

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*

VOLUME	43
NUMBER	1 & 2
2011	

ISSN 0030-1973

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER

Volume 43 Number 1 & 2

2011

EDITOR

R. M. Liuzza, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

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

Bibliography: Robert Hasenfratz, University of Connecticut

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Research in Progress: Heide Estes, Monmouth University

Conference Abstracts: Dana Oswald, University of Wisconsin, Parkside

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 Lopez

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 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 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 © 2011 The University of Tennessee.

www.oenewsletter.org

THE YEAR'S WORK IN OLD ENGLISH STUDIES

2008

CONTRIBUTORS

Anthony Adams	<i>Colby College</i>
Rachel Anderson	<i>Grand Valley State University</i>
Dabney Bankert	<i>James Madison 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>
Nicole Guenther Discenza	<i>University of South Florida</i>
Eugene Green	<i>Boston University</i>
John Harkness	<i>Augsburg College</i>
† B. Rand Hutchinson	<i>Independent Scholar</i>
Richard F. Johnson	<i>William Rainey Harper College</i>
Stefan Jurasinski	<i>State U of New York—Brockport</i>
Matti Kilpiö	<i>University of Helsinki</i>
Aaron Kleist	<i>Biola University</i>
Kevin Leahy	<i>Portable Antiquities Scheme</i>
Karmen J. Lenz	<i>Macon State College</i>
Joseph P. McGowan	<i>University of San Diego</i>
Zoya Metlitskaya	<i>Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow</i>
Andrew Rabin	<i>University of Louisville</i>
Mary Rambaran-Olm	<i>University of Glasgow</i>
Kathryn Powell	<i>University of Cambridge</i>
Mary K. Ramsey	<i>Eastern Michigan University</i>
Elizabeth A. Rowe	<i>Cambridge University</i>
Andrew Scheil	<i>University of Minnesota</i>
Douglas Simms	<i>Southern Illinois U—Edwardsville</i>
Larry Swain	<i>Bemidji State University</i>
Jun Terasawa	<i>University of Tokyo</i>
M. Jane Toswell	<i>University of Western Ontario</i>
Benjamin C. Withers	<i>University of Kentucky</i>
David Woodman	<i>Cambridge University</i>

EDITOR

Daniel Donoghue *Harvard University*

Contents

Foreword	5
1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects	6
2. Memorials, Tributes, History of the Discipline	12
3. Language	21
a. Lexicon	21
b. Syntax, Phonology, Other Aspects	27
4. Literature	51
a. General and Miscellaneous	51
b. Individual Poems.	60
c. <i>Beowulf</i>	75
d. Prose	100
5. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works	116
6. Manuscripts, Illuminations, Charters	126
7. History and Culture.	138
a. General Sources and Reference Works	138
b. Religion and the Church	140
c. Ecclesiastical Culture	145
d. Society and the Family	148
e. Gender and Identity	151
f. The Economy, Settlement and Landscape	152
g. Magic, Medicine and Science	155
h. Law, Politics and Warfare	155
i. Vikings.	162
j. The Norman Conquest and Settlement	164
8. Names	167
9. Archaeology, Sculpture, Inscriptions, Numismatics	177
a. Excavations	177
b. Numismatics	184
c. Sculpture, Monuments, and Textiles.	185
d. The Anglo-Saxon Church.	191
e. Funerary Archaeology and Practices	191
f. Regional Studies and Economic Studies	195
g. Artifacts and Iconography	197
h. Place-Names	199
i. Inscriptions and Runes.	201
j. Miscellaneous	203
Abbreviations	209

Foreword

It is with deep sadness that I begin with the news that one of our reviewers, Rand Hutcheson, died as this issue of *YWOES* was nearing completion. Rand's *Old English Poetic Metre* (Cambridge: Brewer, 1995) is known to many Anglo-Saxonists as a substantial contribution that has left a lasting mark on the field. In reviewing it for *YWOES* 1995, Rob Fulk hailed it as "a work of considerable importance, and one that has already had a significant effect on the way metrists conduct business." While Rand may be best remembered for his work on Old English meter, he was a scholar of unusual breadth with a keen analytical mind. After a promising start in academia Rand changed paths and pursued a career in law, largely for financial reasons, but he never abandoned the idea of returning to the study of Old English. In July of 2009 Rand announced in an email, "I've decided that eleven years is long enough to practice law, so I'm making a move back into academics." He attended the ISAS conference in St. John's Newfoundland later that summer. By that time, however, he was already diagnosed with cancer of the brain, which he fought successfully for several years. I recruited him to review for *YWOES* as a way to help reacquaint himself with the field. I also knew he'd be a terrific contributor, as the four reviews published here in section 4a attest, even as the disease and its treatment sapped his stamina. He never had the chance to finish what he set out to do. Tragically, the latest onslaught overtook him with a speed that caught everyone by surprise. His last e-mail to me, four days before he died, was animated with his characteristic energy and his optimism for the future.

Bellenden Rand Hutcheson, Jr., died 7 January 2012. He was 49 years old. This issue is dedicated to his memory.

With this issue we welcome the following new contributors: Matti Kilpiö, reviewing syntax in section 3b; Karmen Lenz in General and Miscellaneous Literature; in History Kathy Powell and David Woodman; in Archaeology Rachel Anderson and Kevin Leahy; and we welcome back Jane Toswell to the ranks of reviewers, this time in the section dedicated to Manuscripts, Illuminations, and Charters. With our thanks we bid adieu to Robin Norris, Michael Fox, Elaine Treharne, Tom Bredehoft, Peter Dendle, and Frances Altvater.

I continue to be impressed by the professionalism and hard work of all our reviewers, for which they have my gratitude. I thank Joey McMullen and Samantha Berstler for editorial help. The few items that have been reviewed by more than one reviewer in a section are marked with a pair of double daggers (‡‡).

The contributors to *The Year's Work in Old English Studies* are named on the title page, and the authorship of individual sections is indicated by initials within or at the end of each section. Contributors work from the *OEN* bibliography for the year under review. 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* has returned to its original publishing schedule of two issues a year. Beginning with volume 42, *OEN* now prints only the annual *Bibliography* and the *Year's Work in Old English Studies*. Other content—news and announcements, notices of recent publications, annual reports from ongoing projects, abstracts of conference papers, and essays—is freely available on the *OEN* website, www.oennewsletter.org.

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.

1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects

Teaching Anglo-Saxon studies

2008 was a banner year for innovative approaches to teaching in our field. Study abroad programs should be aware of the re-opening of the first building in England dating from the pre-Conquest period, discussed in "Redundant Saxon Church Reopens as Heritage Centre," *Current Archaeology* 211 (2007), 8. St. Peter, Barton upon Humber in North Lincolnshire has been newly renovated and opened as a Visitor Centre dedicated to the history of the church and parish. During the renovation, remains from approximately 3000 individuals were exhumed, the earliest of which date from the reign of King Cnut. A special ossuary has been constructed to house the remains.

For younger learners, the *Life in Britain* series has published *Anglo-Saxon and Viking Britain* by Fiona Macdonald (London: Franklin Watts). In seventeen colorful chapters, Macdonald tells the story of the northern European invaders and settlers who first came to Britain in the fifth century. Using lively illustrations and images of objects and documents, Macdonald recreates the daily lives, homes, foods, and beliefs of these early immigrants. While not targeted for upper-level classes, this book, indeed the entire series, would make a great gift for a budding Anglo-Saxonist.

On a slightly more advanced level, Stephen Pollington has produced *Anglo-Saxon FAQs* (Swaffham, Norfolk: David Brown Books). Divided into thirteen chapters covering aspects of Anglo-Saxon existence (e.g., "Land & People," "Buildings," "Kingship," and "Society & Law"), Pollington's book proceeds by a series of simple questions and answers. Inspired by the sorts of questions he has been asked while giving talks on Anglo-Saxon subjects, the interchange functions in much the same way FAQ documents communicate background information in a concise manner. The questions range from the silly ("Did they have toilets?") to the mundane ("What did they eat and drink?") to the more nuanced ("What was the difference between 'free' and 'unfree' men?"). From his unique perspective and in his own fashion, Pollington offers reasonable answers to these questions. While it may be easy to dismiss Pollington's answers from the lofty heights of academe, one must concede that his answers are a sort of public service; they offer sensible, if occasionally simplistic, answers to common queries that many of us hear on a regular

basis, whether from benign relatives ("You teach what now?") or from students ("You mean they weren't all dressed in animal skins?").

In a far more rarified vein, and perhaps more useful to our purposes, Stephen Harris and Bryon Grigsby have collected a variety of essays on *Misconceptions about the Middle Ages*, vol. 7 of *Studies in Medieval Religion and Culture* (London: Routledge). Marijane Osborn heroically tackles an all-too common misconception in her entry "Shakespeare Did Not Write in Old English" (177-82). Osborn opens with a comparison of two lines each from *Beowulf*, Chaucer, and Shakespeare to highlight the readily apparent differences between Old, Middle, and Early Modern English. In what could be a useful classroom exercise, Osborn follows the lead of linguists Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Mary Louise Pratt in using the first stanza of Lewis Carroll's poem "Jabberwocky" to demonstrate the basic operations of inflected languages. Once all is said and read, it should be perfectly clear to anyone that "Shakespeare did NOT write in Old English."

Stephen Pollington has reissued his 2001 book *Leechcraft: Early English Charms, Plant-Lore and Healing* (Ely: Anglo-Saxon Books). Pollington examines the Anglo-Saxons' understanding of illnesses and their approaches to healing, presenting a variety of healing theories, amulets, and charms in his appendices. He also includes a fascinating list of plants and their properties. Perhaps most useful for the classroom, Pollington provides new translations of *Bald's Third Leechbook*, the *Lacnunga* manuscript, and "The Old English Herbarium."

Several essays approach the subject of teaching Anglo-Saxon studies from a practical point of view. Rick McDonald suggests six strategies to increase enrollments in and the visibility of courses in medieval subjects in his essay, "Enthusiasm and Amusement: Making Students Crazy for Medieval Classes," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 15: 31-38. His first suggestion is to raise the visibility of the program or courses by making oneself known on campus through creative means, such as hosting a medieval feast complete with sword fights and madrigals. The key to retention is making classes entertaining, and McDonald has found ways to do so without compromising the integrity of the content. Assigning intriguing projects and presentations is another way to keep students interested

in medieval classes, as is indulging students' desire to draw connections between medieval culture and ideas and those of contemporary society. Students live in a state of constant multimedia bombardment, so it is helpful to appeal to them on their own turf. Demonstrating the relevance and promise of multimedia and web-based technology in the medieval classroom can win the hearts and minds of twenty-first century students. Finally, enlisting the help of former students in the enterprise of proselytizing our courses can produce excellent results. For the administrators of many schools, the bottom line is "butts in seats," and McDonald's essay offers helpful suggestions as to how we might accomplish this venal but necessary task.

In her essay, "Old English, New Media: Blogging *Beowulf*," *OEN* 41.1: 42-46, Mary Kate Hurley discusses how Anglo-Saxon studies might find a home in the "blogosphere." Begun as part of Hurley's preparations for her doctoral oral exams, her blog, *Old English in New York*, quickly became a vehicle for participating in a sympathetic intellectual community that actively seeks to foster connections between disciplines, something sorely lacking in mainstream, agonistic academia. Through her experience, Hurley has come to believe that blogging creates a space in which one can develop an academic "voice" and enjoy the challenge and camaraderie of a vigorous intellectual community of specialists and non-specialists alike. In lieu of the ivory tower, the blogosphere might "form a kind of global classroom in which we can all benefit from each others' expertise early on in projects that can be made more astute through the interaction" (45). Ultimately, Hurley suggests that blogging could afford Old English studies "a place in a society that often finds it inaccessibly remote" (45).

In another variety of online enterprise, an excerpt from Martin Foys's award-winning book, *Virtually Anglo-Saxon*, appears as "The Reality of Media in Anglo-Saxon Studies" in *Heroic Age* 11. The verbatim excerpt in the online journal seems to be an effort toward achieving what Foys calls a "hypermediacy" of transmission, but to this reader, it does not live up to the promise (e.g., hyperlinks are not incorporated, among other disappointments). Ultimately, it is less satisfying than the excellent but print-constrained text. A review of the book can be found in *YWOES* 2007, Section 1b.

In a vast bibliographic essay, "Anglo-Saxon and Related Entries in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004)," *ASE* 37: 183-232, Helen Foxhall Forbes et al. seek to bring the "quantity and range of entries in the *ODNB* on 'Anglo-Saxon' and 'related' subjects" to the attention of Anglo-Saxon scholars. Forbes

and her co-authors lament the fact that the comprehensive work of the contributors was subsumed under a single entry for the entire set of sixty volumes in the "Bibliography for 2004" published in *ASE* in 2005. The balance of the essay is devoted to a listing of the various forms of entry in the *ODNB*, including Anglo-Saxon, Norman, British, Welsh, Irish, and Scottish subjects.

Finally, Edward Christie performs a vital service to the field each year by collecting and annotating electronic resources in "*Circolwyrde: New Electronic Resources for Anglo-Saxon Studies*," *OEN* 41.1: 47-50. The annual feature this year contains twenty-three annotated entries divided among five subheadings, covering "Dictionaries and Resources," "Pedagogical Tools," "Audio-Visual," "Google Books," and "Important Indices."

Tolkien Studies

Lynn Forest-Hill has edited a collection of ten essays entitled *The Mirror Crack'd: Fear and Horror in J. R. R. Tolkien's Major Works* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars). The essays are mostly extended versions of papers originally delivered in a session at the 2006 Leeds International Medieval Congress with the addition of several contributions from international Tolkien scholars and researchers. Three essays are of particular interest to Anglo-Saxonists. In her brief essay, "From *Beowulf* to the Balrogs: The Roots of Fantastic Horror in *The Lord of the Rings*" (5-14), Maria Raffaella Benevenuto traces the origins of Tolkien's Nazgûl and Balrog to the *Eddas*, Norse sagas, and *Beowulf*. Jessica Burke tackles the range of readers' responses to Tolkien's work in "Fear and Horror: Monsters in Tolkien and *Beowulf*" (15-52). Tossing "terror" into the discussion, Burke examines the musings of Charles Darwin and Stephen King on the subjects of fear, terror, and horror. Ultimately for Burke, fear, terror, and horror are not "similar and therefore should not be used interchangeably" (19). Instead they represent a continuum, in which fear becomes its more extreme form, terror, and can ultimately transform into the abject freneticism of horror. Against the backdrop of this discussion, Burke analyzes Tolkien's monsters. She concludes that there are essentially two types of monsters, those that represent an imbalance in or perversion of nature (such as Ungoliant and Shelob) and those that are corrupted or "fallen" human-like characters (such as Melkor and Gollum). In both cases, Tolkien's monsters "serve to teach us about our own folly" (49) and perhaps warn us of our own monstrous proclivities to devour and destroy that which gives us life. In "Horror and Anguish: The

Slaying of Glaurung and Medieval Dragon-Lore" (151-68), Romauld Ian Lakowski teases out the convoluted genealogy of Glórund/Glómund/Glaurung in the different and contradictory versions of the Túrin saga. Lakowski's work, made possible by the 2007 publication of Christopher Tolkien's edition of *The Children of Húrin*, traces the development of the malevolent dragon from its earliest incarnation in the Silmarillion texts. Lakowski notes the extent to which Tolkien the author borrowed motifs from a wide range of medieval literature, primarily *Völsunga Saga* and *Beowulf*. In the end, Lakowski concludes that Tolkien was "very traditional in drawing on the whole medieval tradition of dragon-lore, while at the same time being most radically innovative in reworking that tradition" (164).

In "The Homecoming of Beorhtnoth Beorhthelm's Son': J.R.R. Tolkien's Sequel to 'The Battle of Maldon,'" *Mythlore* 26.3-4: 65-87, Marie Nelson offers a "dramatic" reading of Tolkien's "recitation for two persons." Intended as a performance piece, Tolkien's narrative "presents a search in the darkness of night for the body of a fallen leader in which the searchers progress by recognizing the bodies of the men most loyal to him" (65). Clearly a sequel to *The Battle of Maldon*, Tolkien's recitation explores two contrasting perspectives on the leader's decision to permit the enemy forces to cross a river that served as a protective barrier against their attack. Nelson applies speech act theory, or linguistic pragmatics, to both Tolkien's piece and *The Battle of Maldon* in an effort to "understand what speakers do when they 'perform' acts of *commanding* and *predicting* and *promising* and *threatening*" (66, original emphasis). The balance of the essay is a close reading and analysis of these speech acts in the two pieces.

Scott Davis Howard explores the extent to which Tolkien's study of *Beowulf* inspired and influenced *The Lord of the Rings* in his English master's thesis at the University of Montana, "Recreating *Beowulf's* 'Pregnant Moment of Poise': Pagan Doom and Christian Eucatastrophe made Incarnate in the Dark Age Setting of *The Lord of the Rings*." Howard's thesis examines a wide range of evidence, including Tolkien's letters, lectures, published essays, the writings of his friends and critics, and the work of biblical scholars, in addition to relevant primary texts from the early Middle Ages. He demonstrates that Tolkien fused early medieval history, Christian apocalypse, and pagan mythology to recreate the "fusion point of imagination" which, Tolkien argued in "*Beowulf: the Monsters and the Critics*," produced the epic *Beowulf*. Through the imaginative collision of pagan doom and Christian salvation, Tolkien allows his heroes, principally Sam and Frodo, to suffer

martyrdom without death, to survive doom and experience salvation. Howard concludes that it is, in part, this "paradoxical thematic union" that readers find so immensely rewarding in Tolkien's trilogy.

In "A Monster that Matters: Tolkien's Grendel Revisited" in *Myth and Magic: Art according to the Inklings*, eds. Eduardo Segura and Thomas Honneger (Zollikoven, Switzerland: Walking Tree, 2007), 187-240, Eugenio M. Olivares-Merino analyzes how Tolkien viewed Grendel's character and function in *Beowulf*. Olivares-Merino traces Tolkien's familiarity and growing intimacy with *Beowulf* throughout his education and early academic career. He further suggests that Tolkien's experiences in World War I, especially at the (First) Battle of the Somme, were formative, influencing his perceptions of evil and horror. Using letters and early drafts of Tolkien's 1936 lecture, "*Beowulf: the Monsters and the Critics*," Olivares-Merino paints a vivid picture of how Tolkien may have come to understand Grendel while he was composing the lecture. Olivares-Merino concludes that Tolkien's conception of Grendel encompasses four principal characteristics: Grendel "is a man alienated from creation, not a demon"; he is "as real as the hero that kills him"; he functions on several symbolic levels; and finally, his "role in the structure of the poem is fundamental" to the success of the narrative.

Beowulf and Film

The release of Robert Zemeckis's *Beowulf* prompted a number of essays on a variety of subjects related to the universality of the poem's themes and characters. In "The Evil Behind the Mask: Grendel's Pop Culture Evolution," *Jnl of Popular Culture* 41.6: 934-49, Jennifer Kelso Farrell examines the evolution of Grendel in popular culture. Focusing on three works in particular—the original poem *Beowulf*, John Gardner's novel *Grendel*, and Matt Wagner's comic book *Grendel*—Farrell argues that the character of Grendel "continually evolves through the decades as society needs him" (934). In the original poem, Grendel is evil incarnate, all action and no reflection. Gardner attributes characteristics of a modern sensibility to Grendel and tells the story entirely from Grendel's point of view. Gardner's Grendel is angry and violent, but not evil. In perhaps the most startling transformation, Wagner's Grendel is an assassin who conducts his violence for profit. Farrell concludes from this survey that "Grendel represents that which is dark within the human psyche.... Through Grendel we are able to live vicariously and imagine giving in to our bestial primal selves" (948).

Stephen T. Asma, Professor of Philosophy at Columbia College (Chicago), muses on the original poem and the new film version in “Never Mind Grendel. Can Beowulf Conquer the 21st-Century Guilt Trip?” *Chronicle of Higher Education* 54.15 (2007): B14–B15. For Asma, the original poem celebrates the “honor culture” values of “brute strength, tribal loyalty, and stoic courage” (14) while Zemeckis’s film reflects the anxieties of our own age. The heroes of the original poem were truly heroic and the monsters palpably evil. And yet the film presents, on the one hand, an “emasculated” Beowulf, a hero who’s “basically a jerk, [and] whose most sympathetic moment is when he realizes that he’s a jerk,” and on the other, a humanized Grendel, a monster who is “visually altered after his injury to look like an innocent, albeit scaly, little child” (15). Despite a few glaring errors (e.g., his claim that “most scholars put the date of the manuscript around 1100 AD”), Asma’s meditation on the place of honor culture values in the “guilt trip” culture of the twenty-first century is entertaining and even intriguing.

