes towards social status (including Bede's), and developing systems of exchange. Among this study's many highlights one might isolate his portrait of a hypothetical late seventh-century Anglo-Saxon village, "Malling" (385–433), an impressive and illuminating "practical" portrait of the systems and shifts that Wickham analyzes elsewhere.

Simon Young's *A.D. 500: A Journey Through the Dark Isles of Britain and Ireland* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 2005) is a fictional sixth-century Byzantine travelogue. In the words of the author, the story "includes in its pages: massacres; nipple-sucking; saintly

ayatollahs; herbal remedies; human sacrifice; bears; wolves; flying ships; boat burials; peculiar haircuts; bizarre forms of Christianity; purple-suited poetry competitions; riddling; tattooed samurai; the siege of Celtic London; and many, many other glimpses of a fascinating but wholly unfamiliar version of these islands" (ix). To this list might be added Young's wholly unfamiliar version of *Beowulf*, in which Beowulf is married to Wealhtheow.

The wide range of contributions found in *The Anglo-Saxons, Studies presented to Cyril Roy Hart*, ed. Simon Keynes and Alfred P. Smyth (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005) reflects something of the honorand's own breadth of interests, though it is doubtful that any one of the contributors could match Dr. Hart for range on an individual level. We learn from the bibliography that closes the volume that his publications for 1973 addressed the topics of tenth-century politics and Athelstan "Half-King"—that definitive paper—as well as Wisbech's early history, and plantar warts: a range worthy of Byrhtferth himself. Certain contributions, however, command the particular attention of YWOES readers. Janet L. Nelson's "The Queen in Ninth-Century Wessex" is a meditation not only upon its stated subject but also upon Pauline Stafford's "justly celebrated" paper "The King's Wife in Wessex 800–1066" (*Past and Present* 91 [1981]: 3–27). Nelson takes her lead from advances in charter scholarship in the years since the appearance of Stafford's piece, exploring the evidence for the changing shape of West Saxon royal family, and its shifting internal loyalties across the middle years of the ninth century, using this, in turn, to frame and address Asser's treatment of Eadburh. Nelson's conclusions are somber: queenship in the ninth century was "only weakly institutionalized when set—as it inescapably was—alongside kingship." (Many of Nelson's other articles on queenship and early medieval gender are now conveniently collected in *Courts, Elites, and Gendered Power in the Early Middle Ages. Charlemagne and Others* [Aldershot: Variorum, 2007].) Audrey Meaney's "Old English Legal and Penitential Penalties for 'Heathenism'" (127–58), is, she reflects, "almost the last of a series of source studies which attempts to isolate and examine what Anglo-Saxon ecclesiasts had to say about 'heathenism' or superstition." Meaney works through the presence of both in legal and canon sources ranging from Wihtrud's law-code to late Saxon penitentials, frequently citing continental parallels for her Anglo-Saxon evidence, from Liudprand's laws of the early eighth century to the penitential of Halitgar, and beyond. In a final discussion section she sets forth a dynamic model of Anglo-Saxon "heathenism," moving

from “residual pagan cult practices” c. 700, to later magical practices, Scandinavian-inflected pagan practice from the Danelaw, gendered occult practices and prognostics.

Peter Sawyer’s “English Influence on the Development of the Norwegian Kingdom” (224–29), revisits a subject Sawyer has addressed on several earlier occasions. Moving from missionary and mercantile connections to royal diplomacy, Sawyer outlines the imprints English influence left upon emergent Norwegian kingship, some linguistic, such as the terminology for the royal household (*hirð* and *hirðmaðr* from OE *hired*, among others), some legal: the laws of Gulathing and Frostathing, with their notions of injuries against a transpersonal, rather than strictly royal, peace reveal a Norwegian adoption of later Anglo-Saxon notions of collective social order. Building upon Harmer’s observations, Sawyer claims Norwegian charter forms and terminology as, aptly, further attestations of English influence. Coinage, naval organization and the emergence of a class of *lendir menn* (landed men)—local magnates and members of the royal household—are other areas where Sawyer sees Anglo-Saxon practice influencing Norwegian structures. Post-Alfredian England has often been seen bearing the traces of Carolingian influence. So, in its turn, Post-Hardradan Norway owes a debt to tenth- and eleventh-century England. Finally in this collection, David Cozens’s “The Demise of Ramsey Abbey” (288–97), offers an elegantly compressed account of the career of its final abbot, John Lawrence, and the monastery’s last years.

In 2001 Michelle Brown and Carol Farr oversaw the substantial *Mercia: An Anglo-Saxon Kingdom in Europe* (London: Leicester UP), a volume that brought together some twenty contributors who collectively produced the most comprehensive assay of Mercian history since Ann Dornier’s *Mercian Studies* of 1977. The year 2005 saw the publication of a further volume taking Mercia as its focus: *Æthelbald and Offa: Two Eighth-Century Kings of Mercia*, ed. David Hill and Margaret Worthington (Oxford: British Archaeological Reports/Archaeopress, 2005). This collection contains sixteen papers that address a wide range of eighth-century Mercian matters, most of which are based, to varying degrees, upon papers originally delivered at a conference in Manchester in 2000. Hill’s observation in his introductory note that “[a]ll those who wished to have their papers published are included in this work” hints perhaps at a somewhat detached editorial policy and opens a varied volume, not least in the actual length of the contributions (some comprising no more than two pages of continuous text). That said, there is much

here of value. Several of the contributors to Brown and Farr’s 2001 volume have a place in Hill and Worthington’s roster and, while there is some overlap, there is also genuine—and in certain cases clearly intended—complementarity. The title of Simon Keynes’s contribution, “The Kingdom of the Mercians in the Eighth Century,” (1–26), signals this from the start, harmonizing with his earlier paper (“Mercia and Wessex in the Ninth Century”) in the Brown/Farr volume. Here, he offers a characteristically rigorous assessment of both the changing historical image of Offa and Æthelbald, taking in Anglo-Norman historians, Matthew Paris’s imagery and Stenton’s influential legacy. “The Mercian Supremacy,” he observes, “is, and always has been, an artificial construct. It has been a dominating feature in the historiographical landscape for some time, but it seems to me that the edifice might usefully be taken apart.” A closely argued reassessment of the political achievements of Æthelbald and Offa follows (Geoffrey Hill, no less than Frank Stenton, goes gently corrected), together with both rulers’ relations with surrounding kingdoms. What substance, and what systems, did eighth-century Mercian authority have? Keynes offers incisive comments on the changing nature of the source material for eighth-century Mercia even within the eighth century itself, and refutes the need to read Æthelbald and Offa’s reigns as parts of a larger narrative of English unity: “They were not the Mercian successors of the seventh-century kings of the Northumbrians, any more than they were the precursors of the ninth-century kings of the West Saxons, or of the tenth-century kings of the English.” How different, then, was the Mercian polity? Keynes closes with a consideration of the notion of the “supremacy” and an even more fundamental question of what was meant by “Mercian”: how coherent, how unified was “Mercia,” and what are the implications of the fact that neither Æthelbald nor Offa left (unlike later West Saxon rulers) a permanent political legacy? Rejecting easy teleologies, Keynes’s approach implicitly throws the achievements of the post-Alfredian English kingdom into starker relief. Damian J. Tyler’s “Orchestrated Violence and the Supremacy of the Mercian Kings” (27–33), argues that “the significance of large-scale violence to Mercian kingly strategies was variable,” by which he means that warfare played a greater part in Penda’s day than in the eighth century. Some might question the terms of the transition he sees occurring from the age of Penda to that of Offa, a shift “from hegemonal and face-to-face, to expansionist and centralizing.” Charlemagne’s empire was expansionist and centralizing. It was also, vitally, hegemonal and, in very many ways, “face-to-face.” So,

for that matter, was Edward the Elder's, Athelstan's, and Edgar's. As in the 2001 Mercia volume it falls to Alex Woolf to offer a (far) northern perspective on matters Midland. In his "Onuist son of Uurgist: *tyrannus carnifex* or a David for the Picts?" (35–42), warfare is also a strong presence. Woolf tracks Onuist's career and Pictish relations with the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms to their south, drawing upon Irish annals, the Continuation of Bede, as well as lost epigraphic evidence. In "Æthelbald, Offa and the Patronage of Nunneries," 43–8, Barbara Yorke explores the fashion in which the political patronage of nunneries by royal houses—a key element of later seventh-century religious landscape—was exercised in the eighth century by emergent royal factions. Politically powerful, often in the hands of members of the royal house, and valuable sites for the construction and propagation of family identity and royal legitimacy, "royal" nunneries are, Yorke convincingly argues, key connections in Mercia's power circuit. She deftly addresses Æthelbald's close relationship with Guthlac and with Repton (in the later seventh century a site with links to other members of his branch of the Mercian royal house), emphasizing the latter as a site that offered Æthelbald considerable support ("Æthelbald's burial at Repton could be taken as a sign of this close connection"). This relationship, it would seem, was the exception, as Boniface's infamous attack upon Æthelbald's mistreatment of nuns suggests. In contrast Offa, influenced, Yorke suggests, by contemporary Carolingian attitudes, displayed an attitude to female religious houses simultaneously more respectful and more conscious of their possibilities as struts for royal authority and dynastic control. Several of his daughters "withdrew" to religious houses at various stages of their lives and one, Æthelburh, seems to have spent her whole life as a nun. Yorke argues that Offa's likely burial at Bedford, a house where Cynethryth would later be recorded as abbess, identifies Bedford as effectively the family's primary *eigenklöster*. [Tyler's, Woolf's, and Yorke's articles were also reviewed in YWOES 2005.]

Several other contributions tackle the subject of eighth-century religious culture. Audrey L. Meaney's "Felix's *Life* of Guthlac: history or hagiography?" (75–84), addresses not only the historicity of the life through its references to events dateable by extra-textual evidence, but also the political, religious and physical landscape in which Guthlac's piety was set. While aware of the *Life's* textuality Meaney nevertheless ponders the nature (Neolithic? Roman? Bronze Age?) and location of the barrow upon which Guthlac took up residence, though admitting that "it would require an extraordinary piece of evidence to identify it as Guthlac's cell."

What of Guthlac's infamous Anthony-like attacks suffered at the hands of demons? Schizophrenia and early English post-traumatic stress disorder may well have been major clinical causes. Guthlac's life is also the subject of Nicholas J. Higham's "Guthlac's *Vita*, Mercia and East Anglia in the first half of the Eighth Century" (85–90). Higham's interest is politics, not piety, and in particular the evidence Felix's work offers for East Anglian attitudes to Mercia in the earlier eighth century.

b. Religion and the Church

Nicholas Brooks's series "Studies in Early Medieval Britain" has already produced several strong contributions to Anglo-Saxon studies. A 2005 addition to this series, *St Wulfstan and His World*, ed. Julia S. Barrow and Nicholas Brooks (Aldershot: Ashgate), is an admirably wide-ranging collection addressing the world of a man born in the age of Æthelred and buried in the year that Urban II convened the council of Clermont. Brooks's "Introduction: How do we know about St Wulfstan?" offers an elegant account of Wulfstan's life and the sources, narrative, documentary, and material (manuscripts, buildings) upon which such a reconstruction is based. "Wulfstan's career reveals the working of an aristocratic kin-group that may have dominated the Worcester community for almost a century from the consecration of Bishop Wulfstan I in 1003 until the death of Wulfstan II in 1095." He was, Brooks concludes, "a man of deeply conservative loyalty, not least towards his own family," but one whose sustained membership of a changing English ecclesiastical elite reveals a figure of reliable loyalty to the rulers under whom he lived and evident personal piety: qualities that made long-term survival possible. It is the calibration between personal piety and political canniness, and the wider reputation he enjoyed for both, that Ann Williams addresses in "The Cunning of the Dove: Wulfstan and the Politics of Accommodation" (23–38). Examining two central episodes in his long career, his dispute with Archbishop Thomas, York's first Norman incumbent, and his lawsuit with Walter of Evesham. With a careful eye upon the sources, Williams charts the strategies employed by Wulfstan, from bribery to the careful exploitation of sophisticated webs of loyalty and obligation. In "The City of Worcester in the Time of Wulfstan" (123–35), Richard Holt offers a lucid account of Worcester's development from the early Middle Ages into the thriving center of the late eleventh century, dwelling in particular upon issues of urban growth, church foundation and successive phases of refortification, themes that have been examined at greater length elsewhere,

not least in Holt's own publication, with N. J. Baker, *Urban Growth and the Medieval Church: Gloucester and Worcester* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004). Nevertheless, this contribution serves as a brief entry-point to Wulfstan's changing material world.

In "Bishops and Clergy in English, Scottish and Welsh Dioceses 900–1215," *La pastorale della Chiesa in Occidente dall'età ottoniana al concilio lateranense IV; Atti della quindicesima Settimana internazionale di studio Mendola, 27–31 agosto 2001* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero Università, 2004), 223–50, Julia Barrow seeks to explore the "career-building" of the episcopacy, and cathedral and parish clergy engaged in pastoral work in the British Isles from Alfred's reign to the death of John. Issues of formation and discipline figure prominently. With a sharp sense of the variety of religious foundations found in the British Isles, Barrow offers a helpful overview of current scholarship on parish formation and the "minster hypothesis," together with some insightful comparative observations that set English developments alongside Wales and Scotland, as well as the changing forms of direct and indirect continental influence. The bulk of Barrow's paper, however, explores the identities, origins, "career path," and responsibilities of the various members of the Church from the bishop downwards. No simple synthetic overview, this paper is rich in original insights.

In *Bonifatius en de kerk van Nederland* (Utrecht: Laboier, 2005), C.J.C. Broer and M.W.J. de Bruijn publicize Boniface's role in establishing Christianity in Utrecht, for although it was Willibrord who led the missionary effort in Frisia, Boniface was his assistant for a short time and later exercised his influence from afar. The result is a biography of Boniface with excursions on the foundation of Utrecht, its first churches, Boniface's involvement with ecclesiastical affairs in Utrecht after his estrangement from Willibrord, the cult of Boniface in Utrecht, and Boniface's failure to establish Utrecht as an episcopal see. A brief description of ecclesiastical developments in Utrecht in the decades after Boniface's death rounds out the story.

In "Lay Piety, Confessional Directives and the Compiler's Method in Late Anglo-Saxon England," *Haskins Soc. Jnl* 16: 47–61, Tracey-Anne Cooper mines Cotton Tiberius A.iii (compiled between 1012 and 1023) for information about lay piety and pastoral provision. Pointing to the theological simplicity of the fifteen homilies, she sees them as constituting a minimal handbook of the basic requirements for salvation. The material for confessors in this manuscript also has a secular orientation, and Cooper argues that it melds, albeit incompletely, the internal piety of the reformed

church and the external piety of the high-status laity. The lay religious culture of late Anglo-Saxon England seems to have been dynamic, responsive, and evolving and not degenerate or desultory, as the Norman chroniclers would have us believe.

Caitlin Corning's *The Celtic and Roman Traditions: Conflict and Consensus in the Early Medieval Church* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan) is aimed at non-specialists. Her purpose is to debunk the modern myth of a "Celtic Church" by reviewing the interactions between the Celtic and Roman traditions in Merovingian Gaul, Lombard Italy, and the British Isles during the period of the Easter controversy. The body of the work proceeds chronologically from Columbanus and the Merovingian Church through later Columbanian monasticism, the British Church, the Irish Church, Iona, the Picts, Northumbria, and Anglo-Saxon England. These chapters are framed by an introduction and a conclusion organized by topic, with descriptions of the issues in the former and the scholarly consensus in the latter. This would be a good text for students, but it is less clear whether Corning's intended audience will change their minds about some cherished fantasies.

Erika Corradini's "Apud Lotharingos Altus et Docutus": Leofric of Exeter, 1050–1072," *Proceedings of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies Postgraduate Conference* 1 (2005): 1–12, explores the continental context of Leofric's learning and attitudes. Offering her own observations, and drawing at certain points upon E. Drage's unpublished research (Oxford D. Phil, 1978, "Bishop Leofric and the Exeter Cathedral Chapter, 1050–1072: A Reassessment of the Manuscript Evidence"), Corradini explores Exeter's cross-Channel connections, the cult of St. Landebert and the part played by Chrodegang of Metz's Rule in the religious life of eleventh-century England, a novelty overseen by Leofric himself. Her work underscores Liège's importance as a scholarly center and connector in the later Carolingian and earlier Capetian periods, while also offering a valuable image of the ways in which English reformers translated continental models. The balance between local interests, specifically the need to consolidate Exeter's position at the heart of a diocese centered since Edward the Elder's day at Crediton, and wider religious concerns, are explored.

"The clergy," argues Catherine Cubitt in "The Clergy in Anglo-Saxon England" *Historical Research* 78 (2005): 273–87, "are amongst the most neglected of all figures in England's early ecclesiastical history." She offers a compact corrective to a vision of the Anglo-Saxon church dominated by the monastic mode, raising important issues about the nature of minsters and Anglo-Saxon

concerns over clerical marriage and stressing, above all, complexity. Concentrating upon the vocabulary used of ecclesiastical institutions in pre-Alfredian sources, Cubitt argues that earlier Anglo-Saxon authors had a clear notion of the distinction between monks and clerics, analyzing (*à la* James Campbell) Bede's words for the two, and his evident care in distinguishing between *clericus* and *monachus*. Felix's *Life* of Guthlac, the letters of Boniface and Alcuin and Clifesho councils of 747 and 786, all come under scrutiny.

Catherine Cubitt's "Bishops, priests and penance in late Saxon England," *EME* 14: 41–63, focuses on penitential practices as they are attested in a variety of sources, gives close consideration to the vernacular terminology of penance, and attempts to widen the range of available evidence by discussing texts that are customarily overlooked by historians of pastoral care. The Old English penitentials are, as Cubitt says, "merely the tip of the iceberg": vernacular prayers preserved in a variety of pre-Conquest manuscripts, many of them "forms for absolution and directions for the use of confessors ... represent a significant resource for the study of both devotional and pastoral practices in England but have occasioned surprisingly little interest" (54). While some historians have lately suggested that the episcopal associations of the relevant texts (particularly Latin and vernacular penitentials) diminish their usefulness to historians of pastoral care, Cubitt rightly notes that this assumption rests on a false dichotomy between episcopal and parochial matters, since "[p]astoral issues were very much at the forefront of episcopal concerns in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries" (62). Cubitt's claims are easily borne out by the eleventh-century manuscript Laud misc. 482. One of the principal witnesses to the tradition of vernacular penitentials, it seems very likely to have been a priest's handbook and yet seems also (along with another manuscript attesting to parochial practice, Cotton Vespasian D XX) to have been connected with bishops. Cubitt's study is one of several in recent years (including the pioneering work of Victoria Thompson, which has likewise focused on Laud misc. 482) suggesting that the obligations of the late Anglo-Saxon clergy may be more apparent to us than is typically realized.

St Wulfsgie and Sherborne, eds. Katherine Barker, David A. Hinton and Alan Hunt (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2005), gathers together the published versions of some nine papers delivered in April 1998 to celebrate the millennium of Sherborne Abbey's foundation together with a further twelve contributions, including a full English translation by Rosalind Love of Goscelin's *Vita* of Wulfsgie. D. H. Farmer's "The Monastic Reform

of the Tenth Century and Sherborne" (24–9), elegantly situates Sherborne's foundation within the wider history of insular monastic reform and insular monastic reform within the wider history of Sherborne as a see and center of religious authority.

Lately most book-length studies of the Anglo-Saxon church have concerned themselves with the years after the Benedictine Reform. Sarah Foot's *Monastic Life in England, c. 600–900* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP) dwells instead on "the period in which the monastic expression was at its height" so as to rescue this surprisingly neglected period from distortions marring the work of the few modern Benedictine historians who have turned their attention to it. Foot is suspicious as well of the idealized representations of this era found in the work of tenth-century reformers and of Bede (30). In her introduction, Foot acknowledges the indebtedness of her study both to the growing tendency among historians to read ostensibly neutral sources more suspiciously and to studies that consider church history as an archaeological problem. But her study does not fit neatly into either of these categories. Though concerned with a problem that has lately been considered through the lens of archaeology—the nature of minsters—Foot's study makes extensive and hermeneutically sophisticated use of textual sources to reconstruct both the concrete aspects of these mysterious communities (what they looked like, where they were located) and the lived experiences of those who dwelt within them. Along the way Foot makes significant contributions to many of the questions that concern historians of this era, such as the means by which the Benedictine Rule was transmitted to early English monasteries and the role of minsters in pastoral care. This is a major contribution to a field whose methods are undergoing a significant transformation.

Michael G. Horowitz's essay is a "Reply to 'Wyrð, Causality and Providence,'" *Mankind Quarterly* 46: 487–89, by Ian McNish (reviewed in *YWOES* 2004), in which McNish contrasted pagan confrontation with what happens in the world with theological abdication to divine will. The point that Horowitz wishes to make is that although ancient Jewish culture championed Mosaic monotheism over Near Eastern polytheisms, Judaism also elevated the role of humanity above, for example, the Babylonian notion that the purpose of humanity was to relieve the gods of toil. Such proto-humanism in fact distantly anticipated the kind of natural philosophy that McNish argued was suppressed by Judeo-Christian theology.

After a detailed review of the trove of documentation pertaining to "Ely Abbey 672–1109," in *A History*

of *Ely Cathedral*, ed. Peter Meadows and Nigel Ramsey (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), 77–97, Simon Keynes begins with Æthelthryth, the seventh-century queen who steadfastly maintained her virginity through two marriages before founding a monastery at Ely and becoming its first abbess. Bede tells of her and also of the second abbess, Æthelthryth's sister Seaxburh, but the history of Ely Abbey from the early eighth century to the late ninth century is almost unknown. When the sources resume with information about the mid-tenth century, we find that the earlier community of monks and nuns had been replaced by a body of priests, and somehow the estate had reverted into royal control. In the 960s, King Edgar allowed Bishop Æthelwold to re-found Ely as a house for monks. Keynes takes us through the succession of bishops, including the silversmith Ælfsige, the beleaguered Leofwine, and the swindler Wulfric. After the Norman Conquest, Ely found itself besieged by William when the rebellious Earl Morcar took refuge there. A monetary settlement was proposed, but after the monks appeared to have short-changed the king, upheavals and depredations followed. Ely lost a number of its far-flung estates to Norman barons in the 1070s, and its abbots were all non-English. Keynes closes with a discussion of its new Norman church. Despite the evolution of the foundation under the conquerors, Ely retained a clear consciousness of its Anglo-Saxon origins, and the cult of Æthelthryth prospered into the fifteenth century.

William Kilbride's "Rationalising Early Medieval Conversion," *Scottish Archaeological Jnl* 25: 87–91, is a review of *The Cross Goes North: Processes of Conversion in Northern Europe, AD 300–1300*, edited by Martin Carver (Woodbridge, 2003). In it, Kilbride objects to the meta-narrative of conversion presented by *The Cross's* contributors, who hold that religion is little different from ideology, whereas Kilbride holds that religion has more in common with science. If questions about conversion are posed in terms of process and sociology, he maintains, the answers will inevitably be found to be social and political. He is also dissatisfied with the specific answers to those questions that the contributors to *The Cross* propose, namely, that Christianity provided permanent religious centers and a means of stable, long-distance communication. Kilbride points out that in the seventh and eighth centuries, the Church was notoriously unstable—hence Charlemagne's ability to acquire a considerable amount of ecclesiastical power—and fond of portable paraphernalia such as the altar of St. Cuthbert. Kilbride does praise the impressive range of the essays in *The Cross*, but he hopes that its premises about religion will be challenged by those

arguing that a primary attraction of Christianity was its ability to explain how the world worked.

Though his article purports to consider "The Origins of the Monastic Communities of St. Benedict at Holme and Bury St. Edmunds," *Revue Bénédictine* 116: 42–61, Tom Licence deals in much greater detail with the Holme monastery, about which much less is known but whose historical importance is much greater than routinely supposed. Licence considers the full range of sources narrating the origins of Holme from its establishment by an obscure hermit named Suneman and his followers to Cnut's endowment of the community with a number of his estates. The latter event gave rise to claims in the work of the thirteenth-century chronicler Matthew Paris that Cnut himself had founded the monastery, but its foundation by Wulfric and the construction of the early history of the monastery out of lost hagiographical sources commemorating his cult seem to Licence to rest on more solid ground. Ultimately he argues that the somewhat more celebrated Bury St. Edmunds owes its good fortunes to its obscure neighbor (some of whose early history can only be reconstructed with evidence afforded by Bury): "After the Conquest, Holme went into decline, leading historians to dismiss it... [I]f there was an early passage of its monks and books to Bury, the formation of Bury's scriptorium during that abbacies of the former Holme monks Ufi and Leofstan might owe more to Holme than we realise" (60).

Valentina Luciani's "Il cristianesimo nel Kent: origine e diffusione attraverso le testimonianze architettoniche (secc. IV–VII)," *Studi e materiali di Storia delle Religioni* 70 (2004): 295–315, is an article arising from the author's *tesi di laurea*, and one which offers an Italian overview of the archaeological evidence for Christianity from late Roman Kent into the age of Æthelberht (Lullingstone, Richborough), albeit one that curiously omits much of the archaeological work and scholarly debate of the last fifteen years, as well as some of the deeper issues in addressing insular Christianity across the period 400 to 600. (Issues handled with originality and clarity in Clare Stancliffe's recent contributions to the *New Cambridge Medieval History* I, c. 500–c. 700). Ultimately, Luciani's piece is of use only for Italian scholars unable to deal with Anglophone scholarship—unlikely readers of *YWOES*, one might conclude.

Rob Meens's "Penitentials and the practice of penance in the tenth and eleventh centuries," *EME* 14: 7–21 takes issue with the view (overtly expressed in at least one major recent study) that the major collections of penitential canons issuing from Francia in the seventh and eighth centuries were no longer being assembled

for specifically pastoral purposes. Though they continued to be copied and even incorporated into collections bearing new names, “these seem to reflect an interest in canon law or ecclesiastical reform” (9) and have thus been assumed to tell us not about the means used by clergy to discipline the laity but rather about episcopal efforts to foster clerical knowledge of canon law. Meens rightly wonders whether the changing manuscript contexts of penitentials and their increasing association with episcopal courts necessarily indicates that these texts have little to say about the nature of pastoral care. What follows is a broad survey of penitential manuscripts that even those who do not subscribe to Meens’s thesis will find very useful. This survey reveals that even texts assumed to have had little direct pastoral use must have guided in some way the procedures of confession (as is indicated most obviously by the circulation of Burchard’s *Corrector sive Medicus* independently from his *Decretum* “from the late eleventh century onwards” [12]). Certainly the failure to produce many new penitential collections in the tenth century does not necessarily indicate that the earlier collections attributed (however speciously) to Bede, Theodore, Egbert, and Cummean necessarily fell into disuse. Meens takes the proliferation of Theodorean collections in this era as evidence for their continued deployment within a pastoral context while conceding that “in general there seems indeed to have been some shift towards the inclusion of penitentials in wider collections of a legal nature” (19). None of this, in Meens’s view, diminishes their value for historians of penitential practice.

The Blackwell’s journal *Early Medieval Europe* has published a number of articles on Anglo-Saxon history consistently characterized by an awareness of cross-Channel connections. The tradition is continued in “The ‘vigorous rule’ of Bishop Lull: between Bonifatian mission and Carolingian church control,” *Early Medieval Europe* 13.3 (2005): 249–276. James Palmer explores the evidence for Lull’s life, intellectual interests and place within wider currents of Carolingian Church culture and politics, as well as his own slow-burning memorialization and, not least, his handling of the memory of another, Boniface. Addressing issues of mission and the transmission of insular culture on the continent (not least Bede’s exegesis). Palmer’s paper offers a sophisticated portrait of a hinge figure between eighth-century England and the Continent.

In “Alcuin, Willibrord, and the Cultivation of Faith,” *The Haskins Society Journal* 14: (2003) 15–31, Kate Rambridge perceptively explores the imagery of growth, fecundity, and “the figurative language of nature” in the Whitby life of Gregory the Great, the Lindisfarne *Vita*

Sancti Cuthbert (and Bede’s own version), and Alcuin’s writings.

As the title indicates, Jean-Marie Sansterre’s “*Ommes qui coram hac imagine genua flexerint ...: La vénération d’images de saints et de la Vierge d’après les textes écrits en Angleterre du milieu du XIe aux premières décennies du XIIIe siècle*,” *CCM* 49: 257–94, deals with the history of the veneration of images, based on sources written in England just before the Conquest and under the Norman and first Angevin kings. Most of these images were located in churches, and not only were they meant to attest to the saint’s presence and to transmit the *virtus* contained in relics or sometimes in empty tombs nearby, but from the eleventh century onward, some of them were even considered to work autonomously as cult figures and sacred mediators. To ensure the prototype’s effective intercession at the place where the image stood, as well as to control the cult, the bishops resorted to *benedictiones*, which originally consisted of real consecrations. Sansterre examines for the first time these surprising liturgical compositions, and he argues that confusion between the saint and the image was not considered a major risk. On the basis of practices recorded for images of Ss. Swithun, Oswine, Ives, and Wulfstan, he sees the end of the Anglo-Saxon period as marking an intensification of the cult of images, which the Normans then inherited.

Brian D. Spinks’s *Early Medieval Rituals and Theologies of Baptism* (Aldershot: Ashgate) offers a brief discussion of attitudes toward the sacrament in Anglo-Saxon England, one necessarily more reliant on non-liturgical sources such as Latin and vernacular homilies, given the lateness of the relevant materials and the influence upon most of these of continental texts such as the Carolingian *Hadrianum*. An important exception, the *Red Book of Darley*, is described with care, and the author situates its prescriptions for the rite amid earlier examples. Some may find this book a bit stronger when dealing with the Roman and Frankish antecedents of Anglo-Saxon theologies of baptism, and the author acknowledges his reliance on others for translations of Old English sources. (Curiously, Spinks cites Bede from an online edition of an out-of-date Edwardian translation.) To be fair, *Early Medieval Rituals and Theologies of Baptism* does not aspire to be more than a handbook, and at the very least succeeds in offering interested readers a more welcoming invitation to liturgical history than Cyril Vogel’s *Medieval Liturgy*. For a basic sense of the major sources, this is probably a sound place to begin.

In “Canterbury and Flanders in the late tenth century,” *ASE* 35: 219–44, Steven Vanderputten edits and

translates four letters addressed by Flemish abbots to the archbishops of Canterbury between 980 and 991. In his discussion of the letters, he examines how they shed light on ecclesiastical relations between England and the Low Countries in the late tenth century. The letters are particularly useful, not just for what they tell us about the cross-Channel interactions among monastic establishments, but also for the way in which they illuminate the use of ecclesiastical communication for political and diplomatic purposes. Dunstan spent part of his 956–7 exile at Saint-Peter, Ghent, and the connections he developed there provide the basis for these letters. As Vanderputten notes, Flemish abbots repeatedly attempted to use their friendship (*familiaritas*) with Dunstan and his successors to strengthen their ties with the court of Æthelred. In addition, the letters reveal the extent to which the tenth-century reform movement in England attracted interest and followers elsewhere in Europe also. The letters edited by Vanderputten include a letter from Wido, abbot of Saint-Peter, Ghent, to Dunstan; a letter from Falrad, abbot of Saint-Vaast, to Æthelgar, Dunstan's successor; and letters from Odbert, abbot of Saint-Bertin, to Æthelgar and his successor, Sigeric.

Lorna Watt's brief "Kirkdale, Lavingham and Bede: A Note," *Northern History* 43.2: 343–4, attempts to account for Kirkdale's absence from pre-Viking age literary sources despite archeological evidence supporting an early foundation. She points out that Bede pairs his discussion of neighboring Lavingham with that of Rendlesham, another church dedicated to St. Gregory. This pairing, she argues, provides a "silent link" (343) with Kirkdale, although why it does so remains unclear. Her reasoning—"that there was much shared knowledge, not always referred to, in much the same way there is today when we read the newspapers" (344)—is based more on negative evidence than anything else and, as a result, her argument remains unconvincing.

In *Corruption, Decline, and the 'Real World' of the Early English Church: Aristocrats as Abbots* (21st Brixworth Lecture, 2003; The Brixworth Lectures 2nd ser. 5; Leicester: The Friends of All Saints Church, Brixworth, 2005), Patrick Wormald suggests that it was the very success of the Anglo-Saxon church at Brixworth that led to its being almost unmentioned in the historical record. Working from the known to the unknown, Wormald argues that Brixworth was very likely associated with a lay-owned monastery of the sort that was so strongly condemned by Bede and Boniface. Furthermore, the name of its abbot might well be found in the late eighth- and early ninth-century Mercian charter witness lists. To illustrate the lay abbacy and the cult of

relics that may have characterized Brixworth, Wormald gives the examples of Einhard and the relics of Ss. Marcellinus and Peter and the tribulations of the monastery at Fulda. Wormald concludes by speculating that Brixworth's increasing secularity and the instability of the ninth and early tenth century led to its seizure by the crown after the Conquest.

In *The Conversion of Britain: Religion, Politics and Society in Britain c. 600–800* (Harlow: Pearson Longman), Barbara Yorke provides an account of the conversion of the Picts, the British, the Irish, and the Anglo-Saxons which is sensitive to the limitations of the written sources as well as the nature of Christianity in the early Middle Ages. She finds that the conversion was a long but generally peaceful process, due in part to the "very attractive connotations" (134) of Christianity, which included the prosperity of the Mediterranean world and the link with the Roman Empire. Indeed, the widespread foundation of religious houses in Britain implies the enthusiastic adoption of Christianity among the elites of the different provinces. While acknowledging that Britain and Ireland produced some of the leading scholars of their day, Yorke draws attention to the infiltration of lay values in the Anglo-Saxon areas, perhaps a result of the greater wealth of the Anglo-Saxons on one hand and the Celtic tradition of a separate learned class on the other hand. Noting that the Anglo-Saxons had a number of bishops to supervise pastoral care and that some British areas had a wealth of local churches, she sees the potential of the Church to have touched the lives of the elites and the peasantry alike. With respect to the penetration of the new religious observances and moral precepts into the lives of laymen, Yorke shows that by 800 a substantial number of people were aware of what Christian ideals were and had incorporated some of the rituals of Christianity into their everyday lives.

Another study that deals with the Anglo-Saxon Church is Steven Bassett's "Boundaries of Knowledge: Mapping the Land Units of Late Anglo-Saxon and Norman England," which is reviewed below in Section F.

c. Ecclesiastical Culture

In conjunction with an exhibition of the Cambridge manuscript of the *Life of St. Edward* (ca. 1236), "Anonymous" [Paul Binski] wrote a richly illustrated popular piece on "The Cult of St Edward the Confessor," *History Today* 55.11: 21–27. After explaining how St. Edward was an aristocratic saint of the Anglo-Saxon type, Binski turns to the promotion of Edward's cult under Henry III, whose special companion he was. Naturally, the

focus is on the exhibited manuscript and its monastic depiction of a peaceable and cooperative king—the perfect expression of the ideals of a reforming church in the period after Magna Carta. Binski concludes with a description of the loss of interest in Edward's cult under Edward I, a result of royal promotion of the cult of St. George.

In “From British to English Christianity: Deconstructing Bede's Interpretation of the Conversion,” *Conversion and Colonization in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Karkov and Howe, 1–30, Nicholas Brooks questions the modern acceptance of Bede's view that English Christianity began with the arrival of Augustine's mission in 597. He argues that the British traditions of the church of Canterbury, as of other cult centers, were deliberately forgotten after 597 in a program of cultural and ethnic amnesia during the seventh and eighth centuries. Brooks also points out the limitations of Bede's account: he was totally ignorant of the history of the see and territory of the Magonsæte and largely ignorant of that of the Hwicce, and it is in just those west midland areas that evidence can be found for continuities between the British and Anglo-Saxon churches. Moreover, Bede tells us the least about the areas where British influence was greatest and where Anglo-Saxon Christian rule took over from British Christian control with little or no period of paganism intervening. One form of this evidence is the concentration in these areas of *Eccles* place names (< Primitive Welsh **eglēs* < Lat. *ecclesia*), which would seem to denote churches or Christian communities established before the Anglo-Saxon takeover, and where Brooks thinks it likely that British Christians did preach to people who considered themselves English. Brooks also discusses the continuity of cathedral and church sites and finds that Canterbury, Rochester, and perhaps Lincoln offer the best potential for continuous Christian cult from Roman times.

Signs, Wonders, Miracles: Representations of Divine Power in the Life of the Church, ed. Kate Cooper and Jeremy Gregory (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005) contains papers read at two meetings of the Ecclesiastical History Society. Of possible interest to Anglo-Saxonists are three papers on late antiquity, one on Gregory's *Dialogues*, and eleven papers on other medieval topics. Three papers are solidly in our field, of which Sally Crumplin's “Modernizing St. Cuthbert: Reginald of Durham's Miracle Collection” is reviewed above in Section 5. In “*Constat ergo inter nos verba signa esse: The Understanding of the Miraculous in Anglo-Saxon Society*” (56–66), Anna Maria Luiselli Fadda emphasizes that according to the Anglo-Saxon perception of Gregorian tradition, it was not the sensible effect

of a miracle that was important so much as the promise of salvation conveyed by the miraculous deeds worked by God. This is seen, for example, in the Old English translation of the account of the Kentish princess Eorcengota in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*, where Bede writes of the *signa miraculorum*, signs of miracles, that were associated with the princess. The Old English renders this as *tacon heofonlicra wundra*, signs of celestial wonders, with *heofonlicra* indicating that the miracles were ultimately dependent on the direct causality of God. The particular missionary of Clare Pilsworth's “Miracles, Missionaries and Manuscripts in Eighth-Century Southern Germany” (67–76) is Leoba, the eighth-century Anglo-Saxon abbess of the nunnery of Tauberbischofsheim, and the particular manuscript is MS M.p.th.q. 28a, quite probably produced at this nunnery, perhaps even under Leoba's abbacy. Although the nunnery was one of those founded by Leoba's kinsman Boniface, who was martyred while on a mission of conversion elsewhere, Pilsworth interprets a miracle attributed to Leoba and also the miracles recorded in the manuscript as part of a “mission” to improve Christians in the region. In different ways, each miracle deals with the question of the degree and type of engagement that female religious should have with the local community.

In her wide-ranging essay, “Folklore and Historiography: Oral Stories and the Writing of Anglo-Saxon History,” *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West*, ed. Tyler and Balzaretto [see sec. 4a], 189–223, Catherine Cubitt attempts to determine how oral folklore traditions shaped the writing of history during the Anglo-Saxon period. She writes that her essay has two aims: “to examine some of the evidence for popular oral stories in Anglo-Saxon England and to explore reasons why this material has been neglected, that is, to set the oral stories of early England in the context of the narratives which have dominated Anglo-Saxon studies” (190). This is a broad topic, and Cubitt covers much ground over the course of thirty-five pages or so. She opens with a discussion of the *Lives* of saints Kenelm, Edmund, and Ecgwine. From there, she moves on to discuss the role of oral stories in the Monastic Reform, the manner in which folklore reception shapes attitudes towards the past, the political consequences of incorporating folklore into historical writing, and attitudes towards folklore among modern historians. The sheer breadth of this article means that not all of these topics are discussed with equal depth, and many questions are left unanswered. In particular, this reader still wonders how (or even whether) one can ultimately distinguish between material drawn from oral folkloric

traditions and that which the author of a text just made up. The mere fact that a narrative conforms to one of Vladimir Propp's folklore tropes or Antti Aarne's story types does not seem sufficient evidence to assign it an oral (or even folkloric) origin. Such questions aside, however, Cubitt has written a provocative, interesting article that will serve as a valuable starting point for further studies.

John Edward Damon's "The King's Fragmented Body: A Girardian Reading of the Origins of St. Oswald's Cult," *Heroic Age* 9 (online) attempts to situate Bede's account of Saint Oswald in relation to the work of René Girard. He argues that the death of Oswald provides the "founding violence" necessary for the establishment of a state religion. He writes, "when considered from the theoretical perspective of Girard's work on mimesis and violence, the same historical and literary accounts reveal another reality: the origins of Christianity itself as a sacrificial religion in medieval England. Oswald's death and the veneration of his dismembered body connect two central aspects of Girard's theoretical framework: resolution of a mimetic crisis and the king as sacrificial victim" (§8). As is often the case with theoretical perspectives, responses to Damon's essay will largely be determined by the reader's receptiveness to Girard himself: those familiar with and sympathetic to his work will recognize Damon's article as a savvy, sophisticated application of his theories. On the other hand, those who (not without some justification) find Girard to be tendentious and ahistorical probably will not have their minds changed here. By and large, however, Damon presents an excellent example of the ways in which one theoretical framework may be imported into Anglo-Saxon scholarship.

David Defries examines "St. Oswald's Martyrdom," subtitled "Drogo of Saint-Winnoc's *Sermo secundus de s. Oswaldo*," in *Heroic Age* 9 (online). Although previous authors had called the king a martyr, the Flemish hagiographer Drogo of Saint-Winnoc (c. 1030–84) was the first to explain how Oswald's death qualified as a martyrdom. Drogo also seems to have been the first to fuse the traits of a just king with the virtues of a martyr by synthesizing English and continental traditions of king-saints. He makes numerous other revisions to Bede's account of Oswald as well, most probably in an attempt to curry favor with the counts of Flanders by presenting a model of Christian rulership similar to the one the counts advanced for themselves.

Pawel Derecki analyzes the legendary framework constructed around the "*Superbus Tyrannus Vortigernus*," subtitled "Sketch to a Portrait of a 5th-Century Briton Ruler (Gildas, Bede, Nennius)," *Quaestiones*

Medii Aevi Novae 10: 199–227, noting that it was not until the ninth century that the tradition surrounding him started to be amplified. With respect to the debate over whether *Vortigernus* was a name or a title, he argues that this is less important than the facts that Gildas was certainly calling him an arrogant tyrant and was playing on the meaning of *Vortigernus*, just as he had when reviling Constantinus, Cunignos, Vortiporus, Cuneglasus, and Maglocunus. Bede was thus only a transmitter of this characterization of Vortigern. When Nennius wrote about Vortigern, the loss of British historiographical works forced him to rely on English sources, but Derecki suggests that Nennius tried to undermine the Saxons' triumph by portraying it as the will of God rather than the result of military successes. For example, Vortigern's fatal love for Hengest's daughter is attributed to intervention by Satan. Derecki concludes by summarizing the debate over Nennius's chronology and touching on the multiple traditions that Nennius conflated to produce his account of Vortigern's children and his relationship with St. Germanus.

Reliques et sainteté dans l'espace médiéval (Saint-Denis: Pécia), edited by Jean-Luc Deuffic, contains twenty-nine essays in the categories of relics and the law, relics and images, relics and territories, relics of Christ, and projects and initiatives. Deuffic's own contribution, "L'exode des corps saints hors de Bretagne: des reliques au culte liturgique" (355–423), reviews the current scholarship on the relics of Breton saints and their transfer to Francia. The core of the essay summarizes what is known about the cults of the twenty-two Breton saints named in the medieval inventories from the abbey of Saint-Magloire in Paris, which lists the relics deposited at Saint-Barthélémy. By far the longest entry is that for St. Samson of Dol, whose relics were particularly esteemed by Athelstan II. The monastery at Middleton, which Athelstan founded, possessed many of the saint's bones, whereas Glastonbury could boast of only one. Anglo-Saxonists may also be interested in Raeleen Chai-Elsholz's "Symeon of Durham and the *memoria* of Bede" (425–38), which analyzes Symeon's use of writings by Bede and stories about him. Just as Bede commemorated St. Cuthbert, Symeon commemorates Bede in the *Libellus de exordio*, using his *memoria* to mark the founding, building, and expansion of the church of Durham.

A letter preserved partially in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* and "sent by Lawrence, archbishop Augustine's successor, and his deputy bishops, Mellitus and Iustus," is the starting point for a lengthy exercise in detective work by Roy Flechner ("Dagán, Columbanus, and the Gregorian Mission," *Peritia* 19: 65–90). The letter

mentions an encounter with a Bishop Dagán, and tells us only that he refused to eat with the aforementioned ecclesiastics or even to set foot in the building in which their meals took place. Knowing more about this mysterious bishop is made difficult by a number of circumstances considered in this article, chief among them the unlikelihood that Bede understood the letter's actual purpose and the strong possibility that he uses it to denigrate the British church for their recalcitrance: "[I]t places the British and Irish on the same starting point (as defiant nations) and shows that they were both given an equal chance to attain the 'perfect way of life,' which only the Irish were wise enough to aspire to" (71). The *Columbus presbyter* mentioned alongside Dagán in the letter is probably Columbanus (74), and the refusal to dine with Lawrence and his companions resembles closely the practice of excommunication as prescribed by the British and Irish church. The few references to Dagán seem to suggest that there was more than one, but Flechner assumes that these "two Dagáns" are derived from one historical person even though they were "venerated as separate saints whose feast days were set exactly six months apart" (83). That the personage referred to in the letter is Columbanus opens up at least one possibility to augment the meager historical record concerning Dagán. A letter by the former to Pope Gregory pleads for the preservation of the 84-year table for the computation of Easter while castigating a person referred to as "the sleeping trunk of Dagon, the inflamed arse of heresy" for having accepted the means of dating Easter advanced by continental bishops (87). Given Columbanus's fondness for onomastic word-play elsewhere in texts attributed to him, Flechner sees irresistible evidence here of his acquaintance with the mysterious Dagán. All of this leads to some significant conclusions for the conversion of Kent itself: the behavior of Columbanus and Dagán toward the missionaries indicates that "elements within the Irish church did not remain indifferent to the missionaries' presence on the neighbouring island, and viewed it as a potential threat. These elements might have been responsible for passing a verdict of excommunication against Augustine and members of his entourage, a verdict which Dagán abided by when he met the missionaries in Kent" (89).

Michael Glatthaar begins his study of *Bonifatius und das Sakrileg*, subtitled *Zur politischen Dimension eines Rechtsbegriffs* (Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang, 2004), by describing the evolution of the concept of sacrilege from its classical origins to its adoption by Christianity. Around 700, this flexible but often poorly defined concept was used in legal, religious, and political contexts. Glatthaar argues that Boniface uses the term in a more

restricted way, but even so it had two meanings, and thus this volume falls into two parts. The first treats sacrilege in the sense of a crime against church property. Glatthaar examines this aspect of the concept in Boniface's letters to King Æthelbald of Mercia and Archbishop Cuthbert of Canterbury and then backtracks chronologically to give the political dimension, which comes from Boniface's efforts to reform and reorganize the Church in Germany. The second part of *Bonifatius und das Sakrileg* treats sacrilege in the sense of unorthodox beliefs such as heresy and paganism. This aspect of the concept is prominent in Boniface's correspondence with Bishop Daniel of Winchester and Pope Zachary about Boniface's efforts to convert the heathen and provide pastoral care to Christians. The political dimension comes from the wars conducted by Charles Martel and Charlemagne against the Saxons.

In "Heroes, Saints, and Martyrs: Holy Kingship from Bede to Aelfric," *Heroic Age* 9 (online), Kent G. Hare considers the different treatments of the role of warfare in the sanctity accorded various early Anglo-Saxon kings, especially Oswald of Northumbria. Hare argues that Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, with its enthusiasm for secular rulers who did not retire to the cloister, proved important in legitimizing martial activities by holy kings and perhaps set the framework within which writers such as Asser could cast the Christian English resistance to the pagan Vikings as religious warfare. Hare maintains that Bede himself would not have favored the idea of religious war and in fact took pains to dissociate Saint Oswald from King Oswald's wars and death in battle. Popular tradition appears to have been more accepting of such a notion, and Aelfric of Eynsham later wrote an account of Oswald that reorganized Bede's material to reassert elements of heroic tradition present in the saintly king's life and death. This view can be traced back to *Beowulf* and the other Old English Christian-heroic poems, which show that the martial activities of thanes and their kings could be seen in a positive light. Hare notes that based on the later scope of Anglo-Saxon history, Bede's view would not be the one to prevail as an everyday, practical ethos. By Aelfric's time, when England again suffered assault from Scandinavia, kings such as Alfred and Athelstan, and perhaps even warriors such as Byrhtnoth of Essex, had won praise as Christian warriors fighting in service to Christian society and were celebrated in works verging on the hagiographic.

Karen L. Jolly, "Tapping the Power of the Cross: Who and for Whom?" *The Place of the Cross*, ed. Karkov *et al.* [see sec. 1], 58–79, surveys remedial prayers occurring in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts that invoke or otherwise

rely upon the cross and makes a number of valuable observations about their provenance and contexts. That many of these remedies seem clearly to have been derived from Irish monastic centers, bearing as they occasionally do garbled traces of the Irish language, “suggest[s] an earlier integration of the Christian cross into medicinal and spiritual health that was then transmitted into the Anglo-Saxon context via monastic or clerical traditions” (59). Texts routinely described as “charms,” but which Jolly rightly views as extensions of liturgical practice into the daily life of the laity implying no traces of paganism, make use of the cross as means of marking spatial boundaries for ritual purposes (69). An immensely useful appendix containing editions of the relevant texts rounds out this valuable study. Jolly’s essay sheds light on the devotional life of the Anglo-Saxon laity as well as on early medicinal and ritual practices.

Ian McKee’s “Gildas: Lessons from History,” *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 51: 1–36, returns to one of the central problems of Gildas studies: “whether the undoubted anachronisms of Gildas’s *historia* resulted from simple misinformation, reasonable misinterpretation, or deliberate misuse of sources” (3). Questions of this sort are almost as old as the text itself, and the reader might be forgiven for wondering how much new can be said on the topic at this late date. In fact, as McKee demonstrates, more than one might think. McKee structures his argument around the examination of several problematic “errors” in Gildas’s text in order to demonstrate that the *De Excidio* was written as accurately as possible, given the information available at the time. It is in these readings of the text’s apparent inaccuracies that McKee’s article is at its best. Whether or not the reader agrees with the overall characterization of Gildas and his work (this reader, at least, questioned the repeated characterization of *De Excidio* as a *historia*—Gildas certainly does not seem to be writing in the same genre as Bede, Eusebius, or Gregory of Tours), the close examination of these passages does provide useful insight into the circumstances of the text’s composition. Ultimately, McKee concludes, “Gildas was not a muddled historian. In his *De Excidio Britanniae*, he interpreted the available sources for his *historia* according to and in support of his thesis, but the evidence is against his having subverted or fabricated his sources to create mere parables masquerading as history. He may not have told the whole truth, as he knew it, but it is arguable that, in his own terms, he told nothing but the truth” (36).

The betrayal of Vortigern by Hengest at Amesbury, an event held by legendary history to have had disastrous

consequences for the Celtic population of Britain and ultimately to have ushered in the Anglo-Saxon era, lacks the kinds of evidence that might grant it even a tenuous connection to real events. Gildas, whose sermon concerning the *adventus Saxonum* is the source wherein we would most expect to find some mention of this event, says not a word about it. Helmut Nickel, “About the Saxon Rebellion and the Massacre at Amesbury,” *Arthuriana* 16: 65–70, argues for this reason that the Amesbury massacre, whose earliest attestation is in Nennius, can probably be considered a wholly literary event. Its borrowings from earlier sources are made plain when it is compared with a source that Nickel argues may well have been available to Nennius: an account of a trap laid in A.D. 376 by Lupicinus, “corrupt governor of Thrace,” who found himself precariously reliant on Gothic support. Doubting the loyalty of his Gothic subordinates after continuous starvation and abuse, Lupicinus invites their leader Fritigern to a banquet. The men of the latter are slain, and Fritigern, like Vortigern in the later story, is left alive as a hostage. Nickel suggests that the similar names of the Gothic and Celtic hostages may have sparked the narrative’s reinvention by Nennius: “the stuff of the tale was simply too good to be passed over and thus became firmly entrenched in legend” (68).

Ross Woodward Smythe asks “Did King Eadwig Really Abandon His Coronation Feast to Have a *Ménage à Trois* with His Wife and Mother-in-Law? What’s the Story behind this Story?” *Quaestio Insularis* 6: 82–97. The story in question is found in the *Vita Sancti Dunstani* (c. 1000), written by a hagiographer known only by the initial “B” (possibly Dunstan’s secretary Byrthelm). Smythe’s answer is that this episode was shaped to echo the biblical account of Jezebel, with Æthelgifu in the leading role, Eadwig as Ahab, and Dunstan as Elijah. Eadwig is thus portrayed as a bad ruler by a hagiographer whose aim is to praise Dunstan. Smythe argues that such a biased, stylized account should not be the sole basis for evaluating Eadwig as a king.

In “Eve of Wilton and Goscelin of St Bertin at Old Sarum c. 1070–78,” *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 99: 204–12, Daphne Stroud takes issue with the usual dating of Goscelin’s attachment to Eve to her early childhood and instead argues for a dating that puts the beginning of the attachment to when Eve was around fifteen. The former depends on a reference to two church dedications that had been held to be those of Wilton and Westminster. Goscelin says that he arranged for Eve to attend the first dedication, but as a professed sister of Wilton nunnery, she would have attended the dedication of the community’s own

abbey church without any "arrangement" by an outsider. If the first dedication was not that of Wilton, then the second dedication, which seems to have taken place shortly after the first, cannot have been that of Westminster. The basis for Stroud's preferred dating is Goscelin's description of Eve's profession, which seems to have been the clothing ceremony of a group of young women who were capable of making their own vows, not the offering of a child oblate by her parents. Goscelin's letter to Eve (the so-called *Liber Confortatorius*) should thus be interpreted without any implication of pedophilia.

Hugh M. Thomas examines the evidence for "Lay Piety in England from 1066 to 1215," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 29: 179–92, and argues that many later aspects of lay piety can be found before the Fourth Lateran Council and often before 1066. Touching briefly on pilgrimage and saints' cults, both of which obviously were popular before 1215, Thomas suggests that the parish church was often the center of lay devotion in this period, with several churches' endowments being partly made up of a number of small gifts. Gifts for lighting churches or particular altars are also found before 1215. The foundation of many new chapels (both parish and private) also speaks to the strengths of lay devotion then, as does the existence of guilds and the practice of vigils, fasting, charity, and devotion to the crucifix by lay people. Thomas closes by placing religious actions that were most common between 1066 and 1215—patronage of monasteries, entry into religious houses, and participation in the crusades—in the context of widespread lay piety rather than dissatisfaction with the secular world.

David Woods's essay, "An 'Earthquake' in Britain in 664," *Peritia* 19: 256–62, accomplishes the sort of *miraculum* that would inspire jealousy in a saint: he makes an earthquake disappear. Pointing out that the *Annals of Ulster* and Tigernach as well as the *Chronicon Scotorum* all mention an earthquake taking place in England in 664, he asks how such an event could have happened without Bede or other English sources making mention of it. Woods traces the "earthquake" reference back to the Irish annals' common source, the "Iona Chronicle," and then speculates as to what sort of scribal error might inadvertently lead to the invention of a fictional natural disaster. The ingenious, if admittedly hypothetical, answer he proposes is that the "earthquake" is actually a reference to the Synod of Whitby. Noting a similar scribal error in *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*, Woods suggests that a reference to a "dispute" in Britain (*commotio in Brittaniam*) or a comment that the church in England was "shaken" (*ecclesia mota est in Brittaniam*)

was mistakenly read as a reference to an earthquake (*terrae motus*). An interesting, intelligently argued essay, Woods's article proves that, without proper care, a scribal error can truly be earthshaking.

The publication of Patrick Wormald's *Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West: Law as Text, Image and Experience* (Hambledon, 1999) made available revised and updated versions of some of the most important studies of Anglo-Saxon law by one of England's most prominent medievalists. Now the posthumous collection, *The Times of Bede: Studies in Early English Christian Society and Its Historian*, ed. Stephen Baxter (Oxford: Blackwell), does the same with Wormald's lifetime of work on the Venerable Bede. Although all of the essays collected here have been previously published elsewhere, he did update and revise the footnotes and wrote additional notes and appendices to several of the essays prior to his death in 2004. These revisions are not simply cosmetic; in many cases, most notably the newly-added appendix to his essay, "Bede, *Beowulf* and the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxon Aristocracy," the material added is nearly as substantial as the essay itself. The essays anthologized here include some of Wormald's most significant pieces, as well as several pieces that, if less known, are no less worth reading. The contents of the volume consist of "Bede and Benedict Biscop," "Bede, *Beowulf* and the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxon Aristocracy," "Bede, the *Bretwaldas* and the Origins of the *Gens Anglorum*," "Bede and the Conversion of England: The Charter Evidence," "Æthelwold and His Continental Counterparts: Contact, Comparison, Contrast," "The Venerable Bede and the 'Church of the English,'" "How Do We Know So Much About Anglo-Saxon Deerhurst?" "Corruption, Decline and the 'Real World' of the Early English Church: Aristocrats as Abbots" (whose first version is reviewed above in Subsection B), and "Hilda, Saint and Scholar (614–680)." As Stephen Baxter points out in his editor's note, "one of the great tragedies of this book is that neither the author nor the dedicatee [Patrick's father, Brian] lived to see it published, another is that Patrick never wrote the introduction to the volume which he had planned" (ix). It would be impossible for the reader of these essays to disagree with either of these statements. This book will certainly be a "must-own" for all students of Bede and of early Anglo-Saxon history generally.

d. Society and the Family

Robin Fleming's "Bones for Historians: Putting the Body back into Biography," *Writing Medieval Biography 750–1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank*

Barlow, ed. David Bates, Julia Crick and Sarah Hamilton (Woodbridge: Boydell), 29–48, surveys a wealth of archaeological literature in order to provide non-specialist readers with a sense of what daily life must have been like in Anglo-Saxon England, focusing on those about whom we know a fair amount (such as monks and canons), and to a greater extent on those whose lives feature not at all in written records. The picture is unsurprisingly grim if fascinating in its details. The skeleton on which Fleming dwells most is that of an eighteen-year-old girl of the seventh century. So unexceptional was her death at an early age that there was probably a “dearth of adult female labour” resulting in the development of “nucleated settlements ... where female labour could be pooled” (38). Though the telltale signs of leprosy are etched into her skull, whose deterioration suggests horrifying disfigurements, her manner of burial indicates that ostracism was not one of the consequences of this disease, as it was in later periods. Fleming provides in what remains of the study a guide to the interpretation of skeletal records that presupposes no extensive medical knowledge yet manages to impart a great deal. Her extensive tabulation of “stress indicators” and other features of the skeletons exhumed from various Anglo-Saxon cemeteries reveals a world especially hard on women and children, and full of sorrows unheard of in even the most desolate parts of the present-day developing world: “Between the ages of four or five and thirty-five, a villager would have probably witnessed the deaths of well over thirty children” in one small community profiled by Fleming (40). The towns where villagers sought refuge from malnutrition and backbreaking labor were themselves “astonishingly filthy” purveyors of disease, and the lethality of these conditions was made worse by the lack of extensive stone construction: the use of inorganic building materials had kept Romano-British communities relatively safe from the pathogens that seem to have plagued the Anglo-Saxons, and these would not be employed again (in York and a handful of other towns) until the late twelfth century. The lives of the regular clergy do not seem to have been obviously longer or better than the majority of laypeople: not until at least a century after the conquest do the skeletons of the former show evidence of significant comparative longevity as well as the ailments that accompany obesity.

In *Le festin dans l'Angleterre anglo-saxonne (Ve–XIe siècle)* (Rennes, Presses Universitaires de Rennes), Alban Gautier remarks that although England is not now renowned for its cuisine, its sources offer an exceptional window into the social, political, and religious practices associated with feasting in the early Middle

Ages. This revised doctoral thesis supplements the accounts of feasting in *Beowulf* and other heroic poems with evidence from law codes, iconography, Latin texts, and archeology. Gautier considers the occasions, participants, places, and constitutive elements of the Anglo-Saxon feast, the best-known type of which is the aristocratic feast taking place in a great hall, and he analyzes the eminent place of feasting in Anglo-Saxon society, its material requirements, the social stakes involved, and its symbolic function. He finds the feast in Anglo-Saxon England to be a phenomenon anchored in practices of distinction, where ostentatious consumption has an essential place. Public and publicized, the feast expresses and reinforces the power of the man who gives it, as well as that of those who attend. More than a communal practice, it is fundamentally hierarchical. Feasts attest to the generosity and liberality of the host, the loyalty and gratitude of the attendees, and to the possession of honor and power in general. This system of values is reinforced by many elements, including the mystique of the hall and of mead, the practice of fosterage, the role of the queen at the table, the use of prestigious beverages and precious drinking vessels, the noble forms of entertainment, and the decoration of the hall with narrative hangings. Gautier sees the same relations of power reflected in the wergild system and in the hierarchical relations between the sexes and between youth and age. Despite its prevalence in poetry and its corroboration by archeology, the once-pagan, Germanic, aristocratic feast should not be taken to be the totality of the material, social, and ideological reality of seven centuries of Anglo-Saxon feasting. The Church attacked such feasts, certainly where clerics were involved, and the relations between the Anglo-Saxons and their Celtic, Frankish, Scandinavian, and Norman neighbors meant that Anglo-Saxon feasting did not develop in isolation. Gautier thus rejects the idea that the character of Anglo-Saxon feasting is essentially Germanic and pagan. It is, however, entirely a phenomenon of the elite.

Ann Hagen's *Anglo-Saxon Food and Drink: Production, Processing, Distribution and Consumption* (Hockwold cum Wilton: Anglo-Saxon Books) begins with an astonishing acknowledgment that the author has consulted no archaeological reports published after 1986. The problems do not end there. The author inexplicably uses the Old English Bede rather than its source even when referring to eighth-century conditions; verse texts are quoted from Bosworth and Toller's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* and employed as if they afforded an unmediated sense of daily life in the tenth and eleventh centuries; important historical sources are typically “quoted

in" from citations in other studies; and sometimes no citation is offered at all. Many important studies are omitted from consideration altogether, such as Hugh Magennis's *Anglo-Saxon Appetites* (1999); the author might at least have consulted the dissertation on which this study is based, which appeared in 1981. In spite of these grave problems, *Anglo-Saxon Food and Drink* is a major survey of a subject that has received surprisingly little attention, and the author displays throughout the text both immense learning and a sophisticated understanding of archaeological technologies. That this ambitious and necessary book was allowed to assume such a degraded final form poses serious questions about its publisher. While there is certainly a place for historical writing that caters to enthusiasts, it is a shame that the consistent refusal of Anglo-Saxon Books to guide any of its manuscripts through the proper channels of peer review or to maintain ordinary standards of documentation has at last done harm to a book that actually deserved to be published. This could have been a landmark study, and it attests to Hagen's talent that in spite of its immense flaws, *Anglo-Saxon Food and Drink* will be the necessary starting point for those interested in this relatively unexplored subject.

In "Changing Faces: Leprosy in Anglo-Saxon England," *Conversion and Colonization in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Karkov and Howe [see sec. 1], 59–81, Christina Lee surveys the archeological and textual evidence pertaining to this subject. The evidence from burials suggests a change in attitude towards lepers during the Anglo-Saxon period, for pre-Christian burial rites included lepers in the community of the dead, whereas Christians buried lepers at the fringes of cemeteries or in emerging communities of the diseased. This differentiation of lepers from other social groups has its parallel in literary depictions of leprosy and other skin ailments as visible signs of sin. Lee most informatively takes us through the Latin descriptions of leprosy known to the Anglo-Saxons, Church injunctions concerning lepers, and the treatment of leprosy and lepers in Old English homilies, hagiography, and medical texts.

"England and the Continent in the Ninth Century: IV, Bodies and Minds," *Trans. of the Royal Historical Soc.* 6th ser. 15 (2005): 1–27, is the fourth and final Presidential Address by Professor Janet Nelson to the Royal Historical Society. Like the three addresses that preceded it—"Ends and Beginnings," "Rights and Rituals," "Vikings and Others"—Nelson focuses primarily upon the "long ninth century," a time that witnessed a deepening impact of Christianization, manifest not least in the multiple relationships between belief and the body. It is a range explored here from the early

ninth-century Carolingian interest in the Roman martyrs—the bodies of a particular category of the holy dead—to the living bodies of the powerful, troubled by the need to meet the demands of political authority, personal piety and post-lapsarian corporeality. From Alcuin's attitudes to tattooing through to the political uses and misuses of mutilation, Nelson offers characteristically original and incisive observations on, *inter alia*, the treatment of the attack upon Leo III by the poet of the Paderborn epic, violence in the *Waltharius* (and the vexed issue of its date of composition), before finishing with a figure who has served as a touchstone for her thought on early medieval politics and belief, Alfred.

Citing archeological finds of dice and *Maxims I's* reference to throwing dice, Ian Payne answers "yes" to the question of "Did the Anglo-Saxons Play Games of Chance?" subtitled "Some Thoughts on Old English Board Games," *AntJ* 86: 330–45. His real concern, however, is whether the Anglo-Saxons played *tabula*, a Roman game of chance played on a board in the fashion of backgammon. Earlier scholars had asserted that a capture-the-king game of skill known as *tæfl* was the only Anglo-Saxon board game, but Payne argues that because the word *tæfl* is derived from the Latin word *tabula*, it very likely referred to the backgammon-like *tabula* as well as to the capture-the-king game.

e. Gender and Identity

In *The Sutton Hoo Sceptre and the Roots of Celtic Kingship Theory* (Dublin: Four Courts Press), Michael J. Enright revisits the topic of his 1983 article ("The Sutton Hoo whetstone sceptre: a study in iconography and cultural milieu," *ASE* 11: 119–34) to refute his critics and expand his argument. An extensive search for parallels for every element of the scepter's materials and iconography makes a convincing case for a purely Celtic provenance within a tradition that was a thousand years old by the time of the scepter's creation. Noting the presence at Sutton Hoo of Celtic millefiori and shield fittings with Celtic motifs, Enright concludes that several Celtic artisans must have been in the king's employ. He suggests that the king wished to demonstrate his kingship in a Celtic way when he traveled to Celtic areas or had direct dealings with Celtic rulers or aristocrats. A scepter in a Germanic style also found at Sutton Hoo leads Enright to suppose that the king suffered from scepter-envy, or at least that he wanted to impress both Celts and Anglo-Saxons. For those who want to follow Enright into the "theory of kingship" that the scepter "surely" embodies (26), there are chapters on truthful

royal speech, its connections to a solar cult, the elements of Celtic kingship theory that are derived from metallurgical practices, and the belief in an Iron-Age solar deity who is the god of wheels and kingship. In an appendix, Enright discusses the Icelandic whetstone anecdotes that have been suggested as being relevant to our understanding of the Sutton Hoo scepter. Again convincingly, he shows that for the most part, the Icelandic whetstones are not close parallels, and where they do seem to be parallel, it is most likely because of Norse borrowing from the Irish. [Also reviewed above in Section 7]

Don Henson's *The Origins of the Anglo-Saxons* (Hockwold-cum-Wilton: Anglo-Saxon Books) is one archaeologist's exploration of the creation of Anglo-Saxon identity. His dissatisfaction with the unfamiliarity of some with material culture and ethnicity theory and with the unfamiliarity of others with linguistics and history results in great unevenness: forty pages on ethnicity theory, one hundred and forty pages on the Anglo-Saxons, and one hundred pages on appendices that introduce rulers outside Britain, the early Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, the Tribal Hidage, Germanic linguistics, the chronology of Anglo-Saxon material culture, place names, King Arthur, European history, documentary and archeological sources, and maps. Moreover, most of the section on the Anglo-Saxons is taken up with summaries of the current scholarship on their migrations, conquests, myths, legends, ethnic labels, language, religion, political structures, and material culture. All this surrounds twenty-six pages ("Summary" and "Conclusion") in which Henson emphasizes that late Roman Britain was varied in its culture and its political and military arrangements and that the settlement of Germanic immigrants in Britain was undertaken by different groups, under different leaders, for different reasons, and within different British contexts. He proposes that these migrants maintained a self-identification as Germans, keeping up links with their homelands and the wider northwestern Germanic world but gradually creating an insular Germanic culture. Only from around 570 did various Germanic and Britto-Germanic families take over existing power structures and begin to create kingdoms that were self-consciously Anglo-Saxon in identity. The major markers of this identity were secondary (i.e., language, religion, and material culture) rather than primary (i.e., kinship and name). Hanson also considers a number of interesting questions, such as why British resistance to Anglo-Saxon advances collapsed between 570 and 634, whether the identity expressed in the Sutton Hoo burial could have been primarily one of status rather

than of ethnicity, and how it was that post-Roman Britain reverted to an identity based on ethnicity instead of the Roman identity based on citizenship.

In "The King's Wife and Family Property Strategies: Late Anglo-Saxon Wessex, 871–1066," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 29: 84–99, Ryan Lavelle elaborates on the observation that Anglo-Saxon queens' estates often seem to have returned to the hands of the kings. Analysis of the royal holdings in the Meon valley in Hampshire shows that the land was not succeeded to queen-by-queen but was instead used as necessary, due to the constant need to reward different groups of people. Royal women were therefore treated with some limitations regarding their holding of bookland, and the general impermanence of the grants suggests that even anointed queens did not enjoy total control. Regular succession of queenly landholding may have been the goal, and may even have been achievable when there was only one queen and one queen mother, but reality tended to be a good deal more chaotic. For example, from her marriage in 918 to her death around 964, Eadgifu (the third wife of Edward the Elder) lived through a period that saw seven royal marriages, four dowagers, and six kings. Permanent grants of land to queens were simply not possible under the circumstances.

Generations of students of early English history found straightforward guidance in Henry Loyn's writings. In the first Henry Loyn Memorial Lecture ("English Identity from Bede to the Millennium," *The Haskins Society Journal* 14: [2003], 33–51) delivered at the University of Cardiff in 2003, Nicholas Brooks explores notions of Englishness in the writings of Bede, Boniface (who "fully shared Bede's conception of a single English people"), Alcuin, the Alfredian court, and Æthelweard, contrasting the thoughts of these authors with the articulation of ethnic identities present in a eighth- and ninth-century charters. Brooks addresses explicitly issues of influence and appropriation: did Boniface borrow from Bede, for example? Blending many original insights with equally valuable reflections upon the thoughts of others and the complex social realities that underlay the formal articulation of ethnicity, "English Identity" is a valuable addition to the burgeoning scholarship on Anglo-Saxon identities and the matter of Englishness.

This year, Ashgate's *Variorum Collected Studies* series published a selection of essays by Pauline Stafford under the title, *Gender, Family and the Legitimation of Power: England from the Ninth to Early Twelfth Century* (Aldershot: Ashgate). Stafford is among the most prominent living early medieval political historians, and readers will be grateful to find so many influential

essays gathered in a single volume. Focusing particularly on the relationship between gender and political power in Anglo-Saxon England, the essays range from "The Reign of Æthelred II, A Study in the Limitations on Royal Policy and Action" of 1978 to "Succession and Inheritance: A Gendered Perspective on Alfred's Family History" of 2003. As is Ashgate's practice, the essays retain their original pagination for ease of reference and citation. As useful as these essays are, however, one might be forgiven for wondering whether the volume is truly worth Ashgate's \$114.95 asking price. Not only is the cost out of the reach of the individual reader, but given the budget crises that plague so many universities, libraries may well be wary of spending much needed funds on a collection in which the contents are readily available elsewhere. The volume does contain one previously unpublished essay: "King and Kin, Lord and Community: England in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries" (VIII.1–33), a 1994 essay based on a talk delivered the previous year at the University of Copenhagen. In this wide-ranging essay, Stafford examines the often tense relationship between political and familial affiliations during a period of increasing royal power and political unification. She focuses particularly on southern England, building her analysis around case-studies of two disputes: the national controversy surrounding the accession of King Edward (later to become "the Martyr") in 956 and a contemporary local controversy involving estates at Sunbury in Middlesex. In her analysis, she emphasizes both what she calls the "predatory face of tenth century rule" (10) and the increasing impossibility of separating familial and political bonds. Although she comes to few definite conclusions, Stafford does highlight the continuous nature of kin-king interactions and the extent to which these interactions contributed to the centralization of royal authority. She writes, "the story of the high middle ages is one of the ongoing interactions of kin, lord, king, and community. It was a story which in England had begun before AD 900, but one in which the tenth and eleventh centuries wrote a critical chapter" (33).

f. The Economy, Settlement, and Landscape

John T. Baker's *Cultural Transition in the Chilterns and Essex Region, 350 AD to 650 AD* (Hatfield: U of Hertfordshire P) is an excellent interdisciplinary regional study that uses the evidence of place names as a way of interpreting the material culture unearthed by archaeologists. Moreover, the introduction presents not only the current scholarly debates over the nature of the Anglo-Saxon settlement in Britain but also the limitations of

the data, and I would not hesitate to recommend this chapter to students. Pedagogy aside, Baker proceeds by devoting a chapter each to the late Romano-British and early Anglo-Saxon finds in this area, and then he devotes a chapter each to the place names that suggest the survival of British speakers and the place names that demonstrate the spread of Old English. The final chapter integrates the earlier conclusions. It appears that in parts of this area, a British way of life was maintained at a time when Germanic culture was spreading through the rest of the region, and the survival of Romano-British settlements into Anglo-Saxon times seems to have been widespread. Baker finds far more evidence for mass migration than for conquest by a small warrior elite, and he suggests that the true picture may be one of general British survival with different levels of cultural change in different localities. [Also reviewed above in Section 7]

In "Ipse Tenet—He Himself Holds: Aspects of Eleventh-Century Estate Management in Buckinghamshire," *Records of Buckinghamshire* 46: 53–63, Keith Bailey examines the estates kept "in hand" (i.e., not subinfeudated) by their tenants-in-chief. Bailey shows that the direct exploitation of such estates varied widely between different categories of overlord and also in relation to the extent to which they held land across different shires. For example, lay tenants-in-chief were much less likely to have estates in-hand than churchmen or the king and queen, who all had special needs for food renders and saleable surpluses. The exception was lay owners of very small estates, who were dependent on their holdings for subsistence. Bailey also considers the questions of why almost two-thirds of estates held in-hand had hidated demesnes and why the proportion of estates held in-hand differed so greatly from south to north across the shire (15.4% in Moulsoe hundred but 80% in Stoke hundred), but no clear answers can be found so far.

Philip Bartholomew's "Continental Connections: Angles, Saxons and Others in Bede and in Procopius," *ASSAH* 13: 19–30, was only in draft when its author passed away, and a foreword by Bruce Eagles cautions that some sections are not up to date. Skipping over Bartholomew's analysis of the *Historia ecclesiastica* as political propaganda, therefore, we come to his main assertions. The first is that the Jutes cannot have come from Jutland. If Bede's *Iutae* are cognate with the *Euthiones* or the *Eutii*, we then know their continental location from a letter written by the Merovingian king Theudebert I, which puts them between Saxonia and Francia (roughly, where Flanders is now). This leads to Bartholomew's second point, that if the homeland of

the Angli lies between the provinces of the Jutes and that Saxons, as Bede says, this new understanding of the province of the Jutes means that the Angli came from Frisia, as archaeology and landscape history suggest. Bartholomew closes with a consideration of Procopius's anecdotes about the ferrying of the souls of the dead from the Continent to Britain as a version of a folk memory of a mass migration.

Nicholas Brooks guides us through a few aspects of the history of "Rochester, AD 400–1066," *Medieval Art, Architecture and Archaeology at Rochester*, ed. Tim Ayers and Tim Tatton-Brown (Leeds: British Archaeological Association), 6–21, as gleaned from Anglo-Saxon documents. He begins with the *Domesday Book*, which shows that the bishop of Rochester was the dominant lord within the walls of the city. The next topics are the foundation of the cathedral, grants of property within the city, and the Viking siege of 885. Brooks concludes with the bridge at Rochester, whose design can be reconstructed from the document describing the arrangements for the repair of the timber superstructure.

The focus of *People and Space in the Middle Ages: 300–1300*, ed. Wendy Davies, Guy Halsall, and Andrew Reynolds (Turnhout: Brepols) is actually narrower than it sounds: studies of medieval territoriality and community in the extreme climates of Iceland and Spain are contrasted with those dealing with the temperate areas in southern Britain and northern France. Three are of particular interest to Anglo-Saxonists. Andrew Reynolds and Alex Langlands ("Social Identities on the Macro Scale: A Maximum View of Wansdyke," 13–44) offer a revisionist view of the Wansdyke ("Woden's Ditch") earthworks, which have traditionally been considered late Roman or immediately post-Roman. There is no conclusive evidence that dates these earthworks to Anglo-Saxon times, but a substantially post-Roman date is suggested by the fact that the Wansdyke line cuts across parish boundaries. If the earthworks were earlier than the parishes, the latter would utilize them as a boundary feature, but they do not. The authors also see clear parallels between Wansdyke, Offa's Dyke, and the Burghal Hidage calculations for the construction of public defense works. They propose that Wansdyke dates to the period when Mercia and Wessex were competing for territory. This frontier did not remain contested for long, but during that time, named for a heroic ancestor, the boundary line must have promoted the forging of a West Saxon identity in early England. In "Boundaries of Knowledge: Mapping the Land Units of Late Anglo-Saxon and Norman England" (115–42), Steven Bassett seeks to prove the reality of the parish of the late-Anglo-Saxon mother-church at Wootton Wawen

(Warwickshire). The original parish is argued to have covered around 7,000 hectares and to have included as many as eleven subordinate churches. After reviewing the evidence of the extent of Wootton Wawen's parish and its subsequent disintegration, Bassett interprets the twelfth-century dispute between Wootton Wawen and Evesham Abbey over control of the church at Oldberrow to mean that Wootton Wawen had had parochial control of Oldberrow before it came into Evesham's hands, probably not later than the 840s. This would make Wootton Wawen yet another example of a mother-church that very probably had a parish before the tenth century. Grenville Astill takes on the problem of "Community, Identity and the Later Anglo-Saxon Town: The Case of Southern England" (233–54) and finds it difficult to isolate obvious signs of an urban identity among the larger southern towns between the late ninth and eleventh centuries. Although he acknowledges the long chronology of urbanization in which the development of clearly urban characteristics was drawn out and faltering, he also suggests that the fluidity of the burghal system may have been underestimated. Furthermore, the older pre-burh pattern of trading- and assembly-places may have continued to determine the social and economic relationships of the majority of the population, despite royal efforts to the contrary.

In the wake of Michael McCormick's masterly study of communication and trade in late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages, the interest of early medieval historians in travel, transportation, and communication has been steadily growing, and rightly so. In "Time, Travel and Political Communities: Transportation and Travel Routes in Sixth- and Seventh-Century Northumbria," *The Heroic Age* 8 (2005): n.p. [online], Lemont Dobson seeks to explore the relationship of political development to travel and communication. Noting references to boat journeys in a range of written sources, some of the material evidence for waterborne trade, Dobson offers a brief account of "potential harbors" from the Firth of Forth down to the Humber, cross-referencing, wherever possible, such harbors with known Anglo-Saxon sites and providing some approximate travel times (though one wonders about the need for seasonal adjustments and man-made obstacles, both official and unofficial, to unfettered early English travel). This is an important subject, not least for its implication for understanding the relationship between central and local power, and the means by which coherent political and economic communities could be created and maintained in the sixth and seventh centuries, and after. It is, however, a topic that demands to be handled with care. Some will find its treatment here uneven, perhaps unnuanced,

and occasionally obscured by unclear—or unedited—prose. Others will find much food for thought.

In “Game Parks in Sussex and the Godwinesons,” *Anglo-Norman Studies* 29: 51–64, Alban Gautier explores both the practice of hunting and the question of its continuity and change before and after the Norman Conquest. As regards hunting, he notes that in Anglo-Saxon England, kings and noblemen essentially ate meat from domestic animals, not from the hunt, even if the proportion of game seems to have become higher and higher as the centuries went on. Furthermore, not all game had the same symbolic value: herons and cranes, for example, had to be taken by trained raptors that only the wealthiest could afford. Turning to deer parks, Gautier argues that the pastimes of the English aristocracy in the time of Edward the Confessor were similar to those of their Norman successors and that several of the parks mentioned in Domesday had been created before 1066. In particular, the fact that the Bayeux Tapestry shows Harold Godwineson coming back from the chase to Bosham (west Sussex), where no park seems to have stood on land belonging to his family, suggests that the Godwinesons had the right to hunt in parks built by their clients and friends. Domesday suggests that Harold’s brother Gyrrh had a park in Merston, and of course the existence of the parks is attested for 1086. There was thus some continuity in land-holding patterns (but not in the landholders themselves) likely during this period.