On the occasion of the release of the movie to DVD, Keith Robinson reviews the blockbuster in his “Beowulf: The Movie,” *Current Archaeology* 216: 22–23. While marveling at the computer graphics and noting their usefulness in helping modern audiences visualize the past, Robinson laments that there is little historical accuracy in the architecture and material culture represented in the movie. However, although the narrative strays from the original, Robinson makes an astute observation: the text as we have it in the *Beowulf* manuscript itself is an “interpretation of an oral work into a textual one, and here [in the movie] we can see the translation of text into visual media for a visually-oriented culture” (23). Although this may not allay the very real anxieties that many Anglo-Saxonists have with the movie, his comment does in fact give us some cover in the age of 3-D multimedia devices.

In her essay “*Inwit* in ‘Barfield’s’ *Beowulf*: Epic and Movie,” *In Geardagum* 28: 77–106, Loren C. Gruber applies “Barfieldian criteria” to the art of translating the Anglo-Saxon epic, both literally and cinematically. Focusing on the word “*inwit*” and its compound forms, Gruber argues that these are “overlooked signs of the poet’s projection of post-Conversion thought backwards upon Grendel’s and Beowulf’s mental processes, insofar as they plan and think before they strike” (80). Through her analysis, Gruber demonstrates that the *Beowulf*-poet combines an earlier poetic diction with the ecclesiastical vocabulary of his own intellectual milieu. Gruber argues that Zemeckis’s movie effectively represents on an emotional and physical level

this “subtle shift from the instrumental sense of personhood to the objective case that suggests an individual’s manipulative cause-effect mentality” (94).

In perhaps the most informative of these essays, “Grendel’s Mother in Stiletto Heels? Alternatives to the New *Beowulf* Movie,” *In Geardagum* 28: 73–75, Alexandra H. Olsen discusses the relative merits of several other renditions of the *Beowulf* epic. While decrying the pitfalls of the Zemeckis movie, Olsen praises two movies, “The 13th Warrior” (1999) and “Beowulf and Grendel” (2005). While neither renders the plot faithfully, Olsen argues that “both are good movies, worth watching repeatedly” (74). She also mentions another *Beowulf* movie, “The Prince of the Geats,” which features a black main character with dreadlocks. An internet search of the working title, “Beowulf: Prince of the Geats,” suggests that indeed the film was completed in 2007 but is not available for purchase. A trailer for the all-volunteer, low-budget production can be viewed at <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cPLcc5L2NaM>>.

Varia

In the opening essay of *Medieval English Comedy: Profane Arts of the Middle Ages*, ed. Sandra M. Hordis and Paul Hardwick (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), Martha Bayless surveys the available evidence of “Humour and the Comic in Anglo-Saxon England” (13–30). Bayless examines a variety of sources, including chronicles, letter, glosses, and saints’ lives. Examples of Anglo-Saxon humor range from the sexually implicit Exeter Book Riddles to the sardonic Durham Proverbs (“Things are bad all over, said he who heard the screaming in hell” [15]). She also finds evidence of a wide variety of purveyors of entertainment and humor, such as jesters, jugglers, and tightrope walkers, in a range of environments from monasteries to courts. Bayless concludes that “far from being too gloomy to appreciate comic tales, the Anglo-Saxons were among the earliest in medieval Europe to import them, to copy them, and to enjoy them” (30).

In *Anglo-Saxon Books and their Readers: Essays in Celebration of Helmut Gneuss’s ‘Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts,’* ed. Hall and Scragg (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University), the contribution by Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr., “‘Mine Is Bigger Than Yours’: The Anglo-Saxon Collections of Johannes de Laet (1581–1649) and Sir Simonds D’Ewes (1602–50)” (136–74), focuses on these two early Anglo-Saxonists’ independent efforts to compile an Anglo-Saxon dictionary. Following detailed biographical accounts of their lives and careers, Bremmer

muses on the origins of de Laet's interest in and study of Old English, concluding that it must have arisen from his "curiosity about the history of the Dutch language" (144). Bremmer moves on to an analysis of de Laet's correspondence to recover the printed sources available to and likely used by de Laet in the compilation of his dictionary. In a comparative examination of the independent efforts of de Laet and D'Ewes, Bremmer concludes that, although lost, de Laet's dictionary must have been more extensive than D'Ewes's. Bremmer's essay is followed by two appendices that present Abraham Wheelock's list of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts from Cambridge in Tresoar, the Provincial Library of Friesland, and a list of de Laet's corrections and emendations to Henry Spelman's edition of the Anglo-Saxon Psalter. (A review of the entire volume is in section 2.)

In the lead essay to a volume in her honor, *Aedificia nova: Studies in Honor of Rosemary Cramp*, ed. Karkov and Damico (see section 2), Rosemary Cramp explores "The Changing Image, Divine and Human, in Anglo-Saxon Art" (3-32). Focusing on themes she first presented some thirty years earlier, Cramp examines three features of Anglo-Saxon figural representation, which she dubs "the mask, the icon, and the dramatic actor" (6). In a wide-ranging consideration of native Celtic and Germanic legendary and symbolic representations of human and divine figures, Cramp charts the changes in the treatment of these figures in the art of the Anglo-Saxon period, noting a softening of and greater intimacy in the representations, especially of divine figures. These transformations resulted in a "changed environment for figural representation" (22), which, Cramp concludes, reflected a transition in late Anglo-Saxon England from popular and collective piety to one more informal and individual. (See section 2 for a review of the collection.)

In "Mary as Anglo-Saxon *Dryhtin* and Norman Patroness: A Fusion of Cultural and Literary Influences in *On God Ureisun of Ure Lefdi*" in *The Propur Langage of Englische Men*, vol. 4 of *Medieval English Mirror*, ed. Krygier and Sikorska (see section 3a), 105-118, Barbara Kowalik offers a close reading of the thirteenth-century poem. Focusing on the "metaliterary vocabulary" of the poem, Kowalik suggests that the poet's choices of genre, diction, and theme reveal that the poet intended "a kind of intermarriage of the French literary tradition (*lai*) and the English language (*englisce*)" (106). The poem is composed in a meter that imitates the French fashion of octosyllabic couplets yet incorporates images from the Anglo-Saxon poetic milieu. Kowalik points out that while the heavenly court represented in the poem is reminiscent of the Norman royal court, the

vision of heaven, with its attendant depictions of drinking and feasting, is clearly "reminiscent of Old English poetry, presenting the social and cultural milieu of the mead-hall" (111). She concludes that the poem "exudes optimism, which is religious in nature in the first place but which may also be interpreted as cultural optimism" (117).

In "Whatever Happened to Your Heroes? Guy and Bevis after the Middle Ages" in *The Making of the Middle Ages*, eds. Marios Costambeys, Andrew Hamer, and Martin Heale. (Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2007), 54-70, David Matthews investigates why the legendary English heroes Guy of Warwick and Bevis of Hampton vanished so utterly from the popular imagination while Robin Hood and King Arthur continue to command attention. Matthews points to the late eighteenth century, and to the work of the antiquarian Samuel Pegge in particular, as a defining moment. Pegge's paper of May 1767 to the Society of Antiquaries on the historicity of Guy of Warwick demonstrated rather conclusively that the "Anglo-Saxon setting was anachronistic and that the tale could only have been composed in the later middle ages" (54). Matthews examines the post-medieval references to both Guy and Bevis up to Pegge's paper, arguing that Guy and Bevis were essentially provincial heroes who disappeared in the vast reorganization and centralization of antiquarian knowledge to metropolitan institutions, such as the London-based Society of Antiquarians, that occurred in the late eighteenth century. Matthews concludes that "[t]his process both allowed the study of medieval literature to begin in an organized fashion, and at the same time removed some of its most popular texts from circulation" (69).

In *Seamus Heaney and Medieval Poetry* (Woodbridge and Rochester NY: D. S. Brewer), Conor McCarthy examines the Irish poet Seamus Heaney's use of medieval material. While McCarthy's book scrutinizes all of Heaney's work for its indebtedness to medieval subject matter, he is especially interested in Heaney's blockbuster translation of *Beowulf*, to which he devotes an entire chapter. His introduction delineates his view that Heaney's medievalism and his translations of medieval texts in particular are "an indirect means of addressing the Northern Irish conflict" (6). Consequently, when McCarthy turns to the poet's translation of the Anglo-Saxon epic, he spends a considerable amount of time on Heaney's use of "Hiberno-Anglo-Saxon" as a means of allaying his anxieties about the use of the "English" language. All too often, McCarthy assumes Heaney's poem is a word-for-word translation of the original despite Heaney's avowal that he did not feel constrained by his source for the original poem, Klaeber's third edition

with its extensive notes and glossary. Given his ideological perspective, McCarthy's appraisal and interpretations of Heaney's translation may not afford the hard-core Anglo-Saxon philologist any satisfaction, but he does offer an interesting perspective on the historical transmission and appropriation of medieval texts by modern authors, who ultimately testify to the enduring tug of the poem.

In "Theory and Practice in the Anglo-Saxon Leechbooks: The Case of Paralysis," *Viator* 39: 65-74, James T. McIlwain, a neuroscientist at Brown University, examines contemporary medical compendia to determine how Anglo-Saxon physicians would treat cases of paralysis. Using the case of Brother Baduthegn as presented in Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* (IV, xxxi [xxix]), McIlwain explores potential diagnoses and remedies for paralysis in the *Leechbooks*. McIlwain determines that Anglo-Saxon physicians understood paralysis "according to the classical theory of its cause, namely obstruction of the channels contained in the nerves or sinews" (72). Lacking translations of particular Greek texts, such as Galen's descriptions of how paralysis results from surgical laceration of the spinal cord, however, Anglo-Saxon physicians are likely to have "depended solely on the humoral theory of physiology" (73) and to have prescribed the application of herbal remedies to the afflicted areas and the purgation of offending humors through such interventions as bloodletting, vomiting, and sneezing.

In a close analysis of seven herbal remedies in *Leechbook III*, in "Anglo-Saxon Ethnobotany: Women's Reproductive Medicine" in *Health and Healing from the Medieval Garden*, ed. Dendle and Touwaide (see section 7), 145-61, Marijane Osborn demonstrates herbs' special significance for women's health. The remedies, some of which are unique to *Leechbook III*, "focus entirely upon women's anxieties and concerns about menstruation and childbirth" (158). Osborn reviews the historical shift in scholarly attitudes toward such remedies, which mix superstition with practical advice. In a tantalizing comment that she does not substantiate (but hopefully may in a future publication), Osborn points out that, to date, no one has noticed the fact that two sections (37 and 38) of *Leechbook III* are "different from the sections that precede and follow" (160), and she seems to hint at the possibility of female authorship, or at least of a female contribution, to the otherwise "male or non-gender-specific material" (160).

Postcolonial theorist, cultural critic, and historian, Robert J. C. Young returns to the questions of "race" and "identity" in his latest book, *The Idea of English Ethnicity* (Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell). Young

sets out to tackle the question of what it means to call oneself "English" and what constitutes the identity of England. Young begins by reconsidering the ways in which English identity was classified in the nineteenth century. With the Act of Union of 1800, earlier attempts to exclude the Irish from English identity gave way to more inclusive notions of what constituted "Englishness," which had nothing to do with race or geographic location. Ultimately, Young argues that "Englishness" has never truly been about England at all. Instead, by the end of the nineteenth century, it had developed into an imperial ideology of appropriation. English identity has come to incorporate the English diaspora, including North Americans, South Africans, Australians, New Zealanders, Caribbeans, and Indians in the mix. Indeed, it is this inclusiveness, Young argues, that has allowed Britain to become one of the most multicultural of modern nation states.

In his self-published book, *This Tribe of Mine: A Story of Anglo-Saxon Viking Culture in America* (Shelbyville, MI: Williston and Robbins), George Hiram Williston strives to answer a troubling question: "Why is our American Culture so militaristic and competitive while a large number of people in our culture claim to follow the teachings of Jesus Christ?" (vii). In the first two-thirds of the book (chapters 1-6), beginning with the Germanic migrations of the fourth and fifth centuries, Williston paints a picture of conquest, displacement, and slavery. He argues that this heritage of violence has led us to our present stratified society, defined as it is by hierarchies of wealth and entitlement. In the last third of the book (chapters 7-9), Williston turns to religion and science. He offers an idiosyncratic analysis of the history of institutional Christianity and its perpetuation of the values of domination and greed. Advocating a return to the authentic lessons of Jesus, Williston argues and presents "evidence" that Jesus traveled to India and Tibet, where he learned his doctrine of brotherly love. In addition, Williston takes solace in the potential of Zero Point Energy to affect healing in the universe. Written in very direct language and style, the book ultimately argues that we must change our cultural values of greed, perpetual struggle, and warfare, which we inherited from our Germanic ancestors, in order to avoid depleting all our natural resources and annihilating each other. While I sympathize with some of Williston's sociological commentary (who doesn't wish for suffering and hostilities to cease?), I find the text difficult to follow in many places, and its logic, history, science, and analysis falter at several key points. In the end, however, there is a sense of brimming optimism in this work, a feeling, perhaps naïve but hopeful

nonetheless, that if we could only set aside our differences and join together as “children of One Universe,” we would be able to secure a more peaceful future. And who wouldn't want that?

Works not seen:

Biddulph, Joseph. *An Anglo-Saxon Studies Companion: Essays and Notes on the Cultural and Linguistic Context*. Pontypridd: J. Biddulph.

Campbell, Alistair and Jan Campbell. *Chester City Beautiful*. Derby: Breedon Books.

Getty, Laura J. “‘Other smale ymaad before’: Chaucer as Historiographer in the *Legend of Good Women*.” *Chaucer Review* 42 (2007): 48-75.

Griffith, John Lance. “Tasking the Translator: a Dialogue between King Alfred and Walter Benjamin.” *Medieval and Early Modern English Studies (Korea)* 16:1-18.

Noone, Kristin. *The Monsters and the Heroes: Neil Gaiman's 'Beowulf'*. K. Noone.

Olsen, Alexandra H. “Old English Warrior-Women and the Hindu Goddess Durga.” *In Geardagum* 28: 43-48.

Watson, Ritchie Devon Jr. *Normans and Saxons: Southern Race Mythology and the Intellectual History of the American Civil War*. Southern Literary Studies. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State UP.

RFJ

2. Memorials, Tributes, History of the Discipline

At the heart of Siân Echard's *Printing the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P) is the desire to “understand the lasting impact, on both the scholarly and popular imagination, of the physical objects which transmitted the Middle Ages to the English-speaking world” (xi). This provocative study of “the postmedieval life of medieval texts” in their material forms is organized in a loose chronology, from the incunabular period to the digital age (vii). Each chapter tells the story of the transmission and reception of a “particular text-object,” considering how printers, publishers, and scholars represented the medieval (xi). In addition to Chapter 1, “Form and Rude Letters: The Representation of Old English,” which is discussed below, Echard takes up “The True History of Sir Guy (and What Happened to Sir Bevis?)”; “Aristocratic Antiquaries: Gower on Gower”; “Bedtime Chaucer: Juvenile Adaptations and the Medieval Canon”; “Froissart's not French (or Flemish): The Travels of a Medieval History”; and a “Coda. The Ghost in the Machine: Digital Avatars of Medieval Manuscripts.”

The “effects of type,” a recurring theme in her study, is “particularly and peculiarly central” to Chapter 1: “Form and Rude Letters: The Representation of Old English” (21-59, 25), although “the visual vocabulary of antiquarianism”—engravings of monuments, pictures, and grave-goods—is considered toward the end of the chapter (45). Like letterforms, engravings are visual markers of the past, and Echard asks what it might mean to understand the medieval past visually. A wealth of examples, drawn from sixteenth- through twentieth-century editions of Anglo-Saxon histories, religious works, dictionaries, and literary texts

illustrate the representation of Anglo-Saxon letterforms as authoritative signs of the past and as, at the same time, alien and distancing. Beginning with the description of the inscription of the Glastonbury Cross in Philemon Holland's 1610 translation of William Camden's *Britannia*, in which the letters are described as barbarous and rude, Echard argues that this “representation (and negative judgment) of antique letterforms” becomes more and more common in many books of British history, and affects “not the history of King Arthur,” on which Camden's illustration of the cross is directed, but the “Saxon age” (25). The letterforms come to represent the authority of the past but also, in characterizing them as barbarous and rude, identify them as associated with a Saxon “cultural backwater” (21, 25). This tension is notable in Matthew Parker's *The Testimonie of Antiquity*, where the specially-cut Anglo-Saxon font facing the roman of the translation typographically assigns the English and Old English “to realms with vastly different implications and prestige values” (30). Echard's more interesting examples of how typography can affect the accessibility of a text are from John Minsheu's polylingual dictionary, *Ductor i Linguas* and Francis Junius's *Etymologicum Anglicanum*. Both differentiate between languages and categories by using different fonts (42). The argument is complex, but one important part of it is the way in which black letter is used for Modern English and, in the case of Junius, for literary quotations from Chaucer, while Old English words are printed in Anglo-Saxon font. Old English, “remotely historical and unreadable,” is both rescued and “made strange” against other Germanic languages, which are printed in black letter or roman (40). In this way type

marks the medieval but “their Saxon dress simultaneously asserts their historicity and separates them from the present to which they speak” (42). Through a range of examples, Echard concludes that Old English tended to be typographically relegated to the realm “of the linguistic, etymological, geographical, and the anthropological,” while the literary (quotations from Chaucer, for example), was made typographically accessible in black letter, italic, and roman. Even portraits, which were popular inclusions and obviously problematic for Old English texts, tended to identify those texts with “the worlds of institutional history, lexicography, and the like” since the editor’s portrait was substituted for the unknown author (48). Only in the early nineteenth century was there a move toward putting Anglo-Saxon texts in roman type (56). Echard concludes, however, with the example of Gareth Hinds’s 2000 edition of *Beowulf*. A script that imitates insular letterforms was designed for the edition, which evokes a past time and “a kind of production now largely lost,” and this, she suggests, indicates that the “limiting aspects of the letter” so prevalent in the earlier periods has relaxed (59).

Anglo-Saxon Books and their Readers: Essays in Celebration of Helmut Gneuss’s Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (ed. Thomas N. Hall and Donald Scragg, Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications), is a slim collection of rich treats honoring Gneuss’s “pivotal achievement in English manuscript studies,” a reliable guide to Anglo-Saxon textual remains, which has, in turn, expanded our knowledge of the “intellectual world of the Anglo-Saxons” (vii). The six essays are revisions of papers presented in Gneuss’s honor at the 2001 International Medieval Congress at Kalamazoo; Gneuss’s own 2001 Richard Rawlinson Center lecture, “A *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: Origins, Facts, and Problems*,” heads the collection. The essays reflect new directions in manuscript studies stimulated by the *Handlist*; particularly new insights into the “uses to which these manuscripts were put both in the late Anglo-Saxon period when they were written and in the Renaissance when the dust was blown off of them by the earliest generation of Anglo-Saxonists” (xii). Gneuss’s lecture, and essays by Scragg (“Cotton Tiberius A. iii Scribe 3 and Canterbury Libraries”), and Hall (“The Development of the Common of Saints in the Early English Versions of Paul the Deacon’s Homiliary”), are reviewed in the appropriate sections below. Essays by Dekker, Brackmann, Kleist, and Bremmer are discussed here.

In “Reading the Anglo-Saxon Gospels in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries” (68–93), Kees Dekker reevaluates Thomas Marshall’s editorial role in the

1665 Junius/Marshall Dordrecht edition of *Quatuor D.N. Jesu Christ Evangeliorum*. Junius’s annotated copy of John Foxe’s 1571 London edition of the Gospels, thought to be lost at the time (now Oxford, Lincoln College Library, MS N. 1.7), offers fresh insight into Marshall’s editorial approach and explains why the 1665 edition differs so notably from the London edition, upon which it is known to be based. Dekker’s discussion of the “possible ‘rediscovery’—perhaps functional rather than physical—of the Gospels in Old English ... between the dissolution of the monasteries in 1536 and Cranmer’s death in 1556” supplies useful historical context for publication, under Foxe’s name but by Parker’s instigation, of the 1571 edition of the Old English Gospels (71). The purpose, as Foxe’s dedication makes clear, was “vindication of the right to read the Gospels in the vernacular” (75). The Gospels themselves were not, however, treated as theologically significant at the time or by subsequent readers, who chiefly mined them for lexicographical projects. One such miner was Francis Junius, whose printing of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, Dekker explains, was motivated by “his belief that they were conducive to understanding the Gothic text and facilitated his philological observations in the *Gothicum Glossarium*” (78–9). He sought Marshall’s help for the project, enlisting him to edit the Old English Gospels and to compile “two chapters of observations” (*Observationes de versione Gothica* and *Observationes in versionem Anglo-Saxonicam*). Before sending his copy of Foxe’s 1571 edition (which was based on Oxford, MS Bodley 441) to Marshall, Junius collated it with CUL Ii.2.11, CCCC MS 140, and Hatton 38; and he copied the commemoration of Bishop Leofric’s gift to Exeter of CUL Ii.2.11, and of Gregory Dodde’s to Matthew Parker, as well as the colophon in CCCC MS 140, and the inscription indicating the manuscript had been copied by Ælfric in Bath and presented to Brihtwold. Junius’s annotations were thus of two types: (1) collation references from the three manuscripts, usually in order (C, B, H); and (2) “miscellaneous corrections without reference to the manuscripts,” emendations that considerably altered the original in terms of spelling, substitution of variants, and “a host of alternatives listed in the margins” (82–3). Marshall made his own (easily identified) additions to and corrections of capitalization, spacing, hyphenation, punctuation, and chapter headings, and he inserted glosses from the Rushworth or Lindisfarne Gospels from Junius’s excerpts (MS Junius 76). By ignoring most of the collation corrections—underlining in red those he kept—and omitting most of the references to unascribed manuscripts, Dekker explains, Marshall converted Junius’s annotated

copy of the London edition to “an exemplar for a new edition” (83). A collation table (84-5) shows the extent to which “the 1665 edition is, above all, Marshall’s edition, in which he made a conscious choice to stay close to the text of his exemplar” (86). Marshall considered date, authorship, provenance, and manuscript tradition, seeking in the works of early historians, an “early vernacular biblical tradition in Britain” (87). Believing there to be more than one Anglo-Saxon bible translation by more than one translator from more than one period, Marshall attempted to determine the age and provenance of the manuscripts he used. Dekker thinks it unlikely that he saw the manuscripts, but instead relied on correspondence with Junius and on the latter’s annotations to the Foxe edition. His conclusion that each manuscript was a “historical document in its own right,” made Marshall a more careful editor who respected “individual manuscripts and their variants” (90). As Dekker shows, Marshall tried to remain faithful to Bodley 44, emending lightly and only when he felt it to be necessary. The result was quite different than would have been the case had he made all of Junius’s corrections. Parker and Foxe treated the Old English text as a sample of antiquity; Junius, as a “scholarly tool” with which to compare Old Germanic and Gothic words; Marshall “set out to perfect the text,” even adding a chapter of notes on errors in translation, scribal variants, unusual rubrics, and differences in the Old English translation that “reflected an exemplar different from the Vulgate” (93). “Through his annotations,” Dekker concludes:

Marshall introduced the Old English Gospels—he did the same for the Gothic texts—into the tradition of the *philologia sacra*, a school of biblical exegesis in which philological annotations present detailed comments on individual lines or verses, with the specific aim of achieving the proper understanding of the text as an ancient document (93).

Laurence Nowell’s extensive Old English glosses to Howlet’s *Abcedarium* represent three distinct projects: a glossary of Anglo-Saxon legal terms, a place-name dictionary, and “a virtually unstudied Old English dictionary” (95). Rebecca Brackmann takes up this third project in “Laurence Nowell’s Old English Glosses in Howlet’s ‘Abcedarium’: In the Margins of Early Modern Lexicography,” 94-105). In a welcome addition to Nowell scholarship, she locates that project in contemporary debates about the English language. Nowell’s dictionary consists of nearly 4500 Old English words

written in the “printed book’s main text” and “next to their corresponding Modern English entries” (95-6). What was Nowell’s purpose in creating this list? Brackmann considers and rejects two possibilities. Since the *Abcedarium* “glosses and the printed text comprise a Modern English to Old English dictionary,” the purpose is unlikely to have been to help him read Old English manuscripts (98-9). Nor does it seem likely that it was “to facilitate composition in Old English,” since Nowell’s only “extended Old English compositions ... are translations from Latin, not Modern English” (100). Moreover, the *Abcedarium* is a trilingual dictionary, organized “around Modern English”; for such a purpose, glossing a Latin dictionary (which would have been available to him) would have been more to the point (100). Brackmann’s solution is elegant. It challenges the assumption “that his chief aim was to recover ancient religious documents, as his contemporaries did” (99). Tempting as it is “to read Nowell in the light of better-known antiquaries such as Matthew Parker and to assume that his motives were tied to the Protestant cause as Parker’s were,” too little is known of Nowell’s politics and religion to assume “his reason for studying Old English was to aid the cause of the Anglican Church.” Instead, we might position Nowell’s project within “early modern debates about inkhorn terms and the ideal lexical content of the English language” and his concerns “with the origins and nature of the English language, a concern that fueled, among other things, a surge in bilingual dictionaries” (100, 105). Examples from the works of William Turner, John Cheke, and John Hart, among others, illustrate “a discernible thread of sixteenth-century discourse concerning the nature of English,” specifically anxiety about the danger of foreign borrowings and the “valorization of older English words over Romance or Latinate neologisms” (103). Indeed, a key feature of these discussions was comparisons of “Modern English words with Latin and Old English ones” (104). Brackmann concludes that we should “expand our explorations of the work of the earliest Anglo-Saxonists into areas that are not explicitly polemical in nature, but that contribute to other discourses in Tudor England” (105).

In “‘Mine is Bigger than Yours’: The Anglo-Saxon Collections of Johannes de Laet (1581-1649) and Sir Simond D’Ewes (1602-50),” (136-174), Rolf Bremmer undertakes an interesting comparison of the pioneering “lexicographical efforts” of contemporaries de Laet and D’Ewes, neither of whom have generated much scholarly interest (136). Both compiled Anglo-Saxon dictionaries, although neither was published. A sketch of the beginnings of Dutch interest in Anglo-Saxon

scholarship, culled in part from annotated auction catalogues of the private libraries of Early Modern Dutch scholars, offers a historical and bibliographic context for “the aims, methods, and motivations of D’Ewes and de Laet” (137). De Laet, matriculated at Leiden University in 1597, and was a student of Bonaventura Vulcanius, whose *De lingua et literis Gothorum*, “a survey of specimens of Old Germanic languages” including Old English, was published that same year, and of philologist Joseph Scaliger (140). A successful and wealthy merchant and a founding director of the Dutch West Indies Company, de Laet also published many books on a variety of topics (e.g., the ideas of Pelagius, a history of the New World, and an edition of Pliny’s *Historia Naturalis*, along with other geographical and historical works) (142). D’Ewes, on the other hand, was “a man of (modest) noble birth,” Cambridge educated, high Sheriff, and member of the Long Parliament of Sudbury Suffolk. His interest in Anglo-Saxon was practical—necessary for his research into Suffolk history—while de Laet’s appears to have derived from “his curiosity about the history of the Dutch language” (144). When D’Ewes wrote Sir Henry Spelman of his intention to compile an Anglo-Saxon dictionary in 1640, de Laet had already made “significant progress toward his own.” Not only was Spelman unable to discourage D’Ewes, but D’Ewes and de Laet began a correspondence that continued until de Laet’s death in 1649, exchanging information, methods, and samples of work in progress (156). De Laet’s reputation in England, bolstered by his many publications and friendship with Scaliger, helped pave the way for his access to Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, many of which he copied during a five-month stay in England in 1648. He was particularly interested in medical manuscripts, which, he wrote to Sir Henry Spelman, “have been left untouched by your lexicographers” (151). Remarkably he was lent Junius 11 by Archbishop Usser, and drew words from it for the dictionary. He was the first to realize the texts in it were verse, not prose, and “the first to be dimly aware of what we now call *Genesis B*” (152). “Unlike the English Anglo-Saxonists,” Bremmer explains, de Laet “ventured into the unknown, thus showing the same exploratory attitude that had also marked his studies of the New World” (152). In contrast, D’Ewes had only “a beginner’s knowledge” of Dutch and German, and, while de Laet discouraged him from adding Dutch and German cognates to his entries, he persevered (158). In the late 1640s D’Ewes sought the lexical help of Sir William Dugdale and later William Somner and Francis Junius in a vain attempt to beat de Laet to publication. In short, though neither dictionary was ever published,

de Laet’s was, in fact, bigger. We might, moreover, apply the article title to the respective libraries of de Laet and D’Ewes. The former’s was impressive, containing “practically all the printed books containing Old English that had appeared before his death” (145). D’Ewes’s was good, including “a fair number that overlap with those which de Laet had on his shelves,” yet he was less well-equipped than de Laet in printed books “necessary for the practice of Anglo-Saxon lexicography in a comparative context” (159-60). While he had better access to manuscripts, his inability to use Dutch effectively was a serious handicap he could not overcome.

In “Matthew Parker, Old English, and the Defense of Priestly Marriage” (106-35), Aaron J. Kleist argues that Parker was responsible for both the first and second editions of *A Testimony of Antiquity*. Whether or not he “composed every word in his *Defence*,” Kleist concludes, “ultimately the responsibility for both editions is his, and this fact may shed new light on Parker’s pre-archiepiscopal knowledge and concerns” (133). While Kleist’s careful articulation of the problem is complex, there are a number of important points to be made. Parker’s publication was motivated by Thomas Martin’s 1554 attack on John Ponet’s *A Defence for Mariage of Priestes*; however, he claimed that it was the work of “a learned man of that tyme, who shortly after dyed,” and that he “wold nether adde to another mans writing, neither diminishe *the* same,” and so presents the book “unchanged” (110). The second edition, published around 1567, includes 77 pages of additions, “including a number of quotations in Old English” (110). Kleist adds a third reason to the two generally mounted to explain that Parker was responsible for this expansion and for publication of both editions: evidence in Dublin, Trinity College MS 248 (TCD 248) suggests that this manuscript “played a key and hitherto-unrecognized role in Parker’s work on clerical marriage.” The main body of it, “a Latin apology for priestly matrimony written in Parker’s hand,” is followed by

a couple of pages of miscellaneous quotations, one of which was also entered by Parker. Like the *Defence*, in support of its argument the Dublin manuscript weaves together hundreds of pieces of evidence, not a few of which show similarities to material in the *Defence* (111-12).

Kleist summarizes the parallels between the main text and the *Defence* and explores how the additions, in particular, more directly connect “the Dublin manuscript and the *Defence*—and thus Parker’s responsibility for the second edition” (113). The evidence—“Parker’s

association with the printing of Old English during this period, the annotations made by Parker in his manuscripts, and the material collected by Parker in TCD 248—suggests that he compiled the second edition of the *Defence* (116). More significantly, however, is that the main body of TCD 248 suggests “that Parker may have been responsible for part if not all of the first edition as well” (116). Kleist’s evidence, chiefly in two parallels between TCD 248 and the *Defence* (extended references to “Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury ... and one of the leaders of the tenth-century Benedictine reform,” and to Hildebrand (Pope Gregory VII) whose decree forbidding priests’ marriage is viewed as a “watershed”), is convincingly rendered yet leads to yet more problems (116, 123): “which text was composed first [TCD 248 or the first edition], and who was responsible for the latter?” (118). Kleist ultimately argues that TCD 248 was “a work influenced by the first edition that in turn would serve as a source for the second” (120). But, given Parker’s prefatory comments about the “author” of the text, “[w]hence ... came the first edition?” (121). If, Kleist speculates, “Parker had appended his own material to that of another author, we might expect” style and content differences between the first and second edition, or “original’ and ‘expanded’ sections in the second edition” of the *Defence* (121). The transition between these sections is, however, “nearly seamless, with densely interwoven evidence being presented throughout, but also both parts reveal a decided interest in Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman matters” (121). If a single author was responsible for both editions and TCD 248, who, then, might that author be? After positing and rejecting several possible candidates for the deceased “anonymous” author—Robert Talbot, Robert Recorde (neither much concerned with priestly marriage), and John Ponet (who was concerned with it but whose descriptions in *A Defence for Mariage of Priestes* are only generally similar)—Kleist nominates Parker and summarizes the evidence, most notably perhaps, the continuity between the original and expanded portions of the *Defence* and Parker’s *Roll CCCC MS 583*, “a series of autobiographical notes on Parker’s early history,” in which he says 26 Oct. 1554 that he “composed a defense of priestly marriage against Thomas Martin” (127). What is to be done, however, with Parker’s prefatory remarks that the *Defence* had been written during the reign of Mary and Philip by a man who had subsequently died, that he would never add to another man’s writing, and that it was published just as he received it? (131). Kleist conjectures that Parker’s claims are rhetorical devices. If Parker and the author of whom he speaks are the same, for both editions of the *Defence* Parker

may ironically but honestly affirm that he “nether adde[s] to another mans writing, neither diminishe[s] the same.” In referring to the “learned man ... who shortly after dyed,” therefore, Parker might well be describing his own experience in 1559, as his life as an exile from office came to a dramatic end with his elevation to the highest ecclesiastical post in the land (132).

Magnús Fjalldal’s “To Fall by Ambition—Grimur Thorkelín and his *Beowulf* Edition,” *Neophilologus* 92: 321-32, is a revisionist biography of a man about whom “amazingly little has been written” even if his edition of *Beowulf* “has attracted constant scholarly attention since its publication in 1815” (321). The lack of primary biographical information has meant, in effect, that “Thorkelín’s edition has been discussed for nearly two centuries almost as if the man who produced it never existed” (321-2). Fjalldal’s goal is to establish, to the extent possible, “relevant facts concerning Thorkelín’s life and career” and “to explore how and to what extent these factors might have influenced the making of his *Beowulf* edition” (322). While Thorkelín’s rise in the scholarly world was initially “nothing less than spectacular ... all was not quite what it seemed” (322). Whether or not he knew of the existence of the *Beowulf* manuscript before he arrived in England in 1786 has been debated, but that he found and rescued it, Fjalldal asserts, is “sheer nonsense” since it was, at the time, “safely lodged in the British Museum” (323). Thorkelín’s two transcripts of the poem from the deteriorating manuscript and his introduction of the poem to the scholarly world in his 1815 edition were his “real achievement[s]” (323). To establish facts of Thorkelín’s life, Fjalldal turns to contemporary memoirs of those who knew him, chiefly E. C. Werlauff’s, and to his surviving letters. The portrait that emerges is not flattering. An upwardly mobile, good-looking, genteel man, he was also excessively fascinated by royalty, and apparently unsurpassed at ingratiating “himself with people in high places” (324). He secured his financial future by marrying a wealthy widow in 1792 and increased his wealth by working as a sort of proto-eBay magnate, buying a variety of goods at auction and re-selling them for a profit (327). His scholarly work suffered from neglect but, Fjalldal explains, “Thorkelín was being called an academic fraud long before his *Beowulf* edition appeared in 1815” (326). There have been a number of explanations for the twenty-nine-year gap between his first sight of the manuscript and the publication of his edition. Fjalldal rehearses these (he was not aware of the true significance of it; he lacked funds to complete the project), but counters that he seemed well aware of its value and complains of the difficulty of the work

in his letters. When his house was bombed in 1807, his claim that he lost all his work except for the two transcripts is suspect since “it is rather difficult to picture Thorkelín having had time and opportunity to rescue his precious transcripts from the fire while his translation and editorial notes—presumably as close at hand and hardly very bulky—were left to be destroyed by the flames” (328). Fjalldal concludes that the long delay is due to Thorkelín’s fear—being the first scholar to produce an edition would have brought him “the kind of scholarly fame that he undoubtedly craved”—but “he may also have had doubts that he was really up to the task of editing the poem” (328-9). The essay concludes with a summary of early reviews, which demonstrate that this fear was not ungrounded. Grundtvig’s criticism was particularly damaging, but John Kemble’s 1833 edition of the poem was “the final nail in Thorkelín’s editorial coffin” (331): Kemble’s “thundering verdict” was that there were “not five lines . . . in succession” that do not “betray the editor’s utter ignorance of the Anglo-Saxon language” (331).

The Correspondence of Edward Lye, ed. Margaret Clunies Ross and Amanda J. Collins (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2004), is a welcome contribution to our expanding knowledge of the history of the discipline in eighteenth-century England. This edition of Lye’s letters, not previously edited, adds to a growing collection of primary sources for historians of the discipline. The 193 letters dated from 1729–1767 between Lye and forty-five correspondents highlight the importance of the scholarly letter as a “medium for discussion, debate and academic business” in the eighteenth century, and reveal the complex interior and collaborative life and work of an important antiquary (4). The letters are chiefly from Thomas Percy’s collection (London, BL Add. 32325) and are, with three exceptions, edited from the original manuscripts and arranged chronologically. Headings provide the name (or conjecture) of writer and recipient, date, direction, endorsement, postmark, annotation, ascription, manuscript location, and recorded printings. Textual footnotes record authorial changes and annotations, annotations by other readers, as well as editorial emendations; a second set of footnotes offers intellectual and historical context as well as translations of non-English text. An introduction provides concise, clear explanations of the scope and arrangement of materials, the layout of letters, and the editorial procedures. A short biography of Lye and a nicely balanced assessment of his “scholarly achievement” round out the introductory section. Each of the four sections that follow are devoted to one of his four major scholarly research projects, *Etymologicum*

Anglicanum, the Gothic Gospels project, the Cædmon translation, and *Dictionarium Saxonico- et Gothico-Latinum*. The five appendices include: (1) Documents Relating to the Publication of the *Dictionarium Saxonico- et Gothico-Latinum*; (2) Documents Relating to the Life of Edward Lye; (3) Documents Associated with the Lye Correspondence; (4) Bibliographical Details of Books Mentioned in the Lye-[Thomas] Hearne Correspondence; and (5) Calendar of Letters Related to the Lye Correspondence. Helpful biographical notes on Lye’s correspondents, a bibliography of manuscript and printed sources of the Lye correspondence, a bibliography of both modern and antiquarian sources, and an extensive index are also included. A particularly valuable navigational feature is the detailed contents list (vi-xv), which precedes the Introduction. Each letter, listed in the order of its appearance in the volume, is numbered and identified by writer/recipient, date, MS shelfmark and folio(s), and finally, the page number where the letter appears in the edition. The system allows for easy cross-reference not only in the annotations to the letters themselves, but also in the introduction, biographical notes, appendices, and index. Correspondence presents difficult editorial challenges, and Lye’s collection is no exception. Clunies Ross and Collins have produced a thoughtful, well-organized scholarly edition with informative and useful apparatus. For example, this reader found the editors’ biographical referencing method lucid and consistent and the contextual notes informative without overwhelming the text. The decision to edit lightly and to silently expand standard eighteenth-century abbreviations (e.g., w^d to would) creates a readable text, while the meticulous textual apparatus preserves authorial practice and original manuscript readings and particulars.

While we might despair when our modernist colleagues remark, as they are wont to do, that there is, after all, not very much Anglo-Saxon literature, we ourselves might assume the Old English textual corpus to be a “mostly static whole” (424). Jonathan Wilcox puts paid to this assumption in his valuable bibliographic review, “New Old English Texts: The Expanding Corpus of Old English,” *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach*, ed. Virginia Blanton and Helene Scheck (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies with Brepols), 423-36. How has the Old English corpus expanded in the last decade or two, and what recent discoveries have been made? First reviewing reference tools that have mapped “the surviving textual culture of Anglo-Saxon England”—Angus Cameron’s classification system for the *Dictionary of Old English*, the DOE’s revised

short-title system, N.R. Ker's *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, and Helmut Gneuss's *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100* (424), Wilcox concludes, "[t]he broad terrain of Anglo-Saxon texts thus charted is provided with a wealth of guides in the form of specialist bibliographies," from Greenfield and Robinson's *Bibliography* to annual bibliographies in *Anglo-Saxon England* and *Old English Newsletter* (426). The balance of the essay is divided into three parts: Discoveries in the Flesh: New Manuscripts and Fragments; New Texts without Flesh: Discoveries from Transcriptions; and Picking at the Flesh: New Readings in Old Manuscripts. The first surveys manuscript finds from 1977, chiefly in the form of glosses, and binding and wrapping materials, as well as the discovery of a "substantial new text in plain sight" (the Taunton Fragments), and others (the Werden Glossary and other fragments) (429-30). The brief second section focuses on transcriptions "of otherwise lost works," chiefly historical, found in the papers of the early antiquaries. The final section considers the discoveries that have been made by "looking at damaged leaves of existing manuscripts with the tools of new technology," for which Kevin Kiernan's projects have been notable (433). These technologies are making it possible to read burnt, erased, soiled, and otherwise damaged manuscripts. "The fate of Old English books," Wilcox laments, "seems to have been just as gloomily diverse—carried away, divided, buried, erased, burned, or otherwise lost" as the men lost in *The Wanderer*, "yet these different methods of loss each allows the possibility of rediscovery" (436).