In “The ‘Farm of One Night’ and the Organisation of Royal Estates in Late Anglo-Saxon Wessex” (*The Haskins Society Journal* 14: [2003]: 53–82), Ryan Lavelle revisits the subject of royal render in kind and hospitality in late Saxon Wessex as seen in the Domesday evidence for Hampshire and Dorset. Refracted through Domesday, the two shires possessed distinct patterns of provision. He concludes: “the provision of the farm of one night may actually have emerged in the late ninth or early tenth century as a part of the regularization of the king’s landholdings, alongside that of lands in the hands of royal family members.”

Clare A. Lees and Gillian R. Overing introduce their edited collection, *A Place to Believe In: Locating Medieval Landscapes* (University Park: Penn State UP) with a brief essay of their own offering to literary and cultural historians of the Middle Ages a new theoretical approach to pre-modern texts. Their method springs from a simple question: How did medieval people understand “place”? The focus of their inquiry is Anglo-Saxon Northumbria, a kingdom of particular interest to these authors not only because of its extraordinary material remains but also because of its status

as “a highly influential—and moveable—territory ... at times extend[ing] further north into Scotland and southwest into Mercia (or parts of modern Yorkshire), according to shifting patterns of alliances” (8). Traveling to what remains of “the triangle of Lindisfarne, Bamburgh and Yeavinger,” the authors note “a complex residual stratification of cultural meaning” encompassing Roman, Irish, and Germanic forms of religious life (13–15). The most intriguing portion of this essay is the authors’ reading of King Æthelberht’s reception of Augustine’s mission as narrated by Bede: in agreeing to meet the mission on Thanet and then securing Augustine and his circle a home in Canterbury, the king may have been following an understanding of place not shared by those who sought his conversion: “Æthelberht achieves a delineation, a bounding, indeed a jurisdiction of place that can be read as royal, secular, and Kentish from his perspective, but Christian, Roman, and other from Augustine’s” (16). Other episodes from Anglo-Saxon history and hagiography are discussed in ways meant to illuminate notions of place peculiar to early medieval England.

Stephen Oppenheimer’s *The Origins of the British: A Genetic Detective Story* (London: Constable) is an iconoclastic work of popular science that uses genetics, archaeology, literature, onomastics, historical linguistics, and epigraphy to investigate the sequence of peoples, cultures, and languages that made their way to the British Isles. Oppenheimer finds that three-quarters of the ancestors of the inhabitants of Great Britain arrived during the late Paleolithic era. More specifically, this applies to 88% of the Irish, 81% of the Welsh, 79% percent of the Cornish, 70% of the Scots, and 68% of the English. There is no genetic evidence for any massive invasions later, as no individual event contributed even one-tenth of the total overall modern genetic mix. These first inhabitants made their way up the Atlantic coast from the Basque region and were not Celts (whom Oppenheimer argues were a Neolithic people of southwest Europe, not an Iron-Age people of Central Europe). Celtic language and culture were carried north into Ireland and Wales by early metal prospectors from the south a good 4,400 years ago, but the genetic evidence shows no sign of Celts replacing the original inhabitants. Even in Ireland, the influx of Neolithic genes is only 4% of the modern mix. Yet by the time the Romans came to Britain, it does not seem likely that all the inhabitants spoke a Celtic language, because a greater flow of Neolithic genes (10–19% of modern gene lines) was arriving in eastern and southeastern Britain from Scandinavia and northwest Germany. Oppenheimer also suggests that some Germanic-speaking Belgae had emigrated

from northern Gaul, and that it was settlements of Saxons that gave their name to what the Romans called the Saxon Shore. As regards the Anglo-Saxons, they contributed less to the gene pool than did the Vikings (in west Norfolk, Danish-linked gene types make up 19% of the sample). In what became Anglia, the rate of genetic intrusion reached 9–17%, but the Saxon areas of the south saw only an intrusion rate of 5%. Oppenheimer understands Bede's *Angli* to mean Anglians, and thus he finds Bede to be more reliable a source than Gildas, who calls the incomers Saxons. The genetic evidence indicates that there was no migration at all from Frisia. And while on the subject of the Anglo-Saxons, Oppenheimer argues that English is not West Germanic as is usually supposed and instead forms a fourth branch of Germanic that arose between 3600 B.C. and 350 A.D. and is closer to North Germanic. As regards the Vikings, they seem to have gravitated to the areas settled by their Neolithic relatives, with the Norwegians concentrating themselves in Orkney, Shetland, north Scotland, and the Western Isles and the Danes avoiding Saxon England and taking land in the northeast. The effect of the Norman Conquest cannot yet be determined, due to lack of information about their gene lines.

Francis Pryor's *Britain A.D.: A Quest for Arthur, England and the Anglo-Saxons* (London: HarperCollins, 2004) is loosely based on programming for the British Channel Four. Archeologically oriented and idiosyncratic, its author's frustration with academic conservatism, medieval historiography, and circular argument is on full display. On the basis of several landscape studies, Pryor argues for substantial continuity in Britain during the first six centuries after Christ and argues against invasions and migrations of any kind. In his view, the battles usually thought of as being fought between Briton and Saxon were more probably battles between the Anglo-Saxonized Britons of the Midlands and east and the Romanized Britons of the west, groups that contrast culturally, not ethnically. As regards English origins, Pryor finds no evidence either for the presence of a small military elite or for incoming farmers. If the Anglo-Saxon settlers were new and different, they should inhabit sites that are new and different, but Pryor cannot see that they did. He concludes that we "should forget the 'Anglo-Saxons' and turn instead to the resident population, who had been there, in their millions and in their various cultures and communities, all the time" (244).

In Mark G. Thomas, Michael P. H. Stumpf, and Heinrich Harke's essay, "Evidence for an Apartheid-Like Social Structure in Early Anglo-Saxon England," *Proceedings of the Royal Society* 273: 1–7, the authors

attempt to "reconcile the discrepancy between, on the one hand, archaeological and historical ideas about the scale of the Anglo-Saxon immigration, and on the other, estimates of the genetic contribution of the Anglo-Saxon immigrants to the modern English gene pool" (5). Thomas *et al.* point out that the high percentage of Continental genetic input would seem to imply migration on a scale far greater—more than 500,000 settlers—than the historical record indicates. Using a statistical model to hypothesize about the relationship between rates of intermarriage and reproduction, they conclude that the discrepancy can be explained by an apartheid-like social structure perpetuating the distinction between native and migrant populations. They find further evidence for this theory in both the legislation of Ine and the grave goods of post-migration Anglo-Saxons. Although the historian might find the rhetoric of contemporary evolutionary biology occasionally opaque (however, the authors do an admirable job of clarifying their argument for a non-scientific audience), this article not only provides convincing evidence for its thesis, it also illustrates the value of this sort of study for Anglo-Saxon scholarship.

In "The Eleventh Century in England Through Fish-Eyes: Salmon, Herring, Oysters, and 1066," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 29: 193–213, Hirokazu Tsurushima proposes that eleventh-century England resembled medieval Japan in being divided into culture-areas characterized by the consumption of different fish. In Domesday, for example, the word "salmon" appears mainly in connection with the western counties, whereas the word "herring" appears mainly in connection with the east. While on the topic of Anglo-Saxon herring, Tsurushima notes that the seafarers who supported the Godwine family in 1052 were also herring fishermen and part of the Godwine family's affinity, and this might be why Earl Godwine refused King Edward's order to plunder Dover, for his duty was to protect these people. Godwine or Harold might well have institutionalized the herring fishery in the Channel and incorporated the herring fleet into the king's naval system. Moving on to oysters, Tsurushima points out that they were probably very abundant in the eleventh century. According to Domesday, the value of the small borough of Seasalter had increased fourfold since the time of King Edward, and given that Seasalter was a traditional center of oyster fishing up to early modern times, Tsurushima speculates that this rise was due to the export of oysters after the Conquest. In 1086, Seasalter was held by a master mason who imported stone from Caen, and perhaps the ships that carried stone from Normandy were laden with oysters on the

outward voyage. Last but not least, William the Conqueror may have exploited the English fishing industry in another way: he landed in England on September 28 or 29—just at the start of the herring-fishing season. Ships that Harold may have wanted to requisition for the ship *fyrð* would have been out at sea and unavailable.

In “Frisians, Saxons, and Franks: Ethnogenesis and Ethnic Identity in Roman and Early Medieval Sources,” *Insignis Sophiae Arcator: Medieval Latin Studies in Honour of Michael Herren on His 65th Birthday*, ed. Wieland *et al.* [see sec. 2], 28–44, Haijo Jan Westra addresses what he sees as a central problem with the modern study of ethnic identity generally and research into early medieval Frisian ethnogenesis in particular: “a revisionist tendency . . . that capitalizes on the absence of evidence from a period inherently categorized by a paucity of literary and archaeological remains, leading to the familiar throwing out of the baby with the bathwater” (28). In Frisian studies, this phenomenon manifests itself in the tendency to find a discontinuity between the Frisian tribes recorded in Roman sources and those found in Merovingian and Carolingian records. The majority of the article is then taken up with a detailed, perceptive survey of the surviving sources designed to emphasize the continuity of Frisian identity. For the Anglo-Saxonist, Westra’s article will be useful both for the light he sheds on Frisian episodes in *Beowulf* and, more importantly, for the model he provides for understanding tribal identity in the pre-migration period. He concludes that “[Frisian] survival points to the importance of a definition of the nation in terms of a collective memory, formative historical experiences, language, literature, law and custom, and a shared sense of identity and belonging” (43). This definition, he points out, carries important implications for the emerging European Union: “The survival of these marginal peoples bodes well for a newly defined nationhood in a united Europe where, in the absence of one dominant imperial power and culture, all will be, to a greater or lesser degree, marginal” (43–4).

In “Anglo-Saxon *gentes* and *regna*,” *Regna and Gentes: The Relationship between Late Antique and Early Medieval Peoples and Kingdoms in the Transformation of the Roman World*, ed. Hans-Werner Goetz, Jörg Jarnut, and Walter Pohl with the collaboration of Sören Kaschke, *The Transformation of the Roman World* 13 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 381–407, Barbara Yorke offers an overview of recent approaches to the formation of the early Anglo-Saxon kingdoms and pre-Alfredian ethnicities. Under the heading “problems and sources” she tackles the vexed issues of interpreting the post-Roman

archaeological record, as well as the difficulties in relating Bede’s eighth-century appreciation of “migration” ethnicities with what may well have been its complexities on the ground. Later sections address the emergence of kings, and the interrelationship of royal power, kingdoms, and peoples, together with notions of dynastic descent. These are fundamental questions, and Yorke addresses them with admirable clarity. Not merely addressing long-standing problems she also raises trenchant questions of her own. Casting an eye back across the Channel Yorke raises the often overlooked issue of pre-*adventus* Anglian, Jutish, and Saxon identity: “Were these earlier *gentes* also linked with the development of kingship, or, failing that, can they be construed as in any broader sense as ‘political’ identities?” Noting that Britain became unmoored from Roman power rather earlier and more definitively than its neighboring provinces, Yorke argues, as others have done, for the importance of *civitates* as key administrative cores around which several post-Roman polities formed. In a final section (“The circumstances that led to the formation of Anglo-Saxon *regna*”) Yorke addresses the processes through which individual families were able to control surplus, exercise coercive power, and establish themselves as in some sense “royal.” While acknowledging that the processes involved were complex and variable, she isolates several factors as vital: population increase, the growing effectiveness of local elites’ exploitation of agricultural surplus, and—building upon Ian Wood’s notions of cross-Channel influence—the application of Merovingian models of rule. “When it came to the ideology and vocabulary of *gens* and *regnum*,” Yorke concludes, “the Anglo-Saxons of the seventh and eighth centuries were in accord with the other Germanic *gentes* and *regna* that had grown out of the dissolution of the Roman empire in western Europe.” Engaging with both recent debates on ethnogenesis and continental early medieval ethnicity and, more specifically, upon the transformations of sub-Roman Britain, this is a perceptive overview and an excellent entry point to the current state of the debates over the making of Anglo-Saxon England. It deserves a prominent place on any undergraduate bibliography on the period AD 400–600.

g. Magic, Medicine, and Science

The Penitential of Theodore has long been a frequent stop for scholars interested in magic and other traces of “heathen” practices, and so it is a credit to Anne Lawrence-Mathers (“The Problem of Magic in Early Anglo-Saxon England,” *Reading Medieval Studies*

33 [2007]: 87–104) that she finds new and valuable things to say about its handling of various superstitions. Lawrence-Mathers begins with an overview of the recent attempts to theorize the nature of magic and the extent (if any) of its separateness from various Christian practices that seem susceptible to this classification. What makes the evidence of handbooks for confessors especially useful for such inquiries are their references to ritual acts known to the Anglo-Saxons, as opposed to those that are referred to largely because of their derivation either from patristic literature or Church councils that antedate Theodore's episcopate (91). Aside from the well-known condemnation of women who place their children on roofs or in ovens as a remedy for fever, magic surfaces also in references to women's use of bodily fluids as aphrodisiacs. Lawrence-Mathers concedes that these are nowhere in the Theodorean canons taxonomized under "clear categories or theological definitions" (96), and their classification as "magic" is also complicated by their occurrence within chapters that are broadly concerned with penalties for the consumption of these fluids largely because those guilty of doing so are in violation of biblical purity laws. Nonetheless, their association with those chapters that seem more explicitly to refer to magical practices is confirmed by their assumption that the guilty party will inevitably be a woman: magic in this text is both "gendered" and "something which is likely to occur in domestic and sexual contexts, where women may attempt amateur divinations, practice simple 'love charms' based on consumption of bodily fluids, or invite *malefici* into their homes if something more specialised is required" (99). Since none of these practices are attested in the Penitential of Cummean (the likeliest source of the Penitential of Theodore), Lawrence-Mathers concludes quite reasonably that they reflect Anglo-Saxon conditions and perhaps show traces as well of a period in which "[t]he work of correlating early-medieval practice with Christian theory" was in its earliest phases of development (100).

The interaction of insular and Frankish culture has emerged as one of the core concerns of historians of Anglo-Saxon England in recent years. In "Le conoscenza mediche nell'Inghilterra anglosassone: il ruolo del mondo carolingio," *International Scandinavian and Medieval Studies in Memory of Gerd Wolfgang Weber: "ein runder Knäuel, so rollt's uns leicht aus den Händen,"* ed. Michael Dallapiazza, Olaf Hansen, Preben Meulengracht Sorensen and Yvonne S. Bonnetain (Trieste: Edizioni Parnaso, 2000), 129–46, Maria D'Aronco turns her attention to the nature of that interaction in the sphere of medical thought. From a brief consideration

of both the obligations to offer care for the sick in the various monastic rules and the increasingly positive scholarly assessment of early medieval medicine with its greater acceptance of some continuities with late Antique medicine, D'Aronco argues that early medieval medicine was above all practical medicine, dynamic, ever-developing and, implicitly, built upon observation of effective ministration. Such developments only really become apparent, however, at the close of the eighth century when the documentation for medical knowledge grows in substance, and it becomes possible not only to see the diffusion of such knowledge in some depth but also to see something of the way in which medical studies functioned at least in some Carolingian intellectual centers, notably Fulda. D'Aronco outlines the medical riches to be found in continental libraries before turning her attention to England, and the range of medical texts extant from Aldhelm's day onwards. Later sections address Monte Cassino's role as a center for the dissemination of medical knowledge, as evinced in BL Cotton Vitellius C.iii (D'Aronco draws upon her own earlier studies into early English herbals to explore patterns of transmission) and the movement of medical learning between England and European centers through cross-Channel connections fostered during the tenth-century reformation.

h. Law, Politics, and Warfare

In a wide-ranging lexical study, "Cowardice' and Duty in Anglo-Saxon England," *Journal of Medieval Military History* 4: 29–49, Richard Abels views skeptically "the assumption that the Anglo-Saxons, at least before the mid eleventh century, had a distinct conception of martial cowardice in the sense of a specific moral failing concerned with fearfulness in war"; what we would be tempted to call acts of cowardice were typically construed by pre-Conquest sources "as failures to perform military duties owed a lord due to insufficient love and loyalty" (31). Though Old English contains no lack of words that "connote timidity or fearfulness, the language lacks any specific word that corresponds precisely to the modern English words 'coward,' 'cowardly,' or 'cowardice,' a situation one would not even begin to suspect based on the many translations that use these terms" (31). Abels goes on to consider in some detail the role of gender in shaping conceptions of courage and cowardice and suggests that differing conceptions of these among English and Norse speakers may have complicated efforts at peacemaking. Old English sources' seeming lack of interest in the motives underlying refusals to perform obligations indicates "an aspect

of Anglo-Saxon culture profoundly alien to our own: its lack of a fully developed sense of interiority," albeit one that seems more characteristic of secular than ecclesiastical discourses (46). In Abels's view, this indifference to the motives of cowardly acts and unwillingness to regard them as in any way extenuating is most evident in the castigation of the ealdorman Ælfric occurring in the C, D, and E versions of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: when he begins to vomit once the opposing army is within sight, the chronicler suggests that Ælfric was merely "up to his old tricks," thereby refusing "[to] permit ... the excuse of a timid nature. In this annal and others irresolution and weakness give way to a different and far more damning source of shame, perfidy, oath-breaking" (47–48).

Abels returns to a favored subject in "Alfred and His Biographers: Image and Imagination," *Writing Medieval Biography 750–1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow*, ed. Bates *et al.* [see sec. 2], 61–76, here considering what the lives of the king authored by Asser, Charles Plummer, Alfred Smyth, and Abels himself suggest not only about the historical Alfred but about the inherent limitations of biographical scholarship. Though Abels is more willing than Smyth to accept the authenticity of Asser's *Life*, he acknowledges that its historicity is severely vitiated by the Welsh bishop's dependence on earlier Carolingian literary models, his tendency to dwell on the religious significance of Alfred's illnesses, and his habit of aligning the events of Alfred's life with the biblical story of King David (65). Though Asser's role as an "image-maker" has been emphasized by a number of scholars in recent decades, Abels insists nonetheless that "the image he devised came ultimately from Alfred himself" and that it remains among the most secure bases for conclusions about Alfred's reign (67). Certainly Plummer's biographical work at the outset of the twentieth century, though in many ways a model of cautious analysis, is no less distorted by the prejudices of his own era. Where Asser's *Life* strains credibility, Plummer sees signs of "his 'Celtic imagination' and its characteristic 'rebellion against facts'; expressions of scorn for relic cults and the other accoutrements of ninth-century English Christianity are likewise the results of Plummer's adherence to the 'High Anglicanism of the Victorian era' (67–8). Though Plummer eliminated from Alfred's biography many of the elements of popular tradition for which he is known today, Abels argues that "Plummer's historical Alfred still looks remarkably like the Alfred of tradition," a king whose "perfect[ion]" rivals Arthur's if only because the reputation of the former rests on a slender but secure basis of historical fact (69). What remained

of this seeming bedrock of knowledge would come under blistering attack nearly a century later in Smyth's massive biography, one that accepts not even the rudiments of Asser's *Life* and goes so far as to question the charters furnishing evidence of Asser's place in Alfred's circle (71). Potentially more egregious is Smyth's acceptance of the Alfredian translations "as a more transparent window into the mind of the king," a tendency Smyth's study shares with that of Plummer, who had argued for Alfred's authorship even of texts that no specialist would attribute to him now (72). (Abels does not point out at length the dangers to which Smyth had exposed himself in doing so.) As Abels observes, both studies appear at times either innocent of or indifferent to philological and diplomatic methods, and so it is not surprising that Smyth's Alfred looks very much like Plummer's (72). What remains of Abels's essay is a narrative of his own problems forming what little secure evidence exists into a coherent narrative. Ultimately, Abels concedes that just about every item of evidence out of which Alfred's biography has been constructed can be legitimately contested, including the supposedly more objective evidence of archaeology and numismatics. Thus even the most skeptical biographers inevitably find themselves repeating the very things about Alfred that Abels suspects he wanted us to say. Abels does not exclude himself from the list of those who have probably found themselves to be Alfred's unwilling mouthpieces.

Timothy Bolton's "English Political Refugees at the Court of Sveinn Ástriðarson, King of Denmark (1042–76)," *Medieval Scandinavia* 15: 17–36, tracks the wanderings of two English bishops following the Norman Conquest and the East Anglian revolt of 1069–71. In an impressive piece of historical detective work, Bolton manages to reconstruct the flight of Bishops Æthelrige and Ælfwold to Denmark, place them at the court of Sveinn Ástriðarson, and ascertain something of their activities while in exile. Because of spotty or incomplete source material, many of Bolton's conclusions are admittedly speculative, but his claims seem to be well supported by the surviving evidence. The argument begins by outlining the connections between Harold's pre-Conquest court and that of the Danish kings, connections that would lead to "the creation of an Anglo-Scandinavian elite in England, which had close familial ties to Scandinavia" (19). Bolton then traces the links between Æthelrige and Ælfwold and the court of Sveinn Ástriðarson. Finally, Bolton examines the circumstances of their exile, including the evidence for their participation in the 1069–71 uprisings, and the possible influence they may have had at the Danish court.

In “A Welsh Record of an Anglo-Saxon Political Mutilation,” *ASE* 35: 24–59, Elizabeth Boyle attempts to explain an obscure reference in the *Annales Cambriae* to the blinding of a “Gwlfach” and “Ubiad.” Pointing out that neither name appears elsewhere in Welsh, she uses linguistic evidence to argue that those referred to are actually Wulfheah and Ufegeat, sons of the Ealdorman Ælfhelm, who were blinded for their participation in the 1006 “palace revolution” under Æthelred the Unready. She suggests that Wulfheah and Ufegeat’s landholdings at Wirral and elsewhere on the Welsh border may have been the justification for their inclusion in the chronicle. However, she also notes that “the short and incongruous nature of the entries in relation to those before and after reinforces the idea that the entry was included because it was contained in a Latin ancestor of the Welsh vernacular chronicles, rather than from any late medieval Welsh awareness of the identities of the victims” (249).

Tim Clarkson tries his hand at “Locating *Maserfelth*,” *Heroic Age* 9 (online). Tradition identifies the site of Oswald’s last battle as the area around Oswestry in Shropshire, but Clarkson raises several objections to this. For example, Bede seems to be suggesting that *Maserfelth* was a battle fought in defence of Oswald’s core territory, but Oswestry is situated a considerable distance from Northumbria’s nearest border. Oswestry is also a considerable distance from Bardney (in Lindsey), which according to Bede became Oswald’s resting place. If Bede’s knowledge of the miracles that occurred at *Maserfelth* was derived from Bardney, Clarkson speculates that the monks of Bardney were able to learn of the miracles because the monastery was not far from the battlefield. As Bardney was destroyed in the 860s, the tradition that *Maserfelth* occurred nearby could have perished with it, to be supplanted by counterclaims nurtured elsewhere. Just as Ælflæd retrieved Edwin’s body and enshrined it at Whitby, her sister found Oswald’s torso and conveyed it on a cart to Bardney, instructing the brethren to venerate the relics. *Maserfelth* might thus be within the eastern conflict zone, which included Hatfield, Lindsey, and the southern marches of Deira. Clarkson suggests that the location of such a decisive battle should be sought in meadows near a major river-crossing or at some other significant topographical feature that warranted the description *felth*, such as the places where Roman roads traverse major rivers such as the Don, the Idle, and the Trent.

Reviewing the question of “Sites and Occasions of Peacemaking in England and Normandy, c. 900–c. 1150,” *Haskins Soc. Jnl* 16: 12–26, Paul Dalton chooses

to focus on peacemaking near rivers and during religious seasons and festivals. Rivers were a good location for peacemaking because they served as barriers, permitting face-saving threats and acts of bravado but also preventing them from spilling over into actual violence. Holy days were good occasions for peacemaking because at these times it was the duty of every Christian to honor the Prince of Peace and His saints by going to church rather than to war. The choice of a specific location or date attests to the careful orchestration of at least some peace meetings.

In “King Alfred’s Naval Engagement with the Danes in 885: Which River Stour?” *Archæologia Cantiana* 125 (2005): 229–41, Christine Grainge rereads the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle’s account of Alfred’s clash with sixteen Viking ships in the mid-880s at “the mouth of the Stour” (*on Stufan muþan*), arguing that this refers to Stourmouth, where the Kentish river Stours empties into the Wantsum Channel rather than the confluence of the East Anglian rivers Stour and Orwell at Harwich, where they debouch into the estuary separating the East Saxons and the East Angles. Grainge’s argument is persuasive, and backed up not only by a reassessment of the relevant passages of the ASC and Æthelweard’s *Chronicle* (*pace* Alistair Campbell), but also by first-hand knowledge of the waters in question. Grainge’s reading casts new light upon a clash often seen as a key episode in both the Alfredian “fightback” of the 880s and the so-called reconquest of the Danelaw, seeing it not as a brave penetration into waters well inside Guthrum’s control but rather revealing West Saxon concern to both protect cross-Channel trade, the Thames Estuary and access to London: a very different set of concerns.

Martin Grimmer investigates “The Exogamous Marriages of Oswiu of Northumbria,” *Heroic Age* 9 (online). He argues that some form of marriage did occur between the Northumbrian ætheling and later king, Oswiu, and Fína of the Cenél nEogain of Ireland and Rhiannmell of Rheged, and he presumes that these marriages were a direct result of the long exile of Oswiu and his brothers and their eventual return to Northumbria. It would be tempting to see the web of alliances created between Northumbria and the Scots of Dalriada and the Britons of Rheged as part of a deliberate strategy on the part of the exiles to consolidate their position in the north, but Oswiu’s marriage to Fína, at least, was probably more a matter of him making the most of a poor situation. There was no guarantee that the sons of Æthelfrith would have been able to return to Northumbria, so any marriages between the sons of Æthelfrith and the Dalriadans, the Irish, or the Picts may have been a necessary part of arrangements to absorb

the exiles more fully into the political and cultural life of their new homes. The marriage between Oswiu and Rhianmellt is the only one that is likely to have been strategic, in the sense that it occurred between two ruling dynasties. The notion that strategic intermarriage may have been an alternative to military conquest is attractive, but Oswiu's marriage to Rhianmellt is the only known case, and it did not necessarily allow the absorption of Rheged into Northumbria.

For a study of the primary sources regarding politics and warfare, Timofey V. Guimon concentrates on paleography in "The Writing of Annals in Eleventh-Century England: Palaeography and Textual History," *Writing and Texts in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Rumble [see sec. 6], 137–45. He finds that MSS C and D of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* offer contrasting examples of eleventh-century annalistics. C is a chronicle updated at intervals between the 1040s and the 1060s, initially year by year and later in two bigger blocks (1052–6 and 1065–6). D is a compilation created by several scribes in or after 1079, based on two main exemplars that are now lost. These exemplars were probably annals updated year by year.

In "Brunanburh Reconsidered," *History Today* 56.6: 2–3, Kevin Halloran rehearses arguments he initially proposed in his article "The Brunanburh Campaign: A Reappraisal," *The Scottish Historical Review* 84.2: 133–48. Claiming that N. J. Higham's identification of Bromborough in the Wirral as the site of the battle described in *The Battle of Brunanburh* does not fit the available evidence, he suggests that Burnswark Hill near Lockerbie would make a better candidate. He points out that the prose sources for the battle describe a topography very different from that at Bromborough while asserting that only one site "fits the political context, the course of the campaign, and the totality of the place-name evidence: Burnswark" (3).

Cyril Hart's *Chronicles of the Reign of Æthelred the Unready: An Edition and Translation of the Old English and Latin Annals* (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press) inaugurates a new series that will include new editions and translations of the most important early chronicles of Anglo-Saxon England, all edited by Dr. Hart. Although these texts have been previously edited (in many cases, more than once), Hart justifies his new versions on disciplinary grounds: "until quite recently, editions of English annals have remained overwhelmingly in the hands of the linguists. Now that the texts of these annals have to a large extent been stabilized and made available to a wider readership, the challenge presents itself for historians to play a greater role in their investigation and interpretation" (iv). While

one might point out that the texts contained in this edition, the C-texts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and the *Worcester Latin Chronicle*, have not been as neglected by historians as Hart suggests, it is nonetheless helpful to have the chance to read them side-by-side. In a lengthy introduction to the editions, Hart advances several claims regarding their composition, some more controversial than others. He first argues that "in most cases it is no longer safe to assume that the surviving annals for a particular year preserve wholly authentic and contemporary accounts of the events of that year, created originally by a single scribe during a single stint of composition" (iii). Few would dispute this assertion, and his second primary claim is also unlikely to raise any strong objections: "we should now view the surviving annals for each year as the work of scribes active in the same period in the same workshop, often using the same materials but writing in different tongues for different readerships" (iii–iv). More problematic is his claim that the annals were compiled at only two centers, Ramsey and Worcester (I), yet he marshals sufficiently compelling evidence to substantiate at least the plausibility of his claim. Concerning the texts themselves, Hart's editions and translations are clear and the parallel arrangement is helpful, yet there is little to cause the reader to choose this volume over other recent versions. All told, Hart has produced a volume that may be profitably consulted by researchers but will not replace the current authoritative editions of these texts.

Also published this year was the second volume in the series, *Byrhtferth's Northumbrian Chronicle: An Edition and Translation of the Old English and Latin Annals* (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press). Unlike the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Byrhtferth's *Northumbrian Chronicle* has not been as readily available to the researcher, and so one must be particularly grateful to Hart for producing a new edition. Although there is much admirable here, the edition is not without its idiosyncrasies. Most likely to raise objections is Hart's claim in the introduction that the *Chronicle* provides evidence to support Alfred Smyth's dubious thesis that Asser did not write the life of King Alfred attributed to him (xcvii–c). Such assertions aside, however, Hart's edition, translation, and detailed introduction examining both the text and its sources should provide a valuable new resource for researchers. As with his edition of the Æthelredian chronicles, Hart's text and translation here are clear and easy to follow. This edition particularly benefits from a more extensive textual apparatus than that included in the previous volume. His decision to incorporate source material for the *Chronicle* in a parallel-text format is especially welcome.

Few if any historians would have been better suited than R.H. Helmholz to author the volume of *The Oxford History of the Laws of England* (London: Oxford UP) devoted to canon law. The scope of the book is immense, stretching from Roman Britain to the seventeenth century, and so it is surprising that Anglo-Saxon England receives considerable attention. Inevitably much time is devoted to telling readers what not to expect from English evidence prior to the twelfth century: without ecclesiastical courts or a formalized body of canon law, the Anglo-Saxon church ends up seeming at times like a bit of a void. Still, Helmholz offers what turns out to be a valuable overview of the English church and its governance that gives necessary attention to often-overlooked texts such as the *Libellus Responsionum* while setting English institutions within the context of Roman law, a subject in which Helmholz is a leading specialist. Few if any of the most important publications concerned with Anglo-Saxon church history fail to surface in the bibliography, and Helmholz explains with admirable clarity and authority the dominant scholarly views concerning just about all of the issues that are of greatest concern to contemporary historians, such as the formation of parishes within dioceses, the forms of penance, the effects of episcopal power on secular law-making, and the nature of the textual evidence out of which these institutions have been reconstructed.

In “Northumbria’s Southern Frontier: A Review,” *EME* 14: 391–418, Nick Higham revisits Peter Hunter Blair’s conclusions about the most important political boundary inside pre-Viking England (“The Northumbrians and their Southern Frontier,” *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 4th ser. 26 [1948]: 98–126). More recent research casts doubt on several key aspects of his case, leading Higham to contest Blair’s backdating of a vernacular version of *Nordanhymbre* in local usage in the north to the second half of the seventh century. It is more likely to have originated as a Latin construct formulated by those around Theodore, who were in search of a designation for the northern diocese and kingdom. The Humber should thus not be viewed as a key divider from which both southern and northern English peoples named themselves or each other at an early date. Rather, it was a major and well-known geographical feature that became used during the late seventh century to demarcate the boundary between two major political systems within England. Higham also queries the supposition that the Roman Ridge dyke system is likely to have been a Northumbrian defensive work, and he critiques the view that the Grey Ditch, at Bradwell, formed part of the frontier. Finally, he does

not see the boundary in the west as being along the River Ribble. Rather, pre-Viking Northumbria more probably included those parts of the eleventh-century West Riding of Yorkshire that lie south of the River Don, with a frontier perhaps often identical to that at Domesday, and it arguably met western Mercia not on the Ribble but on the Mersey. It was probably political developments in the tenth century, and particularly under Edward the Elder and his son Athelstan, that led to the Mercian acquisition of southern Lancashire and the development of a new ecclesiastical frontier between the sees of Lichfield and York on the Ribble, in a period that also saw the York archdiocese acquire northern Nottinghamshire.

In “Athelstan, Charters and the English in Cornwall,” *Charters and Charter Scholarship in Britain and Ireland*, ed. Marie Therese Flanagan and Judith A. Green (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), 15–31, Charles Insley investigates the Anglo-Saxon impact on Cornwall in the tenth century. Setting aside William of Malmesbury’s account of Athelstan expelling the Cornish from Exeter, Insley begins with the evidence for West Saxon hegemony in Cornwall, which may go back as far as 833. Conversely, it is also clear that there were native Cornish kings through most of the ninth century. Turning to the tenth-century charters, Insley sees a measurable increase in West Saxon power in Cornwall in the early part of the century, but placing the Anglo-Saxon bishopric of Cornwall at an existing native episcopal site and appointing Cornishmen as bishops reveals an unusual sensitivity to regional identity. Another anomaly is found in Anglo-Saxon charters that make grants to Cornish saints rather than to the churches dedicated to them. Insley suggests that this may represent the survival of an older Cornish diplomatic practice. In addition, the Anglo-Saxon penchant for despoiling ecclesiastical land is difficult to apply to the cases of grantees with Cornish names, and the Cornish names of slave-owners in the Bodmin list of manumissions hint at the survival of a native Cornish property-owning class well into the eleventh century. All in all, given the Anglo-Saxon patronage of Cornish saints and Cornish churches—Cornish collegiate churches were almost entirely exempt from geld liability—the absorption of Cornwall into the English state seems to have remarkably muted.

Charles Jones offers a close military analysis of *The Forgotten Battle of 1066: Fulford* (Stroud: Tempus), King Harald *harðráðr*’s sole victory in England before being killed by Harold Godwinson at the Battle of Stamford Bridge a week later. Specialists will be familiar with the events leading up to Harald’s invasion—the Norwegian

claim to the English throne, the activities of Earl Tostig, and so forth—but Jones reconstructs the battle through a skilled application of the historical accounts to the physical features of the battleground. Many of the details he proposes are entirely speculative, but the larger picture seems eminently plausible, and scholars who are usually concerned with the question of who won will be intrigued with the explanation of how the Norwegian's improbable victory was achieved.

Simon Keynes's "Re-Reading King Æthelred the Unready," *Writing Medieval Biography 750–1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow*, ed. Bates *et al.* [see sec. 2], 77–97, is as much historiography as history, based on his recent "Æthelred II" (*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 1, 409–19). Here Keynes presents the process of re-assessing a king's reign. The first stage is the study of the development of the king's posthumous reputation in order to start from new foundations. The second stage assesses the testimony of the literary sources. The third stage considers the record of the royal government, such as charters, law-codes, and coins. The fourth stage leaves the biographical form and seeks alternative or complementary perspectives that might help put things in a different light. The fifth stage relates the various items and integrates them into a single study. Keynes's commentary on how this process unfolded with respect to Æthelred returns us to the historical side of things. Keynes concludes that in the 990s the king and his advisors became deeply conscious of their need to propitiate a wrathful God. This need was manifested in the apparently systematic promotion of the cults of saints between 995 and 1005, in the active promotion of the cause of monastic life, and in activities such as manuscript production and church building. Keynes also cautions against overestimating the unity and sophistication of the late Anglo-Saxon state, for this might create the unrealistic expectation that the kingdom ought to have been able to withstand the Danish onslaught, and if it did not, it was Æthelred's weakness that made this difference.

Ryan Lavelle's "The use and abuse of hostages in later Anglo-Saxon England," *EME* 14: 269–96), takes up a subject that seems to have received surprisingly little sustained discussion. Lavelle argues throughout the essay for the distinctness of hostageship from other forms of subjugation, his evidence being the relatively consistent set of terms governing these exchanges and the failure of these ever to be applied to arrangements that might otherwise bear a superficial resemblance to hostage taking (such as "peace weaver" wives and children given up in fosterage). The terminological aspects of hostage-taking in fact occupy a major portion of Lavelle's essay,

and many will find helpful its apparently comprehensive tabulation of all references to hostageship in late Anglo-Saxon sources. Lavelle begins by reminding readers that the captivity to which hostages were subjected was not comparable to the modern variant or even to the institution as practiced contemporaneously in Ireland, and he argues ultimately that hostageship served a variety of ritual functions. The circulation of hostages within the traveling retinues of kings no doubt permitted the latter a visible display of power, while the giving of hostages seems to have served as a formalized means of acknowledging subjection. Lavelle does not minimize the practical aspects of hostageship for maintaining agreements, and he explores at some length the handful of episodes in which hostages were subjected to horrifying violence. He ultimately contends that both their ritual and practical functions need to be appreciated: "[T]he importance of hostages lay in the mixture of the practical threat with political status" (296).

Combining geographical and written evidence, Ian Wood contrasts "Bede's Jarrow" (*A Place to Believe In: Locating Medieval Landscapes*, ed. Lees and Overing [see sec. 1], 67–84 with the Jarrow of the Northumbrian kings of the time. Interestingly, Bede gives the impression of a region much more marginalized than Wood argues it was. The importance of the Tyne and the quality of the tidal harbor at Jarrow Slake gave rise to a cluster of royal sites: the monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow on the south side, a monastery-turned-nunnery on the north side, and the royal residence occupying the Roman site of Arbeia. To lend weight to the tradition that King Oswine was born at Arbeia and buried at Tynemouth, Wood further argues that the Deirans were occasionally associated with territory north of the Tees. For example, Abbess Hild of Whitby belonged to the Deiran dynasty of Ælle, being the daughter of one of Edwin's nephews, yet her first monastery was on the north bank of the Wear. Moreover, Bede does not refer to Bernicia and Deira but instead uses the terms *provincia Berniciorum*, *regnum Deirorum*, and the like. Bernicia and Deira may be better regarded as fluid entities initially associated more with a people than with fixed boundaries. And if the lower Tyne were a focus of Deiran as well as Bernician interest, the region would have been of central importance to Northumbria. In Bede's time, at least, it may well have been the chief heartland of the Northumbrian kingdom.

Damien Tyler's "An Early Mercian Hegemony: Penda and Overkingship in the Seventh Century," *Midland History* 30 (2005): 1–19, seeks to make good a fault its author perceives in current Anglo-Saxon scholarship: the absence of any serious consideration of Penda's

reign. His own view? “Penda’s style of overkingship represented a flexible but essentially conservative reaction to the new strategies of power which Christian ideology and Christian churchmen were providing for other seventh-century kings.” But what, one might ask, does “overkingship” actually mean or, for that matter, *impe-rium*? And what did it mean to be “conservative” in the mid-seventh century Midlands? Beginning with an examination of the familiar sources for Penda’s reign, above all, of course, Bede, but also the ASC, the Tribal Hidage and Nennius, as well as archaeological evidence, Tyler works hard to gather the extant information on his subject, and to sketch an image of Penda’s power and its modes of operation (familiar ones: war, tribute, kinship diplomacy, hostages-taking, and so on) drawing—as one must—upon Bede’s account for evidence even as he seeks to distance himself from Bede’s portrait of Penda as a “furious, pagan warlord.” Tyler also tackles the question of Penda’s paganism, tipping into speculation, as he himself admits, but usefully so. Susan Kelly’s DNB entry “Penda (d. 655),” (*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* [Oxford: Oxford UP, Sept. 2004] online edn.) offers a comparable but somewhat more muted essay of this Mercian ruler. [Also reviewed in YWOES 2005]

It is the identity of the *Encomium Emmae Reginae* as a “social text” that concerns Elizabeth M. Tyler in “Talking about History in Eleventh-Century England: The *Encomium Emmae Reginae* and the Court of Harthacnut” *EME* 13 (2005): 359–83. In this outstanding article, she explores “the social and linguistic contexts of the *Encomium* in order to consider what strategies were available for communicating a Latin text to lay audiences in the specific context of Anglo-Danish England.” Tyler addresses the ways in which the Encomiast (probably from Flanders, probably St-Bertin) recast Emma’s past for an audience in the 1040s, smoothing over past problems in the hope of ensuring future success. Building upon Simon Keynes’s and Andy Orchard’s earlier readings of the *Encomium* as a historical balancing act, produced within Harthacnut’s court and informed by an acute need to rework the recent past into an acceptable form in the face of alternative memories of Emma’s earlier life and political associations, Tyler explores the Vergilian elements of the *Encomium*: as it did for earlier Carolingian authors, the *Aeneid* offered a framework of reference and allusion as well as ideas of civilization and foundation to be exploited by the politically engaged author. Carolingian authors cast Charlemagne as a new Aeneas. The Encomiast cast Cnut in the role. Importantly, Tyler also addresses the explicatory means by which such literary strategies intersected with a wider

poly-lingual world of spoken English, Danish, French, and Flemish. How did political texts actually affect the world about them? She also offers important insights into the distinctive literary culture of early eleventh-century Norman courts both ducal and episcopal, homes to the production of works such as *Moriuht*, *Jezebel*, and *Semiramis*. [This article was also reviewed in YWOES 2005.]

With Patrick Wormald’s “Living with King Alfred,” *Haskins Soc. Jnl* 15: 1–39, the series of completed publications appearing after the death of this great scholar in reasonably accessible venues comes to an end. As its title suggests and its author concedes at the outset, this essay is a decidedly personal response to the career of Alfred (or what remains of it in texts thought by some to be of dubious historicity). Against the charges of its being “propaganda” or forgery, Wormald argues that the eccentricities of Asser’s *Life* afford some sense of its subject’s personality: “[A] logical deduction from the weirdness of Alfred’s biographer is that Alfred was in some sense weird himself—a deduction to which we are in any case driven by the singular fact that he wrote books” (5). Nor should the most personal elements of Alfred’s life attested therein—such as the ailments to which Asser curiously devotes such attention—necessarily be read as attempts to cast Alfred as a uniquely pious king. Wormald follows other scholars in seeing these infirmities as the outcomes of an insoluble conflict between “the lifestyles of the warrior and the clerk” that Alfred probably shared with an “exact contemporary,” Gerald of Aurillac, whose *Life* (taken by Smyth as a model used by Asser) likewise affords evidence “that excess education could disturb a young mind otherwise given to hunting and war-games.... Alfred met all his responsibilities, but perhaps at a cost to his health” (18). That Alfred was one of a few prominent ninth-century “neurotics” is the main argument consistently pursued in this article (20). Beyond the claims paraphrased here, Wormald’s article is exceedingly difficult to characterize, containing a multitude of observations about Alfred’s governance and Alfredian translations. Some are developed at great length, while others are acknowledged to be mere suggestions. More closely argued is the appendix, wherein Wormald mounts a convincing paleographical argument that Alfred learned to read in his fortieth year.

In “Through His Enemy’s Eyes: St. Oswald in the *Historia Brittonum*,” *Heroic Age* 9 (online), Michelle Ziegler explores the content, context, and attitude toward St. Oswald in a ninth-century work written in Merfyn’s Gwynedd. The many years of aggression by the Mercians makes the *Historia*’s anglophilic views

more understandable, and Oswald's slaying of Cadwallon and Oswiu's destruction of the British kings at Winwead demonstrate the fates that befell those who allied themselves with Gwynedd's enemy. Ziegler notes that Oswald's cult transcended ethnic boundaries fairly early and was celebrated throughout the British Isles among friends and foes alike by the time the *Historia Brittonum* was written, but equally important is the *Historia's* use of Oswald's epithet "White Blade," which suggests that he was a figure of British folklore. The *Historia* turns Penda into an iconic image of a demonic Mercian and uses St. Oswald to support this portrait. First, Oswald kills Cadwallon, who supported Penda, who in turn martyrs St. Oswald with guile. Here Ziegler draws a parallel between Offa and St. Æthelbert of East Anglia, who was treacherously slain by Offa and enshrined on the Welsh border. The more saintly Penda's victim, the more demonic Penda himself becomes. When Penda is finally slain by Oswald's brother Oswiu, the *Historia* claims that all the British kings who marched with Penda, except the shamed Cadafael, are slain with him. If Penda is the icon of Mercian evil, then St. Oswald is the martyred icon of piety and holiness. Ziegler concludes that it is in this context that Oswald White Blade became the patron of the Welsh march, with a cult eventually flourishing along the northern Welsh march conflict zone and at Gloucester.

A study that touches on politics and warfare is Hirokazu Tsurushima's "The Eleventh Century in England Through Fish-Eyes: Salmon, Herring, Oysters, and 1066," reviewed above in Section F.

i. Vikings

Lesley Abrams's "Les fondations scandinaves en Angleterre," *Les fondations scandinaves en Occident et les débuts du duché de Normandie; Colloque de Cerisy-la-Salle (25-29 septembre 2002)*, ed. Pierre Bauduin (Caen: CRAHM), 133-44, offers Francolexic readers a succinct summary of current thinking by English-language scholars on society and political organization in the Danelaw, setting Anglo-Saxon experiences of Scandinavian accommodation and assimilation and cultural exchange within a wider European context.

With Vikings and their eye-catching artifacts an ever-popular topic, the question naturally arises: "Why a book on the Vikings with almost no illustrations?" Martin Arnold's *The Vikings: Culture and Conquest* (London: Hambledon Continuum) seems to have been motivated by a desire to attack the approach that privileges Viking sophistication over Viking violence and Viking discoveries over Viking damage. But having rendered

his judgment that "the Vikings in England achieved little and destroyed much ... [s]ocially, politically and economically, the Viking Age in England can readily be assessed in negative terms" (129), he has little to add to our knowledge of the subject. After introductory chapters on "The Viking Age," "Society and Religion," and "Battle on Land and at Sea," the focus is on political history. "England, Ireland and Wales, 789-900" rehearses the familiar story from the murder of Beadheard to Alfred's victories, from the early raids on Ireland to the rise of the Viking dynasty in Dublin. "England, Ireland and Wales, 900-1070" continues the tale with the struggle for the control of York, the history of the kings of Dublin from Olaf Sihtricsson to the Battle of Clontarf, and the English response to renewed Viking incursions from the reign the Æthelred the Unready through that of William the Conqueror. (Arnold also treats "Scotland and the Orkneys," "Western Europe," "Russia and the East," and "Atlantic Explorations and Settlements.") Throughout, Arnold moves smoothly from one topic to the next, and the clarity of his account is aided by the use of dynasties as an organizing framework for the various Ivars, Olafs, and Sihtrics. Here the specialist will cavill: the relationship between the high-medieval Icelandic legends about Ragnar Hairy-Breeches and actual ninth-century Vikings is far more complex than Arnold allows, and the best book on the subject (Rory McTurk, *Studies in "Ragnars saga loðbrókar" and its Major Scandinavian Analogues* [Oxford: Society for the Study of Mediaeval Languages and Literature, 1991]) is not cited. Arnold has produced a not unreasonable starting point, but students of the Vikings will have to seek further for the next level of their education.

Viking Empires (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005) by Angelo Forte, Richard Oram, and Frederik Pedersen has plenty of pictures as well as a new perspective: the authors approach the Viking phenomenon as the reaction of Scandinavian kingdoms to a Roman empire. Forte *et al.* begin with the Roman defeat at Teutoburg in 9 AD, which they see as encouraging the formation of states and royal dynasties in Scandinavia, and they end with those dynasties and states becoming the thirteenth-century champions of Christianity in northern Europe. There is less new insight into the Vikings in England, although the introduction argues on the basis of the wording of Offa's confirmation of the privileges of the churches of Kent that Kent had been the target of attacks by "marauding heathens in roving ships" (10) for generations before 792. The chapter on "First contact: England and the continent" emphasizes aspects of Viking activity such as overwintering and the use of Vikings as allies that were seen both in England and

in Europe, but apart from that, the authors' account of the first phase of Viking activity in England closely follows that of Alfred Smyth's 1979 *Scandinavian York and Dublin* (Dublin: Templekieran Press). The chapter on "The Second Viking Age in England, c. 970–1066" also treads familiar ground concerning the reign of Æthelred, the Anglo-Danish kingdom, and the end of Scandinavian dominance in England. A section on Cumbria, Scotland, and England from 1000 to 1066 is a digression about Earl Siward of York that is probably explained by the Scottish genesis of the volume, for the authors teach at the universities of Aberdeen and Stirling. Although this is not the book to consult for the political history of the Viking Age *per se*, its chapters on Viking settlements and sailing techniques incorporate the latest results of archeology and reconstruction.

In contrast to the above two works, D.M. Hadley's study of *The Vikings in England: Settlement, Society and Culture* (Manchester: Manchester UP) truly advances our knowledge of the subject. Her goal is to re-examine the Scandinavian settlement in England in the light of new research into early medieval social organization, and her interdisciplinary approach is as valuable for the new questions and cautions that it raises as for the new findings that it brings into the mainstream. After an introductory chapter that reviews previous approaches to the available evidence, highlights recent research productive of interdisciplinary dialogue, and discusses the background to the Scandinavian settlements, five thematic chapters follow. "Anglo-Scandinavian political accommodation" shows that a succession of Scandinavian leaders of war-bands quickly adopted a style of rule similar to that of indigenous rulers, for example issuing coinage, relying on the support of the Church, and using literacy. "Scandinavian rural settlement" also argues for a consistent picture of adoption and adaptation, with rapid assimilation the rule. "Scandinavians in the urban environment" finds that little of the Viking-Age development of urbanism can be characterized as specifically Scandinavian. "Churches and the Scandinavians: chaos, conversion and change" balances the indubitable harm to the Church during the period of Scandinavian raiding and settlement with its success in converting the settlers. "Burial practices: ethnicity, gender and social status" returns to the evidence for assimilation, as the settlers seem to have quickly demonstrated a willingness to adapt to the burial strategies of the local people. An epilogue briefly yet informatively compares the Scandinavian impact on England with that on Frankia, Brittany, Ireland, Scotland, the Isle of Man, and Wales. For each of her themes, Hadley comes to the conclusion that there was no single

experience of settlement or of interaction with the local population and their leaders, and she emphasizes that the Scandinavian impact was expressed differently among diverse social groups and within differing settlement contexts.

Jeremy Haslam's "King Alfred and the Vikings: Strategies and Tactics 876–886 AD," *ASSAH* 13: 122–54, consists of two parts. In the first, Haslam argues that as a result of the partition of Mercia by the Vikings in 877, Alfred was deprived of the interests and influence in the London area that he had enjoyed since his alliance with Burgred. After the victory at Edington in 878, Alfred implemented military and political strategies to remove the Viking armies from Mercia and London as well as from their bases at Cirencester and Fulham. The creation of a system of fortresses was one face of this strategy, and the other was Alfred's assumption of the overlordship of Mercia. In the second part of the essay, Haslam argues that the original Burghal Hidage document and the "Calculation" attached to Version A were contemporary with the creation of the system in 878–9.

Donald Scragg's *The Return of the Vikings: The Battle of Maldon, 991* (Stroud: Tempus) is the first in a new series of books (edited by Scragg) designed to present accessible histories of key aspects of Anglo-Saxon England. Eventually, the series will include volumes on such figures as Bede, Æthelstan, and Offa, and such events as the conversion, the compilation of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and the Viking Wars. For the most part, Anglo-Saxonists have not participated in the recent fad for popular histories, and so this sort of effort to make our discipline more accessible to the reading public is particularly welcome. It would be difficult to think of a scholar better qualified to sum up our knowledge of the battle of Maldon for a popular readership than Don Scragg. His expertise combines with a clear, entertaining writing style to produce a volume that even those well-versed in the battle, the poem, and the scholarship will find both interesting and useful. Scragg lucidly presents both what is known and what is unknown about the battle and its aftermath without diminishing the historical and literary complexities involved. He opens with a brief, fictionalized account of the life of "Leofson of Sturmer" (familiar to readers of the poem as the Leofsunu who enters the text at line 244a). This might be a bit too hypothetical for the scholarly reader, but Scragg quickly returns to more conventional history with a chapter discussing the history of the Viking invasions. This is followed by an account of contemporary Scandinavian culture, usefully grounded in a summary of recent archaeological discoveries concerning Viking boats. Subsequent chapters explore the specific

circumstances of the 991 invasion, the English response, the Battle itself and the poem it produced, and the immediate consequences. There's little here that those familiar with the scholarship on the Battle will find new; indeed, most of the conclusions presented here derive from those argued in Scragg's edition of the poem and in his edited collection, *The Battle of Maldon, A.D. 991* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991). Nonetheless, one can easily see this volume finding its way into undergraduate courses on the history and literature of the late Anglo-Saxon period. As a summary of current knowledge or as a general introduction to the field, Scragg's book is an excellent first volume in what promises to be a successful new series.

j. The Norman Conquest and Settlement

In order to make sense of "The Conqueror's Earliest Historians and the Writing of his Biography," *Writing Medieval Biography 750–1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow*, ed. Bates *et al.* [see sec. 2], 129–41, David Bates suggests that we contemplate William of Poitiers's *Gesta Guillelmi*, William of Jumièges's *Gesta Normannorum*, Orderic Vitalis's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, and the D and E versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* not as mere sources for biographical information about William the Conqueror, but rather as a series of polemical responses to his rule and the questions it entailed. In Bates's view, "the central contemporary sources for William's life were directly engaged with events in ways which have not been appreciated, and were created in the midst of contemporary debate about the morality and legality of his actions" (130). While Bates's essay is devoted primarily to reconstructing the lines of influence shared by these biographies, it is also intended as a corrective to earlier historical scholarship, some of which strikes Bates as insufficiently attuned to the literariness of texts that occasionally present themselves (and have, accordingly, been erroneously understood) as objective testimony to the events of William's reign. The view of William as an ambiguous and fundamentally "enigmatic" figure was, Bates argues, the coinage of "sources written during William's lifetime and they in their turn were reinterpreted by the great early twelfth-century historians" (141). The conflicted attitude toward William evident in both the earlier and later sources is probably an effect of the bind in which William is likely to have found himself in the years after the Conquest, caught as he was between the two great obligations of early medieval rulers: to reward generously those who had given support in battle, and to deal justly with those under one's sway.

Bates broaches a subject that he admits is somewhat beyond the scope allotted for his Henry Loyn Memorial Lecture in "William the Conqueror's Wider Western European World," *Haskins Soc. Jnl* 15: 73–87. Though news of the Norman Conquest reverberated throughout Europe, and though "evidence for William's links with the papacy ... [is] so plentiful that it can only be interpreted in terms of established networks, as opposed to episodic contacts" (78), influences on William's reign from outside of England and Normandy are, as Bates observes, little studied. He goes on to suggest that the "treatment of William's thought world" in William of Poitiers's *Gesta Guillelmi* "parallels all the classic early medieval texts on kingship and the debates about legitimacy and illegitimacy which were a feature of the polemic of the civil war of the 1070s and 1080s in Germany" (81). With the Domesday Book as well, Bates suggests (though nowhere claiming to be the first to raise the issue) that "[t]o confine the search for precedents to Normandy is to miss the point entirely" as this text has not only biblical analogues but also parallels in "the so-called Plea of Rizana or Risano, which in 804 followed the Carolingian conquest of Istria of c. 788" (84). The traditional emphasis on the "novelty" of the Domesday inquest seems to Bates unsupportable (83). Reading William's reign and its textual remains in light of contemporaneous sources from the Continent suggests that William and his retinue shared with their European contemporaries a set of political rituals that have since become obscure to modern readers and even "leads to the rejection of the thuggish image of William as an illiterate soldier with no more than a bandit's interest in art" (86).

In "Aspects of the English Succession, 1066–1199: The Death of the King," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 29: 17–34, S.D. Church takes exception to recent scholarship that argues that royal burials in England in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries were relatively unceremonial, low-key affairs. Reviewing accounts of the burials of Edward the Confessor, William the Conqueror, William Rufus, Henry I, and Stephen, he points to the use of feretories, symbolic objects, rich clothing, and processions as ample evidence of ceremony. The short times that elapsed between the death of a king, his burial, and the accession of the next king were due not to a lack of ceremony but to the political instability and the end of "the king's peace" that characterized interregnums at this time.

Colin Flight's *Studies of the Documentation Resulting from the Survey Conducted in 1089* (the subtitle of *The Survey of the Whole of England* [Oxford: Archaeopress]) offers reconstructions of the method of the

survey itself as well as the ways in which the information gathered was compiled, reorganized, and summarized. Textual witnesses of all three stages are extant, and Flight's quite plausible analysis works backwards from the summaries to their sources. (Whereas the survey results were originally organized on a manor-by-m Manor basis, the summaries are derived from a second version that organized the results by the names of the fief-holders.) He then turns to the surviving portions of the original survey results, the geld accounts that accompanied them, and additions made to those surviving originals. Two chapters deal with copies of part of the reorganized version that were made at Ely. The final chapters present the reconstructions of the conduct of the survey and the processing of the results—a fascinating glimpse of William the Conqueror's administration in action.

John Gillingham considers the conflicting views of "Right Conduct before, during, and after Battle in North-Western Europe in the Eleventh Century" (the subtitle of "Holding to the Rules of War (*Bellica iura tenentes*)"; *Anglo-Norman Studies* 29: 1–15). The conflict arose from the introduction of chivalry and the idea that vanquished Christians should be given a measure of fraternal dignity, because they were not unlike the victors. Treating rich prisoners well became a sign of nobility, for aristocrats has the resources and contacts that enabled them to organize the collection of a ransom, whereas poor soldiers were better off killing and stripping their prisoners. By these standards, the Normans at Hastings—whose enormous slaughter of the English horrified writers as far apart as Copenhagen and the Vatican—behaved like peasants. Gillingham speculates that William the Conqueror was familiar with the contemporary discussions of the morality of war and that his founding of Battle Abbey on the spot of the massacre was perhaps a sign of regret.

Carola Hicks's *The Bayeux Tapestry: The Life Story of a Masterpiece* (London: Chatto & Windus) is an often entertaining account of its subject from its creation to the present day. Hicks does a good job of describing the many points on which there is no agreement, and for her own part she argues that the Tapestry was commissioned by Queen Edith, who was both the widow of Edward the Confessor and the friend of William the Conqueror. As the head of an embroidery workshop that had produced textiles for churches as well as for the king, Edith had the means and the motive, namely, a drastic change of allegiance that needed justification. Hicks also discounts the possibility that the Tapestry was in the crypt of the Bayeux Cathedral during its "lost years," as she thinks it would have rotted away

from the damp and the mold. She suggests that it was in Dijon—brought there by Duke Philip of Burgundy—and that it was the theologian Nicolas de Clamanges who arranged for Bayeux to acquire it. After presenting the scandals, controversies, and close calls associated with the Tapestry from the French Wars of Religion to the Second World War, Hicks closes by reviewing literary allusions to the Bayeux Tapestry, its use by films and film theory, its reproductions and parodies, its use as a marketing tool, its fringe interpretations, and its move to a new exhibition space in 1983. Inevitably, the Bayeux Tapestry finds itself juxtaposed with the modern photographs of the preparations for the D-Day landing of 1944 and the slaughter on Omaha Beach, which are on display in other museums in Normandy.

In "Taxation and the Economy in Late Eleventh-Century England: Reviving the Domesday Regression Debate," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 29: 214–27, Andrew Wareham and Xiangdong Wei apply econometrics to a problem of history. After a review of the literature, they present their methodology. Unlike previous econometric studies of Domesday data, they organize it as aggregate figures under tenants-in-chief, but they also employ time-series analyses as well as cross-sectional models. As with the previous studies, cross-sectional analyses demonstrate a positive and strong correlation between taxation assessments and capacity to pay. However, it also appears that the marginal taxation rate decreased between the reigns of Edward and William, due to a widespread increase in rental valuations, while taxation assessments were basically held constant. This contradicts earlier views that taxation was rational or in line with capacity to pay, and other regressions run by Wareham and Wei suggest that there was no strong connection between changes in rental valuations and taxation assessments. The earlier proposition that regressive taxation sustained William's political position thus cannot be borne out, although the economic framework was generally conducive to such a trend. Whereas some had argued that the Anglo-Norman economy was on the verge of collapse by the end of William's reign as a result of an inverse relationship between taxation assessments and the valuation of estates, Wareham and Wei see a much more regionally varied pattern that had not reached a critical point.

SAJ, PJEK, AR, EAR

[SA] reviewed Abels "Alfred"; Abels "Cowardice"; Bates "The Conqueror's"; Bates "William"; Cubitt "Bishops"; Flechner; Fleming; Foot; Hagen; Helmholz; Jolly; Lavelle "The Use"; Lawrence-Mathers; Lees and

Overing; Licence; Meens; Nickel; Spinks; Wormald "Living".

PJEK reviewed Abrams, Barrow "Bishops," Brooks "Introduction," Brooks "Identity," Bullough, Corradini, Cozens, Cubitt "Clergy," D'Aronco "conoscenze," Dobson, Farmer, Grainge, Higham "Guthlac," Hill and Worthington, Holt, Keynes "Mercians," Keynes and Smyth, Lavelle "Farm," Luciani, Meaney "Heathenism," Meaney "Felix," Nelson "England," Nelson "Queen," Palmer, Rambridge, Sawyer, Story "Charlemagne," D. Tyler "Orchestrated," D. Tyler "Hegemony," E. Tyler "Encomium," Wickham, A. Williams "Cunning," Woolf, Yorke "Æthelbald," Yorke "gentes";

AR reviewed Bolton; Boyle; Cubitt "Folklore"; Damon; Halloran; Hart *Byrhtferth's*; Hart *Chronicles*; McKee; Scragg; Stafford *Gender*; Stafford "King"; Thomas, Stumpf, and Härke; Vanderputten; Watts; Westra; Woods; Wormald *Times*.

EAR reviewed Anonymous [Binski]; Arnold; Astill; Bailey; Baker; Bartholomew; Bassett; Broer and de Bruijn; Brooks "From British"; Brooks "Rochester"; Church; Clarkson; Cooper; Cooper and Gregory; Corning; Dalton; Davies, Halsall, and Reynolds; Defries; Derecki; Deuffic "Lexode"; Deuffic *Reliques*; Enright; Flight; Forte, Oram, and Pedersen; Fouracre; Gautier "Game Parks"; Gautier *Le festin*; Gillingham; Glatthaar; Grimmer; Guimon; Hadley; Hamerow; Hare; Haslam; Hicks; Higham; Hill; Hindley; Henson; Horowitz; Horspool *King Alfred*; Horspool *Why Alfred*; Insley; Jones; Keynes "Ely"; Keynes "Re-Reading"; Kilbride; Lavelle "The King's Wife"; Lee; Luiselli Fadda; Oppenheimer; Payne; Pilsworth; Plunkett; Pryor; Reynolds and Langlands; Sansterre; Smythe; Stroud; Thacker; Thomas; Tsurushima; Wareham and Wei; Wood; Wormald *Corruption*; Yorke *Conversion*; Young; Ziegler]

Not Seen

Goebel, Bernd. "Dialogische und emanzipatorische Elemente in der Missionspraxis des Bonifatius." *Verspielen wir das Erbe des hl. Bonifatius?* Ed. Andreas Odenthal et al., 59-84.

Odenthal, Andreas. "Tradition als Inkulturation: Bonifatius und die römische Initiationsliturgie. Überlegungen zur bonifatianisch-karolingischen Liturgiereform und zu ihren Nachwirkungen im Kloster Fulda." *Verspielen wir das Erbe des hl. Bonifatius?* Ed. Andreas Odenthal et al., 11-57.

Odenthal, Andreas; Bernd Goebel, Jörg Disse, and Richard Hartmann. *Verspielen wir das Erbe des hl. Bonifatius? Theologische Betrachtungen aus Anlass seines 1250 Todestages*. Fuldaer Hochschulschriften 47. Frankfurt am Main: Josef Knecht, 2005.

Thiellet, Claire. "Radegonde et Etheldrède: un même idéal de sainteté en Gaule et dans les royaumes anglo-saxons?" *Famille, violence et christianisation au Moyen Âge: Mélanges offerts à Michel Rouche*. Ed. Martin Aurell and Thomas Deswarte. Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne, 2005. 171-80.

Dissertations

Edwards, M. J. "The Anglo-Saxon Origins of Stafford and Its Churches." M.Phil. Thesis, U of Birmingham, 2005. *Index to Theses* 55 (2006): 12888.

Hayes, Jean Anne. "Anglian Leadership in Northumbria, 547 A.D. through 1075 A.D." Ph.D. Diss., Louisiana State U, 2005. *DAI* 66A (2006): 2683.

Keene, Katie. "Margaret of Scotland: The Biography of an Eleventh-Century Queen and Saint." M.A. Thesis, Southern Methodist U, 2006. *MAI* 44 (2006): 3.

Pickles, T. "The Church in Anglo-Saxon Yorkshire: 'Minsters' in the Danelaw, c. 600-1200." D.Phil. Thesis, U of Oxford, 2006. *Index to Theses* 55 (2006): 10031.

Rodger, Valerie Ann. "From Restoration to Retribution: Evolution in the Treatment of Wrongdoing in Early English Law c. 600 A.D. to c. 1135 A.D." M.A. Thesis, U of Alberta, 2006. *MAI* 44 (2006): 5.

Ryan, M. J. "Land, Property, and Power in Anglo-Saxon England c. 600 to c. 800." Ph.D. Thesis, U of Manchester, 2005. *Index to Theses* 55 (2006): 15359.

Vollmer, Rebecca. "The English Royal Forest: A Communication of Power and Politics." Ph.D. Diss., U of California, Berkeley, 2005. *DAI* 66A (2006): 8.

8. Names

Three books published by the English Place-Name Society highlight this year's bibliography. M. Gelling has published *The Place-Names of Shropshire, Part V: The Hundreds of Pimhill and Bradford North* (Nottingham: EPNS) in collaboration with the late H.D.G. Foxall. This volume covers two of the northernmost Shropshire hundreds, is the first Shropshire volume compiled without help from Victoria County History regional volumes, and draws mainly from Foxall's maps for the field-name material. It follows the format of the earlier parts and includes Addenda and Corrigenda to the *Place-Names of Shropshire* parts 1–4 as well as eight useful maps. Gelling's introduction has an interesting discussion of the various meanings of OE *lēah* as a place-name element in various parts of the geographic area and observes that OE *tūn* generally has a complementary distribution with *lēah* but does have "a notable relationship to rivers." D. Parsons has published *The Vocabulary of Place-Names (Ceafor–Cock-pit)* (Nottingham: EPNS, 2004). This is the third volume in the series that will become a dictionary of the words that make up place-names in England. It follows the general format used in the first volume and continues the practice of the second volume of identifying personal names as monothematic or dithematic. An innovation in the third volume, however, is the use of small capitals in giving data about names in Ekwall's *Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, which are generally major names like those for towns and villages, in order to differentiate them for the minor local names that are added in this series. B. Cox's *A Dictionary of Leicestershire and Rutland Place-Names* (Nottingham: EPNS, 2005) begins with an excellent history of the counties of Leicestershire and Rutland as shown by stream-names, hill-names, and settlement-names from their pre-Indo-European past through the Celtic, Roman, Anglo-Saxon, and Scandinavian invasions. Although the historical narrative is intended for the lay reader, it provides much specific place-name information and reflects the latest scholarly research. The entries in the dictionary itself are arranged alphabetically for each of the counties and identified by the National Grid four-figure reference number, and they give the earliest spellings of the name and the source and data as well as the later forms. The etymologies and grammatical information complete the dictionary entries. The volume ends with a fifteen-page list of all the elements in the place-names in both counties.

R. Coates has several articles concerning individual place-names this year. In "Some Observations on Blore,

Staffordshire," *JEPNS* 38: 13–16, he rejects the derivation of *Blore*, which occurs as a village name and in compounds like *Blurton* and *Blorepipe* as well as the lost minor name *Blore Wood* in Staffordshire, from an OE **blōr* 'blister, swelling' and suggests either an OE **blāw-ofēr* 'exposed bank' or a Brittonic cognate of the Gaelic *blār* 'white-faced' in some way meaning 'bare land, moor, heath' in place-names as an etymon. In "The Antiquity of Moggerhanger, Bedfordshire," *JEPNS* 37: 48–51, he says the meaning of *Moggerhanger* is Old English for "sloping wood near [the place called in Brittonic] the walls/ruins [of Sandy]" and derives from OE *hangra* 'sloping wood' and Latin *māceria* 'masonry wall, (perhaps applied to a) ruin', referring to the ruins of a small Roman town at the southern edge of Sandy about two miles east of Moggerhanger. In "Chesterblade, Somerset, with a Reflection on the Element *chester*," *JEPNS* 38: 5–12, he suggests the *Chesterblade* is explicable as coming from a British **Kastron Bladjē* 'stronghold of a/the wolf' with the last element being a proper name. He also discusses the reflexes of Latin *castra* in place-names in England and concludes that there is no explanation for their distribution, except that *chester* seems to be a West-Saxonism that had nationwide administration usage in the Middle English period and then was generalized. In "Verulamium, the Romano-British Name of St Albans," *Studia Celtica* 39: 169–76, he proposes that *Verulamium* derives from an originally British **[wērolām]-ijon* meaning "place of a man named (in British) 'Crooked-Hand'" with the stress on the next to the last syllable. He suggests that the name was influenced by Vulgar Latin pronunciation before it was borrowed into Old English. In "The Pre-English Name of Dorchester-on-Thames," *Studia Celtica* 40: 51–62, he argues that the name *Dorchester* derives from a Brittonic descendent of a form like **Durocuccium* meaning 'boat fort' combined with OE *ceaster*.

A. Breeze also has three essays that deal with particular place-names. In "Wolf Rock, off Land's End," *JEPNS* 37: 59–60, he derives the first element *Wolf* from the Cornish development of a British **gulb-* 'beak' which is also the source of Welsh *gwlf* 'bill, beak, notch' and Breton *goulff*. In "A Celtic Survival at Chicklade," *Wiltshire Archaeological and National History Magazine* 99: 248, he derives *Chicklade*, which is fourteen miles west of Salisbury, from a Celtic first element corresponding to Welsh *coed* 'wood' and the adjectival derivational suffix corresponding to the Welsh *-lyd*. Thus, the name means "woody, abounding in woods" and provides evidence for Celtic survival in Wiltshire after the sixth

century. In "Three Celtic Toponyms: *Setantii*, *Blencathra*, and *Pen-y-Ghent*," *Northern History* 43: 161–165, he suggests that Ptolemy's *Setantii* referring to people living between Mersey and Wyre should be amended to *Metantii* with the first element coming from Celtic **met-* 'cut, harvest', so that *Mentantii* would mean "reapers, cutter-down (of foes in battle)" and refer to the ancient Celtic people living on the south Lancashire coastline. Breeze explains *Blencathra*, the Celtic name for Saddlebook Mountain in Cumbria, as deriving from a Cumbric equivalent of Welsh *blaen* 'top, summit' and the Cumbric equivalent of Welsh *carthwr* 'draught horse', so the name *Blencathra* would mean "draught horse mountain." He also derives the north Yorkshire place-name *Pen-y-Ghent* from the Cumbric form equivalent to Welsh *pen* 'head, summit', the article *y* '(of) the', and the Cumbric equivalent of early Welsh *gynt* from Latin *gent(em)* '(foreign) tribe, (alien) nation'; the name would mean "hill of the foreigners," where the foreigners could be either the English or the Vikings.

There are other essays in the year's bibliography dealing with specific place-names. In "Martlesham and Newbourne: A Note on Two Obscure Suffolk Names," *JEPNS* 38: 31–36, K. Briggs proposes that the first element of *Martlesham* derives from OE *mæreles*, *mæreles* 'mooring rope' with an intrusive *-t-* since *Martlesham* originated as a settlement on the banks of a creek in the Deben estuary. He also rejects the etymology of *Newbourne* from OE *nīwe* + *bourne* 'new stream' because combining "new" with a natural feature like a stream would be very unusual; instead, Briggs suggests a derivation from ON *nīu brunnar* 'nine springs' since there are a large number of springs in Newbourne and there are a number of Old Norse village names on the Suffolk coast. In "The Name of the Isle of Thanet," *Language and Text*, ed. Johnston *et al.* [see sec. 2], 345–74, T. Vennemann rejects the Celtic etymologies proposed for *Thanet* in the *Isle of Thanet* and proposes a Phoenician source: *Tanit*, the name of the main Phoenician goddess. He suggests that the Isle of Thanet was colonized by Phoenicians from Cádiz, Spain who carried the name to their northern colony. He further suggests that the *Thames* itself derives from the Phoenician name *Tamesa*. In "The Owl of Ousden and a Morphological Conundrum," *Names through the Looking Glass*, ed. Gammeltoft and Jørgensen. [see sec. 2], 113–31, J. Insley argues that Ekwall was right in identifying the first element in the Suffolk place-name *Ousden* as OE *ūf* 'owl', so the name would mean "owl's valley." He also takes issue with C. Hart's linguistic analysis of parts of the Chelworth boundary clause of the estate in Suffolk granted in 962 by King Edgar to Lady *Æthelflæd*, his

step-mother. In particular, he argues that *mearcella* derives not from OE *m(i)erçels* 'mark, sign' but from OE *meargealla* 'gentian', a plant-name that is a compound of OE *mearh* 'horse' and OE *gealla* 'gall, swelling, blister', but in a postscript he accepts K. Lowe's identification of the source of the second element as an unrecorded OE **celle*, **cille* 'spring, stream' with the sense of "boundary spring." [See below.]

Several articles focus on the occurrence of particular elements in Old English place-names. In "Topographical Place-Names and the distribution of *Tūn* and *Hām* in the Chilterns and Essex Region," *ASSAH* 13: 50–62, J. Baker uses five large maps and two density maps to show the distribution of topographical place-names as well as separate maps showing *hām* vs. *tūn* and *lēah* place-names in the Chilterns and Essex region to support his conclusions: 1) that topographical elements may have been used more before 730 than after, but they cannot be used to indicate areas of Old English influence before 600; 2) that *tūn* was more important in early place-name formation than early documents would suggest but that there is no one topographical or habitative element that indicates early Old English influence, and 3) that Old English place-names cannot be a precise guide to the spread of Germanic culture. In "Two Notes on Names in *tūn* in Relation to Pre-English Antiquities, Kirmington and Broughton, Lincolnshire," *JEPNS* 37: 33–36, R. Coates uses topography to corroborate his derivation of *Kirmington* from the Welsh *cyrnen* 'cone, stack; small mound or heap' with a proposed OE **Cirnen-tūn* being remodeled to fit the common *-ing-tūn* pattern and to confirm Cameron's derivation of *Broughton* 'mound farm/village' from OE *beorg* (Anglian *berg*) plus *tūn*. In "The Place-Name Element 'beorg' and Other Mounds in Essex," *Essex Archeology and History* 34: 155–160, J. Kemble lists and discusses place-names in OE *beorg*, OE *berwe*, and ON *berg*, which he says refer to both natural and man-made hills, in OE *hlaw* which usually refers to artificial hills, and in OE *cryc*, OE *cruc* and British *crug*, which refer to natural hills with (following Gelling and Cole) "strikingly abrupt contours." In "The Hersum Ditch, Birmingham and Coventry: A Local Topographical Term?" *Birmingham and Warwickshire Archaeological Soc. Trans.* 106: 143–50, the late G. Demidowicz with a Note by M. Gelling identifies the meaning of *Hersum* in *Hersum Ditch* as the ditch that served as the border between town plots and the lord of the manor's park in both Coventry and Birmingham in Warwickshire. Gelling tentatively derives this from OE *(ge)hirness* 'obedience, jurisdiction' or OE *(ge)hirsumness* 'obedience' in an abstract sense but which might also be extended to mean 'jurisdiction, lordship'.

In “Lichfield and Lytchett: A Philological Problem Involving Brittonic */e:/ Resolved,” *Studia Celtica* 40: 173–74, R. Coates uses P. Schrijver’s argument for the shortening of Brittonic */e:/ in pretonic closed syllables to derive *Lytchett* in Dorset and the first element of *Lichfield* in Staffordshire from a late Brittonic **Litgēd* from an earlier Brittonic **Lētgēd* stressed on the last syllable. In “*Mearcella* in S 703 and the Etymology of Childrey Brook (Berkshire),” *JEPNS* 37: 19–31, K. Lowe suggests that *mearcella* which occurs several times in the boundary clause of Sawyer 703, a grant of land at Chelsworth, Suffolk by King Edgar, derives from OE *mearc* ‘boundary’ and OE **cille* ‘spring, stream’. She also strengthens Kristensson’s and Gelling’s argument that the first element of *Childrey Brook*, Berkshire also derives from this unrecorded OE **cille* toponym. In “Blandford Forinseca? The Problem of *forum* in English Place-Names,” *JEPNS* 38: 17–24, P. Cullen argues that the *Forum* part of *Blandford Forum* in Dorset in the result of an expansion of the abbreviated form *Blandford For*, where *For* was an abbreviation of Latin *forinsecus* ‘foreign, external’ with a feminine inflection.

Three entries this year focus specifically on river-names. In “The Rivers Boyd of Gloucestershire and Bude of Cornwall,” *Trans. of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Soc.* 124: 111–112, A. Breeze derives the river-name *Boyd* near Bath and *Bude* in Cornwall from Celtic **boud-* ‘victory, excellence’ with the sense of “virtue, special quality,” and argues that the rivers were likely thought to have medical powers because of the minerals in them. In “Stour and Blyth in English River-Names,” *English Language and Linguistics* 10: 23–29), R. Coates suggests that the five rivers named *Stour* and the seven rivers named *Blyth* in England suggest a basic oppositional primary river-name classification based on whether they were “trouble-inducing, baleful, and unfriendly,” from OE **stūr* ‘strong, gloomy, violent’ or “trouble free, propitious, and happy” from OE *blīðe* ‘gentle, quiet; (of people) cheerful’ respectively. In “River-Names, Celtic and Old English: Their Dual Medieval and Post-Medieval Personalities,” *JEPNS* 38: 63–81, S. Yeates focuses on the Cotswolds area to argue that changes from Celtic river-names to Anglo-Saxon names occurred over a much longer time period than had been supposed by Jackson. He shows that some of the main rivers in the area were known by both a Celtic name and an English one in the Middle Ages; however, once the cartographers like Saxton placed the Early Modern English names on maps, the Celtic river-names were less likely to be used. As a result, the *Bladen*, possibly related to Welsh *blaidd* ‘wolf’, has become the *Evenlode*, and the *Colle* has become the *Rea*.