In "A Nearly, but Wrongly, Forgotten Historian of the Dark Ages," *Myth, Rulership, Church and Charters: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks*, ed. Julia Barrow and Andrew Wareham (Burlington VT: Ashgate), 31-44, James Campbell summarizes the largely neglected scholarship of Eben William Robertson (1815-1874), specifically the influence, acknowledged and unacknowledged, of his two books, *Scotland under her Early Kings* (1862) and *Historical Essays* (1872). The essay is, at the same time, a bibliographic study of recent work that builds on, duplicates, or reinvents Robertson's theories and conclusions. The sheer number of Robertson's discoveries and the apparent breadth and depth of his learning and influence are, as Campbell remarks, rather stunning. "The greatest of [his] gifts was the power of integration of socio-legal changes and political developments," the ability "to relate legal to social change and both to state formation" (41). His work was widely comparative and stretched across England, Scotland, Ireland, and Bavaria "with equal concern to integrate

the study both of local structures and socio-legal developments into a context of state formation. In both ways he anticipates and adds to modern work" (33). Indeed, he anticipated modern directions in research, particularly in legal archaeology (important for a determination of Anglo-Saxon origins); in "the means [by] which rulers in England and elsewhere" established "control over newly acquired lands" (36); in the impact of eighth-century immunity clauses and the division of large parishes associated with minster churches into smaller ones (38); and in the use of charters to "open a prosopographical view of the politics of the tenth and eleventh centuries" (39). As Campbell explains,

What Robertson reminds us of is that to look at almost any of the evidence we have for the socio-legal systems of early Europe is to be faced with innumerable and interrelated regularities which should not automatically be assumed to be merely notional. With social systems as with languages it may be that the older the system, the more complex and rigid the rules (40).

Given the influences Campbell traces, why the neglect of Robertson's work? Perhaps because he was, according to Geoffrey Barrow, "exasperatingly over-learned"; his writing style, "gnarled, sometimes to the point of impenetrability"; and his books "arranged on idiosyncratic principles, one of which is that titles should not provide an adequate guide to contents" (44, 31).

In "John Milton's Recourse to Old English: A Case Study in Renaissance Lexicography," *LATCH* 1: 1-29, William E. Engel argues that "Milton used words derived from Old English to convey special aspects of interiority that, in his estimation, were not brought out adequately by Latinate terms alone" (1). More specifically, Engel focuses on how the Old English word *inly* (meaning 'internal' or 'secret') conceptually links interiority to the origins of the English language (1). He discusses Milton's early interest in the conflict between the active and contemplative life, in logic, and in "the double expression of an issue, which he often marked by the linking word *and* or *or*"—a form of parallelism in which "intentional doubling of expression ... convey[s] a single idea" (5, 7). While accepting that Milton did not likely know Old English or see Junius 11, Engel argues that Milton consciously paired Old English with classical words, achieving "a lilting cadence" and a "more fulsome meaning" (6). For example, the phrase "to bow and sue for grace" in *Paradise Lost* (1.111) pairs "the earthier Saxon term *bow*, connoting physical

abasement,” with “the Latin evocation of supplication, *sue*,” setting up “the derisory and sarcastic tone of Satan’s retort to Beelzebub that this compound act of bowing and suing for grace before the Father will never happen” (7). This example shows that the

theme of grace, especially as it relates to one’s inward motivations and actions, is fundamental to Milton’s self-conscious use of Anglo-Saxon terms in his portrayal of the perturbations of the heart, mind, and soul at pivotal moments in the lives of his characters (8).

Milton uses “inly” four times in his corpus, once in *Paradise Lost* and three times in *Paradise Regained*. For example, in *Paradise Regained*, the Son, God’s “living oracle” to earth, confronts Satan about the end of pagan oracles (14).

[T]he subtle Fiend,
Though inly stung with anger and disdain,
Dissembl’d, and this answer smooth return’d.
(PR 1.460-67).

In the passage, Satan is “stung” but shows no outward anger; instead he dissembles. Every word in these two lines is derived from Anglo-Saxon, Engel notes, except “disdain” and “dissembl’d,” derived from Norman French. This “linking of anger and disdain connotes a break in, and a balancing of, different—but still not classical—linguistic registers,” although Engel suggests there may be a “hidden Latinate echo ... perhaps intended as a subtle joke,” in *Dis*, the Roman Hades, “lord of darkness and master of the underworld” (14-15). Engel’s nuanced explication of the four passages concludes with the claim that these passages are implicitly linked “through the echoing of *inly*, a kind of enchaind aural mnemonic device” connecting “four key moments in Milton’s poetry, where each passage is to be seen in its own right, and then, in the reader’s mind, connected with the other three passages,” encouraging readers to look into themselves and reflect “on moments when we too have inly rejoiced, or been stung, or racked, or raged” (25). The argument rests on the assumption that Milton’s “most important substantive words ... were derived from Anglo-Saxon: *death* and *woe*, *father* and *son*, *harsh* and *mild*, *evil* and *good*” (12). This essay is, Engel admits, preliminary to further study. One example suggests the need for further consideration. As Engel puts it, Old English words “were enlisted to evoke the primal fear associated with the dead ... ‘some howl’d, some yell’d, some shriek’d’” (9).

Can we assume Milton associated Anglo-Saxon words with discord and barbarity?

The four essays that constitute *The Heroic Age* 11: 1-41 began life as posts to Michael Drout’s blog *Wormtalk and Slugspeak*, intended to instigate discussion on the “State of the Field in Anglo-Saxon Studies.” Both Drout’s “Anglo-Saxon Studies: The State of the Field?” (1-13) and Richard Scott Nokes’s “Valuing Anglo-Saxon Studies,” (14-17), pronounce the field healthy from within. “Anglo-Saxonists,” Drout quips “are like a species that is healthy, genetically diverse and parasite free” (3). From without? Our “habitat is being rapidly destroyed,” and we are losing “the Hobbesian competition for resources that is the contemporary academy,” losing positions, losing a place in the curriculum, and losing pages in the *Norton Anthology of English Literature* (Drout 2, 3; Nokes 14). Drout’s solution is “a renewed focus on language,” which would help us to argue the value of what we do “to parents, legislators and critics ... not just in terms of some kind of nebulous ‘critical thinking,’ but in really specific detail” (7). We must make the case that “[p]hilology, detailed historical scholarship, manuscript work ... make English much more interesting” (7). Nokes suggests, probably accurately, that the tendency of Anglo-Saxonists to “self-segregation” is contributing to the loss of habitat, since “[a]cademics who cannot read Old English have strong motive to devalue its study” (15). A case in point is the differing reactions to Jerome McGann’s *The Textual Tradition*—medievalists “thought the arguments elementary, while modernists were thrilled by them” (15). In short, the problem is one of supply and demand. Requiring the study of Old English literature at the undergraduate level, returning “language to the center of our scholarship,” and reaching out “to the non-academic community,” perhaps by exploiting the market for “popular medievalism,” will increase the intellectual value of Anglo-Saxon (16-17).

Agreeing with the importance of language study in the discipline, but less sanguine about the future, is Tom Shippey’s “Response to Three Papers on ‘Philology: Whence and Whither?’ given by Drs Utz, Macgillivray, and Zolkowski, at Kalamazoo, 4th May 2002” (9-13). “[T]he disastrous mistake of English studies over the decades,” he argues, “has been to set its collective face like flint against ANY serious form of language study, philological or linguistic, synchronic or diachronic” (12). Shippey insists that “no student should graduate in English without a respectable understanding of the structure of the modern language, their own language” (12). His argument is framed by an interesting, if depressing, synopsis of the history of comparative philology—from the British administration of “Indian

populations," to the "prodigious" impact of Jacob Grimm's *Deutsche Grammatik*, to its "long relationship with German nationalism" (11). One might say, Shippey tartly concludes, "that the period 1864 to 1954 was one long and noisy argument over the meaning of the word *deutsch*, settled in the end not by rational debate but by tanks and guns. Rational and philological debate would have been better" (11). Thus, Shippey, Nokes, and Drout all argue, if in different ways, for the return of philology to the center of Anglo-Saxon studies.

For Eileen Joy in "Goodbye to All That: The State of My Own Personal Field of Schizoid Anglo-Saxon Studies" (18-41), the mistake has been to "actively dismiss or set to the side or minimize" virtually all "schools of post-structuralist thought and analysis" (23). While she, too, is concerned with how we might "effectively communicate the value of what we do to a broader audience," her solution is to stop "actively resisting and dismissing critical theory," and "to expand the horizons of what we believe is our period of concern," dismantling "the temporal lines that separate 'what we do' from 'what they do,' whoever 'they' are: the intellectual historians of modern France or eastern Europe, the specialists in cyberpunk literature, the queer theorists, the contemporary poets and printmakers and painters" (25-6). Although claiming her purpose is not to survey "who is or is not undertaking this or that type of postmodern Anglo-Saxon studies," or "whether or not such studies have become mainstream or remain marginal within the field, or have been readily accepted or damned with faint praise or outright condemned, such that I might be able to make some sort of pronouncement about the current state of the field with regard to the acceptance or rejection of the *use* of particular critical theories," Joy does offer selective illustrative examples (25). Joy calls for "an Anglo-Saxon studies without conditions—for the right, *as an Anglo-Saxonist* 'to say everything,' even if it be under the heading of fiction and the experimentation of knowledge, and the right to say it publicly, to publish it" (31). There must, she concludes, be room not just for the individual scholar but for "deleuzoguattarian roaming packs and multiplicities to emerge and join with other packs and multiplicities to create desiring-scholarly-machines and critical machines-machines-machines" (31). She calls further for

working groups formed across the temporal divides that separate Anglo-Saxon studies from the "other" Middle Ages and beyond, in which groups [of] Anglo-Saxonists would take leadership positions (while also practicing

anti-hierarchical collaborative work) and the primary impetus for the disparate "joinings" of these groups would be nothing less than a complete reenvisioning of the humanities and its relation to public thought and life (32).

The situatedness of language is an issue in all four essays. For Joy "language *is* situated—first and foremost in human bodies, which are themselves always situated somewhere" (27). For Drout, Nokes, and Shippey, it is not. For Drout "all knowledge is *not* 'contingent and situated,'" and, objecting to Macgillivray's assertion that comparative philology was "situated and contingent," Shippey points out that the difference between a Class I and Class II verb is neither situated nor contingent (4, 10-11).

Howard Williams, "Anglo-Saxonism and Victorian Archaeology: William Wylie's Fairford Graves," *EME* 16: 49-88 was reviewed in 2006; see "Memorials, Tributes, and History of the Discipline," *YWOES* for 2006, *OEN* 41.2 (2008): 10-23.

Memorials and Tributes

The valuable collection, *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach*, ed. Virginia Blanton and Helene Scheck (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies with Brepols), is so titled to reflect what Szarmach "has demonstrated time and again" in his work, "that Anglo-Saxon literary culture is intertextual, that as a corpus it resonates with allusions from many disparate sources" (xiii). Within that broad notion, the volume's twenty-six essays (reviewed individually in the appropriate sections) are divided under three sections: (Re)framing Insular Texts, Engaging Insular Culture, and Tracing Textual Transmission. Together, the essays reassess "received scholarly opinion" of insular texts, consider how material artifacts "work as texts and contexts for new understandings," explore "connections between source texts and insular writings," and discuss the "dissemination of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts" (xiv-xv). Donald Scragg's brief, witty biography, "Paul Edward Szarmach: What Should a Scholar Do?" (xvii-xx) is followed by a portrait, a comprehensive bibliography of Paul's publications, editorial work, and grants, awards, and prizes (xxiii-xxxi).

Myth, Rulership, Church and Charters: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks, ed. Julia Barrow and Andrew Wareham (Burlington VT: Ashgate), is a collection of fourteen essays, one of which is reviewed above (the balance in the appropriate sections below),

an introduction, brief tribute, and bibliography of Brooks's publications (249-54). Barrow's introduction (1-10), provides an overview of Brooks's contributions to each of the four themes represented by the volume title (myth, rulership, church, and charters). Together these four themes reflect the "areas within which he has been able to open up new lines of enquiry and to establish new bases of knowledge" (1). Christopher Dyer's personal essay, "Nicholas Brooks at Birmingham" (11-14), is a warm tribute to Brooks's contributions to Birmingham during his long tenure as Chair of Medieval History.

Clinton P. E. Atchley's "Preface to Essays in Honor of Robert D. Stevick" (v-vi), heads the special edition of *Philological Review* 34.2: i-viii. The brief discussion summarizes Stevick's academic career, chiefly spent at the University of Washington, and his publications on the English language, Old and Middle English language and literature, and pre-1100 Irish and English bookarts. Following the preface are five essays (reviewed separately in the appropriate sections) and a bibliography, "The Works of Robert D. Stevick" (223-28).

Rosemary Cramp's "groundbreaking article" on "Beowulf and Archaeology" was the beginning of a body of work based on the

complex perception that materiality, whether found in literature or in the earth, takes place in time. That temporality, however, is plural and variable, for it takes into consideration the variance between the particular time and environment of a work's production or cre-

ation and the relational time and environment in which it is received by later generations (ix).

The collection of essays, *Aedificia Nova: Studies in Honor of Rosemary Cramp*, ed. Catherine E. Karkov and Helen Damico (Kalamazoo: MIP), derives from papers presented at the 2000 International Medieval Congress at Kalamazoo. While the essays vary in "subject, discipline, and methodological approach," their focus is interpretation of the material world, "whether that materiality appears in literature, in stone, or in the artifacts removed from an archaeological dig" (x). The introduction by Karkov and Damico provides an abbreviated biography and situates the sixteen essays (reviewed individually in the appropriate sections) within this concept of materiality. A clever map of "Rosemary's Major Digs" is included (viii).

In *A Commodity of Good Names: Essays in Honour of Margaret Gelling*, ed. O. J. Padel and David N. Parsons (Donington: Shaun Tyas), Padel and Parsons collect thirty-six essays in eight sections: Names and History, Names and Language, Norse in Britain, Celtic Regions, Microtoponymy, Literary Onomastics, and Place-Names and Landscapes. The essays emphasize Gelling's 50 years of "major contributions to the study of English place-names" (viii).

Memorials published this year include Armando Bisanti, "Cataldo Roccaro (1947-1998): Un Classicista Votata alla Latinità Medievale," *Filologia Mediolatina* 15: 307-76; and Graham Jones, "Harold Fox: An Appreciation," *Landscape History* 29 (2007): 5-15.

DB

3. Language

3a. Lexicon

In *Norse-Derived Vocabulary in Late Old English Texts: Wulfstan's Works, A Case Study* (Odense: NOWELE/University Press of Southern Denmark, 2007), Sara M. Pons-Sanz returns to a subject about which she has already written much. Pons-Sanz has produced studies of "Norse-derived" terms (the preferred designation in her monograph, in which the entire second chapter outlines "Terminology and Procedural Decisions" [32-67]) in Aldredian glosses and other texts that span the range of Old English, and with this study moves through late Old English. For texts dating later than this, Richard Dance's *Words Derived from Old Norse in Early Middle*

English: Studies in the Vocabulary of the South-West Midland Texts (Tempe: MRTS, 2003) can be consulted.

Pons-Sanz's subtitle is essentially accurate: the works of Wulfstan II of York, and those considered reliably "Wulfstanian," are the subject of this "case study." The study primarily occupies itself with two word-fields: those of *lagu* 'law' and *grið* 'peace, truce.' Terms are analyzed "both from a semantic and stylistic point of view" (2), and the Norse-derived subset of Wulfstan's vocabulary is broadly divided into "technical" (especially legal terms or "technolect" [259] as well as terms for weights and measures, coinage, warfare, and social ranks) and "miscellaneous" groupings. The terminological distinction between "Norse-derived," which represents the

“linguistic influence arising from the contact between Old Norse and Old English speakers,” and “Scandinavianized,” which represents “cultural and ethnographic influence” (4), seems generally maintained. One slight disappointment is the overwhelming emphasis on simplex: “Collocations, however, are not generally used in this study in an attempt to isolate the meaning of specific terms, but rather as a tool to explain Wulfstan’s idiosyncratic use of Old English and his contribution to the widening of the senses of the newly-imported Old Norse terms” (36). This is disappointing in that it excludes other examples of semantic and cultural influence, such as the transfer of OE *blæc ond bocfell* ‘scrap piece of paper’ to West ON *blek ok bókfell* (255 note 31) or, perhaps, *membra disiecta* (see also 122 note 152 on OE *utlages weorc*).

Three core chapters in the study concern legal terms: chapter three on *lagu* and its word-field (69-124), chapter four on the *grið* word-field (125-58), and chapter 5 on other legal terms, which include *bōnda*, *cost*, *cyricrēn*, *nām*, *uncwydd* and *unbecrafod*, *unsac*, *drincelēan*, and *hāmsōcn* (159-72). According to Pons-Sanz, Wulfstan was responsible for semantic broadening of these two major legal word-fields (see also 245-54) and for furthering or popularizing what are semantic displacements (as of *æ(w)* by *lagu* or *frið* by *grið*; on the latter see especially 128).

Chapter six deals with “Other Norse-Derived Technical Terms in Wulfstan’s Works” (173-192). Because the bulk of the chapter actually focuses upon three legalistic terms involving status, *bōnda*, *ðræl* and its word-field, and *hold*, it is no surprise that much of the discussion is indebted to or at least makes use of the work of David Pelteret, especially his *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1995); its appendix “The Old English Terminology of Servitude and Freedom” (261-330) is particularly useful to word studies in the domains of status, freedom and slavery, and enslavement and manumission. Wulfstan in his homiletic writings naturally has access to a metaphoric use of *ðēow* and *ðræl*, and so the use of the latter term in Homily 9 to refer to *manswican* ‘deceivers’ who are to be counted as *forboda* and *Antecristes þrælas* ‘messengers and slaves of Antichrist’ seems apposite. However, it does seem to generate a bit of hair-splitting in Pons-Sanz’s analysis: she sees Pelteret’s argument that Wulfstan chose *ðræl* here for its “pejorative connotations” (182-3, citing Pelteret 317) as less likely than her stylistic argument that Wulfstan sought to sustain his *þegn-ðræl* thematic pairing: “[Wulfstan’s] contrasting again thegns and slaves may have played a more important role in his selection of *ðræl* than

any negative connotations possibly associated with it” (189). A fleeting instance of point-scoring, the small gain seems to vitiate, admittedly in a very minor way, Pons-Sanz’s overall preoccupation with Norse-derived terminology. Pelteret’s fuller discussion in the body of his study (97-101) is not cited here nor is his examination of Wulfstan’s attitude toward the institution of slavery in his day. Wulfstan spoke movingly of the plight of female slaves subject to exploitation in Homily 20 (Pelteret 1995: 98), and here the homiletic usage is not metaphorical—these are real slaves.

In fact, use of the Norse-derived term may owe some of its “pejorative connotations” to its linguistic origin; the laws of Æthelred refer to a *Deniscne ðræl* (Pelteret 1995: 317)—a point Pons-Sanz seems to make in her citation of the contrastive “thegn-thrall” pairing in the *Sermo Lupi* (189). The pairing occurs also in the *Grið*, “another piece of legislation showing Wulfstanian influence” (Pelteret 1995: 317), in the phrasing *þræl wearð to ðegene 7 ceorl wearð to eorle*, which Pelteret nominates “one of his [Wulfstan’s] favorite jingles” (317). “Jingle” seems just right in describing this Wulfstanian turn of phrase and, while this indulges matters of “taste” in the old aesthetic criticism, there is much in the Wulfstanian corpus that seems jangly.

The strict focus upon a Wulfstan/Wulfstanian corpus limits discussion of “monetary terms” to just *healfmarc* and *ðran* in chapter 6 (the former is transparent, the latter is glossed by Clark Hall-Meritt as ‘a coin of Danish origin’, s.v. *ðra*), both of which appear in the *Peace of Edward and Guthrum* with reference to payments in the Danelaw: “... *gylde XXX scillinga mid Englum 7 mid Denum þreo healfmare [recte healfmarc] ... þæt is twelf oran*.” Of course, there are other examples in the broader corpus of OE, including those dealt with in Fran Colman’s *Money Talks: Reconstructing Old English* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992), which is not mentioned in Pons-Sanz’s bibliography.

Chapter seven addresses the “Reasons for the Presence of Norse-Derived Vocabulary in Wulfstan’s Works” (193-230). The seemingly apparent explanations, that Wulfstan was a northern archbishopric (York), was of East Anglian origin, and was addressing a “Scandinavianized” audience, are considered in turn. However, Pons-Sanz finds none of the three probative or entirely provable, and she provides “alternative” reasons for his use of Norse-derived terms: linguistic, such as phonetic structure, his choice of *lagu* over *æ(w)*, or his “[w]ord length (and morphological structure)” that “may have contributed to making *eorl* preferable over *ealdormann* in Wulfstan’s ‘active repertoire’” (221); reasons, such as the *eorl* / *ealdormann* example in reference to “sound

effects” (226-7) and his “exploitation of collocational patterns” (227); extralinguistic reasons, such as “different traditions” (227-8), although it is difficult to see Norse-derived terms such as *lahslit*, *ōran*, and *healf-marc* as “fashion in legal language” or “exoticisms” (228-9). (As a side note, with regard to “exoticisms,” one of the intriguing factors in the Anglo-Scandinavian loan situation is the closeness of the cultures in nearly every respect—certainly as compared to later loan situations in the history of the English language.) Pons-Sanz’s conclusion seems fairly non-committal: “These alternative explanations [i.e., those not dealing with Wulfstan at York or in Cnut’s London or his Anglian origins] demonstrate that it is, generally speaking, too simplistic to give one single reason for the selection of a Norse-derived term instead of a native synonym.... A closer study of these terms may stop automatic attributions of a text to a dialectal area on the basis of its use of Norse-derived terms, especially those of a technical character” (229-30).