Other essays also deal with the more widespread use of various elements in Old English place-names. In “Colours in the Landscape: Old English Colour Terms in Place-Names,” *Progress in Colour Studies*, ed. Biggam and Kay [see sec. 3a], 181–98, C. Hough compiles a corpus of Old English place-names containing color adjectives recorded by 1100. She provides one appendix where under each color term, place-names containing the term are grouped alphabetically by generic element and another appendix which groups that place-names with the same generic element in order to show the various color terms associated with individual features. The color terms found in Old English place names include *blæc*, *blāw*, *blēo*, *brūn*, *fāh* (*fāg*), *fealu*, *geolu*, *græg*, *grēne*, *hār*, *hwit*, *mæle*, *rēad*, *rust*, *salu*, *seolfor*, and *tēafor*. A. Rumble, in “The Cross in English Place-Names: Vocabulary and Usage,” *The Place of the Cross in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Karkov *et al.* [see sec. 1], 29–40, discusses the references to standing crosses in Old English place-names in three categories. The category of crucifixes and roods, of course, includes place-names with Latin *crux* and its derivatives, OE *rōd* ‘cross’, and OE *Cristel-mæl*, *Cristes-mæl* ‘Christ’s cross’. The category of possibly Christian symbols and signs which may have been in the form of a cross includes place-names with OE *mæl* ‘a sign, a cross’ again, OE *bēcun* ‘sign, signal’, and OE **tæcne* ‘a beacon’. The category of specially marked out “trees” which might have been crosses includes place-names with OE *bēam* ‘tree; beam, piece of timber; post’, OE *trēow* ‘tree’, and OE *ac* ‘oak’. Rumble observes that ON *kross* and OE *crosc* replaced OE *rōd* in the north and East Midlands, OE *Cristel-mæl* was as common as OE *rōd* in the south, and OE *mæl* was used more frequently in the south, midlands, and north during the late Anglo-Saxon period. In “Die englischen Ortsnamen vom Typ *Bush(l)ey*, die Etymologie von ne. *bush*, *ambush* und die Herkunft von mlat. *boscus*,” *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 41: 275–314, K. Dietz concludes that OE and OHG *busc* and ON *buskr* derive from a Gmc **busku-* and appear in both Old English place-names and personal names, and that Modern English *bush* is simply a development of OE *busc*. On the other hand, *ambush* is shown to be based on the northern French equivalent of central French *embuissier*, but Latin *boscus* ‘wood’ cannot be derived Gmc **busku-*. In “Are There Any Elves in Anglo-Saxon Place-Names?” *Nomina* 29: 61–80, A. Hall identifies two place-names that he says are “reasonably likely” to contain the common noun OE *ælf* ‘elf’: the name *ælfrucge* in Kent occurring in a copy of a charter from 996, probably from *ælf* plus OE *hrycg* ‘ridge’, and the name *ylfing dene* in a boundary charter from 956 at Welford in Berkshire and meaning “the valley of

the elf-place." One problem with determining the presence of *ælf* in place-names is the possibility of the personal name OE **Ælf* or the more likely personal name OE *Ælfa* being the source of the first element of place-names with *ælf*-. In "Buckinghamshire Field-Names 3: Trees and Crops," *Records of Buckinghamshire* 45: 210-13, K. Bailey presents an interim report on the frequency of field-names with tree and related names in Buckinghamshire with *ash*, *crab apple*, *oak*, and *willow* occurring most frequently and field-names with crop-names with *beans*, *grass*, *wheat*, *barley*, *rye*, and *oats* being most common. He also identifies six Old English tree references in the boundary markers charters from Buckinghamshire in an additional table. In "Buckinghamshire Field-Names 4: Shot, Cockshoot, and Weald," *Records of Buckinghamshire* 46: 175-78, Bailey identifies forty-six field names in Buckinghamshire with the element *shot* from OE *sceat* 'corner of land, angle, projecting piece of land', which later seemed to be used as a synonym for *furlong*. Thirty-six of these are in the Chiltern Hundreds. Bailey speculates that many of these field-names "are likely to date from the creation of the open fields between about 900 and 1100." He also identifies eight examples of *Cockshoot* or *Cockshot* in Buckinghamshire from OE *cocc-scyte* 'place where woodcocks dart', which was used for clearings where nets were used to trap woodcocks. Although there are eighteen examples of field-names with Anglian *wald* or Kentish-West Saxon *weald* 'woodland, a large tract of wood, high forest-land' in Buckinghamshire, they do not occur south of the Chiltern escarpment; Bailey concludes that a collective name never developed in that area to describe an extensive wooded area.

Several essays this year focus on personal names. In "Impersonal Names," *Names through the Looking Glass* [see sec. 2], 151-64, R.I. Page cautions place-name scholars against identifying unrecorded personal names as elements in Old English place-names. Although he cites specific questionable examples from *The Place-Names of Rutland*, he says the common use of asterisks before personal names in EPNS volumes is problematic. He cites that same problematic practice of finding unattested personal names in runic inscriptions on coins and other artifacts, also with several examples. However, in "A Brittonic Solution to the Second Element in the Place-Names *Presteigne* and *Kinsham*," *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 52: 49-64, R. Coates, based on Domesday spellings, suggests a Primitive Welsh personal name **Hōyeið* as the source for OE *Hemed* (Domesday *Humet*) which itself survives as the second element in *Presteign* in Radnorshire and *Kinsham* in Herefordshire. In "Der

Name der Heidenheimer Nonne," *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 41: 417-23, A. Bammesberger argues that the name of the nun who wrote the *Lives* of Willibald, the first bishop of Eichstätt, and his brother Wynnebald, the first abbot of the cloister at Heidenheim, was probably OE *Hygeburg* rather than the form from the cryptogram in the *Codex Latinus Monacensis 1086* which produces the form *Hugeburc*, which shows Old High German influence. R. Coates, in "Names," *A History of the English Language*, ed. Hogg and Denison [see sec. 3b], 312-51, presents a very clear overview of the personal name and surnames throughout the entire history of England beginning with the Old English period, with a passing reference to place-names. However, the essay is included in a book "pitched to senior undergraduates in the main," so it is not likely to be something that name scholars need to read.

Three *JEPNS* articles add rather broadly to previously published works. In "Minor Names in Caunton, Nottinghamshire," *JEPNS* 38: 37-42, J. Cameron supplements the 1940 *Place-Names of Nottinghamshire*, and adds a large number of field and minor names of the village of Caunton which incorporates the old manors of Caunton, Beesthorpe, and Knapthorpe as well as the settlement of Middlethorpe. In "Minor Names in Norwell, Nottinghamshire," *JEPNS* 38: 53-58, she again supplements the same volume with field and minor names in the village of Norwell and the settlement of Norwell Woodhouse. She lists the additions in both articles in the style of the more contemporary Place-Name Survey volumes. In "A Tendring Hundred Miscellany," *JEPNS* 37: 37-47, R. Coates discuss seven names in Tendring hundred in the northeastern corner of Essex which was the most affected by the sparse Scandinavian settlement in the county. *Alresford* is a parish-name meaning "eel ford" with the first element from the West Saxon *ælf* in the genitive singular and thus a Tengstrand-name. *Chich*, the earlier parish-name of St. Osyth, is alleged to be an Anglicization of an earlier Scandinavian **Kik*. *Cockaynes* in Alresford is recorded as a surname in a feet of fines in 1279 and first as a place-name in a close roll of 1301. Coates suggests that the first element of *Dengewell Hall* is OE *denisc* 'Danish' or a Norman-French surname *Daneis* of the same origin. *Jay Wick* from a fifteenth century *Clakenjaywyk(k)e* simply drops the verb *clack* and refers to chattering birds or, in this case, probably people. He then derives *Moze* in *Moze Hall* from either OE *mos* or Scandinavian *mosi* 'moss, lichen; bog, swamp'. *Tendring* is said to derive from the Danish place-name *Tønder* close to the west coast of South Jutland rather than *Tündern* in Lower Saxony as had been suggested and to have as its source

Old Danish **tundær* ‘tinder(-fungus), which became OE *tynder* with the same meaning.

Four entries this year focus on the broad issues of name classification. In “Behind the Dictionary-Forms of Scandinavian Elements in England,” *JEPNS* 38: 43–61, R. Coates argues for a greater specificity in identifying Scandinavian place-name elements in Old English place-names in order to reflect the chronology of such elements being borrowed by differentiating between Old Norse and pre-Old Norse forms. Coates says that *Anglo-Scandinavian* should be used to indicate greater specificity of etyma and that identification can be made more precise, if regional features exist, by dividing it into *Anglo-East Scandinavian* and *Anglo-West Scandinavian*. For example, he proposes reconstructed forms of Anglo-East Scandinavian **bōð* and Anglo-West Scandinavian **būð* as pre-Old Danish and pre-Old Norse forms respectively. Three of these essays appear in *Language and Text: Current Perspective on English and Germanic Historical Linguistics and Philology*, ed. Johnston *et al.* [see sec. 2]. In “Early Personal Names and Onomastic Dialects,” 113–31, J. Insley says that there was a common North-West Germanic system of personal names which diverged into a Scandinavian system and North Sea Germanic/Continental Germanic systems “between the latter part of the Migration Period and the early Viking period.” He also shows onomastic isoglosses reflecting Celtic and Germanic interconnections in personal names such as the Germanic element *Wini-* as in OE *Winibald* and Continental Celtic *Veni-carus*, the loan-word **isarno-* ‘iron’ (OE *īse(r)n*) in the Frankish *Isembardus* and British *Isarninus*, IE **kat-* ‘to fight’ in Continental Celtic *Caturmandus* and OE *Headwulf* with the first element from Gmc **hap-u-*, and IE **teutā* ‘the body of the people’ as in OE *Þeodbald* and Continental Celtic *Teuto-malius*. In “England und der Kontinent: Ortsnamenparallelen (Ein Situationsbericht),” 317–43, J. Udolph lists seventeen pages of place-name elements that occur in Old English, continental Germanic languages, or both, and shows the correspondence that exists between English place-name elements and those same elements that occur in Schleswig-Holstein, Denmark, and northern France through the invasions of the Angles, Saxons, and Danes into the other territories. In “*Nomina stirpium*; Sippenamen und Ethnonyme: Probleme einer Typologie der Personengruppenbezeichnungen,” 57–78, W. Haubrichs classifies personal names into both relationship names and qualitative names for both *nomina gentium* and *nomina stirpium* and discusses Old English family names like *Oiscingas*, *Scylfingas*, and *Wulfin-gas* as examples of *nomina stirpium* relationship names.

Three essays in the bibliography use place-name evidence to deduce the ethnic composition of specific geographic areas at specific times. In “Charters, Place-Names and Anglo-Saxon Settlement in South Devon,” *Trans. of the Devonshire Assoc. for the Advancement of Science, Literature and Art* 137: 89–138, P. Luscombe uses King Æthelwolf’s charter of 846 and King Edgar’s charter of 962 as well as the place-name evidence in the areas covered in those charters to examine the settlement pattern in South Devon between the ninth and eleventh centuries. He concludes that the Saxons were a smaller minority in South Devon in the ninth century than in most other parts of England but that their presence increased substantially in the two centuries before the Norman Conquest. Luscombe attaches as appendix A the text of the South Hams Charter of A.D. 846, Finberg’s translation, and the bounds proposed by Finberg and by Petter and as Appendix B the text of the Sorley Charter of AD 962, Finberg’s translation, and the bounds proposed by Finberg and by Hooke. Appendix C is a list of place-names with woodland elements by parish as shown on a map on the third page of the essay. In “Anglo-Norse Place-Names on the Yorkshire Wolds,” *Names through the Looking Glass*, ed. Gameltoft and Jørgensen [see sec. 2], 85–93, M. Gelling focuses on place-names in the East Riding of Yorkshire which include a large number of forms like *Whar-ram* which are based on dative plurals, particularly in the wapentakes of Buckrose and Dickering. She concludes that there was a substantial loss of population on the Yorkshire Wolds after the Roman period and an influx of mixed Old English and Old Norse speakers in the late ninth and early tenth centuries when the toponymic use of the dative plural was fashionable. In “Britons in the Barony of Gilsland, Cumbria,” *Northern History* 43: 327–32, A. Breeze praises J. Todd’s essay on Cumbric place-names in the Barony of Gilsland; he lists fifty-three names identified there and comments on and provides possible etymologies for sixteen of them. He says Todd’s data provide evidence of the Cumbric-speaking settlers from the Strathclyde resettlement of Northern Cumbria in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and he suggests that a thorough survey of Gilsland would uncover hundreds of Cumbric names.

In “Marston Montgomery and Markeaton, Derbyshire,” *JEPNS* 38: 25–30, M. Wiltshire and S. Moore show that the de Ferrers Domesday manor of *Merchetune* should be associated with the parish of *Marston Montgomery* rather than the parish of *Markeaton* in Derbyshire. They accept Cameron’s etymologies for both place-names, however, as “marsh farm” and “Mearca’s farm” respectively.

E. Woo's "Remarkable Similarities between Traditional Chinese and Anglo-Saxon England's Naming Customs," *Names* 54: 211–20 is a curious essay. Her real focus is on the changing Chinese-American interpretation of Chinese given-names of two characters or words put together to form one name as being two separate given-names. However, she does compare the original way of viewing the Chinese given-name with the Old English dithematic names from two elements used to create new names like *Eadweard* 'rich guardian' and

the use of the same theme in family members name in Old English such as Eadweard of Wessex using the element *ead* 'rich; wealth' in the names of his sons *Eadred* and *Eadmund* to the "generation name" in the names of Chinese siblings.

Another study that deals extensively with place names is John T. Baker's *Cultural Transition in the Chilterns and Essex Region, 350 AD to 650 AD*, reviewed above in Section 7.

JDC

9. Archaeology, Numismatics, Sculpture

a. Excavations

In "The Saxons," *Current Archaeology* 200 (November/December 2005): 416–23, the anonymous author provides a useful summary of Anglo-Saxon archaeology as recorded in the previous hundred issues of the journal, especially as these reflect developing views of various types of site. The first section, for example, covers recent interpretations of the royal sites of Sutton Hoo, Taplow, and Prittlewell. Progress in understanding the development of the English village (using Mucking, West Stow) is next considered, concluding with the current consensus that the English village is the product of the late Anglo-Saxon period and not of the earlier. There is a brief study of one village, Slapwich in Somerset, for which the earliest evidence was found to be tenth century. Saxon towns are covered, including the work of the Biddles in church excavation at Winchester and St. Albans, and there is particular reference to the problem of identifying Minster churches using the example of Bampton—here the author is more persuaded by the idea that the presence of a Minster, rather than of a royal palace, was instrumental in early town development.

An anonymous article in vol. 202 of *Current Archaeology* (516–24) entitled "AD 616: The Battle of Chester," opens with a description of an earlier excavation (in 1929) which had left a dating puzzle: a number of burials found inserted into Roman buildings at Heronbridge near Chester, in which all the skeletons excavated were males, all between the ages of 20–40, many of whom had died from apparent weapon blows to the head, most apparently buried in a mass grave, and all without grave goods. A project to solve the mystery by radio-carbon dating the skeletons had been frustrated as none of the skeletons could be found in Manchester Museum—the result either of an unrecorded reburial or loss through bomb damage in the Second World War. A

recent project, therefore, has sought to solve the puzzle by re-excavating the mass grave. As a result fourteen more skeletons were found, and on the basis of their layout and the evidence from the early twentieth-century reports, it was estimated that the grave had held 120 bodies originally. As before there were no grave goods, and a detailed study of two skeletons confirmed the weapon wounds to the head. The modern study of the general levels of health, diet and nutrition of these two were revealing: upper body development suggested that both men were accustomed to weapons practice and use, and were therefore likely to have been involved in military service. The radio carbon dates centered on A.D. 535–75 for one, 595–620 for the second. There was also evidence for a temporary camp, which could only be dated between the end of the Roman period and ca. 750 A.D. On this evidence, the author suggests that this is a rare case in which archaeological evidence supports a recorded historical event—the Battle of Chester in A.D. 616, attested by Bede, in which the Anglo-Saxon king Æthelfrith won over his British opponents but is recorded as suffering heavy losses. But in the absence of grave goods, were these the Anglo-Saxon or the British dead? The author admits that at the time of writing radio-isotope analysis which can pinpoint geographical origin is lacking, but suggests that the victor would be the one most likely to have the time and resources to bury the dead with the care that the orderly mass grave suggests.

"Excavations at Station Road, Gamlingay, Cambridgeshire," *ASSAH* 13: 173–330, by Jon Murray with Tom McDonald, is in effect the full excavation report, complete with grave catalogue, catalogues of buildings and features, and specialist reports, for a Saxon farmstead and cemetery (fifth to eighth century) carried out in 1997. Part I looks at the location of the site, its topography and geology, and its previous history from documentary sources and early maps; followed by a survey

of earlier work on post-Roman and early medieval activity in the region, again backed up by documentary sources. Part II is the excavation report, and part III details the finds, with specialist reports on Roman and Saxon pottery, building materials, glass, metalwork, bone (artifacts), stone, slag, and human, animal and plant remains. The site and finds are summarized in part IV. It appears that the Roman remains suggest reuse and collection by the Anglo-Saxons, from an as yet undiscovered site nearby. The section includes an interesting analysis of the development of built structures over the life of the site; and another on craft specialization, including textile working (no textiles survived), comb production, lead and ferrous metal working, and food production and consumption. The cemetery is mainly Middle Saxon, the Early Saxon cemetery not having been located. The author concludes that the site provides “unprecedented evidence of daily life in the Early Anglo-Saxon era, revealing detailed information on the industrial and domestic practices taking place and the rituals and beliefs held by the inhabitants.” This is a large claim, but the site will undoubtedly be of considerable importance both in the development of the larger regional study and for the study of settlement patterns and development.

Keith Parfitt, “Excavations at the Anglo-Saxon Cemetery Site at Gilton Mill, Ash-Next-Sandwich,” *Archaeologia Cantiana* 126: 391–92, is an account of a small excavation in 2003 in the garden of a private residence, in advance of building work for an extension, in an area of special interest because it is within the early Anglo-Saxon cemetery dug by Faussett in the eighteenth century. The excavation revealed a single grave (grave 109). There was iron staining in the natural sand at one end of the grave, but no other grave goods were found. Only one other grave has been discovered in this part of the site (in 1973), even though there had been terracing of the site and other excavation for the building’s various services. The author suggests that wide spacing between graves was more typical of the seventh century than the sixth, but otherwise the grave is undatable.

Mark Brennan in “Cumwhitton,” *Current Archaeology* 204: 623–9, records excavations carried out at Cumwhitton, near Carlisle, Cumbria, following a metal-detector find of two Viking age “tortoise” (oval) brooches. The finds from all six graves found are detailed, most in a well-illustrated insert, all dating to the ninth to tenth centuries. There is nothing which would indicate that the community represented were Irish-Norse following the expulsion from Dublin in 902, rather than to some other event or movement of people in the time frame, but all the finds show strong

Scandinavian influence, and some buckles of Hiberno-Norse origin are singled out.

“Late Iron Age/Early Roman and Early Medieval Activity in the Lea Valley at Chingford,” *Essex Archaeology and History* 34 (2004): 63–68, by Barry Bishop, is a brief report of an excavation at 3, Lea Valley Road, Chingford, in advance of redevelopment. It revealed two main phases of cultural activity at the site. There was a little evidence datable to the Bronze Age, but the Iron Age produced evidence of possibly prehistoric field boundaries reconstructed around the period of the Roman Conquest and sealed by at least two episodes of flooding. The next sign of activity, which may have been agricultural or domestic, dates to the Late Saxon period with a pit and gully dated by early medieval pottery and filled by the second half of the twelfth century. A long, useful section places these slight indications within the wider context of the region in the period studies and contributes to a picture of a (localized) area with sporadic activity punctuated by flooding episodes.

The paper by Alan Graham, with contributions by Peter Bellamy *et al.* “Evidence for the Medieval Hamlets of Pykesash and Ash Boulogne: Archaeological Excavations at Ash,” *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History* 148 (2005): 11–40, is based on excavations at two housing developments and looks at evidence from the prehistoric and Roman periods through to the fifteenth century. Evidence for Saxon occupation showed activity from only the tenth century and was confined to one site on the hill overlooking the western of the two hamlets, Ash Boulogne. It consisted mainly of a scatter of tenth-century pottery fragments and fragments of at least three bun-shaped, fired-clay loom weights. Some of this material was residual, but there were some Saxon features, notably four small pits. It is suggested that some of the undated ditches which relate to the later medieval site could belong to this earlier period. Burnt clay daub, some with wattle impressions suggested the possibility of a decayed late Saxon timber-framed building, possibly north of the excavations.

Craig Cessford, Mary Alexander, and Alison Dickens, with contributions from M. Allen *et al.* *Between Broad Street and the Great Ouse: Waterfront Archaeology in Ely* (East Anglian Archaeology Report 114, Cambridge: Cambridge Archaeological Unit) report, in chapter 2, “A False Dawn: The 9th to Mid 10th Centuries,” (5–6) that although the earliest features found were of the Middle and Late Anglo-Saxon periods (mainly dated by pottery finds), these vestiges were slight, consisting of a pit and gullies. These had been covered by evidence of inundation. The authors suggest that these remains were from areas close to the rear of buildings, with the

gullies acting as boundary markers. A silver cross or cross type penny of the Kentish king Baldred, minted ca. 823–25 indicated activity of some status, but the flood damage implies that this part of the site lay on the limits of marginal ground and was eventually abandoned. This may have been a secular settlement founded by or dependent on the nearby high status religious community suggested by earlier excavations.

Market Lavington, Wiltshire: An Anglo-Saxon Cemetery and Settlement; Excavations at Grove Farm, 1986–90, by Phillip Williams and Richard Newman (Wessex Archaeology Reports 19, Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology), is the final report on a site, excavated in 1990, of which the most important surviving features were settlement evidence from the early and mid-Saxon periods, including three sunken-featured buildings and a contemporary cemetery, which revealed inhumations of the fifth to sixth centuries and some unstratified evidence suggesting that a seventh-century continuation had been destroyed by pre-1990 development in the area. There are specialist reports on artifacts of various materials, the most detailed of them from metalwork and textiles, both important in the later summaries of the significance of the site. The textile report (by Penelope Walton Rogers) looks at the textile evidence in relation to dress. Here the overall conclusion is that both weave types and dress in general are typical of the early Anglo-Saxon period as evidenced in other cemeteries, and that most weaves would have been produced on the site. However there are two examples of more exotic weaves: a “Summer and Winter” weave, and a possible “rosette” twill, which, it is argued may have come from some specialist weaving center—possibly artisans connected with the Frankish court (113). The evidence for a single brooch fastening an undergown is also seen as a useful find in relation to the study of female dress of the period. Environmental evidence is emphasized (chapter 5), and is important for its study of cereal crops especially, but also for the unexpected evidence of a vineyard in the late Saxon settlement—but no other evidence for exotic fruits. An important feature of the book is the discussion section, in which the site is put into context of other sites of the period and the region. The section on the cemetery by Nick Stoodley is especially detailed and valuable in this respect.

Mark Phillips, with contributions by Ellen Hambleton *et al.*, and illustrations by Cecily Marshal, “Excavation of an Early Saxon Settlement at Pitstone,” *Records of Buckinghamshire* 45 (2005): 1–32, is the complete report of an excavation, together with specialist reports, undertaken in advance of housing development. The investigation uncovered at least slight remains from the

late Bronze Age onwards, but the most significant discoveries related to an unenclosed settlement of the early Anglo-Saxon period, the evidence for which included sunken-featured buildings, pits and a refuse dump, dated by pottery to a time prior to the mid-seventh century. A settlement site was not unexpected here because a number of Saxon inhumations had been discovered in the vicinity previously, including one with shield and sword. One hut (building G32) was distinguished from others by its size and shape and contained among other objects three bone, cigar-shaped, double-ended pin-beaters (the two complete ones of different lengths) and fragments of ten fired-clay loom-weights, most in a tight cluster in the northern corner of the hut, suggesting to the authors this was possibly a weaving shed. In the light of this possibility, a slot in the floor is identified as possibly having contained either the lower part of the frame of a warp-weighted loom, or accommodated the weights suspended from the loom. Of most interest for the broader study are the analyses of the animal bones and plant remains. The former show difference in species composition between buildings, suggesting different activities undertaken in and around each building; the latter are typical of cereal crops of the period. The author usefully relates the picture provided by these remains to other sites in the region and suggests Pitstone is an example of the extensive, dispersed, probably shifting village site, similar to the well-known example from Mucking.

Saxon, Medieval and Post-Medieval Settlement at Sol Central, Marefair, Northampton: Archaeological Excavations, 1998–2002 (MoLAS Monograph 27, London: MoLAS), by Pat Miller and Tom Wilson, with Chiz Harward, is an addition to a growing body of excavation reports from this town. The authors look at the archaeological sequence, of which the most important sections here are 3.1 and 3.2, which cover between them the Saxon period from ca. 400 to the mid twelfth century (6–15). There is little evidence, however, for occupation of the site before the tenth century, suggesting that it lay beyond the middle Saxon focus of activity around St. Peter's church, to the southwest of the study area. That had proved to be an important site with large timber and stone halls indicating either a secular or ecclesiastical authority from the seventh century onwards (6) as indicated in earlier publications. The spread of buildings to the area studied from the tenth century indicates that the earlier area of settlement was increasing towards the limits of the Saxon *burh*, with sunken-featured buildings the main construction type of the period. Evidence for various small-scale craft activities predominated—and these are studied in some detail

in chapter 5, which includes sections on horn working or butchery waste, metalworking, malting, tannery, and pottery making and use. There are also useful sections on crop remains, showing evidence that semi-cleaned crops were brought in for final cleaning and drying before milling; and there is also some limited evidence for pulses and some fruits. The meat evidence again suggests that most animals were brought to the town for food purposes rather than reared there, with beef predominant in the meat diet. The younger age of the animals represented by some of the bones, suggests a higher-status diet than for some other areas of Northampton (though this is odd, and not commented on, because otherwise it seems an area of craft activity, with the higher status buildings apparently poorer in animal bone remains). Chapter 5 concludes with a section on the discovery of a cemetery in the south-east corner of the site, attributed to the chapel of St. Martin from the twelfth century, with some pre-Conquest burials suggested to have belonged to an extension of St. Gregory's churchyard, which lay to the south, or to a previously unknown place of worship. The book is very much a summary—the documentary sources, methodology and specialist reports are all laid out in a .pdf file supplied on a CD: these cover flint, ceramic building material, pottery (the unusual number of lamps, it is suggested, would have been for carrying out fine work such as fine metal work—for which there is evidence on the site—in poor light); and a select catalogue of finds in other materials. The full catalogue is to be found in the research archive. Items of stone, glass, metalwork, bone and leather are listed here; followed by the specialist reports on plant and animal remains; and on human bone. The electronic .pdf will be useful for readers wishing to search for specific features, but is more easily read as a printout.

Vaughan Birkbeck, with Roland J. C. Smith, Phil Andrews, and Nick Stoodley, with contributions from Michael J. Allen *et al.*, and illustrations by S. E. James and Rob Goller, *The Origins of Mid-Saxon Southampton: Excavations at the Friends Provident St Mary's Stadium 1998–2000* (Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology, 2005), is a report from the excavation prior to the development of a new stadium. The site was located on the north side of the middle Anglo-Saxon (seventh- to ninth-century) trading town of *Hamwic*. The excavation revealed a mixed cemetery dating to the seventh/eighth centuries. The extent of the cemetery could not be established. Twenty-three inhumation burials (among them seven sub-adults) were excavated, as well as eighteen cremations. Bone analysis found demographic variations between the cremated and interred

populations. The condition of the unburnt bone was quite poor. Most graves were furnished and some contained very unusual finds, such as gold pendants and gold thread (which is generally known from ecclesiastic embroidery, such as the maniple of St. Cuthbert or the *vellum* of SS Harlindis and Relindis. The inhabitants of the cemetery were supposedly an elite group and may have been associated with the royal estate of *Hamtun*. The cemetery pre-dates other *Hamwic* cemeteries and pushes the origins of Southampton into the seventh century, which is in line with the two other large trading centers of London and Ipswich. Seven further unaccompanied burials were found in the area of the North Stand and are dated to the eighth century. The excavation also revealed evidence for settlement, and here a large amount of animal bone recovered from pits gives insight into the eating habits of the population. The vast majority were from cattle, sheep, and pig. Other animal bones were from dogs and horses. Animals were brought to the site on the hoof and slaughtered on site. Evidence for plant remains includes apples, grapes, quince, wild plum, lentils, peas, barley, coriander, opium poppy, fennel, blackberries, gooseberries, as well as flax and hemp, which would have been used for textiles. Analysis of the waterlogged remains has shown that *Hamwic* was a rather dirty place with streets covered in rubbish. The unhygienic conditions are further evidence in the presence of Coleoptera (dung beetle) found in the pit samples. The site seems to have not had any middens. The site was abandoned by the ninth century, but a find of pottery in a nearby pit suggests that perhaps the settlement has shifted, rather than being given up.

Excavations at Little Oakley, Essex, 1951–78: Roman Villa and Saxon Settlement, East Anglian Archaeological Report 98 (Essex County Council: 2002), by P.M. Barford *et al.*, is the report of a multi-period excavation at the Roman villa at Little Oakley near Colchester in Essex. After the end of the Roman occupation the villa was dismantled and some pits were dug onsite. Anglo-Saxon presence can be demonstrated from the fifth century onwards from pottery remains and an Anglo-Saxon brooch that was found in the plow-soil. No evidence for early Anglo-Saxon buildings was found near the villa, but there may have been a settlement nearby. There is further evidence for Middle Anglo-Saxon activity in form of pottery and ridge-and-furrow plowing. An inhumation of a male adult with possible tuberculosis was made on the site of the former villa and there seem to have been two further burials. There is no clear dating evidence for this burial, which seems to have been excavated without a record being made,

but the position of the body may indicate that this is an Anglo-Saxon rather than Roman burial.

Alison Dickens, Richard Mortimer, and Jess Tipper, "The Early Anglo-Saxon Settlement and Cemetery at Bloodmoor Hill, Carlton Colville, Suffolk: A Preliminary Report," *ASSAH* 13: 63–79, give a preliminary report from the most extensive excavation of an Anglo-Saxon settlement in East Anglia since West Stow. The settlement was dated to the seventh century and contained a contemporary cemetery that lies within it. It covers an area of ca. 250m east-west and 180m north-south. It consists of thirty-nine *Grubenhäuser* (sunken floor buildings) and at least eight post-built buildings. It seems that the *Grubenhäuser* were filled with rubbish once they had become unused. Several pits were discovered in the hollows of an ancient Romano-British trackway. A large amount of pottery has been recovered from them, as well as animal bone. Among the species distribution, cattle, sheep/goat, and pig are most frequent, and there is further evidence of domestic fowl, duck, red deer and roe deer, and whale. The artifacts recovered suggest a considerable amount of textile manufacture at this site. Twenty-six inhumation burials have been recovered with a further three graves situated slightly away from this group. Some seem to have been cut by pits. Burials are laid out in four tightly packed rows without intercutting in an east-west orientation. Three graves were richly furnished, with an inlaid garnet brooch, a gold pendant, silver linked pins and remains of a wooden casket. These graves lie to the outside of the buildings. Both settlement and cemetery were abandoned in the late seventh or early eighth century.

Michael Ponsford, "Excavation at a Saxo-Norman settlement, Blickley, Cleeve, 1982–89," *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History* 146 (2003): 47–112, is the report of an excavation of a late Anglo-Saxon and early Norman settlement. The site revealed two buildings and a kiln, which are later than the Anglo-Saxon period. However, there is evidence for earlier use of this site in form of earth features.

Graham Priestly-Bell, "Excavation of a Mesolithic occupation site and Saxon building to the rear of Upper Bognor Road, Bognor Regis, West Sussex," *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 144: 51–61, gives a report from a field evaluation of a multi-period site undertaken in 2001 in advance of a building project. Evidence for sixth/seventh century Anglo-Saxon occupation comes in the form of a charcoal and pottery fragments, which together with post holes have been taken to be remains of a *Grubenhäuser* (sunken floor building), with a tripod arrangement.

Susan Clelland, in "Two Medieval Extra-Mural Sites in Southampton," *Proc. of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Soc.* 61: 153–59, summarizes the 2004 excavations undertaken by Wessex Archaeology in Southampton. The excavation of SOU 1282, Back of the Walls, did not reveal the possible late Saxon plow-soil which had been suggested by SOU 397 to this site's immediate south, and no Saxon-Norman structural remains were found, though several sherds of flint-tempered ware, probably 12th century, and a single sherd of Romano-British pottery were uncovered. Bones, including cattle, sheep/goat, and pig were also found here but were too few to produce conclusions. In SOU 1283, Orchard Place, all of the deposits were 13th–14th century with the exception of two residual sherds of Anglo-Norman scratch-marked ware from the late 11th/12th century. While these two sites were unproductive for Anglo-Saxon finds, they do help to delimit the geographic boundaries of Southampton, especially in the late 11th and 12th centuries, from the Saxon core in the southwest.

In "A Mid-Saxon Site at Anderson's Road, Southampton," *Proc. of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Soc.* 61: 81–133, Chris Ellis and Phil Andrews, with contributions by Michael J. Allen *et al.*, make an extensive site report of excavations undertaken in 2003 in advance of a housing development in the area (south of Chapel Road and north of Chantry Road in a 2.2 hectare rectangle), given that the site lay partly within the boundaries of the town of Hamwic, active between the 7th–9th centuries. Evaluation in 2001 had turned up small amounts of Roman pottery and a small hoard of five Roman coins; the deposit date was uncertain. The current excavations revealed clear Saxon structures (pits, wells, gullies) in the northern and the eastern sections of the site; twenty-two mid-Saxon post holes were recorded, primarily in the eastern section. Fifty-six pits of probable mid-Saxon date were also found; the authors discuss in depth the primarily domestic and craft/industrial refuse finds, but there were a striking eight pits which contained only imported pottery (scattered distribution, none on the east side). Of the glass finds, they are almost exclusively mid-Saxon and characteristic of the pale blues and greens of Hamwic. There was some evidence—primarily bone waste—of craft work in the area; later, the authors conclude the possibility that these were waste pits for debris from a site in the buildings along Chapel Road. There are extensive reports on animal bones and plant remains (particularly of charred cereal remains); there is also a section on pollen samples, showing a profile typical of urban archaeological sites. The authors summarize

their findings by suggesting that the excavation was “very much as anticipated on the basis of previous investigations in the vicinity” (122). They trace a Saxon route through the site from the landing place on the waterfront to an enclosure and St. Mary’s church; the extent of the settlement here is discussed in terms of the thinning brickearth overlying daub, suggesting that this was marginal land suitable primarily for grazing. The medieval remains, from after the ninth century decline of Hamwic, are all along Chapel Road, suggesting the continued importance of the route.

Adrian M. Chadwick, with contributions by Michael J. Allen *et al.*, has published the excavation report, “Bronze Age Burials and Settlement and an Anglo-Saxon Settlement at Claypit Lane, Westhampnett, West Sussex,” *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 144: 7–50. The article focuses almost exclusively on the more important and more expansive Early and Late Neolithic pits, an Early Bronze age cremation burial, three Middle Bronze Age ring ditches and their associated burials, and the Middle to Late Bronze Age settlement. For the Anglo-Saxon period, two isolated but typical sunken featured buildings were found; both were oriented east-west and are 3.1m × 2.5m and 3.8m × 3.4m respectively. Because we have very little pottery from West Sussex, the 176 sixth- to seventh-century sherds found are of importance; they are undecorated and not well finished, but they are of sandy or organic tempered ware and lack the key fifth- to sixth-century characteristic of a coarse-slipped surface. The evidence from this excavation joins other finds from nearby, including another similar building and a small inhumation cemetery (A.P. Fitzpatrick, 1997 excavation report). This increases the small amount of knowledge we have of West Sussex Anglo-Saxon settlements and notably suggests the continuity of the site over time.

Simon Stevens, “Excavations at the former site of Tribe’s Yard, Berstead Street, Bognor Regis, West Sussex,” *Sussex Archaeol. Collections* 144: 115–27, describes a small excavation of a middle Anglo-Saxon (650–750) group of features at a multi-period site. One of the features contained evidence for middle Anglo-Saxon domestic pottery, but this small area was heavily truncated by later Saxon and medieval activity. This is a significant find since few middle Anglo-Saxon settlements from sites not associated with *emporia* have been recovered so far. The environmental analysis as well as the nature of the pottery recovered suggest that Berstead is part of an unknown agrarian settlement, which may have been abandoned at the end of the medieval period.

b. Regional and Settlement Studies

“Flaxton—The Layout of the Original Planned Settlement,” *Yorkshire Archaeological Jnl* 78: 61–83, by David Bourne, is a closely argued paper supported by plans and drawings from the 1856 and 1911 ordnance survey maps and documentary sources from Domesday book forward, in support of the author’s contention that the township of Flaxton “remained remarkably unchanged from before the Conquest through to enclosure in 1658” (82), and that this shows a planned single-row settlement which was still reflected in the 1911 1/2500 scale Ordnance Survey map of the area. The argument is set out in four stages, each supported by a detailed analysis of the available evidence, which relates to the number of oxgangs in Flaxton at the time of the Domesday survey; the relationship in Flaxton of two oxgangs to one tenement; the relationship between the number of tenements and the length of the frontage of the settlement; and finally the sequence of events and their dating. Each section has a concluding passage setting out the inferences which can be drawn from the evidence put forward. The first two sections are based on Domesday and later documentary sources, the third on an interesting analysis of the settlement based on the 1911 map and its relation to the Domesday holdings (which to support his thesis require twenty-four tenements relating to the 48 oxgangs he maintains is the correct reading of the Domesday allocations). The reading of the map is accompanied by a revisiting of the implications of the Domesday and later accounts: it is this section which in the author’s view confirms a planned settlement of twenty-four tenements laid out in a single row. The argument in the section dealing with the sequence of events over the life of the settlement is as technical and complex as in the three previous sections and looks at the probability of open field before Domesday; the enclosure of small fields and the relationship of these to the tenements; the existence of a Back Lane (apparently a feature of planned villages in Yorkshire); and the probable dates of the Green and other features. The fact that most of the township came into the hands of several religious foundations may account for the stability of the settlement layout between Domesday and the seventeenth century. The author disarmingly states in his very helpful summary introduction that his argument resembles a four-storey house of cards which could be all too easily demolished if any one step could be disproved. Nevertheless, the detailed argument deserves a close reading, and will be of interest to all interested in village development.

Richard Jones and Mark Page, in *Medieval Villages in an English Landscape* (Macclesfield: Windgather Press), provide an authoritative account of the history of this subject and the present state of knowledge. For our period, the authors are concerned to show the inadequacy of some earlier views of village development in England in the post-Roman period, in which Germanic invaders were seen to have imposed a fully-formed nucleated village structure on a very different landscape of hamlets and farmsteads, in a landscape denuded of its indigenous British population. Possibly this is an over-simplification of these views, but there is no doubt that, as they say, opinion now “stresses the importance of the three or four centuries after AD 800 as the key period of village—open-field formation” (7). The authors’ own approach is based on earlier work of the Medieval Settlement Research Group, which identified the Whittlewood area on the Buckinghamshire/Northamptonshire boundary as a suitable test-bed for exploring rural settlement and landscape, with the potential of having a wider application for medieval England as a whole. This study area is introduced in chapter 3, which looks at the area up to and including the Roman period in some detail. The effect of administrative divisions and patterns of land ownership are investigated in chapter 4, in which the importance of the ninth to eleventh centuries is stressed. Of equal interest to Anglo-Saxonists will be Chapter 5, in which the ninth to thirteenth centuries are identified as a period of change and development: as in fact the period in which the previously dispersed pattern of hamlets and farmsteads was gradually replaced by the nucleated village, and in which field systems were reorganized and the open-field system adopted, woodland became more managed, and more marginal lands began to be exploited. The authors link these changes to wider developments of the emerging state as a unified kingdom, and the development of towns (both processes beginning before and continuing after the Norman Conquest). The subject is explored in relation to the Whittlewood area and its implications for other areas are thoughtfully assessed. This is probably not the last word on this subject, but it is of great value as an overview of the subject, from a group dedicated to unraveling this particular history, which has risen in importance over the last few years.

Keith Bailey, in “Early Medieval Stewkley: Settlements and Fields,” *Records of Buckinghamshire* 45 (2005): 93–114, is a contribution to this ongoing debate on village development, albeit there is more of speculation in his account. He looks at the available sources for the medieval village of Stewkley (first mentioned in

Domesday Book and very sketchily thereafter) in order to determine what can be learned of its early settlement patterns and the evolution of its field system. The paper is concerned mainly with the two centuries after 1086. Section II (95–6), however, examines in detail the findings of Domesday Book, and in later sections the author speculates on the field system before this date, suggesting that although the evidence is late, it appears to show that the earlier Anglo-Saxon landscape was “parceled out between a series of small settlements with their own fields, and that a large amount of wood and other unused land existed,” and that 40–50% remained uncultivated even in 1086—a marked contrast with the picture he is able to draw of the situation in 1279. Nevertheless he suggests that the process of creation of communally-owned open fields and their associated planned villages began in the early- to mid-eleventh century and was still underway at the time of Domesday Book.