It seems clear, at least to me, that Wulfstan’s life in Scandinavian-influenced regions of England (in the face of debates over how much time Wulfstan actually spent at the see of York), his preaching to audiences under similar influence (whether ethnically mixed, Anglo-Saxon and Norse, or genuinely Anglo-Scandinavian in ethnicity or, as is likely, both), and his legal work for Cnut compromise the likeliest vector of transmission of Scandinavian loans and loan influence (in both directions, ON upon OE, OE upon ON); it seems even clearer that Pons-Sanz may be underplaying the conclusions of her work. Having published extensively on the subject of “Norse-derived terms,” she is well positioned to draw stronger conclusions. Thus chapter eight, “Wulfstan’s Impact on the Legal Language,” is rather muted, which is a bit odd after more than 200 pages of word-study and word-field evidence. At least we do get the assertion that Wulfstan may have been responsible for the export of the term *cyricgrið* to Scandinavia (254)—a term that appears later in the *Brut* and *Ancrene Wisse* (257).

The overall conclusion to the study notes “[t]wo fundamental conclusions, which contradict generally accepted views” (258-60): that some of Wulfstan’s coinages may not be so much “loanblends” as “new-formations hinting at the deep integration of the borrowed material in the archbishop’s vocabulary” and that “[n]either Wulfstan’s contact with his Scandinavianized archdiocese, nor his possible Anglian origin can easily account for the presence of Norse-derived terms in his ‘active repertoire’” (259). As in chapter six, Pons-Sanz emphasizes “other factors in order to explain

this disconcerting lexical trait” (259). Why the use of such loans (without specifying whether Wulfstan did the borrowing or blending or not) would be “disconcerting” is not clear, since the English language would march on in its borrowing ways, soon redoubling the effort after the Norman Conquest. The “Word Index” of forms cited besides OE seems rather short (314-8); for example, everything cited from PIE and Sanskrit (at 318) comes from discussion of *grið* (at 57). This is an indication of the strict focus of the word study as *word-study* – etymology was not so much a concern (though it might have been put to more use). No recourse was made to Celtic for either comparative linguistic or cultural purpose. The heart of the study is chapters three and four, the analysis of the *lagu* and *grið* word-fields (68-158); here the reader is grateful for the painstaking detail with the vocabulary study itself and the sometimes wide-ranging, discursive moments that often give cultural as well as linguistic insight. One might fault the study for being too conservative in its conclusions, though the pointing out of desiderata throughout the investigation seems to suggest that more work on the subject is forthcoming.

Magdalena Bator’s “Obsolete Scandinavian Loanwords – A Semantic Analysis of Two Fields: ‘The Army’ and ‘The Sea,’” *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny* 55: 33-47, examines twenty words, believed to derive from ON, from these two semantic ranges. Bator mentions OE in passing and all of the forms in question (*atwinnen*, *auke*, *barling*, *betas*, *bolaxe*, *brinie*, *farcost*, *fuk*, *houscarl*, *hune*, *kete*, *ladebord*, *orrest*, *ra*, *spennen*, *stam*, *stave*, *sterneles*, *steven*, *tulk*) date to the ME period, especially early ME. Bator examines the words by grouping them in terms of the reasons assigned for their “obsolescence”: rivalry of synonyms (the most frequent explanation [46]); restriction of usage to local dialects; and disappearance of referent (the explanation given for *bolaxe*, “an ax for cutting or splitting wood; pole-axe” [36], *farcost*, “a kind of a boat or ship; a condition, welfare, circumstance” [38], and *houscarl*, “a member of the body-guard or household troops of a (Danish) king or noble” [39]). The form *ra*, ‘a sail-yard’, in Bator’s view (*pace* the *OED*) may not actually have become obsolete but rather may have become restricted to “the local dialects of the Shetland and Orkney Islands” (43). *Stam* and *stave*, ‘the stem or prow of a ship’, might have been displaced more readily “by the presence of the native *stem*, from OE *stemn*, *stefn*” (44).

Linda van Bergen’s “Negative Contraction and Old English Dialects: Evidence from Glosses,” *York Papers in Linguistics* 8 (2007): 1-33, analyzes scholarship concerning the nature of corpora that have been used to

draw conclusions about *ne* + verb-form contractions (*næfde*, *nolde*, etc.). She scrutinizes the general understanding of such negative constructions in OE and finds S. R. Levin's work, a longstanding standard statement on the question, to be largely valid and a more recent observation on the occurrence of uncontracted forms in West-Saxon to be imprecise. To begin with the latter: in "The Spread of Negative Contraction in Early English," in *Studies in the History of the English Language II: Unfolding Conversations*, ed. Anne Curzan and Kimberly Emmons (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2004), 459-75, the late Richard Hogg noted possible exceptions in the Salisbury Psalter gloss pattern that uncontracted forms occur much more frequently in Anglian than in West Saxon. In the gloss to the Salisbury Psalter, he saw "evidence for the existence of a variety of WS in which negative contraction frequently fails to occur" (3). Here van Bergen thinks the nature of the data led his analysis astray; more likely, in her view, is a case of "interference from Latin" (3), "since uncontracted forms are strictly limited to cases where Latin *non* is involved" (23). In the former matter, van Bergen largely agrees with Levin's analysis concerning the frequency of uncontracted forms in Anglian (more frequent) versus West Saxon (rarer) and the usefulness of these forms in the dialectal classification of OE and ME. (A similar pattern occurs for Northern varieties of ME versus, for instance, East Midlands [1].) This is signal praise for a 1950s doctoral dissertation, Levin's "Negative Contraction with Old English Verbs" (diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1956) as well as its supplementary work, "Negative Contraction: An Old and Middle English Dialect Criterion," *JEGP* 57 (1958): 492-501. (As a side note, Samuel Levin, late of CUNY Graduate Center, would become better known for his work with metaphor and semantics, including *The Semantics of Metaphor* [Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins UP, 1977]; he passed away in November 2010 at the age of 93.)

The bulk of van Bergen's study analyzes the use of negative contracted and uncontracted forms in OE as a dialectal criterion. In assessing the usefulness of the criterion, one longstanding difficulty of OE dialectology is that the Anglian data is largely from glosses (such as Lindisfarne Gospel glosses and the gloss to the Durham Ritual) while the adduced West Saxon data is from prose texts. Van Bergen offers "[a] more detailed look at interaction with Latin" (section 3.1.2; 8-11), watching for influence from the Latin *lemmata* that might skew any data set drawn from the glosses. (Her test examples include OE renderings of Latin *nolite* + infinitive and *non licet* constructions.) With regard to the Lindisfarne gloss, "it is certainly not the case that one word in the

Latin consistently led to use of contraction ... nor does expression of negation by the use of a separate word in the Latin necessarily give rise to uncontracted forms in the OE gloss" (8); differences observed in general in the parts of the Lindisfarne gloss are in fact also observable in terms of contracted and uncontracted negative forms (11). She then considers the Northumbrian glosses in the Rushworth Gospels (13-14) and Mercian glosses (Vespasian Psalter and Farman's gloss to the Rushworth Matthew; 15-20). This leads to broader consideration of negative contraction in psalter-gloss types. Van Bergen concludes:

It seems likely, then, that uncontracted forms with *is* were more widespread in the archetype than in any of the surviving A-type glosses [A is the siglum for London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A.i], and that subsequent scribes had a tendency with various degrees of strength to replace them with contracted forms—most consistently in *Vespasian*, very consistently in *Cambridge* after the first six psalms, and more haphazardly in *Junius*. The data are also compatible with the possibility that uncontracted forms might originally have been used consistently to gloss *non* followed by a form of *esse*, i.e., the glossing procedure may have been completely mechanical in the original gloss. (17)

The applicability of contracted and uncontracted negative forms is re-asserted (for example, a case in which a WS text with Anglian features exhibits some uncontracted forms that indicate remodeling of an Anglian original to WS norms, 26). Van Bergen also calls for and promises further study. Though she was writing primarily a linguistically (as opposed to textually) oriented study, it seems odd that van Bergen used relatively little psalter-gloss scholarship; the bibliography in *Old English Glossed Psalters: Psalms 1-50*, ed. Phillip Pulsiano (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2001), which was not cited in this study, would have provided a number of helpful, additional views on psalter-gloss scholarship.

Don Chapman investigates the very interesting matter of OE insults in his "You Belly-Guilty Bag': Insulting Epithets in Old English," *Jnl of Historical Pragmatics* 9.1: 1-19. Chapman draws upon a rather limited contextual corpus, as the "insulting" epithets identified by Chapman are found in only four general contexts: lives of saints, soul-body dialogues, addresses to devils or demons, and addresses to sinners. Chapman

perhaps underplays the initial irony that this sub-corpus is entirely Christian: “the culture in which the insults were used was largely religious, so the pretexts for insults were different from the taunting and name-calling more typical of Old English heroic poetry like *Beowulf*” (13). Chapman does note that the flyting and boasting described in heroic literature must have had ‘counterpart’ insulting epithets, but he limits his study to direct discourse, and “[d]irect address in the Old English record practically never occurs in the reporting of actual speech” (3). A pragmatic concern for the matter, as it appears in a journal of the linguistic sub-discipline of pragmatics, is that: “[t]he quoted dialogs are not reports of actual conversations, but instead are literary creations inserted into a narrative for artistic effect” (4). One could argue just how insulting some of the terms Chapman considers actually were (for example, what was the force of OE *dysig* or *stunt* in alleging stupidity?), but his consideration of the passages from which the terms are drawn is useful (6-7, 11-13). Especially interesting is his tally that, of the 256 tokens observed in the corpus, sixty allude to “low social standing” (5). Here, an essential point may be the distinction between a relatively non-offensive or normally neutral term used in an insulting manner and forms that might have been considered inherently ‘low’, ‘vulgar’, or ‘offensive’. (On the latter, see McGowan, “Praefanda Anglosaxonica,” *Studia Neophilologica* 75.1 [2003]: 3-10.) As to the titular insult ‘belly-guilty bag’ (*wambscyldiga fætels*, from the Vercelli Homilies), Herbert Dean Meritt notes in his supplement to the Clark Hall lexicon, “read *wamscyldig*, ‘sinful’” (Chapman lists the form as *wamscyldig* on p. 18), presumably indicating a compound comprised of *wamm* ‘stain, spot; sin’ + *scyldig* rather than *wamb-* ‘belly’ + *scyldig*—which would leave OE one insult poorer.

In “Viking, Week, and Widsith. A Reply to Harald Bjorvand,” *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 123: 23-8, Eldar Heide offers a rejoinder in the debate among Scandinavian scholars on the etymology of *Viking*. While the reply is immediately directed at Harald Bjorvand’s objection to Heide’s proposal (made in Bjorvand’s *Være arveord* [Oslo: Novus, 2007], 1305) that ON *viking* (f.) and *vikingr* (m.) belong to the same etymological complex as ON *vika* (f.), meaning ‘sea mile’, with an original sense of ‘the distance between two shifts of rowers,’ clearly the debate over the origin of *Viking* involves much larger matters, some of which are briefly touched upon in Heide’s reply. While Heide sees the OE glossary entry *piraticum: uuicingsceadan* (found in the Épinal-Erfurt and Corpus glossaries) as proof that *Viking* forms cannot be interpreted as ethnic terms

(Bjorvand and others see the forms refer to ‘Scandinavians’), it still seems speculative to assert that *Viking* = ‘sailor, seafarer; pirate’ indeed “favours the rower shifting etymology of ‘Viking’” (28). Nonetheless, some very interesting details are mustered to support the interpretation of ON *vika* as having a sense of ‘shift, turn, order’, such as a plausible Germanic conception of the ‘week’ as consisting of a shift or “rotation of gods ‘in office’ one day each then ‘relieving’ each other” (25). Heide also cautions against assuming that the *wicingas* of *Widsith* refers to a Migration Period people (26-7). It seems certain at least that there will be more on this matter—and soon.

Old English appears very briefly in the background to Amel Kalle’s “The Lexical Reanalysis of *n*-words in the History of English: A Case of Disambiguation,” *York Papers in Linguistics* 8 (2007): 103-19. Much of Kalle’s paper surveys the linguistic literature on the absence of Negative Concord (NC) in MnE, that is, the development in English away from “the use of two or more negative elements which do not cancel each other out and together express a single negation” (103). Kalle first cites the opinion of Otto Jespersen in “Negative Cycle,” which explains that “original negative markers, e.g. *ne* in OE, weaken phonologically and often become cliticised to the finite verb, thus losing much of their negative import. They then need to be reinforced by an independent element which eventually becomes the sole negative marker. The clitic marker becomes optional and eventually disappears” (105). The theoretical discussion then considers the work of Noam Chomsky during his Principles and Parameters era (*Barriers* [Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1986]). Kalle argues against explanations that “the loss of NC is triggered by the loss of the ex-sentential negator *ne*” and instead posits that “the loss of *ne* could have triggered the introduction of the polysemous status that *n*-items developed” (115).

JMcG

Alfred Bammesberger, in “Is There an Old English Adjective Scrid ‘Swift’?” *N&Q* n.s. 55: 117-19, points out that, though the *hapax* form *scrid* from *Andrew* 496b (“*Is þes bat ful scrid*”) is generally glossed and translated as ‘swift,’ this adjective is not readily explained as a derivative of *scriþan* ‘go’. It is easier to derive it from the past participle of *scrydan* ‘clothe’, giving *scryded* > *scrydd* > *scryd*, with the common variant of *i* for *y*. The metaphorical equivalence here is between ‘fully clothed’ and ‘fully equipped’.

Ewa Ciszek, in “On Competition between OE *-estre* and OF *-esse* in Early Middle English,” *Kwartalnik*

Neofilologiczny 55: 23-31, charts the usage of the Old English feminine ending of the title, carefully lists all instances of its appearance, and quotes all earlier treatments of the suffix, sometimes to the point of repetitiveness. She concludes that, because in Middle English *-estre* had come to denote male as well as female occupations, the Old French *-esse* became the preferred way to unambiguously designate purely feminine agent nouns. Though this is certainly likely, her argument could have been strengthened and fine-tuned if she had more thoroughly examined the actual use of terms in texts rather than merely perusing secondary sources, useful though these can be. She notes that the change of gender designation may have been prompted by the fact that both sexes had come to practice occupations, such as brewer (*brewestre*) and baker (*baxtre*), once associated with women. But looking at particular early uses of occupational terms may have made this clearer. Ciszek also did not discuss what connotations may have been attached to these early uses of the *-estre* ending as gender neutral or masculine, such as in *demester* and *huckster*. (One also cannot help but wonder in exactly what contexts the term *lyckestre* 'female who licks' was employed.) Hopefully future developments of this important work will more fully explore these details, as well as the interesting pre-history and later history of this peculiar ending.

Lisi Oliver, in "Æthelberht's *Fedesl* Revisited," *N&Q* n.s. 55: 125-26, builds on her earlier work in "Cyninges *fedesl*: the feeding of the king in Æthelberht §12," *ASE* 28 (1999): 59-75. In this earlier paper, she concludes that *fedesl* must mean 'food render', both because of its structure—the instrumental ending *-isl-* + the root for 'feed'—and because of its OHG cognate *votisal*, which is glossed *pastio*, meaning 'food render,' in Latin legal texts. In "Æthelberht's *Fedesl* Revisited," Oliver provides further evidence for this definition by analyzing the use of the verb *feden* in passages from the Leir episode of Lazamon's *Brut*, in which *feden* consistently means 'provide sustenance for'. Furthermore, Oliver matches *feden* in one passage (86) with *paistra*, a verbal form of the aforementioned Latin legal term *pastio*, in the parallel passage of Wace's *Roman de Brut* (49).

In his typically careful style, Alfred Bammesberger, in "Zur Etymologie von ae. *bāt* m. 'Boot, Schiff,'" *Anglia* 126.1: 97-103, suggests that OE *bāt* is not a direct nominal form of the Germanic root **beit-a-* 'bite' (> OE *bītan*...) as Seebold and others have suggested, since the semantics are strained at best. (See Seebold's *Vergleichendes und etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen starken Verben* [The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 1970].) Instead Bammesberger points to the OE verb

bātan (< Proto-Germanic **bait-ijan-*), one meaning of which is 'to beat against the wind,' and suggests that *bāt* (or rather its predecessor **bait-a-*) is a back formation from *bātan*, much as **kuss-a* (> OE *coſs*) is derivable from **kuss-ijan* (> OE *cyſsan* 'to kiss') and **wōp-a* (> OE *wōp*) from **wōp-ijan* (> Gothic *wopjan* 'shout').

Adrian Poruciu in "Two Romanian Terms (*tureci* and *cioareci*) Based on Old Germanic Designations of Leg-Coverings," *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 36: 163-84, presents as "undeniable" (167) the connection between Modern English *breeches* (< OE *brēc* < Proto-Germanic **brōk-*) and the Proto-Indo-European root **bhreg-* 'to break, crack'. But to account for the Celtic form *brāca* (whence the Latin), which he assumes was borrowed from Germanic after the consonant shift but before the rounding of *ā* > *ō*, he must implicitly posit a PIE ***bhrāg-*. Such a form, however, cannot be derived from **bhreg-* by any well established morphological or phonological rules. For the etymology of Romanian *tureci* (pronounced /tureč/) 'leggings, trousers', Poruciu agrees with Diculescu and Gamillscheg (against Meyre-Lübke) that it is from Gepidic **peu(h)-brōki* 'thigh breaches', a cognate to Gothic *þiuhbrūks* whence Latin *tubrucus* (and its many West Romance derivatives). As to *peu(h)-brōki*, I am skeptical that an umlaut would exist in East Germanic; this form has also been posited as the source for Albanian *tirk*. From this same Germanic root, Poruciu also derives the more widespread Romanian term *cioareci* 'leggings, trousers'. Unfortunately for his argument, in the other examples he gives to support variation between *c* and *t* in Modern Romanian—*țeara* ~ *ceara* 'wax' and *șinti* ~ *cinci* 'five'—the segment in question did not originate from a dental.

William Sayers, in "The Etymologies of English *dog* and *cur*," *Jnl of Indo-European Studies* 26: 401-10, presents an etymology of Modern English *cur* from an unattested "Romano-British compound of Late Latin *curia* 'court-yard, farm-yard' and British *ci* ['dog'], in lenited form *-gi*" (406). After pointing out the many large and small problems with this etymology, Sayers concludes, "the total lack of evidence and the absence of any comparable form from other parts of the Roman Empire oblige us to leave this etymology in the realm of speculation" (406-7). His proposal that OE *docga* 'dog' is from an (again unattested) Welsh compound of *da* 'good' (< **dago-*) and the same second element as above—yielding either **deyg*, **dacci*, or **decci*—is no more convincing since it depends on both unattested forms and unattested sound changes. The author seems to be unaware of the recent work on this form by Piotr Gąsiorowski in "The Etymology of Old English **docga*," *Indogermanische Forschungen* 111 (2006): 275-84.

Merja Stenroos, in “A-Marscled in ‘The Man in the Moon,’” *N&Q* n.s. 55: 400-404, supports and refines H. Meroney’s unelaborated contention in “Line-notes on the Early English Lyric,” *MLN* (1947): 187, that the word *a-marscled* is a metathesized form of *malskren* ‘bewilder, confuse; wander’ related to OE *malscung*. *Malscung* is unhelpfully glossed as *fascinatio*, *festinatio*, *fascinat* i. *laudatis stultæ*, and *pressicium*, and also appears in a riddle and in a medical text, apparently with the meaning ‘spell, confounding’. More distant cognates, according to OED, include Gothic **malsks* ‘foolish’ in *untila-malsks* ‘precipitate, headstrong’ and OS *malsc* ‘proud’. A full review of Middle English usage of *malskren* concludes that the passage in question, *ichot þart a-marscled in-to þe mawe* (line 22 on folio 115r.), can be translated as either ‘I know that you are confused to the innards’ or as ‘I know that you are completely under a spell’, which is closer to the OE meanings. For a parallel to the proposed distant *r/l* metathesis, the author might have noted Spanish *milagro* from Latin *miraculum*.

Thorlac Turville-Petre, in “The Etymology of ‘Road,’” *N&Q* n.s. 55: 405-406, derives Modern English *road* from an OE feminine noun **rodu* only seen in place names and with no attested nominative singular form. The meaning is generally ‘field’, but in certain cases it refers to linear clearings and is contrasted with *smallan wege* ‘narrow path’. In one case it clearly refers to the Roman road running from Otmoor. This connection leaves open the question of why an apparently common word for a street was unattested (though perhaps, as suggested here, appearing once in *Patience* 270) in the literary record for hundreds of years, from Anglo-Saxon times until Shakespeare.

JUH

3b. Syntax, Phonology, Other Aspects

In “Old English preverbal elements with adverbial counterparts” in *Beowulf and Beyond*, ed. Hans Sauer and Renate Bauer (Bern: Peter Lang), 101-15, Michiko Ogura studies free-morph Old English verbal prefixes that have adverbial counterparts. To give an example, the Latin prefix *ex-* in John 4.30 *exierunt* has been rendered both by the free-morph prefix *ut-* in *Ru2: ut-eodun* and by the postposed adverb *ut* in *WSCp: eodon hi ut*. Ogura’s paper consists of two sections. In the first, she proposes four major patterns of element order involving free-morph prefixes or their postposed adverbial counterparts. Predictably, a considerable amount of word-order variation exists within the categories. The second section provides a comparison of Gospel translators’ different strategies when translating

Latin verbs of motion into Old English and Old High German (OHG). The Germanic texts discussed are either glosses (*Li*, *Ru1*, and *Ru2*) or translations (*WSCp* and the OHG *Tatian*). The translations of the prefixed Latin verbs (*intrare*, *introire*, *exire*, *abire*, *egredi*, *descendere*, and *advenire*) range from the free-morph prefix type and the postposed adverb type to simple verbs. Ogura finds that postposition is rarest in *Li*, while postposed adverbs are slightly more common in *Ru2* and even more so in *Ru1*. *WSCp*, which represents translation proper, makes recourse not only to postposition but also to simple verbs with a prepositional phrase. The translatorial solutions adopted in *Tatian* place it somewhere between *Ru1* and *WSCp*.

Caroline Imbert, in her “Path Coding in Old English: Functional Story of a Typological Shift” in *Historical Englishes in Varieties of Texts and Contexts*, ed. Masachio Amano, Michiko Ogura, and Masayuki Ohkado (Bern: Peter Lang), 17-32, addresses a topic related to Ogura’s preverbal elements paper discussed above. Approaching her Ælfrician material, consisting of all of the *Lives of Saints* and part of the *Catholic Homilies*, from a functional-typological angle, she bases her theoretical approach on Talmy 1985 and 2000, in which the term “Path” refers to the path followed or site occupied by the moving or localized entity. Imbert restricts her discussion to the directional alternative. The article studies the strategies used in coding Path in OE and explores the “typological shift” from verb-prefixing patterns to verb-particle patterns. She argues that by the time of Ælfric the “inventory of items exclusively or mainly dedicated to the coding of Path decreases” and, furthermore, that the “functional boundary between prefixes and adpositions tends to be increasingly blurred” (21). However, when Imbert claims that in Ælfric’s language the tripartite system of directional adverbs is decaying, she gives a slightly misleading picture of the loss of ablative adverbs: *þanon* and *hwanon*, both attested in Ælfric’s *Lives of Saints*, should be added to the leftmost column of Table 2. Generally speaking, the author dedicates substantial space to diachronic considerations when discussing the typological shift that affected OE, which is problematic since the corpus studied only consists of Ælfrician works.

The *York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose* (YCOE) has proved an invaluable tool for linguists interested in the clausal syntax of Old English. However, since searches in the current version of the YCOE are only possible within sentences, researchers are not able to extend their analyses beyond the sentence level to investigate the information structure from a wider perspective. In “Coding

the *York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose* to investigate the syntax-pragmatic interface," in *Studies in the History of the English Language IV*, ed. Susan M. Fitzmaurice and Donka Minkova (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter), 61-80, Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Susan Pintzuk address this problem. First, they assess factors relevant to the analysis of the information structure. They then describe the system by which they coded OE data retrieved from the *YCOE*. This system takes into account the following semantic, discourse, and pragmatic factors: (a) Animacy; (b) Antecedence (further categorized by type of or lack of referent in prior text); (c) Givenness (with a hierarchy consisting of three categories: hearer/addressee-old, uniquely identifiable, and referential indefinite); (d) Poset, that is, "partially ordered set," or the relationship of the preposed object to a referent in the prior context; (e) Contrast relationship of the preposed object (or subject of a left-dislocation) with a nominal constituent in the prior or following context; (f) Topic persistence, which describes instances in which the referent is used as an overt pragmatic topic. The authors conclude by discussing the potential value of coding the corpus. This endeavor will make it possible to study and to quantify long-term changes in information status in the history of the English language. Additionally, pragmatic coding will enable linguists to carry out comparative studies of languages typologically different from English.

The government and binding (GB) theory of Noam Chomsky (1986) and studies written in its wake form the theoretical framework of Susan Pintzuk and Eric Haeberli's "Structural Variation in Old English Root Clauses," *York Papers in Linguistics* 2.8 (2007): 164-99; reprint *Language Variation and Change* 20: 367-407. Pintzuk and Haeberli first outline their basic assumptions about the structure of OE clauses and demonstrate the way in which the position of particles, negative objects, stranded prepositions, and pronominal objects can be used as diagnostics for underlying clause structure. Then, using these four diagnostics, the authors measure and analyze the frequency of head-final constituent order in clauses and present their conclusions and implications. They are careful to exclude any constructions that ambiguously allow two different analyses (see 373, 375, 381, 382, and 390 in the reprinted version). Summarizing their main findings, the authors explain:

The quantitative patterns are very regular: late OE texts have a lower frequency of head-final constituent order than early OE texts: root clauses have a lower frequency than

conjoined clauses, which in turn have a lower frequency than subordinate clauses. We have provided clear evidence that these elements do not postpose in head-final structure; and for particles, stranded prepositions, and negative objects, we have shown that the frequency of preposing from postverbal position in head-initial structure, if it occurs, is low. We conclude that the frequency of head-final constituent order is comparable to head-final structure, although not identical to it. It seems likely that the frequency of head-final constituent order is somewhat higher than the frequency of head-final structure, although it is difficult to quantify this difference, given the small amount of data. ... Regardless of how it is analyzed, it is very clear that the frequency of head-final structure in root clauses (and, in fact, in the other two clause types) is much higher than has previously been assumed or demonstrated. (399)

Pintzuk and Haeberli then discuss why earlier researchers have reported a much lower frequency of head-final structure in root clauses. According to the authors, the main cause of this discrepancy appears to be the frequent occurrence of V-to-C movement and Verb (Projection) Raising in OE root clauses, both leading to V2 order; Pintzuk and Haeberli derive these two structures showing V2 constituent order from head-final structure, although they admit that "their constituent orders may also be derived from head-initial structure" (399). Furthermore, they point out that earlier work was often based on clauses containing auxiliaries, leading earlier scholars to the conclusion that these clauses exhibit head-initial structure; accordingly, OE is a V2 language. In contrast to the commendable care with which the authors exclude ambiguous material from their analyses, they occasionally show a lack of attention to the co-text of their examples. On page twenty-seven, the clausal direct object of *geþafiað* immediately following the citation has escaped their attention. Additionally, in example thirty-two, the accusative singular feminine pronoun *hi* 'it' refers anaphorically to the noun phrase *ðas burh Hai* 'this city of Hai' in the immediately preceding co-text.

In "Insubordination in Old English," in *Historical Englishes in Varieties of Texts and Contexts*, ed. Masachiyo Amano, Michiko Ogura, and Masayuki Ohkado (Bern: Peter Lang), 93-107, Mitsuru Maeda presents a hypothesis that derives the use of the subjunctive in OE main clauses. It begins with a main clause containing

a jussive element and a subordinate noun clause. With the loss of the main clause, a meaning component from it is transferred to what used to be the subordinate noun clause but now has main clause status. Consider the following example, not from Maeda's article but still fully illustrative of the path with two ellipses that he suggests: **Ic wysce þæt he do swa he wylle* > **Þæt he do swa he wylle* > *Do he swa he wylle* (Solil1 49.8). In this scenario, the performative utterance *ic wysce* is first ellipted; the remaining noun clause, which according to Maeda has a parallel in French in the type *Que Dieu vous bénisse!* (97), receives the meaning component of the ellipted main clause. The noun clause finally becomes the attested OE main clause after the ellipsis of the subordinator *þæt*, accompanied by verb-fronting. This is a theoretically interesting hypothesis, but verifying it empirically will obviously require further work. The intermediate stage with the clause-initial subordinator *þæt* will serve as an example. The two instances Maeda cites both occur in chapter headings. However, because headings as a sentence type are characterized by ellipses of various kinds, it would be essential to show that the subordinator-headed construction has a robust existence outside headings in OE.

In "Object Movement in Old English Subordinate Clauses," in *Historical Englishes in Varieties of Texts and Contexts*, ed. Masachiyo Amano, Michiko Ogura, and Masayuki Ohkado (Bern: Peter Lang), 169-83, Tomohiro Yanagi examines the two object-verb patterns attested in OE subordinate clauses. He uses the *YCOE* as his database but limits his search to simple sentences in subordinate clauses. As a result, he excludes clauses containing modals or auxiliaries, such as *beon* or *habban*. The most frequent clause types in his material are adverbial clauses, relative clauses, and *þæt* clauses, though clause type itself has only a minimal effect on the position of objects in relation to adverbs. Yanagi also examines different types of objects. In regards to their placement, there is a clear difference between pronominal objects and nominal objects: pronominal objects prefer the pronoun-adverb order, while nominal objects take the adverb-noun and noun-adverb order with about equal frequency, the adverb-object order being marginally more frequent. "Heavy" nominal objects, consisting of more than two words, prefer the object-adverb word-order. Finally, Yanagi studies the effect of the definiteness of nominal objects: definite objects slightly prefer the object-adverb order, while indefinite objects, by an even smaller margin, prefer the adverb-object order. The article concludes with a theoretical discussion concerning the syntactic position where the object can move. Yanagi posits

a functional projection (FP) above the VP: a nominal object moves to the specifier of FP, and a pronominal object is adjoined to the head of FP.

In her article "On the placement of pronominal adjectives with complements: Evidence from Old English," in *Elements of Slavic and Germanic Grammars: A Comparative View; Papers on Topical Issues in Syntax and Morphosyntax*, ed. Jacek Witkoś and Gisbert Fanselow (Bern: Peter Lang), 147-77, Agnieszka Pysz draws on empirical evidence from the *YCOE* to examine the placement of adnominal, and in particular pronominal, adjectives with complements in OE. After a cross-linguistic overview and a survey of the rather restricted occurrence of this word-order in Present-Day English, Pysz concentrates on a corpus-based analysis of the situation in Old English. Pysz recognizes three orders: (a) both an adjective and its complement are pronominal, and the former follows the latter: ComplADJ+Adj+N; (b) both an adjective and its complement are pronominal, and the former precedes the latter: Adj+ComplADJ+N; (c) an adjective is pronominal and its complement is postnominal: Adj+N+ComplADJ (161). This last order is represented only by one instance, example thirty-six. As this example comes from an alliterating homily by Ælfric, it should not be given too much weight; it is plausible that the unusual word-order is as a by-product of the exigencies placed on Ælfric by the pattern of alliteration. Another construction that is problematic considering Pysz's theoretical assumptions consists of instances in which complements of pronominal adjectives occur in the leftmost periphery of a noun clause, cf. Pysz's example thirty-three a, *Gode se wilsuma wer* 'the man devoted to God' (170). It is tempting to assume with Pysz that these instances, all from the OE Bede, represent "some idiosyncrasy of this particular text" (172). An essential part of this article is its discussion of the derivation of the surface strings of attested OE word-orders. Pysz assumes that two movements can be seen operating here: the escape movement and the remnant movement, both with their corresponding features and projections.

Another article by Agnieszka Pysz deals with the placement of adjectives: "True or False? Postposition of adjectives in Old English," in *The Propur Langage of Englische Men*, Medieval English Mirror 4, ed. Marcin Krygier and Liliana Sikorska (Bern: Peter Lang), 29-54. Pysz recognizes six types of word-order: (Type 1) Adj + N (e.g. *gastlicne wæstm, se gooda heofonlica fæder*); (Type 2) N + Adj (e.g. *gebeoras bliðe, (in) þissum life ondwardum*); (Type 3) CONJ + Adj (e.g. *seftne drenc & swetne, se æðela papa & se halga*); (Type 4) Adj + CONJ (e.g. *lease & ungelærede men, se arfæsta and se*

mildheorta God); (Type 5) N + Dem + Adj (e.g. *Saulus se arleasa, ungelæredne fiscere þone leasostan*); (Type 6) N + Adj + CONJ + Adj (e.g. *seo wealaf sorhful & sari-mod, ðine hæðenan godas dumbe and deafe*). Contrary to the mainstream view, according to which Types 2, 3, 5, and 6 are postnominal, Pysz regards only Types 4 and 6 as postnominal and the rest as prenominal. In her analysis, the surface placement of adjectives is not decisive; rather, the classification is based on the ability or inability of the adjective to take weak inflection. Thus, adjectives are prenominal if they can take weak inflection, and postnominal if they cannot. Pysz's alternative way of looking at the placement of adjectives brings OE much closer to Present-Day English on the prenominal and postnominal axis.

In "Functional projections in Old English: DP and NumP" in *The Propur Languge of Englische Men*, ed. Krygier and Sikorska, 55-65, Artur Bartnik argues for the existence of a determiner phrase (DP) in OE. He adduces three pieces of evidence. First, certain word-orders that involve the co-occurrence of particular modifiers are easier to account for if we assume the existence of a functional shell above NP. Second, in terms of DP-internal movement, Bartnik recognizes partial movement, which concerns the adjective-noun and noun-adjective patterns, and N-to-D movement, in which possessive arguments of an OE noun can be placed postnominally (e.g. *on frymþe middangeardes*). The third piece of evidence has to do with argument structure. Like verbs at the clausal level, nouns can take arguments that are hierarchically ordered. Bartnik mentions genitives that are in apposition to each other and that can precede, follow, or flank the noun head; *on æpelredes dæge cyninges* exemplifies the last option. The latter part of the article discusses the number phrase (NumP). Using morphological, syntactic, and semantic criteria, Bartnik concludes that OE has a functional projection called NumP. At the morphological level, for example, this claim is supported by the presence of endings encoding plurality in nouns, by adjectival quantifiers, and by numerals.

The influence of discourse on OE syntax is the theme throughout Ans van Kemenade, Tanja Milicev, and R. Harald Baayen's "The Balance Between Syntax and Discourse in Old English," in *English Historical Linguistics 2006, volume I: Syntax and morphology*, ed. Maurizio Gotti, Marina Dossena, and Richard Dury (Amsterdam: Benjamins), 3-21. The authors coin the term "discourse partitioners" to refer to a number of short adverbs and particles (e.g., *þa, þonne, nu, eac, and la*) that "define on their left an area in which discourse-(linked) elements occur" (4). Discourse partitioners

allow OE grammar to extend the range of possible positions for subjects and objects, enabling, according to the authors, increased discourse flexibility. The present article focuses on one area where these extended positions are found, namely the position of pronominal and nominal subjects in relation to *þa* and *þonne* in subclauses. Prenominal subjects almost exclusively precede *þa* and *þonne*. With nominal subjects, the positional analysis yields a rather surprising result: a majority of these subjects (221 out of 350 instances) occur to the left of *þa* / *þonne*. The authors are able to explain the high incidence of nominal subjects in the high position: in the large majority of instances, nominal subjects occurring to the left of the adverb have specific, not generic, reference, and they refer anaphorically to an antecedent. If there is no antecedent, a definite expression can inhabit the high position if it is associated with a strong sense of presupposition (e.g., *God*).

The authors have developed a model that makes it possible to quantifiably analyze the relationship between "the narrowly circumscribed syntactic system and the relative diffuseness of the discourse referential facts" (4). The database, from the YCOE, consists of all the relevant subject-initial subclauses. The discourse-relevant properties of each subject have been analyzed according to four parameters, each with a range of numerical values. The parameters are NP type, NP position, specificity of NP, and antecedent type. The statistical analyses corroborate the authors' hypotheses presented: they were able to establish significant correlations between high position for the NP, definiteness of NP, and specificity of NP. They were further able to prove that there is "a highly significant correlation between the specificity of NP and the presence of a discourse antecedent" (19).

MK

In "An Aspect of OV Order in the *West Saxon Gospels* with Special Reference to the Collocation 'Verb + *God/Gode*,'" in *Historical Englishes in Varieties of Texts and Contexts*, ed. Masachiyo Amano, Michiko Ogura, and Masayuki Ohkado (Berlin: Peter Lang), 79-91, Yoshitaka Kozuka discusses element order in the *West Saxon Gospels* with particular reference to the collocation "Verb + *God/Gode*." The order OV (i.e., "*God/Gode* + V") is very frequent in main clauses beginning with *and*, which cannot, Kozuka argues, be due to Latin influence since the Latin source has VO for the majority of instances in question. Kozuka partly attributes this tendency to syntactic factors: in coordinate clauses, Old English prose writers often place objects before a finite verb, and light or unmodified objects tend to precede a

finite verb. The preference of OV in the collocation is also due to a lexical factor: a phrase like *Gode þancode*, often attested in verse texts, is formulaic to such an extent that “the OV combinations consisting of *god(e)* and verbs of thanking or praising were set patterns for the translator(s)” (86-87).

Another article in the same volume concerned with element order in religious texts is Tadashi Kotake’s “Differences in Element Order Between *Lindisfarne* and *Rushworth Two*” (63-77). Although Aldred’s gloss in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and Owun’s gloss in the *Rushworth Gospels* are believed to be closely related (the latter presumably having copied the former), Kotake has found a considerable number of differences in element order between the two glosses: “Aldred is far more audacious in changing element order than Owun, who strictly follows the Latin” (76). Moreover, the deviation from the Latin source is most remarkable in John’s Gospel in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, which might question the unity and authorship of Aldred’s gloss.

In “Linguistic Politeness in Anglo-Saxon England? A Study of Old English Address Terms,” *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 9.1: 140-58, Thomas Kohnen investigates the use of address terms in Old English with reference to the notions of politeness and face. Based on data taken from the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus*, he examines three terms of courteous address: *leof*, *broþor*, and *hlaford*. *Leof*, which is the most common courteous address and is primarily found in Old English religious texts, can be used by a superior addressing a subordinate as well as by a subordinate addressing a superior. *Broþor* also belongs to the religious domain and “may be a particular sign of Christian solidarity” (151). *Hlaford*, on the other hand, is used in secular as well as religious texts when a subordinate addresses a superior. Kohnen concludes that *leof* and *broþor* may serve as address terms indicating the friendliness and affection requested in Christianity, whereas the authoritative *hlaford* reflects a fixed hierarchy. Kohnen adds that none of the three address terms can be associated with linguistic politeness and face. The use of *hlaford*, which is automatically triggered by one’s fixed position in society, “could not be called politeness in the sense of face work” (155); the friendly and affectionate relationship associated with *leof* and *broþor*, meanwhile, reflects mutual obligation and kin loyalty rather than positive politeness.

In another article, “Directives in Old English: Beyond Politeness?” in *Speech Acts in the History of English*, ed. Andreas H. Jucker and Irma Taavitsainen (Philadelphia: John Benjamins), 27-44, Kohnen considers linguistic politeness with reference to the use of directive

speech acts such as orders and requests in Old English. Since directives can threaten the addressee’s negative face (i.e., the freedom of action and freedom from imposition), Present-Day English affords a variety of polite directives (e.g., *Could you give me a hand? Will you do me a favor?*). An interesting question arises as to “whether considerations of politeness and face work determined the choice of directive speech acts in Anglo-Saxon England” (27). On the basis of data taken from the Old English section of the *Helsinki Corpus*, the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus*, and the electronic version of Bosworth and Toller’s *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, the author has found that directive performatives are in more frequent use in Old English than in Present-Day English, while the use of polite speech-act verbs denoting suggestion or advice is rather limited. The author also found that the *þu scealt* or *ge sculon* constructions, which would have sounded obtrusive, are limited in the secular or Germanic texts, while the more polite constructions with *uton* or *neodþearf* generally belong to religious instruction. Kohnen concludes that at least within secular or Germanic contexts, “[t]he Anglo-Saxons used seemingly face-threatening performatives fairly often,” while the use of “conventionalised indirectness does not seem to have been a typical feature of Anglo-Saxon interaction” (40).