Medieval Devon and Cornwall, often neglected in general studies because of the lack of recent work, have at last received the attention which is their due in a number of books and papers. Michael Calder, for example, in “Early Ecclesiastical Sites in Somerset: Three Case Studies,” *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History* 147 (2004): 1–28, explores the possibility of identifying “British” church sites before the Anglo-Saxons had a significant impact on the area—i.e. before the late seventh century. He looks at three sites, Street, Kew Stoke and St. Decumans (Watchet), which have associations with “Celtic” saints which may be genuinely early and not a result of the eleventh century resurgence of interest in these saints. The first part surveys the factors which have been used previously to identify such sites, concluding that none on its own can provide unequivocal evidence. Nevertheless he uses these indications—topographical, archaeological, and place name evidence—in his own analysis. He concludes that Street has the strongest case to have been a pre-Saxon monastic site, but that there is some evidence for each of the other two. Possibly his most interesting argument is in connection with St. Decumans, which he says shows the impact of Anglo-Saxon settlement, involving the abandonment of the earlier church site; he suggests that the Anglo-Saxons moved the church nearer to the conjectured site of a *burh* mentioned in the Burghal Hidage, but that it was subsequently moved back to its original site.

S.J. Rippon, R.M. Fyfe, and A.G. Brown, in “Beyond Villages and Open Fields: The Origins and Development of a Historic Landscape Characterised by Dispersed Settlement in South-West England,” *MA* 50: 31–70, challenge the view that the areas of England outside the

“Central Province” (broadly the Midlands of England) did not share in the “great re-planning” in the Middle to Late Anglo-Saxon period which led to the development of villages and open fields. The authors point out that previously very little pollen evidence had been used to contribute to our understanding of the origins and development of the medieval landscape. This paper, however, is based on conclusions drawn from analyses of nine sequences from central Devon and the edges of Exmoor. These suggest substantial clearance of woodland in lowland areas and the upland fringe by the Late Iron Age, and between then and the fifth century, little change in management of the landscape. However, they revealed an apparently a marked change in the seventh to eighth centuries, which may have been “the context for the creation of today’s historic landscape [in the area of study] of small hamlets and isolated farmsteads set within a near continuous fieldscape, replacing the late prehistoric/Romano-British/post-Roman landscape of small, enclosed settlements with only very localised evidence for field systems.” This transformation appears to be roughly contemporary with, or even earlier than, the creation of nucleated villages in the “Central Province” of England, suggesting that the “great re-planning” was just one of several regionally distinctive types of landscape change in the period. The technical data relevant to the pollen analyses are provided (36–40) and analyzed area by area (40–43), followed by an analysis of the results period by period. The text analyses are fully supported by maps, tables, aerial photographs, and pollen diagrams. The authors conclude that “the appearance of such a strong cereal component in these pollen sequences without an equivalent significant decline in woodland/pasture . . . must reflect a new system of agriculture that brought arable farming close to the peat bogs, but within a regime that still included a strong pastoral component alongside areas of woodland and heath” (55), and that this suggests that a system of rotational cropping known as “convertible husbandry” [see below], well-attested in the region from the fourteenth century, was in place from the seventh to eighth centuries. The last part of the paper is a thoughtful analysis of the reasons for the change and for the differences from the Midlands pattern of development, which must be of considerable importance in the wider study of both village and landscape development.

Two books, one edited and one written by Sam Turner, also concentrate on the same area. The former, Sam Turner, ed., *Medieval Devon and Cornwall: Shaping an Ancient Countryside*. Landscapes of Britain (Macclesfield: Windgather Press) is a full regional study in which each chapter examines one aspect of the

historic landscape. The foreword notes that it is a necessary update to the work of W.G.V. Balchin and W.G. Hoskins in the 1950s and 1960s, since, while archaeological work in the area is still patchy, “the materials which touch on settlement before 1066 are now nearly all in place,” providing access to sources unavailable for those earlier studies. Turner’s introductory paper, “The Medieval Landscape of Devon and Cornwall,” 1–9, covers the Roman period and the evidence for the kingdom of Dumnonia (sixth and seventh centuries) through which he suggests that earlier boundaries, probably relating originally to Roman administrative structures, were probably perpetuated. His survey also includes what evidence there is for the takeover of the peninsula by an expanding Anglo-Saxon Wessex between the seventh and tenth centuries, using documentary sources, sculpture and place name evidence. A large part of the chapter discusses the area’s geology and its influence on settlement types and farming practice. Turner raises the issue of differences in these respects between the peninsula and the so-called “Central Province” of open fields and nucleated settlements stretching from Dorset to Northumberland, suggesting that the region has more in common with Celtic areas, north-west Spain and Brittany as well as Wales and Ireland. He raises a question concerning these connections—“how much do they owe to similar environments, and how much to shared cultures?”—but only partly answers it through a discussion of the influence of the sea and seaborne communications, including evidence of links with these other areas as Atlantic regions. Here too the evidence includes documentary sources, inscribed stones, and imported goods such as pottery, effectively summarizing much of the work in these areas over the last several decades, and also providing an introduction to more detailed discussions in later chapters.

One of these, “Palaeoenvironmental Perspectives on Medieval Landscape Development,” *Medieval Devon and Cornwall*, ed. Turner, 10–23, by Ralph Fyfe, covers some of the same ground as the paper by Rippon, Fyfe, and Brown discussed above, but with a different emphasis. He discusses the distinctive features of settlement (dispersed, with sprawling hamlets and a mixture of open and enclosed field systems) mentioned in the previous chapter as distinguishing the region from the rest of England. He suggests that it was also different from that prevailing in the Romano-British period (though this seems to have continued into the period of the Kingdom of Dumnonia in the sixth century) so there must have been a period of change, which he firmly argues has nothing to do with a population decline as has sometimes been suggested. His thesis derives from

a detailed study of the environmental evidence, from which he concludes that the changes were complete by the eighth century. Its most distinctive feature, which is confined to this region, is the system described as “convertible husbandry,” a rotational cropping system in which the majority of the fields (whether closed or open) were subject to alternating grain or grass crops—the first usually for two to three years, the latter for the next 6–8 years—in roughly a ten year cycle.

‡Sam Turner himself takes up the development of “The Christian Landscape” (in the same volume, 23–43). Turner again starts with the situation as it was in the Kingdom of Dumnonia and argues that the medieval pattern emerged between the seventh and ninth centuries. Here the documentary sources, imported pottery, and ogham and Latin inscribed stones briefly mentioned in his introductory chapter are covered more fully. Turner discusses the probability that some of the memorials to the dead stood at church sites, others on the boundaries of emerging territories. Tintagel is given its due as the site about which the most is known from the early period. This, however, like other Romano-British “rounds” (settlements enclosed by banks and ditches) seems to have been abandoned after the seventh century. The possibility that some of the early churches served as foci for new patterns of settlement is considered, while the continuing lack of archaeological evidence for the sequence from ancient burial ground to church with graveyard is acknowledged. There is also little evidence as yet to push the foundation of medieval churches before the seventh to the ninth centuries, and some are clearly even later. The relationship between the later crosses and the Anglo-Saxon takeover in the region is discussed (33–), including a useful discussion of the possible ways in which the crosses were used, and the difficulties in many cases in identifying their location.

Sam Turner's *Making a Christian Landscape: The Countryside in Early Medieval Cornwall, Devon and Wessex* (Exeter: U of Exeter P) exemplifies and develops these aspects in greater length and detail; it includes a useful introduction to the materials of early landscape study, and a plea to landscape archaeologists to “employ the greatest possible range of evidence in pursuit of their research questions” (chap. 2). The book includes a very full discussion of the parallels and differences in patterns of monastic settlement between Wessex and especially Cornwall, including a discussion of links to centers of earlier royal power (chap. 3). The detail is impressive; this has to be a very important book for the future study of this area. Both books on this previously neglected region are notably well illustrated. The first

covers a wider range of landscape aspects and a longer timespan; the latter more detail on the Christian landscape, and also on the historical and material sources available.

In “The Origins of King's Lynn? Control of Wealth on the Wash prior to the Norman Conquest,” *MA* 50: 71–104, A.R.J. Hutcheson uses a survey of the origins of the Norfolk town carried out over ten years from 1962 under the aegis of the Society for Medieval Archaeology as a case study on the nature and development of “productive sites.” The author explicitly questions the usual date of origin of the town, said to be 1090, when Herbert of Losinga, bishop of Thetford, established the priory of St. Margaret there. The introduction to the paper includes a brief but necessary survey of previous discussions of “productive sites,” and earlier work on seventh- to ninth-century estate administration. His basic premise is that “the growth of coinage in the eighth century was related to experiments in economic strategy carried out during the seventh and eighth centuries by the state that were intimately linked to land management, the incoming policies of the church, the adaptation of old systems of justice, and primogeniture in inheritance” (72). Subsequent sections fill this out for the whole of East Anglia by means of metal detector finds and pottery surveys (the evidence for these partly based on surveys of the results of the Portable Antiquities Scheme), which show that Norfolk accounts for half of the artifacts recorded annually through the scheme and Suffolk for one-sixth. The evidence of animal bone assemblages is also used. Differences between the types of evidence for the continuity of estate centers inside and outside the Danelaw are explored, with north and western Norfolk (including the area around what became King's Lynn) retaining “a multi-focal set of central places,” while southern and eastern Norfolk gravitated towards the larger central places at Norwich and Thetford. King's Lynn did not have burghesses recorded in Domesday Book, but as a result of his survey, Hutcheson concludes that the priory was founded there because there were several large estate centers in the vicinity (supported by the archaeological evidence), which was at a strategically important part of the Wash. He suggests that the area's separate administrative situation began early and survived the Viking wars, but was already changing in the eleventh century when Archbishop Stigand obtained significant holdings in the area, setting the stage for bishop Herbert of Losinga “to develop those holdings into the institution that eventually became known as King's Lynn.” The area survey pulls together much useful information and is clearly important to the eventual development of

the town, the foundation of which as a town does not seem to have been put any earlier, however.

Braudel's theory of "la longue durée" seems to have had a resurgence of interest and influence, with not entirely happy results. It should be said that all excavation reports and area studies worthy of the name, including most of those discussed here, report on the geology and topography of a region or site and their influence on settlement, farming and regional interconnections and trade; and on the archaeology from the earliest period through to the latest (which interestingly often makes obvious the period of maximum activity at a site). It is obviously of interest to archaeologists, and has been for a long time, that what new settlers of a site knew of what went before—or how a new period of artifactual evidence relates to the old, in terms of the interconnectedness or not of the inhabitants of both periods—is important. While finding the answers to these questions is not easy, it is actually what opens up our subject to productive argument and debate. Reviews on these pages have hosted evidence of ongoing discussions on various forms of "continuity," village development, urbanization, site type identification ("productive sites"), trade links, and stylistic evidence for the movement or interactions of peoples, to name but a few. One survey in the present bibliography, Stephen James Yeates, *Religion, Community and Territory: Defining Religion in the Severn Valley and Adjacent Hills from the Iron Age to the Early Medieval Period*, 3 vols (BAR British Series 411, Oxford: John and Erica Hedges), however, explicitly takes issue with much writing about the early medieval period, objecting to the way in which, he says, incoherent views of the past are constructed as a result of academic concentration on "time-period specific study," as opposed to his attempt at a "di-chronological study" based on longer-term evolutionary themes (explicitly citing Braudel), in which changes are perceived as happening gradually "with constant repetition and ever-recurring cycles." It is this approach he attempts to bring to a discussion of the pre-Christian religion in one area occupied from before the Roman period by a British group we know as the Dobunni, and later by the Hwicce, which he concludes were the same people "demonstrated most cogently by the recognition of the tribal goddess with her sacred vessel," evidence for which also continues through the Christian period into later medieval traditions. His supporting evidence includes a two-volume gazetteer, in which sites and monuments record cards are reproduced as found under the heading of minster or mother churches (which in some cases must at least beg a question or two), covering boundaries,

cemeteries, religious sites and cemeteries of all periods. Each minster church entry is followed by a "synthesis" of points picked out from the cards, but the overall effect of the gazetteer is overwhelming and indigestible. How does the reader discern that what is picked out is the most significant? In relation to the thesis, set out in volume 1—the reader would have to be an expert on archaeology and history from prehistory through to the Middle Ages; and a specialist in medieval Welsh literature (*Culhwch ac Olwen* and the *Mabinogion*, for example) and how safely this can be taken to present a picture of pre-Christian mythology (and if so of what period and what area)—to arrive at a just estimation of the conclusions reached. The present reviewer lays claim to no such breadth of knowledge. The work of Sam Turner and his colleagues reviewed above deal with similar concerns.

Fred Orton in "At the Bewcastle Monument, in Place," *A Place to Believe in*, ed. Lees and Overing [see sec. 1], 29–66, is more interesting because he looks at an enormously broad sweep of geological as well as historical time, often interestingly detailed, especially of what must have remained standing of the Roman fort at the place which became the site of the Bewcastle cross, which he describes as "arguably our premier survival of pre-Viking stone sculpture." This is indeed arguable, although others may prefer different specific monuments or even be against the need to single out one from its context of other monuments and related cultural artifacts. In the end, however, Orton leaves the reader with some "metaphoric" drawn from Heidegger's *Building Dwelling Thinking* in which the monument is seen as exemplifying the "fourfold" of earth, sky, mortals and gods—which must be true of a religious monument planted by people in the earth, in the open air, though perhaps not the most that can be said to elucidate its specific meaning either now or for its makers.

A very different study in the same volume offers an interesting look at first the influence of changing sea levels and tectonic changes on the "edge" between land and water, in both the continental homelands of the Anglo-Saxons and their new settlements in England, suggesting, for example, that land loss to the sea on the continent was a factor in the arrival of "Angles, Saxons and others in Britain" (Kelley M. Wickham-Crowley, "Living on the *Ecg*: The Mutable Boundaries of Land and Water in Anglo-Saxon Contexts," *A Place to Believe in*, ed. Lees and Overing [see sec. 1], 85–110). The topic is explored by the use of topographical terms in place and feature naming, starting with a short study of the variety of words for types of hill and the uses

of water names such as *mere* and *wella*, before concentrating on terms which imply “edges” between land and water, including *ecg* (edge or coast), *garsecg* (coast or gore’s edge, possibly implying an horizon), *fen*, *iege*, *ealond* (island), *mere*, *mersc*, and *mor*. The importance of these terms is then traced through the discussion of the importance of topographical land/water edge terms in various saint’s lives, including those of St. Cuthbert and especially Felix’s life of Guthlac; poetry (*Wulf and Eadwacer*, *The Wanderer*, *The Seafarer*); and in the fact of and choice of sites for ship burials (Oseberg, Sutton Hoo, Snape, evidence from Repton and York of continuing Viking practice); the choice of monastic sites (Jarrow, and especially Whitby). Her conclusion, concerning the need to take into account how the Anglo-Saxons perceived their landscape, of the *isle* of Britain (Wickham-Crowley’s italics), which we cannot do “without factoring in the pervasive, changing, and influential presence of water and sea” is speculative, but interestingly so, and grounded in her study of the literature and the archaeological and topographical features of the sites discussed.

Richard Mortimer, Roderick Regan and Sam Lucy, *The Saxon and Medieval Settlement at West Fen Road, Ely: The Ashwell Site*, East Anglian Archaeology 110 (Cambridge: Cambridge Archaeological Unit, 2005), is a report of the Cambridge Archaeological Unit on an excavation at Ely in 1999 and 2000 prior to housing development. The site was established during the eighth century and had been continuously occupied until the fifteenth century. It seems that the settlement was deliberately laid out in the remains of Iron Age and Romano-British earth works. The fact that very little domestic pottery was found indicates that the date of settlement must fall to the period after the introduction of wheelmade Ipswich ware, and the excavators suggest the second half of the eighth century. The settlement is located near the established Anglo-Saxon abbey of Ely. Twenty-nine buildings were excavated with a possible further nine conjectured. Twenty-seven were associated with Anglo-Saxon and medieval contexts. The Anglo-Saxon buildings were timber-covered and held up by beams, aligned either north-east or south-west. The amount of buildings increases towards the late Anglo-Saxon period. There is slight evidence for textile production, but the excavators point out that clay spindles and unfired clay would be impossible to identify on a site built on clay. There is indication for small-scale iron smelting and suggestion of bone and antler working. Other animal bones found have been associated with food, and here the main species of consumption were sheep/goat or cattle. Few pig bones were found

which may suggest that pigs were bred at specialized farms and not reared on the settlement. Small numbers of horse bones with butchery marks, deer, rabbit, chicken, goose, duck, teal, and woodcock indicate variation in the diet. As at other Anglo-Saxon sites there are few fish bones, and the majority of them are from eels. The main cereal seems to have been wheat, but there is indication for the cultivation of small amounts of rye and oats, as well as beans. The late Anglo-Saxon period saw the addition of barley and hulled wheat, and there is evidence for flax. Among the small finds were a moderate number of dress fittings and jewelery (including a fine cloisonné enamel brooch) mainly from Late Anglo-Saxon contexts, as well hooked tags, strap ends and combs.

Tim Ayers and Tim Tatton-Brown are the editors of a solidly researched and focused collection from the 2002 British Archaeological Association Conference that examined *Medieval Art, Architecture and Archaeology at Rochester* (British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions 28, Leeds: British Archaeological Association). The initial essays in the book set Rochester Cathedral in its Roman and early medieval historical contexts (Mark Hassall, “Roman Rochester in its Wider Context” and Nicholas Brooks, “Rochester AD 400–1066”). Tim Tatton-Brown, in “The Topography and Buildings of Medieval Rochester” (22–37) presents a thorough and very readable summary of the interplay of city buildings over time. From the small Roman settlement along present Watling Street, Tatton-Brown then looks at literary, historical, and archaeological records to trace the development from the important second bishopric to the prosperous borough of the ninth century and later. These sections, punctuated by drawings which show the town plot and its relationship to key landscape features such as the River Medway and the marshes, trace Rochester’s development right through to the fourteenth century. Richard Plant then offers a fascinating examination of the remains of “Gundulf’s Cathedral” (38–53); after providing documentary history to set the stage for the cathedral in the later eleventh century, Plant then walks the reader through an outline of the remaining physical evidence. The tufa nave of the Romanesque church covers the same eight bays as the current building with a two-order portal on the west end, likely with a free-standing tower (given foundation evidence) but likely without a transept. Where Plant’s discussion clearly blossoms is in the evidence of the crypt, the most controversial section of Gundulf’s cathedral; the discussion is richly layered with the presentation of historiographic analysis of St. John Hope’s and McAleer’s analyses of the

crypt as well. The use of tufa with Reigate stone and imported Marquise stone, the unusual bases and capitals, and the huge size of the crypt lead Plant to connect the physical evidence to square apsidal buildings such as St. Gregory's Priory in Canterbury, St. Mary-le-Bow in London, as well as the more commonly connected Canterbury Cathedral, churches which further emphasize the connections between Gundulf and Lanfranc. Jane Geddes also takes up the archaeology of Gundulf's cathedral in her essay, "Bishop Gundulf's Door at Rochester Cathedral" (54–60). While dendrochronology places the door "after 1045," Geddes is particularly interested in the three saltire crosses which decorate the surface, since the pattern can be repeatedly found elsewhere in the cathedral; the iconographic association with St. Andrew must have been deliberate, given the Cathedral's dedication. Geddes places it convincingly in the context of other Romanesque doors and argues for the importance of dendrochronology as an archaeological tool. The rest of the collection looks at Rochester, with three essays addressing the twelfth century fabric, an essay on the medieval shrines and one on thirteenth-century choir stalls, and several on the late medieval Cathedral. An article on historiography and a quick look also at the tower of Rochester Castle and the Collegiate Church of All Saints, Maidstone round out this examination.

Based largely on the author's doctoral thesis (Durham University, 2004), Simon Draper's *Landscape, Settlement and Society in Roman and Early Medieval Wiltshire*, BAR British Series 419 (Oxford: Archaeopress) is structured therefore with an extensive introduction and much emphasis on literature study. This work aims to be a multidisciplinary study of the region, beginning with the Roman period to better flesh out the understanding of Late Antique (300–700) Wiltshire and the Roman to Anglo-Saxon transition and ending around 1100 with the Domesday Survey. Addressing typical cultural references to Wiltshire as a landscape divided between the "chalk and the cheese," Draper looks closely at period settlement patterns, territories and boundaries, drawing in such varied evidence as place names, field archaeology, manorial and church history, and coins and hoard finds. After looking at settlement patterns and place names in chapter two, chapter three addresses that fraught conundrum of the Roman end, in which Draper's Wiltshire finds support the idea that there was no catastrophic collapse in the mid fourth century and that there seemed to have been a continuing prosperity, seen in coin hoards and grave finds, that points rather to a slow decline between 370 and 450. Chapter four addresses literary and burial

archaeological evidence in an attempt to better understand Wiltshire's cultural identity, concluding that Wiltshire was "a place of social dynamism, where bilingualism and acculturation led to a melding of cultures." Chapter five is the most theoretical and controversial of the chapters here; it examines territorial boundaries, seeing Wiltshire as a palimpsest of medieval land structuring over a diminished role of Roman land divisions of *territorium*, *civitas*, *pagus*, or *villa*. It is best read, I think, in connection with chapter seven's material on landscape and *villa regales* and nucleated settlements. Chapter six addresses church history and the development of minsters and monasteries, showing a very high level of cooperation between church and crown in Wiltshire. All in all, because of its multi-disciplinary approaches, this is a thorough and useful close examination of the region of Wiltshire and its development in the early medieval period.

c. The Anglo-Saxon Church

The sites of Monkwearmouth and Jarrow were excavated between 1959 and 1988, and their long-awaited publication, *Wearmouth and Jarrow Monastic Sites, Volume 1*, by Rosemary Cramp, with contributions by G. and F. Bettess *et al.*, and principal illustrations by Y. Beadnell and N. Emery (Swindon: English Heritage, 2005), comes aptly in a period in which the identification of high-status sites has become an important issue. The monastic status of these two sites has never been in doubt, but they are undoubtedly of importance as types sites. The description of each includes detailed accounts of earlier discoveries and excavations, with many early illustrations of the buildings, and maps and views of the sites immediately prior to excavation. There is a useful appendix of documentary references to the sites from the seventh to the twentieth centuries. In both cases, parts of the Anglo-Saxon church buildings are still standing, so a detailed study of the surviving fabric is made alongside early drawings and descriptions. The account of the modern excavations in each case begins with a detailed study of the burial ground before moving on to the archaeological study of the Anglo-Saxon and medieval buildings (some still partly standing in the case of Jarrow), through to the latest occupation in the modern period. The Jarrow section includes a chapter on the boundaries of the medieval cell on the south (chap. 21, 317–37) based on C.D. Morris's Jarrow Slake excavations from 1973–6. Chapter 24 provides an excellent summary of the main findings (to date) concerning the location of the Anglo-Saxon churches, monastic buildings and their layout, and the cemeteries of both

sites, usefully considered in relation to the wider context of monastic sites in England and on the continent. Chapter 25 looks at questions that remain unanswered and the potential for further excavation both of buildings and cemeteries. The artifactual evidence will be considered in volume II, which will be needed before the complete picture of these major sites can be seen.

A brief but lavishly illustrated area study, based on Glanville Jones's work in the 1960s in which a main settlement ("caput") has grouped around it a number of dependent hamlets, is a less successful attempt to define an area as a monastic estate: Mick Aston, "An Early Monastic Estate in Somerset," *British Archaeology* 90: 36–41. Aston interprets a series of early charters and land grants relating to Muchelney Abbey in the light of Glanville Jones's work, while acknowledging doubts about the authenticity of these sources. The paper is therefore necessarily somewhat speculative, with reference to a possible pre-existing British monastic settlement on the site; the presence of a royal palace in the area (he suggests at Ilminster); and also as to the founding and later depopulation of various settlements by the monastery. The main target appears to be at the end of the piece where the author points to the necessity of much detailed research on all available fronts before the development of an area can be understood, in contrast to what he describes as a "crackpot"—the "quick-fix concept"—of historic landscape characterization, espoused by English Heritage, which is not however described in this paper.

Equally speculative as an attempt to identify an early monastic site is Steve Dickinson's "Running with the Runes," *British Archaeology* 87: 36–39. This is partially an interim account of an excavation at Great Urswick, Cumbria in 2004–05, which appeared to confirm a Roman military presence and a re-occupation in the fifth to sixth centuries AD. The author goes on to suggest a possible link between Urswick and St. Patrick's recorded home estate of *Bannaventa Berniae* "Promontory meeting place at the hills" on the ground that this is phonologically close to the Roman name, Glanvonta, which also suggests a meeting place or market at a promontory, and which he considers better fits the topography of Urswick than other sites suggested for it. This speculation is linked to a well-known pre-Conquest stone at Urswick, with a runic inscription, which he redates to the eighth to ninth centuries on the basis of his identification of one figural scene as evidence of a dispute over "the date of Easter and monastic hairdressing." There is real difficulty, however, in dating the cross as early as the phonology suggests, on the evidence of its style and decoration. The dress of the

figures in the scene referred to is possibly secular dress, which also suggests a later date. The arguments concerning its style and date are considered in volume 2 of the *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture*.

John F. Potter takes a fresh look at dating Anglo-Saxon churches in "No Stone Unturned—A Re-assessment of Anglo-Saxon Long-and-Short Quoins and Associated Structures," *ArchJ* 162 (2006 for 2005): 177–214. This is a lengthy account of "almost all" recognized Anglo-Saxon churches in respect of specific features—quoins, pilaster strips and arch jambs. He begins with a useful survey of earlier studies on the significance of these features before commencing his own review. In this, he proposes a new system for describing the way the bedding orientation of the sedimentary stones used in these features lie in relation to the walls into which they are inserted—specifically, whether used horizontally (the natural position) or vertically, in which case whether they appear on the side or edge also becomes significant. He concludes that his very detailed examination shows that the Anglo-Saxon masons selected stones for their purposes with an understanding of the bedding planes and an appreciation of the decorative qualities to be obtained by varying their orientation in quoins, pilaster and jambs, particularly as many such stones were not from the local underlying geology but were often brought in from outside and/or were reused Roman stone. Each type of construction is analyzed to show that particular choices were exploited to decorative effect in each. His thesis is that these analyses can be used to identify hitherto unrecognized Anglo-Saxon portions of churches, and to differentiate pre-Conquest from Norman work, or more recent repair work (although he is scrupulous in noting exceptions in both pre- and post-Conquest work). He concludes with an appendix of notes on some of the structures examined and tables relating to each of the three analyzed structures, and all churches examined which exhibit the features discussed. The main text is also illustrated with drawings of each type of structure (with a terminology for describing the bedding orientation deployed in each), and photographs. "Anglo-Saxon Building Techniques: Quoins of Twelve Kentish Churches Reviewed," *Archaeologia Cantiana* 126: 185–218, by the same author, builds on his analysis in the previously mentioned paper by looking in more detail at twelve Kentish churches, in respect of their quoin construction only. Some information on bedding orientation is repeated from the main study. In his conclusions he notes the possibility of other types of construction in the Anglo-Saxon period not covered by his analysis (and Kent is very rich in flint-built churches, for example), while other

churches may have or have had quoins which cannot be studied because now covered up or removed in later repairs. He points out that his chosen churches include some long known to be Anglo-Saxon, others classified as such by previous architectural historians such as the Taylors, but also some which only emerge as Anglo-Saxon because of his analysis. It will be interesting to see whether this technique wins acceptance.

Tim Tatton Brown, with a major contribution by Bernard Worssam, "A New Survey of the Fabric of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Bosham, West Sussex," *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 144: 129–54, reviews previous studies of this church, using documentary sources, and reassesses its architectural history in the light of these and archaeological evidence. In distinguishing different periods of building, he shows the usefulness of studying the use of different building stone types. The late Anglo-Saxon remains, confined to the three lower storeys of the western tower and parts of the nave and chancel, are described in detail on pp. 131–2; the building stone types and cutting methods used in this period are in Worssam's excellent study on pp. 141–4. The use of this evidence allows the authors to conclude that the chancel arch is Norman rather than Anglo-Saxon, which, if true, reverses some previous studies.

The previously earliest known history of the church discussed in "The Church of St Mary's at Linton near Ross," *Church Archaeology* 7–9 (2003–2005): 21–32 by Stephen Yeates, dates from the 1086 Domesday entry. The author considers that this entry describes attributes associated with a church of minster status, but also implies a reduced status. He therefore focuses on any evidence from all documentary sources which might suggest either the possible extent of its pre-Conquest *Parochia*, or that there was originally a royal church at the center of a large estate. He supports these slight suggestions by a study of the fabric of the church, first describing the stone types used in the church, followed by a structural analysis of the building, partly based on the variable thicknesses of the walls (supported by detailed drawings in plan and section), from which he suggests that the shell of the nave is Anglo-Saxon, as indicated by the quoins in the east wall; that the west end of the north wall of the north aisle might also be Anglo-Saxon, possibly re-using Roman stone; and that the insertion of the north wall arcade dates to the eleventh century. The analysis of the building takes in several further phases, taking the development of the church up to 1876.

Several studies of Anglo-Saxon cathedrals appeared in the 2006 bibliography. The restoration of a beautiful thirteenth-century tiled pavement at the east end

of Westminster Abbey has been in the news recently. Kevin Blockley, in "Westminster Abbey: Anglo-Saxon Masonry below the Cosmati Pavement," *ArchJ* 161 (2005 for 2004): 223–33, records a detailed examination of the area in advance of the conservation of the floor. When the pavement was repaired in the nineteenth century, remains of the presbytery of King Edward the Confessor's church, consecrated in 1065, had been found and preserved in under floor pits accessed by manholes. Part of the apse of the mid-eleventh century uncovered in the Chapel of Edward the Confessor had been similarly preserved. These remains have now been recorded in stone-by-stone detail in both plan and elevation. The investigation revealed two phases of construction: one ca. 1050–65, exemplified by the pier bases of the presbytery; the second the construction of the a new abbey church from 1246 onwards (consecrated 1269), with the laying of the Cosmati pavement 1267–8. The main discoveries in each pit are described and illustrated in plan and elevation, and also by photographs, leading to a new interpretative plan (illustrated on p. 232). The east end of the Anglo-Saxon was apsidal (but may have had more than one apse) and possibly an ambulatory, and there appear to have been two steps between the presbytery and the sanctuary.

Warwick Rodwell, in "Lichfield Cathedral: Archaeology of the Sanctuary," *Church Archaeology* 7–9 (2003–2005): 1–6, begins with a survey of the church's early history, from the burial of St. Chad in 669 recorded by Bede, to a brief period of archiepiscopal status for the see from 787–802, under the aegis of Offa of Mercia. An excavation in 1992–4 had found Anglo-Saxon walls and burials, suggesting that the pre-Norman cathedral lay axially beneath the present building. This Anglo-Saxon archaeology is re-assessed here in the light of further excavations undertaken in 2003–04 when a new nave sanctuary was constructed in the second bay of the nave west of the crossing. These revealed foundations of a west wall and parts of the north and south walls of a substantial rectangular building, ca. 7 m wide, of Anglo-Saxon date, on the same alignment as the Norman and later churches but slightly offset to the south. It was not possible to decide whether this was the main building or the west end of a more elongated building, but there were at least three burials which suggested it was not the main body of the church. A narrow rectangular cell was also discovered attached to the west wall. The most exciting discovery was in the main body of the building: a semi-rectangular chamber, ca. 2 m square, originally lined with either lead or timber (though none of its lining had survived). If lead, this was possibly a baptistery, but if timber, the

author suggests it might have been a small burial crypt or *hypogeum* with access from the east. Either interpretation is supported by the evidence for a pillared canopy (*baldachino*) of which one of four original columns was found, and which would have marked out the presence of the structure above floor level. It is noted that this embellishment was later than the crypt/baptistery, but still stratigraphically early. The suggestion is that this may have been the burial place of St. Chad, which the author considers supported by the remarkable discovery of a polychrome Anglo-Saxon sculpture of an angel, probably half of an Annunciation scene, which would have formed one corner of a hollow rectangular block—possibly part of a coped chest with lid—concerning which Bede's description of the burial place is cited. The sculpture is dated to the late eighth century, by comparison with other Mercian sculpture. A possible ritual reburial of a desecrated sculpture after a Viking raid is suggested, as the burial of the sculpture post-dates the spread of burnt material across the site and predates a coin of Edgar (957–75).

Mark Johnson, in "New Clues to the Development of Beverley Minster," *Church Archaeology* 7–9 (2003–2005): 138–41, describes the result of a small excavation outside the north and south nave walls, undertaken by the York Archaeological Trust in 2003. Again this is in connection with an early saint—as later documentary sources identify the monastery of *Inderuuda* in which Bede records the burial in 721 of St. John of Beverley (Bishop of Hexham and later of York) with the minster at Beverley. An earlier excavation had revealed a possible part of the monastic enclosure with a surrounding ditch of eighth century date. The new excavations revealed evidence of early structures overlaid by tenth century burials in wooden coffins (dated by dendrochronology). The Anglo-Saxon nave, it is suggested on the basis of the alignment of these burials, lay within the area of the present, fourteenth century, nave. There were later burials of the eleventh to thirteenth centuries suggesting a similar layout. The only trace of an earlier church so far, however, is of a buttressed nave of late twelfth to thirteenth century date but incorporating earlier twelfth century material, which also underlay the present fourteenth century nave.

Christopher Guy and Sally Crawford, in "The Search for a Late Anglo-Saxon Cathedral," *Current Archaeology* 204: 652–55, explore and then discard the possibility that Worcester's circular Chapter House, apparently the earliest of this form, had been influenced by a prior Anglo-Saxon rotunda. It was, however, found to have been built over part of the lay Anglo-Saxon cemetery, including some burials with fragments of textiles,

possibly shrouds. Also discovered was a small fragment of late Anglo-Saxon sculpture (an animal head p. 652), and a stretch of Anglo-Saxon lead pipe.

Warwick Rodwell, "Lichfield Cathedral: archaeology of the sanctuary," *Church Archaeology* 7–9 (2003): 1–6, is a report of the excavation of the nave of Lichfield cathedral which unexpectedly revealed the remains of an Anglo-Saxon church and a pre-Viking Age piece of sculpture ("the Lichfield Angel"). The church may go back to the time when Chad was consecrated bishop of Mercia in 669. The building of the Anglo-Saxon church seems to have been a gradual process, with an early church and several extensions, including a sunken chamber with a presumed canopy of honor (*baldachino*) which functioned as a shrine. The "Lichfield Angel" sculpture has been dated to the eighth century and was presumably made in Mercia, since it has close affinities with a piece of sculpture at Breedon-on-the-Hill, Leicestershire. It depicts a male figure, winged and draped with his hand raised in a blessing and had been colored at the time of deposition. It is interpreted to depict the Archangel Gabriel at the Annunciation. At some stage it had been broken and placed into a small pit. The author is ready to blame this on some unsubstantiated "Viking activity." Little evidence has been found for late Anglo-Saxon activity, apart from the position of the north and south wall.

In *Excavation on the Site of Norwich Cathedral Refectory, 2002–3*, East Anglian Archaeological Reports 116 (Norfolk: Norfolk Museum Services), Heather Wallis reports on the excavation of Anglo-Saxon contexts underneath the refectory of the Norman cathedral at Norwich. The site is evidence for an expansion of Norwich during the late Anglo-Saxon period. There was no evidence for early Anglo-Saxon activity, but by the late period the area seems to have housed rubbish pits and had a road built on it. Due to the limits of excavating downwards no overall structures could be detected. Finds include pottery sherds from the tenth century, as well as small-craft objects, some bone working as well as some smithing debris from late Anglo-Saxon contexts. Among the animal bones found from this context were cattle, sheep/goat, pig, rabbit, and deer, which were foodstuffs, as well as dog and cat bones. It seems that the age of death of food animals differs between the Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman periods since Anglo-Saxon animals seem to have been quite old at the time of slaughter, whereas later periods also record evidence for very young animals, indicating that they were reared on site.

Christopher Herbert begins his article, "Permanent Eastern Sepulchres: A Victorian Re-creation?" *Church*

Archaeology 7–9 (2003–2005): 7–19, by considering the documentary evidence in the Winchester *Regularis Concordia* of the tenth century for the instructions relating to the sepulcher on the altar; he argues that there are vagaries in the language (*altare* can refer to the whole sanctuary as well as the more specific table) that may complicate the positioning of the cross. Further, he presents a short-form argument on the architectural presentation in the east end (rather than the west) and audience reception that suggests that the intention was to make the spectacle of burying the cross dramatic, visible, and instructive for the viewing laity. Attentive to the wide variety of crosses made and used, Herbert uses the Brussels cross as an exemplar of the kind of cross which might have been carried in; this draws attention to a direct contradiction that in the tenth century, it was not a consecrated host placed in the sepulchre, as is frequently claimed by nineteenth- and some twentieth-century scholars. Following liturgical uses related to Winchester and many later in date, Herbert makes a convincing case against the idea of a permanent structure, noting omissions of the deposition; the most important section of this may be the connection of Lanfranc's emphasis on the nature of the Host and the development of the Sarum Rite which specifies a consecrated host but not the nature of the sepulcher itself. There may have been a number of structures used as sepulchers, including aumbries and freestanding wooden storage lockers; there were early permanent structures rarely but possibly, as at St. Michael's, Aston Clinton (Buckinghamshire), but Herbert examines the way in which renovations and antiquarian interpretations, particularly Pugin in the nineteenth century, have perpetuated these ideas.

Part of a larger examination of medieval Devon and Cornwall that considers a broad spectrum of archaeological and geographic material, †Sam Turner's chapter, "The Christian Landscape: Churches, Chapels and Crosses," *Medieval Devon and Cornwall*, ed. Turner, 24–43, argues that the foundations of later medieval Christian building in the area should be sought in the eighth and ninth centuries. Turner first traces the spotty written records, noting accounts of the Easter Controversy as part of a political identification as well as the issues of self-identification with the Roman or Celtic traditions in the early Church of the extreme South-West. Turner is also interested in the social nuances of the area, using inscribed stones with their associations to Celtic practice, but their use of Latin, English, and Irish alphabets and names demonstrate how complicated the expression of personal social identity might be; the issue of tying Christian artifacts like

these memorials to boundaries as a way of identifying both political and religious identity is similarly connotative. Turner then considers the abandonment of the trading center at Tintagel in the seventh century and the subsequent emphasis placed on parish churches, often associated directly with burial grounds, as part of the transformation of the region to medieval agricultural organization and the foundations for later medieval church activity. The bulk of the chapter is devoted to Turner's examination of the holy monuments in the region, including evidence of well-developed cult worship, and the boundary, protective, and worship functions of these cross stones. Turner helps us to see distinctions between their copious remnants in Cornwall and meager remains in Devon, which may help us to better understand medieval religious practice in the period between the seventh and tenth centuries.

d. Artifacts and Iconography

In an interesting article ("Constantinian Crosses in Northumbria," *The Place of the Cross*, ed. Karkov *et al.* [see sec. 1], 3–13, Ian Wood takes a fresh look at the development of the cult of the cross in Northumbria, taking as his starting point Bede's description of Oswald's wooden cross at Heavenfield, and developing into a detailed study of the literary accounts of the finding of the true cross and the importance of these in the imagination of the Anglo-Saxons. He looks in some detail at what visitors might have seen at Jerusalem both before and after the Persian attack in 614 AD, and how descriptions of the crosses including relics of the true cross there relate to the stories of the Emperor Constantine's vision of the cross at the battle of the Milvian bridge, and those of the discovery of the true cross by his mother Helena. The interpretation of these literary accounts in art (widely) and in poetry (especially for his purposes in Anglo-Saxon poetry) as *cruces gemmatae* he suggests make his main point, that "representations, both literary and visual, [act] on and [react] to other representations—and in the case of Anglo-Saxon representations, they belong to the worlds of the eighth century." The implications for representations of the cross in Anglo-Saxon art, however, are not discussed.