Although a noun is usually assigned a single grammatical gender in Old English, gender fluctuation sometimes occur such that the same noun has more than one gender: a quick look at the words given under the letter A in Clark-Hall’s *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* shows that almost half of the nouns have more than one gender. Letizia Vezzosi’s “Gender Assignment in Old English,” in *English Historical Linguistics 2006: Selected Papers from the Fourteenth International Conference on English Historical Linguistics (ICEHL 14)*, Bergamo, 21-25 August 2006, ed. Maurizio Gotti, Marina Dossena, and Richard Drury (Philadelphia: John Benjamins), vol. 1, 89-108, demonstrates that “gender variance is not arbitrary, but depends on various semantic and pragmatic factors” (90). For instance, the same noun fluctuates between two different genders according to its semantic role in a sentence: “masculine and feminine genders are preferred when the noun plays the role of an agent, whereas neuter gender is selected for the patient” (90). Vezzosi argues that this tendency, as well as other semantic features influencing gender assignment in Old English, derives from the more general principle of individualization: a noun with a high degree of individualization (e.g. one with semantic features like [+countable, +animate, +human]) is more likely to be classified as masculine or feminine; a noun of low

individualization (e.g. one with semantic features like [-countable, -animate, -human]), on the other hand, often belongs to neuter gender. The parameter of individualization, adds Vezzosi, can provide an explanation for the gender variation observed in varieties and dialects of Present-Day English in which inanimates may, for instance, be “upgraded by the use of *he* or *she*, only if they are countable and individuated” (105).

In contrast to other Germanic languages, English has limited the spread of the *n*-stem declension or weak declension. Its influence was mainly reduced during the period of Middle English, although some Middle English dialects saw a revival of the weak declension. In her article “On the (in)Stability of the Old English Weak Declension” in *The Propur Langage of Englische Men*, ed. Marcin Krygier and Liliana Sikorska (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang), 9-28, Elzbieta Adamczyk argues that “traces of instability of this declensional type can be found already in the Old English period, most probably in its later stage” (9). In particular, according to Adamczyk, the fluctuation of the weak declension is attested in a group of light stem feminine nouns (e.g. *cine* ‘fissure’, *hrace* ‘throat’, *pere* ‘pear’, etc.), where the regular inflectional *-e* and *-an* in nominative singular and accusative plural are replaced by new endings *-u* and *-a/e* respectively, probably borrowed from the strong feminine *o*-stem declension. These innovative inflections are well exemplified in late Old English texts, “especially those of West Saxon, but also of late Northumbrian provenance, primarily in Gregory’s *Dialogues*, the writings by Ælfric, the 10th century manuscript of *Læcebooc* and *Durham Ritual*” (25).

Peter Petré and Hubert Cuyckens’s “The Old English Copula *Weorðan* and Its Replacement in Middle English,” *English Historical Linguistics 2006*, 23-48, provides an account of the replacement of *weorðan* ‘become’ by other copulas like *become* in the Middle English period. In Old English, *weorðan* can be used in a variety of constructions: intransitive constructions (with the meaning of ‘arise’), constructions with dative (‘happen’), and copula constructions with a prepositional phrase, adjectival phrase, noun phrase, perfect participle, or passive participle (‘turn into, get, become’). Based on the framework of Construction Grammar, the authors demonstrate that the different functions of *weorðan* were closely related to each other in Old English. Two constructions in particular (*weorðan* + adjectival phrase and *weorðan* + past participle) are strongly linked, which is “evidenced in the occasional occurrence of the co-ordination of adjectives and participles following a single occurrence of *weorðan*” (34). The existence of a strong link between

the *weorðan* constructions, according to the authors, would lead to the loss of *weorðan* in all its functions almost simultaneously. On the other hand, although in Old English it is primarily used in copula + prepositional phrase constructions, in the course of Middle English *becuman* spread to the copula + adjectival/noun phrase constructions to acquire all the major functions found with *weorðan*. Petré and Cuyckens argue that this extension is made possible by an analogical process on the basis of the functional and semantic similarity between *weorðan* and *becuman*. A final section of the article considers the cause for the disappearance of *weorðan*. The close link between participle and adjectival constructions would prevent *weorðan* from acquiring the usage of non-adjectival passive, a new syntactic pattern that is indispensable in the grammar of English. It follows that the failure of the functional extension would make *weorðan* sound archaic and so lead to its disappearance.

JT

Phonology and Other Aspects

Wolfgang Kühlwein’s “The Semiotic Patterning of Cædmon’s Hymn as a ‘Hypertext,’” in *Language, People, Numbers: Corpus Linguistics and Society*, ed. Andrea Gerbig and Oliver Mason (New York: Rodopi), 99-128, argues that the Hymn exemplifies above all “God’s act of GIVING.” The final two lines of the Hymn, especially, present God as “lawfully ... [and deliberately making] Creation serve Mankind ... [intentionally designating] Creation to be His gift to Mankind ...” This conclusion rests on Kühlwein’s semiotic analysis of the poem. He adapts C. S. Peirce’s semiotic sets of relations to explore both how Cædmon binds “God and Creation ... Creation and Mankind ... God and Mankind,” and how these pairs form an overall interlace. This exploration tests the premise that the Hymn is, for its audience, representative of “actual existence,” that “what it expresses is true or false.” To test the semiotic pairing of God and Creation in the Hymn as representative of actual truth, Kühlwein focuses on lines 1–3a. Taking a semiotic approach, he maintains that these lines are consonant with Peirce’s view that “*Creative Activity* ... [is] *an inseparable activity of God*.” Thus, lines 1–3a identify God’s firstness, his essence as innate strength; they also address God’s role as creator, his strength as a maker—this attribute is termed his secondness. These two features of God, announced in the opening lines, are central to the hymn’s “constitutive theme,” essential to its status as a “semiotic ‘Hypersign.’” The idea of a constitutive theme here lies in Cædmon’s conceiving of

God in his essential form: divine strength embodying divine capacity to act. The lines following 3a then present God in his functions and comprise three parts: lines 3b–4 stand as a sign of his relationship to Creation in general; 5–7, a sign of the same interrelationship in specifics; 8–9, a sign of his making Creation inhabitable for mankind. These three parts share a “basic semiotic pattern,” attributable to the power of God as the causation of wonders, including the creation of heaven and earth. Furthermore, this threefold pattern is demonstrably iconic, inasmuch as throughout the Hymn, reference to God pronominally and substantively precedes or follows each of his identified creations. Kühlwein argues that this distribution of references to God “shows [him] as the beginning and the end of whatever is created.” A second, higher semiotic pattern in the Hymn reveals that all creation is “an emanation of God’s,” his “essence.” Insofar as God is the agent and topic, and his creation is, linguistically, the comment, the linkage exemplifies a “semiotic *dyad*.” The *dyad* so identified implies a second, iconic pattern—in this instance a ring, designating God, enclosing the created world. The analysis offered then turns to semiotic patterns joining “Creation and Mankind.” As the recipient of God’s creation, humans first enter the Hymn at line 5. (Kühlwein apparently does not accept an implicit reference to *we* as the subject of *scylun* in line 1a.) In lines 5–9, the poet mentions humans first and their gift second, yet this arrangement suggests not an interlocking dyad but rather a syllogism:

Major premise: God created and shaped Earth;
Minor premise: Earth gives rise to humanity
 (here Kühlwein invokes Genesis);
Conclusion: God created humanity.

Yet this act of creating mankind remains implicit because Cædmon wishes to emphasize God as a gift-giver. To substantiate the schemes already presented, Kühlwein undertakes an analysis of the Hymn’s diction, primarily through the use of plausible but not altogether convincing semiotic and semantic frameworks. His discussion does not consider possible caveats to the claims he asserts. The essay concludes with the view that the Hymn is what Peirce calls “dicentric,” by itself it bodies forth a symbol of “*God’s Creation for Mankind*”—a symbol also lodged in the minds of audiences. All the strands of semiotic, iconic, and dicentric patterning converge to create a unified Hypersign. One difficulty that the essay does not evade is that much of the semiotic analysis seems unwieldy and, finally, unnecessary.

Tamonori Yamamoto reconsiders the evidence that alliteration adds to analyses of the OE sound system in *Historical Englishes in Varieties of Texts and Contexts*, ed. Masachiyo Amano, Michiko Ogura, and Masayuki Ohkado (Oxford: Peter Lang), 157–168. His essay “A Reconsideration of the Reliability of Alliterative Evidence for the Sound System of Old English: Does Old English Poetry Work Aurally or Visually?” urges attention to graphemes. Largely because Penzl alludes to their relation to such visual patterns of OE poetry, he begins with eye-rhymes, such as when the grapheme *c* works alliteratively in a line. Presumably, this grapheme may have more than one phonemic value, even in the same line. The best evidence Yamamoto is able to supply is a comment in David Payne Harris’s 1954 dissertation that devices like “eye-rhymes” were apparently “too sophisticated” for scribes to employ consistently. A second consideration is that Cynewulf’s runic signature provides a basis for a visual (rather than aural) alliterative system. Here Yamamoto begins his analysis of runic signatures by citing Sisam’s belief that they could work visually in manuscripts but aurally for audiences. Runes, rather than, say, a Latin acrostic placed initially in lines, were appropriate for OE poems written like prose in continuous stretches. Furthermore, Anglo-Saxon audiences, hearing the pronunciation of runes, would readily seek to connect them, a practice associated with solving some riddles. (This assumption is also arguable.) Runes, too, may contribute to the alliteration of lines, even though they are not visually identical with the letters (mostly consonants) that do. Other visual possibilities that may clarify the issue enter Yamamoto’s argument less through demonstration than through a reliance on other scholars’ considered views. O’Keefe maintains that the visual properties of OE poetry hardly accorded with those in Latin, whether or not oral or visual readings in the two languages differed. Huisman’s conclusion that oral readings established an OE text as a poem seems to beg the question. Yamamoto finds from his sources grounds for affirming that visual patterns were too inconsistent in OE poetry to offer consistent guidance to audiences. The evidence for aurally-based alliteration centers mainly on vocalic patterning. The vowels that alliterate in lines generally differ from one another as graphemes. Yamamoto also cites Kaluza’s view that unwritten glottal stops accompanying vowels in such lines are largely responsible for their alliterative structure. A further source of evidence lies in proper names beginning with the grapheme *H*. These names alliterate often enough with vowels found initially

in common nouns. Proper names, Roman numerals, runes, and some common nouns that have initial *Hi*, *Ph*, *ps*, *Z*, *G*, *c*, may enter into aural alliteration with words beginning with comparable graphemes. Yamamoto concludes that, if graphemes consistently pattern with phonemes, the alliterative system in OE is aural, though sometimes adapting visual signs stemming mainly from borrowings.

Masayuki Ohkado's article from the same volume, "Stylistic Fronting in Old English Prose," 121-34, analyzes arrangements of modal and BE collocations. His earlier work on the *Lindisfarne Gloss* determined that infinitives collocating with modals may appear as head-initial or head-final. If a subject pronoun occurs in these modal constructions its frequency in head-final arrangements does not significantly outnumber its frequency in head-initial arrangements. If the subject pronoun does not occur in a participle collocation, then a form of BE generally follows the participle. Likewise, if the predicate construction consists of a participle and a form of BE (*were gefulwad* or *gesene sie*), then the fact that the subject pronoun precedes the auxiliary yields significant results. The occurrence of BE or modal as head-initial defines style fronting. The head-initial modal collocations, attributable to the presence of a subject pronoun, called stylistic fronting, also characterizes past and present Scandinavian languages. Ohkado initially suggests that the *Lindisfarne Gloss* distribution of the modal contrasts may be due to Scandinavian modal usage (but see below). In dialects other than Northumbrian, as in the Mercian *Vespasian Psalter Gloss*, however, the significant distributions found in the *Lindisfarne Gloss* do not exist. In the current study, Ohkado relies on the *York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose* (YCOE). His analysis encompasses subordinate clauses, more likely to contain examples of style fronting than main clauses. Earlier on he found that, in the absence of extra elements (excluding clitics), BE is head-initial, in collocation with a participle. Otherwise, an alternative exists between the head-final pattern and a verb-middle pattern. In the verb-middle pattern the collocation splits. Either the head (BE or modal) or the V (participle or infinitive) may come first before the extra element (excluding subject or object pronouns or subject NPs). The current study addresses modal and BE collocations but not those constructions that contain extra elements (e.g., prepositional phrases). To gather data, Ohkado uses CorpusSearch2 to select (with modal and BE collocations) negative clitics, noun phrases, proper names, personal pronouns (nominative, accusative, or dative [object] cases), and empty subjects. The results

are indecisive for the prose corpus as a whole but significant for texts including more than ten examples of modal and BE collocations. For modals+infinitives collocating with noun phrases, pronominal or zero subjects, these include Ælfric's *Lives of the Saints*, *Catholic Homilies II*, *Cura Pastoralis*, and the *West-Saxon Gospels*. For BE+participles collocating with noun phrases, pronominal or zero subjects, these include the same texts (but *Catholic Homilies I* for *II*) and Bede's *Historia* and Gregory's *Dialogues*. Significantly, three groups of texts (Ælfric's *Homilies I* and *II*, *Cura Pastoralis*, *West-Saxon Gospels*) have the modal or BE as head-final if a zero personal pronoun is subject. The same pattern holds, yet less sharply, if the subject is a personal pronoun. For collocations with noun phrases, scarcely any occur with modals, and head-initial BE is more frequent. Since these three groups are West-Saxon, Ohkado suggests that personal pronouns in this dialect count as clitics ("virtually empty") and thus promote stylistic fronting in BE+participle collocations. This result does not apply to the Northumbrian *Lindisfarne Gloss*. This finding prompts Ohkado to qualify the influence of Old Norse on stylistic fronting and to suggest that the movement is characteristic of North and West Germanic languages. As a caveat to this argument, the West-Saxon *Regius Psalter Gloss* does not instance stylistic fronting.

Daniel Donoghue surveys "Early Old English (up to 899)" and includes a map, "Anglo-Saxon England, late ninth century," in *A Companion to the History of the English Language*, ed. Haruko Momma and Michael Matto (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell), 156-64. The survey, divided in five parts—Introduction, Early England, From Cædmon to Alfred, Mercia and the Vikings, Alfred and Literacy—addresses social, cultural, and linguistic issues. The Introduction centers on Bede's eighth-century *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, especially on its account of the insular languages, primarily that of the *gens Angolorum*, and on Latin. The Celtic languages cited are British (Donoghue supposes that Bede meant Welsh), Pictish (of northern Scotland), and Irish (spoken as well in parts of Northumbria and Scotland). A native speaker of the OE Northumbrian dialect, Bede wrote his *History* in Latin as the language of learning and the Church. Old English, as it later came to be called, was the vernacular of the *gens Angolorum* but also the medium of much oral poetry, its roots "stretching back centuries." Donoghue concludes his Introduction by alluding to the expansion of OE into writing, particularly during Alfred's ninth-century reign. The second part of Donoghue's survey, Early England, moves from

Bede's observations on the languages of his insular contemporaries to larger movements of theological and political history. As Donoghue makes clear, much in Bede's account of the Germanic incursions and subsequent developments into what became Anglo-Saxon England remains at best approximate. The victorious Germanic invaders became Christians, yet across England "conversion was often a faltering process," despite Columba's influence in Northumbria and Augustine's in Kent. As for secular history, Bede's sense of a single *gens Anglorum* leaves unexplained the institutions and policies developed in the several kingdoms that historians have since called the Heptarchy. Part three, From Cædmon to Alfred, also elaborates Bede's *History*. Donoghue includes Bede's rendering of the dream that bestirred Cædmon's gift for poetry but also observes that his hymn in the vernacular attests to an abiding oral tradition. The composing and reciting of poems shaped from "formulaic phrasing" and well-established meter "was apparently widespread." In reviewing Cædmon's achievement, Donoghue alludes to its manuscript history of twenty-one versions, one of which he edits, and infers that its preservation is due to its Christian theme. One example of Christian emphasis that resulted in the writing out of oral Germanic poetry is Cædmon's *eci dryctin* 'eternal lord', a remaking of *eorla dryctin* 'lord of men'. A further observation on the linkage between the oral and the written history of Germanic poetry is that the ordering of the manuscript lines resembles prose. Yet, as Donoghue says, "the scribe expected readers to be so familiar with the language and conventions of poetry" that the hymn's "continuous text" hardly prevented reciting it aloud. One reason for choosing the version included in Donoghue's essay is that its spelling, as in *dryctin*, illustrates an instance of orthographic "conventions ... still developing." A brief review outlines the shift from runic inscriptions to the Latin alphabet, owing to Christian practice. The adaptation was not straightforward, and so Donoghue outlines the vocalic and consonantal uses of <u>, those of the digraphic <th>, together with the variant digraph <ae> and ligature <æ>. Some runes (called *futhorc*), too, contributed to OE orthography—*wynn* and *thorn*—as did the invented <ð>, shaped from the insular form of <d>, and the renderings <sc> for /ʃ/ and <cg> for /dʒ/. Donoghue concludes his third section with a note on the rendering of Bede's *History* into OE under the aegis of Alfred. In Bede's Latin original, Cædmon's immediate audience mostly comprised the scholars who first heard his hymn. The OE translation has Bede saying that "his very teachers learned and wrote from

his spoken words [lit. from his mouth]." Donoghue's point is that the West Saxon translator "recognized the practical and symbolic importance of committing Cædmon's words to writing" and that a writing program lay at the center of Alfred's educational policy. The fourth part of Donoghue's exposition, Mercia and the Vikings, is necessarily sparse. Few written records remain of the powerful Mercian kingdom, and they do not sufficiently detail how initial, Viking inroads during the eighth century led to military encampments in 866. Alfred's reign, begun in 871, found his West Saxon kingdom surrounded by Viking settlements. Yet Alfred succeeded in overcoming Viking threats to his kingdom through, as Donoghue indicates, "crucial victories on the battlefield and ... skillful diplomacy." His leadership helped expand his kingdom, influenced the conversion of the Viking leader Guthrum in 878, and resulted in a peace treaty that established a border for West Saxon and Scandinavian lands. Place-names such as Woodthorpe and Grimsby attest to thriving communities of Norse and Danish, whose speech "began to influence the local dialects" and later contributed significantly to the English language. In his final section, Alfred and Literacy, Donoghue examines a trove of West Saxon documents produced in the late ninth century. Their production grows from Alfred's founding of scribal centers and his enlisting of scholars from Mercia and Gaul as well as the Welsh Asser, who wrote a Latin biography of the king. Alfred's program, as Donoghue demonstrates, was especially innovative in its support for OE as a medium for writing in addition to Latin. The review of Alfred's program lists the major works produced in the time of his kingship and cites his own contributions in translating and in setting out a law code. As for the compilations of poems, Donoghue argues that although the surviving manuscripts for most of them come from the tenth century, many poems are likely of earlier provenance. In all, his is a fine overview.

‡‡ In his chapter from the same volume, "English as a Germanic Language" (142-149), R.D. Fulk provides phonologic, morphologic, syntactic, and typological evidence for a coherent classification of English. The phonologic evidence resides in consonantal and vocalic features of the Germanic languages that help to constitute them as a distinctive group in the Indo-European family. Fulk begins with an outline of Grimm's analysis that traces developments of stops and fricatives in Proto-Germanic from Indo-European. The examples given, of course, are those of attested forms. For the Indo-European series /p, t, k/ English now has corresponding, voiceless fricatives (*father* for Latin *pater*,

three for Latin *trēs*). A further correspondence holds between Indo-European voiced stops /b, d, g/ and Germanic voiceless stops /p, t, k/ (*two* for Latin *duo*, *kin* for Latin *gens*). The Indo-European aspirated stops /bh, dh, gh, gh^w/ have correspondent, voiced fricatives in the Germanic languages, as in Sanskrit *mádhu-*, Icelandic *mjöðr* 'mead', and Sanskrit *nábhas-* and OE *nifol* 'dark' (where *f* represents a voiced sound [v]). This correspondence depends, however, on the positioning of cognate sounds. At the beginning of a word or after a nasal consonant, the Germanic languages have, instead, voiced stops for the Indo-European aspirated stops, as in *bear*, Sanskrit *bhárati* and *bind*, and Sanskrit *bándhati*. Fulk helpfully includes a table, "Grimm's law (somewhat simplified)," that classifies the correspondences presented; he also notes that their discovery encouraged studies in "diachronic change and consistency of explanation." The discussion of vocalic development covers the emergence of full vowels before resonants (syllabic in Proto-Indo-European [PIE]), and the changes, too, of /o/ elsewhere to Germanic /a/, and of /ā/ to /ō/. Examples given for changes in syllabics include Sanskrit *sprṇóti* 'wards off' and *spurn*, Sanskrit *vṛkaḥ* < PIE *wṛk^wos and OE *wulf*. For /o/ > /a/, Fulk offers Latin *hortus*, Greek *χόρτος* as cognates of *yard*, and Old Icelandic *garðr* as well as Latin *quod* as cognate with *what* and Old Icelandic *hvat*. The PIE /ā/ to Germanic /ō/ change offers these pairings: Latin *māter* and Old Icelandic *mōðir* and Doric Greek *πᾶχυς* and Old Icelandic *bógr* as well as (*el*)*bow*. English illustrations of prosodic shift to the first syllable in most word classes and to the root syllable of verbs from the varied patterns elsewhere in Indo-European present difficulties. Bypassing the complexities occasioned by stress patterns in words taken mostly from Romance Languages, Fulk resorts to contrasts between nouns and verbs in current English: *outbuilding* and *undertow* but *outweigh* and *undergó*. Since shifts in stress effect a weakening or loss of final and penultimate syllables, English words stemming from Germanic are often shorter than cognates elsewhere: *melts* but trisyllabic Sanskrit *márdati*; *young*, Latin *juvencus*. Of course, this overview enables Fulk to summarize Verner's findings that the fricatives /f, þ, s, χ/ were voiced after the vowels immediately preceding them became stressed. So PIE **sutonós* evolved in OE, not as **soþen*, but as *soden*.