Rosemary Cramp, with contributions by C. Roger Bristow *et al.* *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture, Volume VII: South-West England* (Oxford: Oxford UP) provides the definitive study of the pre-Conquest sculpture of another area of England, in a volume which maintains the high standards of an important series. It has the same format as preceding volumes, with a detailed catalogue set out by modern county, supported

by photographs of every carved face, and with a lengthy introduction by the main author covering previous research, historical background, monument forms, ornament, iconography, and the implications of these for a regional study, supplemented by additional chapters on geology (Roger Bristow and Bernard C. Worssam) and inscriptions (John Higgitt). The catalogue includes analyses of the iconography and dating of every piece, at some length for some important pieces (see for example Bristol 1, pp. 145–6 and the illustration on p. 198), and some important new material (for example Canterbury 1a–c), which along with other fragments gives an indication of what has been lost in this region from late Anglo-Saxon monumental art. The volume covers an area in which the sculpture of this period is more thinly spread than in some areas of northern England, but among those surviving are many pieces of great interest for their distinctiveness of iconography and ornament, or innovation in monument form. In relation to this last, the section on fonts (38–40), sometimes said not have been an Anglo-Saxon monument type, is particularly important. The argument for patronage links within the area and with other Anglo-Saxon kingdoms (70–71) as the necessary context for understanding the function and status of monuments and their grouping is well-made and significant for the remainder of the chapter. This (chapter IX: Regional Distinction and Problems of Dating), includes an important section on “iconic figures,” on the evidence for example of large-scale roods, angels, and representations of the Virgin, culminating in an assessment of the whole area covered by the volume, in which “the monuments of western Wessex, although not as numerous as those in some other kingdoms, can be seen as an important reflection of the devotion of their time.”

Elizabeth Okasha's paper on “Script-Mixing in Anglo-Saxon Inscriptions,” *Writing and Texts in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Rumble [see sec. 6], 62–70 is a thought-provoking piece, raising questions concerning literacy and the perception of languages in Anglo-Saxon England. She first provides an interesting introduction on the concept of “code-mixing” using modern examples from conversations between bilinguals and from advertisements, followed by an analysis of the conscious use of different languages for different purposes in Anglo-Saxon texts. This is contrasted with the study of inscriptions, which are usually very short and in which the question of what language the original audience might have perceived a specific text to have been written in can be difficult to answer. This is relevant here as most such inscriptions are on artifacts, many on sculptures.

The first example chosen is that of the sundial from Aldbrough in Yorkshire, in which the syntax and morphology are Old English but out of nine separate words, six are Old English, two are Scandinavian personal names, and one is Old Norse. The usual reading is to see this as Old English with a Scandinavian flavor but the author suggest this may be a modern perception, and re-reads it to show a more significant Old Norse emphasis is possible even though the syntax and morphology remain English. Another example is the use of the Greek letters Α and Ω (Alpha and Omega)—were these perceived as Greek, Latin, or Old English words? She suggests they might have been seen as a cryptic way of writing certain Latin words, a suggestion also made for the abbreviations “ihs” and “xps” for Jesus and Christus. After a number of other examples which raise similar questions, the author suggests that the interest of inscriptions, seen as short written texts, is that they might have resembled (more closely than longer texts) spoken texts of the time—as what matters in short texts and speech is that meaning has to be plain without need for glossing. Inscriptional texts, she maintains, are from a different world from more extended writing—one where literacy only matters because it served some useful function, such as advertising good workmanship or asking for prayers. Awareness and recognition of different languages would then have been, as now, a privilege of the educated.

In “An Eighth-Century Inscribed Cross-Slab in Dull, Perthshire,” *Scottish Archaeological Jnl* 25 (2003): 57–71, by Robert S. Will, Katherine Forsyth, Thomas O. Clancy, and Gifford Charles-Edwards, the known history of a church documented only from the twelfth century is described, up to and including excavations in 2002–3, in which was discovered an inscribed, cross-decorated slab. The personal name in the inscription appears to be Gaelic. The slab is dated on stylistic and palaeographical grounds to the eighth century, and it is suggested that the church may have been the site of a Columban monastery founded from Iona, possibly as early as 700 AD. The authors note that the inscribed recumbent cross-slab, while typical at Irish sites, is known in Scotland only on Iona.

“Knowledge of Whelk Dyes and Pigments in Anglo-Saxon England,” *ASE* 35: 23–55, by C.P. Biggam, will be of great interest for the study of literature and linguistics, manuscript and textile studies, since it is concerned with evaluating evidence for the use of whelk-dye in Anglo-Saxon England for coloring both imported textiles and garments, and for dying or coloring parchment or textiles carried out in Anglo-Saxon England. The author ranges widely over both archaeological and

linguistic evidence, evidence from non-destructive techniques (Raman spectroscopy and X-Ray fluorescence) applied to Anglo-Saxon artifacts including manuscripts, and dye analysis of Anglo-Saxon textiles. There are detailed discussions of color vocabulary in the (modern) ranges red, purple, blue, used by Bede and Aldhelm and their later glossators, which, the author suggests, indicates that both were aware of whelk dyes and correctly described them within the color terminology of their day. There is archaeological evidence for vat-dyeing from whelks on some scale from Ireland but none so far from mainland Britain: however, here the author points to the possibility of small-scale dyeing direct from the whelk or using whelk eggs, apparently recorded as practiced in some areas in the seventeenth century—such a method if practiced earlier would have left no archaeological trace. The evidence from manuscripts produced positive evidence for whelk dye on only one page of one manuscript tested, and no evidence has yet been found from any dye-tested textile, but here it seems that non-destructive testing methods are only beginning to be used. The author concludes by demolishing the argument that imported “purple” textiles are unlikely because of Byzantine imperial restrictions and the vast costs associated with textiles of this level by noting that that cheaper, lower-grade purple dyes of less than imperial quality were available even in the Byzantine world and widely sold. This paper is an important addition to Carole Biggam’s well-regarded series of color studies.

Seiichi Suzuki, in “The Undley Bracteate Reconsidered: Archaeological, Linguistic and Runological Perspectives,” *ASSAH* 13: 31–49, begins with an explanation of the bracteate form and its geographical distribution, with an account of the four main types by which the form has hitherto been categorized. This forms a useful background to an exhaustive description of the bracteate that is the subject of the paper, which with only three others, it is suggested, forms a new distinct group. Furthermore, *contra* John Hines, it shows by its distribution that it is part of the “Saxon cultural province,” as distinct from the Anglian. The Anglo-Saxon example is therefore considered to be an import, again a new interpretation. In support of this is a lengthy discussion of the runic inscription, identified (in line with the argument as to origins suggested above) as pre-Old Saxon, rather than Anglo-Saxon. It will be interesting to see if proponents of other views re-enter the argument, particularly in reference to interpretation of the inscription. In the case of the article reviewed here, however, it is sometimes difficult to extract the significant features of the argument from the overwhelming mass of detail.

The Saxon Relief Style, BAR British Series 410 (Oxford: John and Erica Hedges), by Peter A. Inker, will be a useful source book for the study of the relief style in equal-armed, applied, and saucer brooches, for those interested in early metalwork, the development of art styles, and the origins of Germanic settlers in England. The background to the study is the identification of the material culture of the Saxons in their homeland, from the third to eighth centuries in the area around and especially south of the River Elbe. The spread to other areas of settlement is noted, particularly in the Netherlands. The origins of the style in Roman metalwork are discussed. Chapter three considers the introduction of the style in England in the fifth and sixth centuries, and chapter four (probably the main focus of the book) is a detailed study of the style in the Avon Valley, chosen apparently because a previously rather neglected region (it is not clear how typical this is of other regions in which the style appeared). In this section the author notes early conservatism in copying homeland types but notes that by the sixth century there were moves to a new style “more dynamic and less well-defined”—a new English form of the Saxon Relief style was developed.

Chris Fern, in “An Anglo-Saxon Disc Brooch from Bletchington, Oxfordshire, with Style II Animal Art,” *Oxford Jnl of Archaeology* 25: 311–16, discusses technique and style of a disc-brooch found in 2003, which she identifies as a high-status dress-fastener with gilt animal ornament (Style II) and garnet setting, which she dates to the period 575–610. The most interesting point is that its ornament appears to represent a local variant of a new animal style.

A useful addition to the corpus of lead models of early-medieval precious-metal or copper alloy artifacts is recorded in “A Lead Model for a Late 5th- or Early 6th-Century Sword-Pommel,” *MA* 50: 243–49, by Barry Ager. However, its potential for illuminating relations between Scandinavia and England in the Migration period is compromised because the exact find spot was not recorded—it was purchased in London but could have come from the Thames or from a collection of items of Scandinavian origin. It is unfinished and has animal ornament of Salin’s style I, dating it the late fifth to the early sixth century. The paper gives a detailed description, including full details of metal content from X-ray fluorescence, and of the ornament. The author concludes by saying that, while its form compares best with a group of mainly southern Scandinavian silver sword pommels, its unfinished state makes it difficult to be certain whether it is of Scandinavian or Anglo-Saxon origin. Its main importance is that it

provides evidence for the purpose of such models as an intermediate stage in the casting process, although, as he acknowledges, the precise method is still under debate.

Tania M. Dickinson, Chris Fern, and Mark A. Hall discuss the significance of the discovery of a cruciform bridle-fitting, a surface find from 150 miles farther north than any previous find of an Anglo-Saxon object decorated in Salin's style I, in "An Early Anglo-Saxon Bridle-Fitting from South Leckaway, Forfar, Angus, Scotland," *MA* 50: 249–60. This is positively identified as early Anglo-Saxon by reference to a burial from Lakenheath, Eriswell, Suffolk, of a horse with its head-harness and snaffle bit still in position. The fitting is discussed in comparison with the full range of similar fittings from England, which shows its nearest parallels are a series from Cheesecake Hill, grave 4, Driffield, Yorkshire; and one from Fring, Norfolk; noting that the majority from all sites are decorated in Salin's style I animal ornament, which arose in Scandinavia in the late fifth century but is found in England mainly in objects of the sixth century. There is an interesting analysis of ideas as to the route of the transmission of the style as it is applied to cruciform-lozengiform fittings as at South Leckaway, all pointing to an origin in Kentish Style I, but continuing in Anglian areas of the east of England until possibly as late as the second half of the sixth century. The remainder of the article (256–60) is concerned with a different kind of route of transmission, from England to Pictland. This points out that in spite of enmity between Picts and Angles in the seventh century, Northumbrian and Pictish royals were social peers and in some cases actually kin, while the life of St. Cuthbert also indicates another type of high level cultural contact along the eastern sea route. The authors argue that these relationships and contacts, which become visible in the seventh to eighth centuries, could have been economic and artistic, as well as military, political or religious, and that they probably evolved from earlier but less visible ones. Other rare examples of early finds are usefully noted in support of this argument, concluding with special reference to Dunadd a late sixth- to early seventh-century site with metalwork and other objects in other materials including Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Saxon related objects. The explanation of the South Leckaway find, it is concluded, might lie in the context of exchange between the Pictish elite and peer-groups in Anglo-Saxon kingdoms—possibly East Anglia or Kent, as well as nearer Northumbria.

Carol Neuman de Vegvar, in "High Style and Borrowed Finery: The Strood Mount, the Long Wittenham

Stoup, and the Boss Hall Brooch as Complex Responses to Continental Visual Culture," *Conversion and Colonization in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Karkov and Howe [see sec. 1], 31–58, is an attempt to redefine the terms of discourse in relation to the Southumbrian reception of Frankish visual culture, in opposition to some rather extreme views centering on the finds from Sutton Hoo Mound 1, which define such reception either as "all-out" acceptance or rejection of Frankish hegemony. Neuman de Vegvar prefers an approach which acknowledges "shifting and variable attitudes to the influence [of Europe] over time," and in particular she suggests that "perceptions of colonialism both by the Anglo-Saxons themselves and by modern interpreters of their age, are subjective and highly variable." Her first two examples concern imported objects of originally Christian significance found in probably pagan but certainly secular graves, which may have carried connotations of prestige in assemblages of objects otherwise reflecting purely local practices: her point here is that despite their prestige value, the rarity of such finds indicates there was no great demand for them, an impression reinforced by the lack of local imitation. She is also able to show, through an admirably detailed study of the Boss Hall brooch, that real influence from objects from a much wider geographic range can be found (in this case Ostrogothic Italy or Visigothic Spain), indicating the existence of patrons drawn from a wealthy and well-traveled elite with concerns and individual agendas at variance with those more narrowly political issues suggested by the views with which she is arguing.

Gabor Thomas, in "Reflections on a '9th-Century' Northumbrian Metalworking Tradition: A Silver Hoard from Poppleton, North Yorkshire," *MA* 50: 143–64, describes and discusses the significance of a hoard found on the outskirts of York. The find produced two matching sets of four strap-ends and fragments of an openwork silver disc. He interprets the disc fragments as most likely parts of a disc-brooch with a projecting loop possibly for a safety chain, dated on stylistic grounds to between the mid- eighth to the late-ninth centuries. The discussion, however, concentrates on all aspects of the strap-ends, including methods of manufacture (a hand-wrought technique involving bending a silver strip in two); function (possibly terminals to woven girdles; or in view of their size possibly to heavier leather straps, including possibly satchels or horse harness); style (Trewiddle); and when and where they were made (Northumbria, late ninth to early tenth century). The author rightly identifies the Northumbrian sub-genre defined in the strap-ends as the major importance of the find overall.

“Sword Pommel,” *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 64.2: 24, by C[harles] T. L[ittle], loses some of its value as a record of an important find because it does not include any exact record of a find spot. It records a recent acquisition by the Metropolitan Museum of an Anglo-Saxon sword pommel (copper decorated with silver panels inlaid with niello) dated to the late ninth century, the decorative techniques suggested by the author to have been a specialty of East Anglian metalworkers of the period of Alfred: the Fuller Brooch is cited in comparison. It would have been interesting to know whether this attribution is purely based on style, or whether the find spot actually supported this opinion.

The Hoen Hoard: A Viking Gold Treasure of the Ninth Century, Acta ad Archaeologiam et Artium Historiam Pertinentia 14 (Rome: Bardi Editore), edited by Signe Horn Fuglesang and David M. Wilson, is a detailed study of this important find from the south-east of Norway, discovered originally in 1834. The claim, made in the first few lines of the introduction, that it is probably the most important such find discovered in Scandinavia, seems reasonable in view of the quality of the remains and the range of origins of some of the pieces. The introduction shows the determination of the scholars gathered to examine the hoard and its individual pieces anew, without preconceptions based on the attributions proposed by earlier scholars: the re-attribution of some supposed Russian items (and other supposed foreign imports) to Scandinavian manufacture is one result. The production date of the latest items in the hoard is the third quarter of the ninth century, with the date of the deposition about then or later in the same century. Earlier suggestions that this was a votive or temple hoard are rejected, as is the suggestion that it was a jeweler’s hoard. David Wilson, discussing the hoard in relation to other finds, suggests that most of the items could be parts of one multi-stranded necklace, and that all of it could have been worn by one person or members of one family: and the degree of wear suggests it was worn. Pre-conquest students of metalwork will want to read every section because of the discussion of techniques of manufacture as well as style, and because of its relevance to the study of metalwork from Viking-Age England. David Wilson supplies the chapter on the only Anglo-Saxon item in the hoard (after the re-attribution of the largest of the pendants to Scandinavia), a ring in the Trewhiddle style dated to the ninth century (pp. 119–21 and plate 17).

A study of an inscribed lead pendant with a lightly incised Crucifixion scene is an interesting addition to the corpus of objects with this iconography. David

Howlett, however, in “An Inscribed Lead Pendant from Norfolk,” *AntJ* 86: 320–26, only briefly comments on this aspect, which he relates to Insular analogues though without giving any precise parallels. He does allude to some interesting Hiberno-Latin literary parallels, especially one which describes the cross as a “fork-shaped yoke,” in connection with the upward sloping arms of the cross on the pendant, and to others which mention the titulus above Christ’s head, possibly intended by a lightly incised square above Christ’s head on the pendant. His interest, however, lies with the two inscribed lines of Anglo-Latin on the reverse as a different kind of parallel: the Hiberno-Latin texts, he says, have an alphanumeric value, and so does the inscription. This is in an Anglo-Saxon script of the tenth century or later which, translated, gives “+ the Name of God is in Hebrew El, Lord, and also Adonai.” It is the author’s contention that this is two lines of decasyllabic verse, “the symmetry of which, in words and syllables and letters, is a verbal equivalent of the symmetrical disposition of decorative elements on side A.” It is certainly interesting in its use of Hebrew, Greek and Latin names for God, but its relationship with Insular parallels in view of its date (which is not disputed), seems much less certain. There are in fact tenth century Anglo-Saxon sculptured crucifixion scenes which are parallels to the form of the cross—Nassington, Northamptonshire, and Newent and Wormington, both Gloucestershire, spring to mind.

An attempt to establish the origin of Germanic body armor, specifically chain mail, looks at its early history among the Scythians and Sarmatians from the fifth to third centuries BC, and attempts to account for its transition to the Celtic, Roman and, Scandinavian worlds. Carla Morini, “OE *Hring*: Anglo-Saxon or Viking Armour?” *ASSAH* 13: 155–72, suggests that the only example discovered from Anglo-Saxon England is the fragment of neck protector from Sutton Hoo—this is in contrast with numerous finds from Viking areas. It appears that body armor is first documented for England only in late Anglo-Saxon laws and wills. Illustrations of chain mail in late manuscripts and in the Bayeux tapestry she ascribes to Scandinavian influence. However, one might point to successive Scandinavian invasions and the reign of Scandinavian rulers such as Cnut to suggest that body armor including chain mail might have been more familiar to Anglo-Saxons than this analysis suggests—I can think of at least one sculptural depiction dating from the late Pre-Conquest period, at Winchester.

Lloyd Laing, with Matthew Ponting, “Some Anglo-Saxon Artefacts from Nottinghamshire,” *ASSAH* 13:

80–96, draws together some finds both from recent excavations and metal detectors from an area apparently not well-documented archaeologically up to now. The finds are listed chronologically, starting with two from Roman sites; a longer section (items 3–26) representative of pagan Anglo-Saxon settlements in the Newark area; and a few from the late Anglo-Saxon period from various sites. Each section opens with a brief description of previous knowledge in the period/area covered, thus attempting to fill in the identified knowledge gap. The finds are mainly metalwork, but a whetstone is included. Ponting supplies an analysis of the metallic composition of a number of the objects.

In “The Earliest English Lead Tokens?” *Coinage and History in the North Sea World*, ed. Cook and Williams [see sec. 2], 589–600, Geoff Egan discusses the find in London at the Guildhall Yard site of nineteen lead or lead-alloy coin-like items, some plain some with cast devices, which he suggests may be the earliest English lead tokens identified, though he leaves what function they may have served open to question. The date of these finds by various means, such as associated ceramics or dendrochronology has been assigned to the period ca. 1050–1140, which straddles the Norman Conquest—the author clearly assumes a Norman date, though suggesting the date range just leaves open the possibility of use before 1066 (592).

“Saxon Timber from Porlock Marsh,” *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History* 147 (2004): 183–85, by Richard McDonnell, records the discovery of a roughly-hewn plank fragment with two crudely cut mortices through its thickness, dated by Carbon-14 analysis to a date range of 780–1020 A.D. This is the second fragment with mortices to have been found in the same area.

Richard N. Bailey and Jenny Whalley, “A miniature hogback from the Wirral,” *Antiquaries Journal* 86: 345–57, is a report on a hitherto unknown Viking hogback from Bidston near Meols in the Wirral. The object was found in the former vicarage of St. Oswald’s Church. The decoration is a central interlace pattern which is flanked by two beasts with open jaws and may have been made from local sandstone. The composition of the ornamentation is unique in parts, however; some of the stone is quite weathered, which makes identification difficult. The interlacing of three interlinked Staffordshire knots has been interpreted as a reference to the Trinity. The ornamentation dates this hogback to the first half of the tenth century. The position of the stone underlines the position of Meols as an important trading place in the tenth century. The hogback underlines a Hiberno-Norse identity of the person or group commemorated by them.

Elizabeth Coatsworth, “Inscriptions on textiles associated with Anglo-Saxon England,” *Writing and Texts in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Rumble [see sec. 6], 71–95, is an investigation of textile inscriptions with an added corpus of the inscriptions on the Bayeux Tapestry. While inscriptions on other media have been well-researched, there has been no comparative study or even a catalogue of material from textiles that were made in Anglo-Saxon England. Coatsworth looks at the extant corpus—ranging from the ninth embroideries dedicated to SS. Harlindis and Relindis, now at Maaseik in Belgium, to the post-conquest embroidery commonly known as the Bayeux Tapestry.

“The Discovery of an Anglo-Saxon Painted Figure at St Mary’s Church, Deerhurst, Gloucestershire,” *AntJ* 86: 66–109, by Steve Bagshaw, Richard Bryant, and Michael Hare highlights the find and examination of the painting. Given the extreme rarity of Anglo-Saxon wall painting, the find is of importance and the authors do a very thorough job of explaining the architectural context on the north wall of the east end with a posited but not extant match on the south wall, the shallow cut setting out lines on the panel, and the red wash without further pigmentation that suggests that this was a unfinished preparatory drawing. The iconographic discussion of the figure itself—a standing figure with prominent halo, likely holding a book—is perhaps overly thorough in its catalogue of English and Continental precedents for the form; the authors try to place this panel in the context of the tenth-century Winchester School and the images derived from the tenth-century Carolingian Ada School by specific references to the copy of Gregory the Great’s Pastoral Care (Oxford, St. John’s College, MS 28, fol. 2) or the Sherbourne or Dunstan Pontifical (Paris BN, MS lat. 943, fol. 6). The figure itself hardly warrants the attention of this iconographic depth, but the extensive discussion of the petrology and assemblage of the church which follows is of critical importance, as the authors posit an unusually high level chancel chapel, possibly for private devotions, within the construction of a polygonal choir. As part of this visual context, given the monastic history of Deerhurst as a minster, as a site with an important local patron (Æthelric, and his father, Æthelmund), and as a site for the early career of St. Alphege (Ælfheah), this standing figure helps fill some of the extensive gaps in our still incomplete understanding of Anglo-Saxon wall painting.

In “The Cross in the West Riding of Yorkshire,” *The Place of the Cross*, ed. Karkov et al. [see sec. 1], 14–28, Elizabeth Coatsworth builds from W.G. Collingswood’s 1915 survey to include the over 200 fragments and sculptures from pre-Conquest West Riding, Yorkshire.

Challenging his assumption, based on the A-form of the cross, that the area south of Leeds only sees the development of Anglo-Saxon sculpture around 800 and was outside the Scandinavian influence of the Viking period, Coatsworth begins by assessing medieval historical and geographic boundaries for the West Riding, putting its development of an Anglo-Saxon identity a century earlier with the late sixth or early seventh century union of the kingdoms of Bernicia and Deira, and complicating its Scandinavian elements with its York entanglement (867–954). Strong site evidence is provided from Ripon, not only in its monastery but also in its sculptural works; Coatsworth dissects the lorgnette designs of the Adhyse Cross, once thought to be first half of the ninth century as “late A,” as part of a transitional phase of the late seventh century, pointing to a formal development from Deira to Bernicia. She further considers a stone built into the steps of the crypt of Ripon Cathedral, which has zigzag and twist ornament; never originally a step, its post and rail design suggests either a cross or altar base. Coatsworth draws on analysis of interlace cutting traditions to suggest earlier dates for Ripon cross heads. For Viking influence, Coatsworth notes the Sigurd cross head as well as a late ninth to early tenth century cross head now at St. Wilfred in Blackpool. Discussing in depth the little known, probably eighth-century cross head from Little Ouseburn, Coatsworth suggests a free armed cross with a figure of Christ (or perhaps Mary) at its center, with a few parallels from Bernicia and Mercia but very similar to the bust of Christ on the cross at Easby, North Yorkshire; the Little Ouseburn cross head could be an early surviving example of the type. The point of Coatsworth’s analysis is to question Collingswood’s isolation of the area and to suggest much more interconnection between the region and Mercia.

In “The King and His Cult: The Axe-Hammer from Sutton Hoo and Its Implications for the Concept of Sacral Leadership in EME,” *Antiquity* 80: 880–93, Andres Siegfried Dobat reinterprets one of the objects from Burial Mound 1 at Sutton Hoo, the iron axe-hammer, within the understanding of the complicated cultural context of Sutton Hoo which has emerged (particularly in the work of Martin Carver, *Sutton Hoo: A seventh-century princely burial ground and its context*, 2005). Dobat suggests that rather than the traditional assertions of the axe as a simple weapon or tool, we should be seeing it in the pagan Germanic assertions of the boat burial as a whole. He suggests the positioning in the burial chamber away from the other weaponry suggests its importance and its ceremonial function relayed by the ring at the shaft end, drawing on archaeological evidence of

admittedly rare axes from other Anglo-Saxon graves which shows the more common, much lighter *francisca* type of throwing axe. He notes the similarity to axes used for butchery but draws attention to weight, design and other parallels, such as Roman Pontifex Maximus sacrificial practices and Anglo-Saxon/Germanic animal sacrifice in connection with grave finds, to suggest that this is a symbol of sacerdotal responsibility as part of the royal identity. Dobat’s combination of archaeological and comparative literary and religious evidence makes a compelling interpretation.

e. The Bayeux Tapestry

In “Identity and Status in the Bayeux Tapestry: The Iconographic and Artefactual Evidence,” *Anglo-Norman Studies* 29: 100–20, Michael John Lewis categorizes certain iconographic elements in the Tapestry as the designer’s means of marking cultural identity—English or Norman—and social status. While interesting as an iconographic analysis, Lewis’s study becomes more important if you consider the Tapestry as a unique object, without direct prototype, because then the visual forms standardized here both suggest cultural biases and illustrate contemporary narrative practices. One of the more telling theoretical points that becomes clear is that Lewis is not making the case that these are exact representations of how the English looked or what the Normans wore; these are ways of organizing visual details to create a cohesive narrative. Forms such as the hair style and costumes of culottes and leg garters show key identifications of Norman identity as a shorthand for figural legibility. Pennant flags, cups, ships and weapons are used to create national identity as well—for instance, long hafted axes are used almost exclusively by English while the Normans typically use bows. Social status is often shown by slight changes in size and elaboration on furniture and clothing. Lewis then compares the Tapestry with contemporary parallels from manuscripts and surviving archaeological record, particularly of brooches and weaponry. Tracking these identifications also means paying attention to small changes, such as the absence of mustaches on the English in the Battle of Hastings or the attaching of social importance to the quite common round shield; Lewis also suggests issues of facture which may account for some changes. This article certainly adds to our understanding of the sophisticated nature of the narrative design of this work.

The Archaeological Authority of the Bayeux Tapestry, BAR British Series 404 (Oxford: John and Erica Hedges, 2005) is a publication from Michael John Lewis’s

dissertation submitted for the history program at the University of Kent at Canterbury; it has a number of illustrations, although the substitution of line drawings for photographs, presumably done for clarity, occasionally distracts from the author's actual point. In the initial chapter there is an invaluable summary of scholarship and what we "know" (assume) about the Tapestry as a work, from the measurements and materials to the patronage. Beginning with the second chapter, Lewis examines the correspondence between the ways works are presented in the Tapestry and the ways these elements appear in the archaeological record. First, Lewis looks at the thirty-three buildings depicted in the Tapestry against both type analysis and actual archaeological record in the cases of Mont-Saint-Michel, Westminster Abbey, and the fortifications of Dol, Rennes, Dinan, Bayeux, and Hastings Castle. His conclusion is interesting, for it suggests that the designer drew primarily on types of forms, more referential than directly copied, authentic representations. Chapter three addresses arms and armor, and again suggests that the designer was more proficient in borrowing from artistic contexts than representing exactly the weaponry used, though elements such as the conical helmets indicate knowledge of contemporary forms. Lewis presents the types of arms and armor in a correspondence to the material record of these works; while clearly useful, Lewis does not separate Anglo-Saxon versus Norman use in a way that helps us understand whether or not, in the use of artistic prototypes and the use of older examples, the designer had a bias of archaism or modernism as part of national identity. Chapter four presents material evidence for ship usage that draws on both inhumation ships and the few functional examples still extant; once again there is an impression of authenticity, but the sources here are exceedingly problematic in their failure to replicate key details of actual ship building. Chapter five is remarkable in noting the higher degree of accuracy and correspondence in contemporary dress; Lewis's analysis shows that there are a number of influences, including older manuscript representation and observation, and a use of clothing as an indicator of status and national identity. Chapter six focuses on the depiction of animals and birds in the Tapestry, raising issues of function as to where the images appear and the degree of naturalism in presentation. Chapter seven looks at the little examined area of vegetation; Lewis again draws on the importance of function and the use of elements as scenic dividers or narrative commentary is of critical importance and interest. While Lewis relies heavily on a formalist methodology and he remains particularly (and almost exclusively) interested

in the specifics of the Tapestry's patronage and creation, the book's conclusion does draw our attention to the theoretical implications of our scholarly assumptions of authenticity and historical correspondence, raising the more important questions of how we tell stories visually, how we create iconographies which are culturally vested and significant, and what that process, in and of itself, tells us about the designer and his intended audience (and indeed, of ourselves).

Briefly summarizing in very clear form the much larger discussion in his 2005 book (*Was the Bayeux Tapestry Made in France? The Case for Saint-Florent of Saumur*, reviewed in YWOES 2005), George T. Beech, in "Saint-Florent of Saumur and the Origin of the 'Bayeux Tapestry,'" *Francia* 33.1: 17–32, counters the possible English origin of the Bayeux Tapestry under Odo of Bayeux with a proposal of creation in Saint-Florent of Saumur under either William or Mathilda. While I would not presume to pronounce in this review forum on this thorny question, I would note that the absence of comparative images in the *Francia* article makes it impossible to evaluate the art historical evidence, making it a problematic choice as a summary of Beech's book. Beech begins with a history of the little studied (but much documented in medieval sources) monastery in the period between the 10th and 13th centuries, noting the presence of a textile workshop in the 11th century whose inventory contains works in the same material, size, and borders as the Bayeux embroidery. He then emphasizes the very personal connection between William the Conqueror and Abbot William of Saint-Florent of Saumur (1070–1118), suggesting that the abbey was known among these noble circles in endowments as well as in textile production. He later postulates that this personal connection is the reason for the Tapestry's prominence of the Dol scene and its divergence from the literary source account; the bulk of the article is a presentation of this evidence. The inclusion of Dol, the anti-Conan bias, and the geographic details are seen by Beech as a subtle emphasis on the Breton politics of the moment and of deliberate importance to the patron of the Tapestry. Beech's argument also presents a number of visual connections, notably between certain figures in the Bayeux Tapestry and Loire valley Romanesque figure painting, as at Saint-Hilaire-du-Bois at nearby Vihiers; the connection of Saint-Florent to Saint-Hilaire-du-Bois through later Angevin patronage maintains the idea that visual production at both sites was known within this network of patrons and producers. Beech draws attention to similarities between the lions in the borders and the few remains of capitals from Saint-Florent, though the

connection to Anglo-Saxon and Middle Eastern precedents (W.B. Yapp, 1987; Carola Hicks, 1992 and 2006) remains strong. Beech newly introduces Aesop's fables, by way of Adémar of Chabannes's own handwritten version (Leiden University, Voss. Latin 815, folios 195–204), with specific visual parallels to the ones in the borders of the Tapestry. The weakest presentation in the article, perhaps for reasons of its summary nature, is the Saint-Florent of Saumur connection to the Tapestry through the poem of Baudri, who Beech argues would have known this work well. The final section of the article attempts to forestall some of the criticism of the theory by drawing possible connections between the monasteries of Saint-Florent of Saumur and St. Augustine of Canterbury and pointing out the theoretical nature of an Odo patronage.

Gale R. Owen-Crocker, "The interpretation of gesture in the Bayeux Tapestry," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 29: 145–78, is an assessment of hand gestures in the Bayeux Tapestry with an appendix of scenes. Owen-Crocker shows how these gestures should be read; for example, the finger pointed may refer the observer to another scene or a significant person within a scene. Other gestures, such as an "open hand facing down" signify that the character is dead. Not all of the gestures are clear-cut; Owen-Crocker pays particular attention to the Ælfgifu-Emma scene. It is not clear who the female figure under the heading is supposed to be. Her appearance is read to refer to her resurrection, and Owen-Crocker thinks that the ungrammatical inscription shows that whoever embroidered it was also not quite able to understand the scene that went with it.

In another article, "The Embroidered Word: Text in the Bayeux Tapestry," *Medieval Clothing and Textiles* 2: 35–59, Owen-Crocker discusses the inscriptions in the Bayeux tapestry from all possible points of view. Some of these have been considered before, as for example when she suggests that the use of Latin probably indicates Norman patronage, while some usages and one error might imply that the text was taken down by an English scribe. She also considers in some detail the evidence for different hands at work, both of scribes and embroiderers. A most interesting suggestion is that the tapestry script resembles that of inscriptions on stone sculpture rather than that of manuscripts. Her point that the scribes (and/or the embroiderers) used punctuation and a variety of embroidery stitches to emphasize particular characters or events is particularly illuminating concerning the elaboration involved in the scene in which Harold is given the crown: that the crown was offered and not seized was an important issue politically. Further sections discuss the function and position of

the text. In particular the one titled "Vocabulary, Syntax and Rhetoric" notes the surprising poverty of the text in the first two of these areas, and the limitations of any rhetorical character to only two scenes: the occasion when Harold crosses the sea and arrives in Normandy, and William's rallying speech before the battle. The section on "Text and Graphics" notes the layout of text in relation to the action depicted, including where it occasionally overrides scene divisions; occasions when scenes have no accompanying text, or where the graphics suggest more than the inscriptions tell; and the converse, where inscriptions tell more than the graphics, particularly interesting in the discussion of the scene of Harold's capture by Guy of Pontieu. This paper breaks new ground in raising, though not necessarily completely answering, interesting questions about the creative process and the relationship between the various contributors to the completed work and how these might have worked together.

Carola Hicks's *The Bayeux Tapestry: The Life Story of a Masterpiece* (London: Chatto and Windus), is—I cannot resist saying—a ripping yarn about the history of this embroidery. Opening with a digest on the plot, Hicks then succinctly summarizes the issues of patronage and the physical presentation of the work; designed for a general readership, Hicks's writing is meant to present the controversies around issues such as patronage, and her arguments are thus presented with the barest of footnotes, though of course, the scholarship is clearly represented in the book's bibliography. The patronage chapter makes an extended case for the inclusion of Edward's widow, Edith Godwinson, in the vast list of possible/plausible/improbable patrons. Chapter four opens the section on the post-Anglo-Norman history of the embroidery, beginning with the mention in the 1476 inventory of Notre-Dame Cathedral in Bayeux; Hicks then traces the history under antiquaries like Nicolas-Joseph Foucault in the late 17th century, where her interest in social history and custom can be seen in questions such as why Foucault engaged a professional artist, how the work was reintroduced into the scholarly community, and how eighteenth century engravings changed the view of the original to make it more suitable to contemporary artistic taste. Several chapters address the ways in which the Tapestry became part of the claim of patrimony for both England and France, with thrilling stories of preservation despite Revolution, Napoleonic propaganda mills, and zealous copying in wax by Charles Stothard. Hicks makes abundantly clear the slow path that understanding of the tapestry has taken in these narratives, showcasing both the harm and the good that scholars have done in

bringing the work to light. In addition to the nationalist history of and claims on the Tapestry, Hicks's narrative of the Tapestry is also sensitive to issues of gender, as chapter twelve takes up the interest of women in the study of the Tapestry and in its replication. Section 5 of the book addresses Nazi fascination with the work and the Tapestry's history through World War II. My own feeling is that the last section of the book is perhaps the most interesting as it addresses the afterlife of the Tapestry in literature, visual arts like cartoons, advertising, and new creations of embroidery, and in the psyche of moderns in their fondness for the Middle Ages.

f. Death and Burial

Jo Buckberry's "An eye for an eye: the Anglo-Saxon execution cemetery at Walkington Wold," *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 129: 69–70, is the abstract of a poster presentation at the AAPA conference on the cemetery at Walkington Wold, East Yorkshire. Previously assumed to be the site of a fifth century massacre, the cemetery has now been identified to be a seventh-eleventh century execution ground. Bone analysis has shown that all inhabitants were men between the ages of 18–45 years of age. The paper was looking at the paleoanthropological evidence from this site.

The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Finglesham, Kent, Oxford University School of Archaeology monograph 64 (Oxford: Oxford University School of Archaeology), by Sonia Chadwick Hawkes and Guy Grainger, is a report of the sixth- to eighth-century Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Finglesham, Kent. The site was excavated between 1959 and 1967 under the supervision of the late Sonia Chadwick Hawkes, and this report has been constructed from her notes. The cemetery housed a total of 216 graves, and 218 skeletons were identified, among them 165 adults (above 15 years of age), six adolescents and 43 children (under ten years of age). The cemetery at Finglesham is renowned for its lavish grave goods. A considerable amount of weapons, glass beakers, necklets, and silver jewellery indicates an affluent community with long-reaching trade connections. Among the more unusual finds are a necklace with a copper-alloy pendant which seems to depict a human face with horns on the head, and seems to have been contained in a leather bag. The site also revealed a great amount of textiles, including some spin-patterned fabric.

Graham Hayman and Andrew Reynolds, "A Saxon and Saxo-Norman Execution Cemetery at 42–54 London Road, Staines," *The Archaeological Journal* 162 (2005): 215–55, describes an excavation on the southern side in 1999 that revealed a number of multi-period

features, among them the remains of thirty inhumation burials, all of them dated to the late Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman period. It seems that all of the thirty-five bodies recovered from the graves may have been executed, but only sixteen show unmistakable evidence of execution. There is at least one body which has been sexed female (SK 440). Some of the bodies were buried prone, and others were interred in multiple burials. Many of the skeletons show evidence for osteological changes, but this may be related to the age and lifestyle of the persons afflicted. Fourteen skeletons could not be aged, three were older than 50 years of age, three were between 20 and 30 years old, and six were adolescents, as well as one child of around ten years of age. The cemetery shares characteristics with other execution sites. The longevity of use is taken as an indication of a centrally organized judicial system. The site is placed in context with other known execution cemeteries, and Reynolds suggests that the executed multiple inhumation burials may have been punished for sexual transgression. The location of the site on a major route (the Roman road from Silchester to London) and close to a boundary seems to be one of the main characteristics of late Anglo-Saxon execution sites.

In "Approaches to violent death: a case study from early medieval Cambridge," *International Journal of Osteoarchaeology* 16: 347–54, P. Patrick offers a case study of weapon-injuries from the late Anglo-Saxon/Early Norman (ca. AD 950–1120) church cemetery at Church End, Cherry Hinton, Cambridge. Twelve individuals were identified with weapon injuries, but the main focus is skeleton 2981, a man of 35–44 years of age who showed extensive pathology, as well as at least four different weapon injuries, three of them on the head (cranium). The wounds clearly indicate that these were sword cuts. There is no firm date with which the battle could be associated, but the report offers an insight into the possible body position during the fight.

Nick Stoodley, "Changing burial practice in seventh-century Hampshire: The Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Portway West, Andover," *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society* 61: 63–80, is the evaluation of seventeen graves from the final phase cemetery at Portway West, which had replaced an earlier burial site at Portway East in Andover. Most of this site was excavated in 1981, but one grave had been recovered earlier. Three graves contained only partial skeletal remains, and it is expected that the original cemetery was much more extensive but was destroyed through later intrusion. The main cluster of graves is arranged in rows, and unlike many other final phase cemeteries, grave good assembly is fairly limited (only thirteen

objects were recovered from six graves: mainly knives, a possible spearhead, a buckle, a comb and some beads and a silver garnet composite pin). There is no evidence for coffins, planks or stone lining at this site. Most bodies were laid out supine, except for burial 17, which was lying on the right side. Grave 3 contained the multiple inhumation of two adult males, who had been decapitated, and a third person (only fragments survive from this body). This was a single grave, and the bodies of the two males had been included at a later stage. Deviant burial increases in the seventh century, but this period does not yet see evidence for execution sites that have been found from late Anglo-Saxon contexts, indicating that though this may have represented a form of punishment they are still included in the community of the dead. Stoodley points towards the Hampshire cemetery of Winnall II which also housed two decapitations and a number of disfigured people. The cemetery is located close to a parish boundary and may show a step in the development of execution sites.

C.J. Webster and R.A. Brunning, in “A Seventh-Century AD Cemetery at Stoneage Barton Farm, Bishop’s Lydeard, Somerset and Square-Ditched Burials in Post-Roman Britain,” *ArchJ* 161 (2005 for 2004): 54–81, describe the excavation of an Anglo-Saxon cemetery amid Roman rural settlement. The size of the cemetery is not known, but at least four inhumations were found inside a square-ditched enclosure. Bone preservation was bad, but at least one of the skeletons has been identified as that of a woman. The excavators compare these graves with other contemporary stone-lined burials and square-ditched graves in England, Wales, and Scotland. The alignment of these burials, as well as their stone-lining suggests that this was the inhumation of an elite group who were imitating Roman mausoleum burials and may have even been converts to Christianity.

Howard Williams, *Death and Memory in Early Medieval Britain* (Cambridge: CUP), joins the long-standing debate about the purpose of furnished burial. This book suggests that we see burial as one part of a process which creates memory and identity, going from the creation of individual memory to landscapes of memory—either real or “created.” On the basis of several pre-Christian and Christian burial sites and burial options, Williams poses that burial is a carefully orchestrated event in which objects and the body are arranged into “layers of memory.” Williams suggests that in the early burials grave goods do not have a static identity, but are incorporated into the burial ritual to produce images which could be remembered by the mourners. Objects in final phase burials represent choices by a wider kin group and signify more than just the

memory of the individual. Williams argues that memorable images which are created through objects or body posture are denied to some people. The changing body, either cremated or concealed, thus signals a difference in the person’s state. After the conversion to Christianity, the body itself becomes a mnemonic agent. Burial is orchestrated, and posture, space, and orientation of the corpse become significant markers of the dead person’s identity. Likewise, monuments are physical representations of memory, whereas texts can link memory with landscape, as for example in the *Life of St. Guthlac*. William’s main focus is on Anglo-Saxon burial ritual, but he also draws parallels to other North European traditions within the British Isles. The book looks at every aspect associated with Anglo-Saxon burial, from the layout of the body, to the furnishing of the grave to the grave markers, as well as the “afterlife” of the grave as a visible token of memory. It considers the relationship between monuments (including re-used features, such as barrows) and landscape, between earlier and later forms of burial. The book suggests that burial is an important process between the dead and the mourners, which transcends ethnic and chronological boundaries.

g. Health, Illness, Diet, Architecture

B.T. Fuller, T. I. Molleson, D.A. Harris, L.T. Gilmours and R.E.M. Hedges, in “Isotopic Evidence for breastfeeding and possible adult dietary differences from late/sub-Roman Britain,” *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 129: 45–54, describe a study of breastfeeding patterns from the multi-period site of Queenford Farm, Dorchester-on-Thames, Oxfordshire. This is the largest cemetery excavated from the late Roman to early Anglo-Saxon period (dated to the late fourth to the mid-sixth century). This site yielded 164 skeletons, but it is assumed that originally 2,000 people were interred at Queenford farm. Despite the assumption that this was the burial ground of a Christian community, neonates are missing from the burial record. The aim of the study is to determine the age of weaning by comparing carbon and nitrogen stable isotope patterns of juveniles and adults. Breast-fed babies have a higher nitrogen isotope signature than their mothers, but between the ages of two and four years of age this ratio declined. Once a child is weaned, their signature will be nearly identical to that of their mother. The level of stable isotopes can give indications of whether a child has been breastfed or not, which can help to identify stillborn children from children who died shortly after birth since there should be variations in the signatures. The highest number of child deaths at Queenford Farm

occurred at the proposed time of weaning (between the ages of two and three years of age). The fact that some children were given breast milk up to the age of three years is congruent with the teachings of Roman medical writers. In addition to the breastfeeding patterns, the researchers also looked at dietary differences in adult populations. Nitrogen and carbon isotopes are ingested with food, and there is a difference between the isotopes of a marine-based diet and that of a carnivore diet. Other Roman sites investigated, such as the cemetery at Poundbury, Somerset, show a difference in signatures between people buried in high status structures (such as lead coffins or tombs) and those who are buried without. Additionally, women at Queenford farm ate less protein-based foods. Such differences may be based in a gendered distribution of food stuff that favors the male members of society, and which may be based in limited resources available to the community.

Simon Mays, "Spondylosis, spondylolithesis and lumbo-sacral morphology in medieval English skeletal population," *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 131: 352–62, studies congenital diseases of the spine on adult skeletons (18 years and over) from the medieval village of Wharram Percy, North Yorkshire (10th–14th century). Six hundred eighty-seven burials were recorded from this site, most of which fall into the post-Conquest period. The author compares the date from medieval skeletons with data taken from modern US Caucasians. The prevalence of inter-vertebral defects was much higher at Wharram Percy, which may be the result of lesions or defects acquired when the body was growing up and a side effect of heavy manual labour during this period. Spondylolithesis, a malformation of the lumbo-sacral spine, in contrast, is lower than in modern test populations. The study offers some in-depth analysis of medical reasons for the various spinal conditions suffered by the population at Wharram Percy, but unfortunately they are not linked to other information such as dating evidence, and thus need cross-referencing with the burial catalogue.

Naomi Sykes, "The Dynamics of Status Symbols: Wildfowl Exploitation in England AD 410–1550," *ArchJ* 161 (2005 for 2004): 82–105, gives an examination of wildfowl consumption and hunting practices between the mid-fifth and mid-sixteenth century. The author describes the problems with assessing bird taphonomies, since the bones are often discarded differently from that of other animals and since wild fowl may also resemble domestic fowl. Her evidence comes from the analysis of 237 assemblages. Her analysis shows some significant changes in the number of bird fowl samples. Early to mid Anglo-Saxon England sees wild

birds predominantly in assemblages from rural sites, whereas in the mid-to late Anglo-Saxon period there is a predominance at urban sites. Whereas elite sites show more bird bones in the earlier Anglo-Saxon period, this is less pronounced towards the later period. Sykes sees such changes as a response to consumer demand. Late Anglo-Saxon England was a time of economic change, as well as growing gender division and social hierarchy, and Sykes sees hunting changing to a predominantly male elite activity. This has implications for the perception of species; swans, for example, seem to move from low status animals to high status birds during the Anglo-Saxon period. Sykes concludes that while wild fowl was never a large part of the diet of medieval England, they nevertheless are good indicators for social groupings and status. Exploitation of wild fowl was not a high status activity in early to mid Anglo-Saxon England, with few exceptions, such as falconry. Legal restrictions, as well as species distribution in late Anglo-Saxon England, show a shift in the perception of hunting and consuming wild fowls.

"Variable Nucleotide Tandem Repeat (VNTR) Typing from Two Palaeopathological Cases of Lepromatous Leprosy from Mediaeval England," *Jnl of Archaeological Science* 33: 1569–79, by G.M. Taylor, C.L. Watson, A.S. Bouwman, D.N.L. Lockwood, and S.A. Mays, discusses how, by using ancient DNA methods, the authors identified two archaeological cases of leprosy, one from Wharram Percy, dating between 960–1100. This was a child skeleton with rhino-maxillary changes typical of lepromatous leprosy (LL). The second was a later medieval burial from London. This was the skeleton of a male adult who showed both typical rhino-maxillary changes and osteitis/periostitis on the leg and foot bones. The discussion is interesting but highly technical, and it demonstrates the feasibility of the methods used for identifying strains of the disease.

Christina Lee's "Changing Faces: Leprosy in Anglo-Saxon England" in *Conversion and Colonization*, ed. Karkov and Howe [see sec. 1], 58–81, is an incisive and rigorous assessment of the evidence of both the disease and attitudes towards it through the Anglo-Saxon period. Early burial evidence, argues Lee, suggests that high social status "cancelled out" the stigma associated with the disfiguring disease, citing the fascinating evidence of the high-status bed-burial of a young woman with advanced leprosy from later sixth-century Barnington, Cambridgeshire. However, the close grouping of sequence of leper burials in later Anglo-Saxon cemeteries (notably St. John the Baptist, Norwich) point towards a changing attitude to the disease in which sufferers were increasingly isolated from the wider

community. Lee suggests that formal leper colonies of the kind identified in contemporary Merovingian and Carolingian Francia may also have existed in Middle and Late Saxon England. Etiology is also addressed, and in particular the problems of early medieval identification of discrete diseases, together with legal and conciliar positions on lepers and leprosy. Lee offers a valuable overview of references to leprosy in both vernacular and Anglo-Latin texts, taking in Asser, Bald, and Ælfric along the way. In the process this article reveals that she is one of that small band of scholars able to move between the material and the textual with equal facility. [reviewed by Paul Kershaw; also reviewed in sec. 7]

Possibly one of the most important studies of building types to have emerged in the last few years must be *The Grubenhäuser in Anglo-Saxon England: An Analysis and Interpretation of the Evidence from a Most Distinctive Building Type*, Landscape Research Centre Archaeological Monograph Series 2, vol. 1 (Yedingham: Landscape Research Centre, 2004), by Jess Tipper. This looks at what the author rightly calls one of the defining features of early Anglo-Saxon settlement, the sunken-featured building, the interpretation of which has been under debate since the first ones were identified in the 1920s. She concludes that most of the archaeological evidence points to them as having been ground-level buildings with a suspended floor supported above a pit. She argues that most of the material found in these buildings bears no relation to their function or date, but relates usually to the re-use of the hollow left when abandoned as a rubbish pit. The discussion of the archaeological evidence for this conclusion is meticulously detailed, as is the evidence for the arguments for and against their function (which she notes may in any case have varied over the period of use—she is also very clear that we should not assume a “rigid distinction between the functions of different building types.” The discussion of the evidence, employing archaeological and documentary sources for the use of the Grubenhäuser for textile production, a use often put forward, is particularly detailed. In this case, she does not deny that spinning and/or weaving might have been undertaken in some such buildings, but she notes that these functions could equally have been carried out in post-hole structures or even outside: she notes that in general the use of external space seems to be undervalued by archaeologists.

Helena Hamerow’s “Special deposits’ in Anglo-Saxon settlements,” *MA* 50: 1–30, is a preliminary survey of “special deposits” (mainly humans and animals) from Anglo-Saxon settlement sites. Hamerow compares her

record with data from the Iron Age and Roman periods and puts it in a larger frame of North Sea communities. She has identified forty-two potential deposits from sixteen settlements in England, of which twelve are human deposits. More than half of the deposits have come from the contexts of *Grubenhäuser* (sunken floor buildings) and are associated with the abandonment and dismantling of the site. Three out of four deposits from ground level buildings were positioned at the entrance, and boundary ditches seem also to be a place of depositions. In some cases more than one species was uncovered, and some of the depositions seems to have been made over a longer period, as for example, at Friar’s Oak, West Sussex, where there is an eighth/ninth century deposit as well as a ninth/tenth century deposit in a different area. The most common species of deposition is cattle, which is represented in at least eighteen examples. There also seems to be a custom of using objects as deposits. Most of the human remains were those of infants, and their number is much higher than those found at Anglo-Saxon cemeteries. In some cases there is evidence for a careful burial and in one case there seems to be a deposition of a re-used skull. Though the chronology of the depositions seems to be difficult, there is a preponderance after the Conversion period.

h. Numismatics

The anonymous “Anglo-Saxon Gold Coin,” *History Today* 56.4: 9, merely mentions, in the media summary section, the sale to the British Museum of an Anglo-Saxon gold coin of King Cœnwulf of Mercia found in 2001.

‡Martin Allen, “The Volume of the English Currency, c. 973–1158,” *Coinage and History in the North Sea World*, ed. Cook and Williams [see sec. 2], 487–523, is a highly technical survey of and analysis of the various arguments used to estimate money supply in the period covered. For the specialist, Appendix 3, with summaries of the contents of every hoard, will be indispensable, along with the numerous tables in which various estimates of the volume of currency are laid out or compared, showing the wide variations arrived at: these include estimates of average outputs of reverse dies and of various mints. Arguments against or modifying the use of these estimates through consideration of, for example, records of payments of tribute that involved export of coins to Scandinavia between the 990s and the mid-eleventh century are also considered. The author puts forward his own estimates, which are in some cases lower than the lowest previous estimates

(and very much lower than the highest), “as no more than a contribution to the debate on the volume of the late Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman currency, in the hope that that future work will provide more specific and secure estimates.” For the less specialized, there are useful catalogues both of single finds and hoards in the period covered.

A different perspective on the development of the coinage is offered by Marion M. Archibald, in “The German Connection: German Influences on the Later Anglo-Saxon and Norman Coinages in Their English Context (10th and 11th Centuries),” *Fundamenta Historiae: Geschichte im Spiegel der Numismatik und ihrer Nachbarwissenschaften; Festschrift für Niklot Klüßendorf zum 60. Geburtstag am 10. Februar 2004*, ed. Reiner Cunz; Veröffentlichungen der urgeschichtlichen Sammlungen des Landesmuseums zu Hannover 51 (Hannover: Niedersächsisches Landesmuseum Hannover, 2004), 131–50. This study will be of interest to students of iconography as well as numismatists. It is concerned with coins with ruler effigies on the obverse, which, following Roman Imperial precedent, are found on English coins from ca. 600 AD to the present day. These coins are called “portrait types” to distinguish them from aniconic issues, even when, as the author tells us, the earliest Anglo-Saxon versions display no recognizably contemporary features—such as in the manner of headdress—nor make any attempt at portraiture, resolutely portraying rulers as clean-shaven in the Roman manner regardless of actual practice. The study starts with the later coins of Athelstan (924–39) from the 930s in which, though the face was still unshaven, an open crown, represented as having three globule-topped stalks, was introduced—very like the crown with which Athelstan is portrayed in a manuscript portrait. Although the older fashion returned for a time, it was the beginning of a trend. Archibald demonstrates there were sometimes direct German prototypes for later coins and offers other examples of influence of a less direct kind. Features explored include types of crown, beard, frontality and profile images, full figure, sometimes enthroned, and busts. Particular emphasis is placed on the influence of the more realistic images on coins from the reign of the German Henry II (1002–1014) onwards, not only on the late Anglo-Saxon coinage but on that of the early Norman period also. The coins are well-illustrated, and there are helpful references to royal portraiture in contemporary manuscripts and in the Bayeux tapestry. The influence of Byzantine coin portraits on the German coinage is also discussed.

In “Currency under the Vikings; Part 2: The Two Scandinavian Kingdoms of the Danelaw, c. 895–954,”

British Numismatic Jnl 76: 204–26 [Presidential Address 2005], Mark Blackburn follows on his earlier address on the early phases of Viking coinage in the Danelaw, which looked at weights as continuing an East Anglian standard rather than the 880 reform of the coinage under Alfred by analyzing coin types from the period of ca. 895–954. Around York, Sigferth (ca. 895–900) and Cnut (ca. 900–5) minted coins distinctive from the Anglo-Saxon and Carolingian contemporary issues, with a real and deliberate emphasis on regal size and weight precedents and overtly Christian iconography; Blackburn argues against Rollason’s assertion of ecclesiastical primacy in the minting of these coins. Blackburn adds hoard analysis to suggest a homogeneity of Danelaw coinage up to the period of Anglo-Saxon reconquest ca. 910–920, a marked difference after Edward the Elder’s reconquest of 917. The East Midlands and Lincoln seem to have resisted Edward the Elder’s coinage changes in favor of Scandinavian continuity in size, design, and literacy; the Five Boroughs reflects a dual monetary and bullion economy into the mid 920s. With great technical detail, Blackburn traces the regional history of coinage and political change, showing that by the mid 940s, despite the changes under Athelstan (ca. 927) and Anlaf Guthfrithsson (939), coins fall into the standards of the Anglo-Saxon system. There is a useful appendix of the corpus of coins of the anonymous sword type, another on the coins of St. Martin, and a third on Sihtric Caoch (920/1–27).

One of the most important things D.M. Metcalf’s article, “The Coinage of King Aldfrith of Northumbria (685–704) and Some Contemporary Imitations,” *British Numismatic Jnl* 76: 147–58, does is reassess the coinage of Aldfrith, based on a much increased corpus of examples; his evidence shows a greater scale and a wider distribution south of the Humber than was previously known. Metcalf looks closely at these coins for a better understanding of die practices, since Aldfrith’s coins with their Alfridus and cross on the obverse and a three-pronged tailed horse on the reverse show a close adherence within the series and appear to be based on Merovingian sources. Most interestingly, Metcalf looks at Aldfrith’s issues within the political contexts of Northumbria, including Aldfrith’s personal disputes with Bishop Wilfred and the succession of kings with their failure to mint royal sceattas and, topically, the influence of the trade between Northumbria and the North-Sea countries. A close geographic analysis of find-spots seems to suggest that these coins were clearly part of a monetary economy in the old East Riding region and notably functional in the south-east of the kingdom. Finally, Metcalf analyzes the alloy content known for

a small number of the extant coins and their weight, suggesting a possible deterioration over the series. The article contains a useful appendix of specimens.

John Naylor begins “Mercian Hegemony and the Origins of Series J Sceattas: The Case for Lindsey,” *British Numismatic Jnl* 76: 159–70, by outlining the recent conclusions on mint attribution in the secondary sceatta issue of series J, arguing against the idea of a mint site of York given the heavy distribution in the area between the Humber and the Tees, combined with a possible royal iconography, and their mint gap between Aldfrith (684–705) and Eadberht (737–758). Not an article for those unfamiliar with the intricacies of this coin series make-up, Naylor’s essay then leads the reader through a complicated regression analysis to present the possibility of the kingdom of Lindsey, especially for types 37 and 85 and likely for type 36. The connection between Lindsey and its more powerful and dominant neighbor Mercia is critical to Naylor’s discussion, given the infrequent distribution in the region’s pre-Viking sites (Flixborough, Torksey), the suggested chronology of the coins between 710 and 725, the political, trade, and resource production (salt and wool) consolidation of the area (especially under the Mercian Æthelbald, 716–57). Naylor concludes by admitting that while the area is likely the source for this series, it is not possible to place them at a mint site and that there are still considerable remaining questions within the series categorization and finds.

It is a testament to the mentoring, support, and inspiration of Marion Archibald that *Coinage and History in the North Sea World*, ed. Cook and Williams [see sec. 2] is such a varied tome, stuffed cover to cover with some of the best scholarship on medieval coins. Its focus is on the connections between England and the Scandinavian North Sea areas. The book is divided into four sections: immediate post-Roman period and coinage in the 5th through 7th centuries, the 8th through 10th centuries, the Viking period, and the international movements of the 11th and 12th centuries. Given the critical significance of these coin articles for increasing dramatically our understanding of patterns of contact between England and Scandinavia, I have here reviewed the works in the first three sections closely as being of greater interest to the readers of this publication.

After an appreciation, the book opens with a reference article. Richard Abdy and Gareth Williams, in “A Catalogue of Hoards and Single Finds from the British Isles, c. AD 410–675” (11–73), provides the key material on the substance of 379 finds of either hoards (two or more coins deliberately deposited in association, whether in grave deposit, cache, or loss) or single

finds. The thoroughly presented catalogue is usefully divided to make clear pre-Roman finds, imported coins (including Byzantine, Merovingian, Frisian, and Sassanian), and English coins and reused coins as jewelry and ornaments. Richard Abdy then follows with “After Patching: Imported and Recycled Coinage in Fifth- and Sixth-Century Britain” (75–98), which looks at the hoard from Patching (fifty coins from ca. 470, fifty-four scrap pieces of silver, and two gold rings) for patterns of silver coin clipping in sub-Roman Britain. Abdy convincingly presents a theory of the circulation of siliquae from the taxed population that follows a valuation on their weight but a re-distribution of clipped siliquae to the foederati (barbarian warriors) based on face value. T.S.N. Moorhead, in “Roman Bronze Coinage in Sub Roman and Early Anglo-Saxon England,” (99–109) examines the paucity of Roman bronze coins, some 60% of which were pierced for adornment and largely recovered from women’s graves; he considers the idea of writing on the coin as talismanic, not in its actual meaning, but rather in the way in which writing itself can be considered important in non-literate cultures. Moorhead finishes with a discussion of Roman bronze coin circulation, suggesting that the currency was already changing by ca. 400 with little influx of new coinage; the Bishop Camings hoard is read in detail to explain the unusual hoarding of the bronze coins, their connection with the clipped silver in the hoard, and the removal of bronze coins from circulation by 410 given their lack of value as bullion (a problem that he complicates, but dismisses, at the end of the essay with the examination of finds that argue for longevity of base-metal coins into the 5th and 6th centuries). Arent Pol, in “Twenty-two Soldiers, a Goddess and an Emperor: A Small Group of Sixth-Century Pseudo-Imperial Tremisses with an Unusual Reverse Type” (111–126), looks closely at the iconography, weight, content, and find spots of a group of late sixth- and seventh-century Merovingian coins that do not show the standard Victory on the reverse but a two soldier motif (clearly on eleven examples, with the typical garbling of inscriptions found on Merovingian pseudo-imperial coins). The point of Pol’s study is to contextualize these coins as part of the normal production at the periphery of the Frankish empire in the sixth century. In “Two New Types of Anglo-Saxon Gold Shillings” (127–140), Mark Blackburn examines two seventh-century finds, the first possibly dated to the reign of Eadbald of Kent (616–620), a series complicated by few issues, an anomalous a London mint site, or, in the case of the Goodnestone find, an inscription that seems to suggest a Merovingian origin despite the similar iconography of the cross on globe inside of a

pearled circle. Working carefully through the possible Merovingian combinations and comparing weight and composition with other Eadbald issues, Blackburn contextualizes these within a production marked by poor literacy and rapid copy degeneration. The second part of Blackburn's article addresses a 1980s find of a daisy (obverse) and annulet cross (reverse) shilling; the coin is remarkable for the full daisy form, which might suggest a jewelry intention were the weight and content not consistent with seventh century coins. Blackburn traces other examples in coins and manuscript iconography to suggest it was a south-east English import to Northumbria. "A Pale Gold Thrymsa in the Name of Vanimundus," (141–143) by Nicholas Mayhew, is a short examination of a third-quarter of the seventh-century coin in the Ashmolean collection, which follows Grieron's identification of the iconography of the cross on base but with a higher gold content (20%) than is typical of the debased gold coins of the period, suggesting an early date in the Vanimundus issues and an unusual find spot in Kent (against the posited mint north of the Thames in London or Essex). Gareth Williams's "The Circulation and Function of Coinage in Conversion-Period England, ca. AD 580–675" (145–192) is an essay that is ambitious, comprehensive, and beautifully written; one can imagine using in many different scholarly and teaching contexts. One of its objectives is to examine the theoretical/historiographic issues of coin study, noting the slight evidentiary record, the assumptions made based on Kent and the context of Classical circulation, which created a conclusion of a comparative total absence of a monetary economy. Williams incorporates the developments since the 1970s that have changed these perceptions, including studies of maritime North Sea contacts and settlement life versus grave economy for coin reuse; he outlines the issues in the Roman withdrawal of troops in 410 and the decline or continuity of Roman administration. Williams suggests some importation through trade into the fifth and sixth centuries, the use of bronze coins in urban contexts, the question of whether piercing for jewelry necessarily removed the coin from monetary circulation, and the issue of Anglo-Saxon seventh-century heavy reliance on Merovingian coins that preserved the authority of the Roman issues, raising many points and questions as to how coins were used in this period of a mixed bullion and currency economy and how we might use them today as archaeologists and historians. Following Williams's article with Anna Gannon's "Imitation is the Sincerest Form of Flattery" (193–210) was an excellent editorial choice since she is also interested in the way coin forms create a culture of meaning,

looking specifically at the iconography of early Anglo-Saxon gold coins from the Crondale hoard of the 640s for their connections to Roman, Germanic, and Christian forms. Gannon suggests that these coins should be seen as not out of sequence or irregular but as deliberate, deriving their commercial viability from their visual connotations (in imagery and inscription forms).

Part two of the volume, "The Northern World: An Age of Transition (Seventh to Tenth Centuries)," opens with Elizabeth Pirie, "Contrasts and Continuity within the Coinage of Northumbria 670–876" (211–240). Pirie develops a sequence for the series beginning with York issues of 640–50 under Egfrith and double issues for the archbishops Ecgberht and Eanbald I through the first known coin of King Earduulf (796–806, 808–10); she then continues with an iconographic analysis, beginning with the early gold thrymsas showing a stylized building plan, in keeping with the building concerns of Egfrith's reign under Wilfred and Benedict Biscop, the pagan allusions of Aldfrith's canine and tree, and moving to the scarcities of sceattas in the 730s which, while materially conservative, are iconographically unusual with their imagined stag, perhaps referencing St. Aidan. Pirie's work takes these elements of metal content, size, orthography, and iconography to suggest the ways in which Northumbrian coins circulated both inside the kingdom and in Southumbria; further, she suggests the strength of iconographic connections in the choice of reverse emblems to pre- and post-Celtic forms in these sceattas that may help to explain the reasons for the marked differences between Northumbrian coins and other British currency. In "Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea: hoards in ninth century Frisia" (241–266), Stuart Coupland looks at two hoards from Frisia, suggesting that the differences in their constitution from Carolingian hoards with more Arab coins and a higher proportion of mixed deposits, particularly in the 840s and through to ca. 855, suggest a real anxiety around sea raids, and a dearth of Frankish coins reaching the area marks poverty in the area. Kevin Leahy, in "Anglo-Saxon Coin Brooches" (267–286), looks at the range of coin brooches produced, offering a catalogue and discussion that looks at both the use of English and Continental versions and possibilities of how the iconographies might have been used by different groups and social classes. Looking at rare South Baltic coast finds, Stanislaw Suchodolski in "A Coin of Æthelwulf of Wessex from Ancient Truso in Poland" (287–296) considers a coin dating to the reign of Æthelwulf (839–858) unusual because it predates the Danegeld tribute coins from Æthelred II's Crux type (991–997) by more than a century but explains it in the context of the emporium

at Truso and the conversion of the coin to an ornament, which likely removed it from monetary circulation. In “Not the Oldest Known List: Scandinavian Moneyers’ Names on the Tenth-Century English coinage” (297–324), Veronica Smart looks at patterns of geographic distribution of Scandinavian names in lists of moneyers from the tenth century; the heaviest concentration can be found at York (three out of four under Æthelred and Cnut, and nearly all by the Conquest), whereas the South Danelaw shows a lesser presence, and South England shows Scandinavian names to be rare. Finally, this section closes with “The Pre-Reform Coinage of Edgar—the Legacy of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms” (325–348) by Kenneth Jonsson. The article contains a useful summary of research on coinage before the ca. 973 reform and builds on the author’s earlier study of the regional division of coinage after the reconquest of lands ceded to the Vikings in the ninth century; Jonsson controversially suggests that local level changes made by ealdormen, not national level changes, and the ealdormen positions that remained deliberately vacant under Edgar opened the way for a national currency reform. He tracks changes in the chronological phases of Edgar’s regional coinage to support the idea of a dismantling of the system ca. 973 and its replacement with a national type and centralized (royal control) die cutting.

The third section of this book is “England and Scandinavia: Tenth to Thirteenth Centuries” and opens with D.M. Metcalf’s “Inflows of Anglo-Saxon and German Coins into the Northern Lands, ca. 997–1024: Discerning the Patterns” (349–387), which looks at the large quantities of coins that went north in the period from 1024–1056 in an attempt to suggest routes and whether those coins were circulated or hoarded on arrival. Looking at the Long Cross and Quatrefoils from 997–1024, Metcalf finds evidence that pecking was increasingly common at this point, bespeaking the importance of bullion content and the circulation on Gotland before burial; this material is combined with an interesting analysis of Anglo-Scandinavian coins from Skåne and Sigtuna as a way of better understanding the actual monetary value of these imitations within a geographic area. His analysis shows that Anglo-Saxon and Germanic coins were entering an active silver economy that used Islamic dirhams as well; the distribution analysis also shows German coins from distant mint towns were overrepresented in the hoard, showing a marked preference for Köln coins around 1010, an incomplete mixing, and most importantly, that Anglo-Saxon coins from many different mints arrived in Scandinavia already mixed with other coins, reflecting toll and tax practices,

whereas German coins from relatively few mint centers remained unmixed, reflecting trade practices. Metcalf continues with much more theoretical discussion of monetary travel by ship, particularly from ports in the Danelaw, and looks at the patterns of tens of tons of silver moving across the North Sea as a major artery and Köln as a commercial center. Jens Christian Moesgaard, in “The Import of English Coins to the Northern Lands: Some Remarks on Coin Circulation in the Viking Age Based on New Evidence from Denmark” (389–434), looks at evidence from Bornholm that suggests direct importation of English coins, corresponding to Danegeld and Heregeld payments that favored Northeast English mints before 980/90 and the diminishing proportion of English to German coins as one moves west to east. The majority of English hoards in Denmark show one or two types with the Tyskegård hoard, as the only hoard wholly of Æthelred II’s Long Cross pennies struck between 997 and 1003, showing little wear or pecking and very slight bending, thus showing the likelihood that these coins were recent arrivals, hoarded before they could be mixed or circulated. In “The 1954 Rone Hoard and Some Comments on Styles and Inscriptions of Certain Scandinavian coins from the Early Eleventh Century” (435–448), Brita Malmer comments on the Rone Hoard makeup (989 coins, 320 English, 10 Irish, ca. 1036), following careful changes in the quatrefoil types to note dies from the South (genuine English dies, close imitations), Danish style, and Sigtuna dies (more independent forms, showing a native style). Christof Kilger, in “Silver-handling traditions during the Viking-Age—Some Observations and Thoughts on the Phenomenon of Pecking and Bending” (449–466), encourages a new line in thinking of these practices, beyond the purely monetary sense of circulation. Pecking as a practice of marking the coin may not be simply a test of purity and may not be an accurate reflection of circulation duration; pecking patterns suggest that some die duplicates were handled together and may never have entered circulation. Pecking could have been done as a repetitive practice or ritual, perhaps with both sides of a transaction pecking the coin as a sign of contractual agreement. In “Anglo-Saxon Coins in the Baltic East—Some Comments on Two Recent Volumes of the *Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles*” (467–476), Tuukka Talvio reflects on interesting patterns for the period between 978 and 1154 in Estonia, Finland, and Russia (which climax around 1020 and stop abruptly in 1050) of die linking among the Æthelred II coins of the Long Cross 997–1003 type, suggesting generally unmixed parcels with little circulation. This section closes with Jørgen Steen Jensen’s “Two

hoards of Short-Cross sterlings from Ribe, and English Merchants in Denmark in the Middle of the Thirteenth Century" (477–485), which categorizes a pot hoard of 1190 Short Cross sterlings and one loose hoard of 165 Short Cross sterlings from the very active trading center of Ribe, noting its geographic importance between the North Sea and Baltic countries; in it, he suggests the possibility of the deposition of these hoards in 1247 over civil unrest between King Erik Plovpenning (1241–1250) and his brother Abel, Duke of Schleswig (King of Denmark, 1250–1252).

The fourth section concentrates on the kingdom of England in the tenth to early thirteenth centuries; as it is later in date than the focus of this publication, it is treated summarily here. †Martin Allen, in "The Volume of the English Currency, c. 973–1158" (487–524), looks at the fraught issue of estimating die outputs to consider the total size of currency; Allen includes a table of estimated reverse dies and numbers of single finds for the period, based on the idea that later currency (mid-12th to mid-15th centuries) sees an approximate correlation in these numbers, although he then considers issues such as increases after the large-scale Scandinavian payments ceased under Edward the Confessor (1042–1066), contraction in the 1070s due to silver mine exhaustion, and mint outputs. Alan Vince's essay, "Coinage and Urban Development: Integrating the Archaeological and Numismatic History of Lincoln" (525–543), traces Lincoln's development from its pre-Viking days, looking at post-Roman coins and correlating those finds with changes in pottery and the ways in which they reinforce the idea of a border along the Welland through their distribution, tracing critical changes in the mid-seventh century, marked by introduction of Merovingian tremisses and English shillings as well as new pottery production, ending with the consistent growth of the late ninth to mid twelfth centuries. "The Moneyers of the Worcester Mint, 1066–1158: Some Thoughts and Comments" (545–588), D.J. Symons develops a detailed survey, an extract from his dissertation material, of moneyers working here after the Conquest, raising issues of mint changes after the Conquest (limited here, as is evident elsewhere in England) and moneying as a profession with hereditary trends and high social status. Geoff Egan looks at "The Earliest English Lead Tokens" (589–600) and their function as exchange units in a number of possible circumstances (ecclesiastic, brothel, customs checks, or travel passes). In "Henry II, the St. Augustine Dispute and the Loss of the Abbey's Mint Franchise" (601–616), T.C.R. Crafter looks at the 1150s conflict from its literary sources to better understand the issues of

royal involvement, church property, and minting practices. "En Monnaie Aiant Cours: The Monetary System of the Angevin Empire" (617–686), by B.J. Cook, reviews monetary system under the Angevins to argue that Aquitaine's continental currency zone was distinct from England's and was generally geographically limited, although there was indeed interaction in the kinds of coins used and based on the development of the system over time. Heather Sebire also looks at cultural connections between England and the Channel Islands in "Iles-Anglo Normandes: Some Coin Evidence of the Impact of the Events of 1204 on the Channel Islands" (687–699); the strategic and political importance of Guernsey is outlined at the beginning and is followed by coin analysis. The last substantive article is by Edward Begly, entitled "Few and Far Between: Mints and Coins in Wales to the Middle of the Thirteenth Century" (701–720). It traces the coin-poor history of Wales from its post-Roman period onward, building on the works of David Dykes and George C. Boon, and closing with a useful appendix on the hoards and single finds in Wales for the period ca. 790–1066. The volume closes with a bibliography of Marion Archibald's publications to 2005.

i. Miscellaneous

Mark Gardiner, in "Implements and Utensils in *Gerefa* and the Organization of Seigneurial Farmsteads in the High Middle Ages," *MA* 50: 260–67, takes up a conclusion of P.D.A Harvey that "*Gerefa* is more the product of the scriptorium than the farmyard." While acknowledging the justice of many of the points he makes, Gardiner suggests this view may lead to a danger that we dismiss *Gerefa* too readily as a historical source. He points to its uniqueness—there are no examples of the genre of practical instruction to agricultural managers until the thirteenth century. He seems to answer the question he asks (whether we can imagine that the text of the *Gerefa* was actually intended as a manual of practical instruction for reeves and could have been read to or by them or their masters) in the negative. His approach is different: after a preliminary analysis of the manuscript in which he discusses acknowledged features such as the stages by which it arrived at its present state, including an adaptation by Bishop Wulfstan or someone strongly influenced by his style and a twelfth century updating in grammar and spelling "by someone with little understanding of English," he concentrates on the part of the text which records that the reeve should provide tools for building and utensils for the manor. This includes two lists of tools. The first (List A), which details tools

for building work and for making textiles, he considers especially for its interest in alliteration and assonance, suggesting that this show the lists were compiled originally in English, not translated from the Latin. More importantly for his purposes, the second list (List B) which begins with farm equipment and ends with a list of utensils which belong in domestic buildings, he suggests is an interpolation. The relationship of both lists with glossaries is explored, since these also included lists of words under headings, including "Agricultural tools" for example in Ælfric's glossary, which also lists the contents of a chamber—noting that glossaries could be used to form the basis of didactic texts (*Ælfric's Colloquy*). With reference to items in List B, he looks to the twelfth century *De Nominibus Utensilium* of Alexander Neckam as a true parallel, and "to reveal the logic of their order" (which he sets out in a helpful table on pp. 264–5), showing that they do indeed seem to fall into groups relating to different buildings or storage/working areas of a large farmstead, such as kitchen, dairy, granary, buttery, pantry or spence, and a bakehouse and brewhouse. His preliminary survey of the manuscript is relevant here since it is dated ca. 1100, pointing out that the indications that it is interpolated leave open the possibility that this took place in the late eleventh century. This allows him to associate the structure of work areas in the list with the late eleventh century estate farmstead, with particular reference to the extensive excavation of Grove (Bedfordshire), suggesting that the text of list B indicates that the way farmsteads were laid out and organized was established at least in the late eleventh century and can be used to in the consideration of excavated sites. If he is correct, then List B becomes helpful, but to later medievalists rather than to Anglo-Saxonists.

CL, EC, FA

[CL reviewed Bailey & Whalley, Barford, Birkbeck, Buckberry, Chadwick Hawkes & Grainger, Coatsworth, Dickens, Fuller, Hamerow, Hayman & Reynolds, Mays, Molleson et al., Mortimer, Mortimer & Tipper, Owen-Crocker ("Interpretation"), Patrick, Ponsford, Priestly-Bell, Regan & Lucy, Rodwell, Stevens, Stoodley, Sykes, Wallis, Webster & Brunning, Williams.

EC reviewed "The Saxons," "AD 616," Ager, Alexander et al., Allen, Archibald, Aston, Bailey, Biggam, Bishop, Blockey, Bourne, Brennand, Brown, Calder, Cessford, Cramp (*Wearmouth, Corpus*), Dickinson, Egan, Fern, et al., Fern, Fuglesang & Wilson, Fyfe, Gardiner, Graham, Guy & Crawford, Howlett, Hutcheson,

Inker, Johnson, Jones & Page, Laing & Pointing, Little, Miller & Wilson, McDonnell, Morini, Murray, Neuman de Vegvar, Okasha, Orton, Owen-Crocker ("Embroidered"), Parfitt, Philips, Potter ("No Stone," "Building"), Rippon et al., Rodwell, Suzuki, Taylor et al., Thomas, Tipper, Turner (*Medieval Devon*; "Medieval Landscape," "The Christian Landscape," *Making a Christian Landscape*), Wickham-Crowley, Will et al., Williams & Newman, Wood, Yeates (*Religion, Community, and Territory*, "Church of St. Mary").

FA reviewed "Anglo-Saxon Gold Coin," Abdy, Abdy & Williams, Allen, Ayers & Tatton-Brown, Bagshaw et al., Beech, Begly, Blackburn ("Currency," "Shillings"), Chadwick, Clelland, Coatsworth, Cook, Cook & Williams, Crafter, Coupland, Dobat, Draper, Egan, Ellis & Andrews, Gannon, Herbert, Hicks, Jensen, Jonsson, Kilger, Leahy, Lewis, Malmer, Mayhew, Metcalf ("Coinage," "Inflows"), Moesgaard, Moorhead, Naylor, Pirie, Pol, Sebire, Smart, Suchodolski, Symons, Talvio, Turner ("Christian Landscape"), Vince, Williams.]

Not Seen

Adams, Brian. "An Anglo-Saxon Spearhead from Redbourn." *Hertfordshire Archaeology and History* 14 (2004–05): 75–76.

Ford, Rachel. "Christian in a Pagan World." *Archaeology* 58 (2005): 8–9.

Hammon, A. J. "Late Romano-British–Early Medieval Socio-Economic and Cultural Change: Analysis of the Mammal and Bird Bone Assemblages from the Roman City of *Viroconium Cornoviorum*, Shropshire." Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Shropshire, 2005. *Index to Theses* 55: 3010.

Laing, Lloyd. *The Archaeology of Celtic Britain and Ireland c. AD 400–1200*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. xiv, 406 pp. ill.

Lyon, Stewart. "Silver Weight and Minted Weight in England c. 1000–1320, with a Discussion of the Domesday Terminology, Edwardian Farthings and the Origin of the English Troy." *British Numismatic Jnl* 76: 227–41.

John F. Potter, "A Geological Review of Some Hampshire Anglo-Saxon Churches." *Proc. of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Soc.* 61: 134–52.

Tyrell, Ros. "An Early Saxon Brooch from Buckland." *Records of Buckinghamshire* 46: 184.

West, Simon. "A Stylised Chessman from Medieval St Albans with a Note on Early Chess." *Hertfordshire Archaeology and History* 14 (2004–05): 81–84.

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_oen@wmich.edu
<http://www.wmich.edu/medieval/mip/journals/oensubsidia.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
email: oswald@uwp.edu

Information about research in progress, including current research, work completed, and forthcoming publications, should be sent to:

Heide Estes
Department of English
Monmouth University
West Long Branch, NJ 07764
fax: 732-263-5242
email: hestes@monmouth.edu

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
301 MCCLUNG TOWER
KNOXVILLE, TN 37996-0430