The paragraphs on morphology in Fulk's discussion outline developments in verbs, nouns, and adjectives. The systematic changes from the Indo-European paradigms in Germanic are pervasive in matters of voice, mood, and tense. Inflected verbs in Germanic retain,

except for Gothic's medio-passive, only the active voice. Of the IE four moods, Germanic inflects for indicative, subjunctive, and imperative. Of six tenses, English and its cognate languages retain inflections for the present and preterit. Fulk summarizes the patterns for inflecting Germanic verbs. His method is to outline inflectional features for verbs characteristic of other Indo-European languages, some of them no more than relics in Germanic. So Greek reduplication, as in *δί -δω-μι* 'I give', Latin uses of infixes *frangō* 'I break' and suffixes [g]*nō-sc-ō* 'I get to know' have no counterparts in Germanic, except for the relic *n* in *stand*. Furthermore, the bare root functions as present tense in Sanskrit *é-ti* 'goes', in some instances with a connecting vowel, as in *bhár-a-ti* 'bears'. As for the Germanic system as a whole, Fulk underscores the vocalic contrasts shown in the ablaut series of seven conjugations. (He does not, of course, in this chapter specify each ablaut series.) He notes, however, that in Proto-Germanic the ablaut series already had become a closed system and that new verbs added *-ed* in the preterit and the passive participle. This pattern includes verbs that on first view would seem irregular: in English now, for example, *brought*, *had*, and *made*. The origin of this system, found nowhere outside Germanic, may lie in the remaking of the verb *do* into a productive inflection. Fulk suggests that the familiar preterit *nailed* possibly evolved from a Proto-Germanic equivalent of *nail-did*. A brief review of preterit-present forms brings Fulk's discussion of the verb system in Germanic to a close. His outline begins by noting the use of these forms, originally in the preterit tense, to indicate "present meaning." For example, **woida* 'I know' (literally, 'I have seen'), a perfect form of the root **wid-* assumed "present-tense meanings." In the wake of this semantic change, "new preterits ... were developed for them." This group of verbs, furthermore, evince characteristics of the ablaut series and the *-ed* inflectional pattern. So OE *sceal* 'shall', though in form comparable to a strong verb preterit, appears in the preterit as *sceolde*, its inflection derived from the *-ed* pattern. Three features make preterit-present verbs a separate class today: (1) they function without a third person, singular, present-tense inflection *-s*; (2) they are without the auxiliary *do* in questions or negative sentences; (3) they are without the form *to* in collocating with bare infinitives.

Fulk's survey of morphology for nouns and adjectives has a structure akin to his presentation of verbs. A comparison with Indo-European comes first. (Germanic has fewer cases and inflections.) The further losses in ME (less severe among pronouns) have a

brief review. Then Fulk describes some collocations of nouns and adjectives. Definite nouns in OE and in several other current Germanic languages take, for the most part, adjectives with weak inflections. Indefinite nouns generally collocate with adjectives inflected as strong. The distinction between definite and indefinite nouns prompts Fulk's reference to the definite article as innovative in Germanic, since none are found in the earlier Indo-European. The origins of the definite article lie in the Indo-European demonstrative pronoun, yet the innovations of this article from one Germanic language to another differ. The Icelandic *-in*, as in *bók-in* 'the book', differs both in form and position with *the*; *-in* also has an origin and development different from *the*.

On word order, verb second in independent clauses, more firmly established in German and Icelandic than in OE, begins the outline. Subsequently in English, the subject-verb-object pattern dominates, although Fulk includes examples of exceptions: *In the tree lived two owls*; *Up jumped the prosecutor*; *"Hello," said the parrot*. From this compact survey, Fulk draws some conclusions on the descent of the Germanic languages (diagrammed in a table). Proto-Germanic stands at the apex of a tree, above Northwest and East Germanic (Gothic alone here), and the lower limbs distinguish West and North Germanic, above Anglo-Frisian, High and Low German, and West and East Norse. The lowest branches list languages still extant. The paragraphs on this grouping allude to debates on its arrangement, especially to the incidence of forms for 'have,' Gothic *haban* and German *haben*, for example, as opposed to North Germanic forms, Icelandic *eigi* and Swedish *äga*. These differences aside, the view prevails that North and West Germanic have the strongest affinities, their separate identities forming somewhat later than the contrasts that distinguish them from East Germanic. Yet Fulk qualifies this prevailing view: features supposedly distinguishing languages in Germanic do not evolve simultaneously, nor do they always have well-defined distributions.

In support of the argument for the divisions among the Germanic languages, as presented in the tree figure, Fulk lists a number of distinguishing features. For Gothic, the incidence of reduplication is almost entirely distinctive for the seventh ablaut class, as is the medio-passive voice. For West Germanic, a salient change is that of /ð/ to /d/, as found, for example, in English now: *ride* and *glad* (North Germanic Icelandic has *riða* and *glaður*). Even more significant, however, is the West Germanic development of gemination (except for the *rj* sequence) between short vowels and

resonants: OE *settan* as opposed to Gothic *satjan* and Old Icelandic *setja*.

In his conclusion, Fulk discusses Frisian and English within West Germanic. Both languages differ from (West) Germanic through the fronting of long and short *a* to roughly [a] as in some pronunciations of *father*, the monophthongization of *ai*, and palatalization and affrication of velar consonants "adjacent to certain front vowels and glides" (say, *church*, *singe*). To highlight the affinity of the two languages, Fulk includes this rhyme: *Buuter, breed, in griene tjiiz / is goe Ingels in goe Fries* "Butter, bread, and green cheese is good English and good Frisian." These developments and others compel Fulk to conclude that already OE "occupied a relatively peripheral position in the West Germanic division." Innovative developments occur in the oldest stages of English and foreshadow still other changes during the centuries to come. Fulk's chapter skillfully presents detailed linguistic features, as they clearly and succinctly reveal through time comparisons and contrasts within Germanic as it evolved from Indo-European.

In their chapter in the same volume, "Phonology: Segmental Histories," 29-42, Donka Minkova and Robert Stockwell summarize developments among vowels and consonants from OE. Their discussion of OE vowels incorporates both orthographic and linguistic evidence; their account of vowels in Middle and later English highlights major changes. The history of consonants in English presents few complexities. The examination of orthographic evidence refers to the regularities introduced at Winchester late in the tenth century and to spellings found in the earlier *Corpus*, *Épinal*, and *Erfurt Glossaries* (eighth to ninth centuries). The authors' analysis of the *Glossaries* results in a six-vowel system, long and short vowels paired, diagrammed as an "[i]dealized vowel triangle" (Anglo-Saxon scribes did not orthographically contrast short and long vowels). The term "idealized" stems from their acknowledgment of two OE rounded vowels [ö(:)] and [ü(:)] that their vowel triangle excludes. As for the back-gliding diphthongs [iɥ], [eɥ], and [æɥ], they contribute, together with the front-gliding [ii(:)] of the tenth century, to a modification of the authors' idealized OE vowel chart. Furthermore, the tenth century also saw a change from back-gliding to in-gliding diphthongs [iɥ>iə], [eɥ>eə], [æɥ>æə]. Minkova and Stockwell's second diagram, "Vowel triangle for late Old English," includes long and short vowels, together with the front rounded [ü] and the changes in diphthongs. This diagram, however, does not set off short from long diphthongs and relies on a circumspect

explanation for including [ū] but not [ō]. One reason for the use of a single symbol for each diphthong is that the short ones are predictable, the long ones not. In OE texts, short diphthongs, spelled <ea, eo, io>, predictably appear before [-rC, -lC, -h, and -w]. Further indication of their status is that they “are etymologically short ... count as short in the prosody ... merge with simple short vowels later.” Additionally, Minkova and Stockwell find that differences between short diphthongs and “normal bimoraic diphthongs are typologically unattested.” Lastly, these short diphthongs merge soon enough with the vowels “they sprang from”; the authors choose as examples the following pronunciations: *earm* [ærm], *heofon* [hɛvən], *nieht* [niht]. The reasoning behind the inclusion of [ū] but not [ō] in the authors’ second diagram on the late OE vowel triangle is not altogether clear. Both vowels have their source in a change during the sixth and seventh centuries, which is due to the anticipatory assimilation of back vowels of root words to following suffixes, begun with [-i, -y]; under the same condition the front vowel [æ(:)] went upward to [e(:)]; likewise the [e(:)] found in diphthongs rose to [i(:)]. This broad set of changes, known as “*i*-mutation,” appears with illustrations: OE *full* – *fyllan* < *full + yan; *fōt* – *fēt* < *fōt – iz, *mann* – *menn* < *mann + iz. Minkova and Stockwell provide a third diagram—“Effects of mutation”—that outlines these changes. As for unstressed vowels in OE, their distinctiveness had already begun to fade once fixed stress on initial syllables became widespread in Proto-Germanic. During the ninth century, the extant short vowels [e, a, o], though still discernibly different, were soon, in even later OE, to become so indistinguishable that scribes interchanged letters in recording them. Very likely, schwa [ə] (typically written as <e>) became the vowel most frequently used in unstressed syllables. Syncope, as in <heofnes>, and epenthesis, as in <mycele>, recur in late OE. This chapter also includes an excellent discussion of English vowels, stressed and unstressed, as they developed in ME and later periods.

The chapter’s review of consonants and their development in the history of English begins with a table of OE phonemes. The table includes the short consonants; the text also provides examples of such geminates as *pytt*, *tellan*, and *cuppa*, all following short vowels in OE stems. During the later OE centuries, geminates, especially in medial syllables, also began to sound short. Minkova and Stockwell examine the lenition of fricatives in OE, identifying it as the voiced allophone in the pairs [f-v], [θ-ð], and [s-z] and locating it at the onset of an unstressed syllable. Morphological analysis also shows which structural contexts

supported the lenition of fricatives and which did not. Lenition affects the initial fricative of verbal suffixes like *-sian* as in [klænzian] but not roots as in *beðencan* or adjectival suffixes such as *-fæst* and *-sum*. Lenition also affects final fricatives before grammatical suffixes beginning with a vowel: examples in English now include *staff-staves*, *brass-brazen*, *cloth-clothe*. A diagram of these alternations appears captioned as “Allophonic voicing contrast in Old English fricatives.” The history of these fricatives continues into ME, partly bridged by the finding that native words in OE dialects south of the Thames, especially in Kent, already revealed phonemic contrasts for [s] and [z]. The development of two other fricatives—[ɣ] and [h]—also benefits from the authors’ discussion of ME. This compact chapter encompasses much.

Geoffrey Russom begins his chapter in the same volume, “History of English Prosody” (81-87), by focusing on OE. In order to lay out what is known of prosody in OE, he provides a definition exemplified by verses in *Beowulf*. The definition applies both to the metrics of versification and to sound patterns for words, phrases, and sentences as characterized by linguistics. In a metrical framework, the scansion of OE poetry centers on a pair of alliterating half-lines, the first the a-verse and the second the b-verse, with a space between them. Each half-line typically consists of a syntactic unit: a word, as in *gub-gewædu*; a phrase, as in *Wedera leode*; or a clause, as in *syrcean hrysedon*. Alliteration in a half-line falls on the first syllable that has “metrically significant stress,” located at the beginning of a verse or inside it. An alliterating /w/, for example, occurs at the onset of the a-verse and inside the b-verse in *Wedera leode on wang stigon*. The a-verse of a line may have two alliterating sounds, as in *sæ-wudu sældon*. The b-verse contains one alliteration.

To demonstrate the specificity of OE meter, Russom contrasts it with an Old Irish meter called *roscaid*. In regard to alliteration, the pattern in *roscaid* differs from the rules of OE. In Old Irish, alliteration bridges the half-lines, as in *Eo Rossa roth ruirthech* “Yew of Ross, wheel strong-running”: the a-verse ends with the alliterating resonant before the stressed syllable, and the resonant in the b-verse occurs at the onset, again before a stressed syllable. Furthermore, *roscaid* permits a second instance of an alliterating sound in the b-verse (*roth ruirthech*—here the resonant) and its continuation in the following line, as in *recht flatha, fuaimm ruinne*, “power of a chieftain, sound of a wave.”

Despite this contrast in the pattern of alliterating sounds in half lines, Russom finds several correspondences between OE meter and *roscaid*: (1) both “have

predictable stress on word-initial syllables”; (2) alliteration usually involves repeating the same first consonant before the vowels of stressed syllables; in “special cases, (3) all stressed syllables that lack a prevocalic consonant alliterate with one another, as if they began with the same ‘zero consonant’”; and (4), in three OE *s* + stop clusters, “*sp*- alliterates only with *sp*-, *st*- only with *st*-, and *sk*- only with *sk*-” (in *roscad sm*- is the only alliterating, sibilant cluster). As for linguistic patterning, OE and *roscad* half-lines alike favor stressed, two-word, syntactic constituents. This patterning is characteristic of OE verse, not of OE prose. The differences, as Russom summarizes them, center on the position of the verb in relation to its complement. In early Germanic, the verb appears after its complement, an order continued more frequently in verse than in prose—for example, *sæ-wudu sældon* and *on wang stigon*. Like the verb, the preposition in Germanic verse, more frequently than in prose, follows a noun object. The ordering of constituents, verb after complement, also influences stress in half-lines. Typically, the phrase-initial complement draws full stress; the verb following, if phrase-final, is weakly stressed.

This syntactic patterning and stressing of words in half-line help Russom to present as a table Sievers’s five types of stress patterns, the complement before verb occurring in three of them. Like *syrcean hrysedon*, noun phrases such *beaga bryttan* also evince a strong-weak pattern, identified by Sievers as type A, the most recurrent of the five. In these half-lines, the fully stressed root syllable precedes the unstressed inflections. Like the resolved *sæ-wudu sældon*, the noun phrase *leof land-fruma* illustrates type D, two strong stresses, then a weak stress and a final, unstressed syllable. Like *holm heolfre weoll*, the phrase *scede-landum in* illustrates type E, a compound that has an initial, strongly stressed, resolved noun, then a weakly stressed second noun, and a strongly stressed preposition. Yet in verse, as in prose, OE also developed sequences in which verbs precede complements. This innovation led to the formation of two further metrical patterns, each with an initial stress. The sequences *geworhton ðā* and *þis ellen-weorc*, alternate weak-strong sequences, are identified as type B. Finally, the sequences *oð þæt lyft drysmaþ* and *mid scip-herge* exemplify type C, their pattern weak-strong-strong-weak.

Russom takes these parallels between verb and noun phrases a step further through an analysis of the word-foot as a significant element in metrical patterning. He argues that a phrase such as the type A *beaga bryttan*, composed of two words (each word a metrical foot) has analogs with word groups, such as *æghwylc /*

oprum trywe (stress on the vowels of the first and second words) also in the same type. Analogs, furthermore, recur for the other four metrical groups: type D *leof land-fruma* has an analog in *gid / oft wrecen*; type E has analogs in the word foot pattern *Scede-landum in* and in the word group *fif nihta / fyrst*. The word-foot pattern for type B *þis ellen-weorc* has strong stress in the first and third syllables of the compound; in *on / fleam gewand*, the pattern weak-strong-weak-strong stress strings itself out throughout entire phrase. In type C, the strong stresses follow each other as the word foot in the compound *mid / scip-herge* shows and as the word phrase in *on deop wæter* also does. Russom offers, too, examples of hypermetrical lines, noting that differences in their stress patterns accord with their appearing in a-verses or b-verses. This resourceful scrutiny of OE prosody, a highly-organized discussion, prefaces developments in ME and later practice.

Mechthild Gretch combines culture, politics, and linguistics in her chapter, “Late Old English (899-1066),” in the same volume (165-71). Her discussion begins with a brief summary of regnal descent after Alfred’s death to the rule of Æthelstan (924-39), who ruled the first “Kingdom of all England,” nearly reaching the Humber. During this span of forty years, especially during Edward the Elder’s reign (899-924), the realm supported the production of at least four manuscripts (probably at Winchester). The manuscripts produced include two translations: the oldest texts of Pope Gregory’s *Regula Pastoralis* (two volumes) and that of Orosius’s *Historia Aduersus Paganos*. Additionally, one scribe recorded the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (its A-version from the earliest times to the 920s) and a Latin psalter with an Old English gloss (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 27).

Gretch notes that all these manuscripts exemplify Early West Saxon English. The nature of Early West Saxon English, however, needs clarification. Inasmuch as the language of the manuscripts extant from Edward’s second decade reveals the presence of Anglian dialect forms, their inclusion still goes unexplained. Gretch reviews three suggestions yet finds none satisfactory. Some of Alfred’s “literary helpers” probably spoke the Anglian dialect, but only one of them might possibly have lived into the 920s. The idea that these Anglian forms testify to Mercian spelling conventions assumes an orthographic practice that has no convincing basis. And the suggestion that most scribes who wrote out the manuscripts in the 920s hailed from the West Saxon regions bordering on Mercia lacks evidence. The most cogent account of Anglian forms in a body of West Saxon English relies on the

Old English gloss in Junius 27. Copied from London, BL. Cotton Vespasian A.i (9th century), the Junius gloss is, as Gretch says, “a comprehensive ‘West-Saxonization.’” This rendering of Cotton Vespasian A.i is, however, not fully systematic—it retains words of the Anglian dialect identified phonologically and lexically. One instance of phonologic contrast is that of Anglian *færan* and West Saxon *feran* (the result of *i*-mutation); lexical instances include *leoran* and *æswic*. According to Gretch, these Anglian forms in the Old English gloss were deliberate efforts to respect the dignity of Mercians in Edward’s court. Though intriguing, this observation on Junius’s Old English gloss might benefit from statistical data (curiously, Gretch says that the incidence of Anglian forms varies in the cited West Saxon manuscripts). The argument that West Saxon incorporated Anglian English as a political gesture causes Gretch to posit that the A-version of the Chronicle contains no anti-Mercian bias. But relying on negative evidence often enough leads to false positive claims. A third element in Gretch’s argument—that Mercian scholarship enjoyed prestige from early on in Alfred’s reign—conflicts with her comments on the background of Edward’s learned advisors. Her finding that at best one Mercian at Arthur’s court survived into Edward’s qualifies her claim for the Anglian dialect in West Saxon manuscripts as a political gesture. Yet Gretch recognizes that her argument on the use of Anglian forms for political purposes depends on undemonstrated policy and on a supposition that many Mercians participated in Edward’s court.

Nonetheless, Anglian (or Mercian) forms recur in many Old English manuscripts until the turn of the eleventh century. The presence of these forms is a prelude to Gretch’s discussion of the Winchester vocabulary and to Standard Old English. The dating of the Winchester vocabulary to the 940s and later in the tenth century is attributable to the initiatives begun during Athelstan’s reign (924–39). Gretch’s account of the Winchester vocabulary covers the semantics of Christian concepts, the formation of words, and the choice of lexical forms to designate interplay of ideas. Her discussion of this vocabulary surveys the manuscripts containing it, the scholars who promoted it, and the motivating impulses that established it.

On the semantics of Christian concepts, Gretch infers that the Winchester vocabulary distinguished between concrete and abstract meanings. In reference to the senses of *ecclesia*, OE *gelapung* encompasses the spiritual communion within Catholicism, whereas *cirice* applies to a church-building. The word *wuldorbeag*, however, links the theological and the political;

in some contexts, for example, it designates a ‘crown of eternal life,’ in others ‘the coronation and portraiture of kings’. Word formation and doctrinal issues appear deliberately related in the use of *modig* as a member of such collocations as *ofermodignysse* and *unmodigan*.

Texts associated with the Winchester vocabulary include the interlinear gloss to the Psalter in London, BL, Royal 2.B.V, the translation of *Regula Sancti Benedicti*, and Ælfric’s works. The vocabulary benefited from the support of scholars like Bishop Æthelwold of Winchester and Dunstan, who became Bishop of Canterbury. The groundwork for the Winchester vocabulary began in the Court of Æthelstan, its aspirations imperial, its coterie open to foreign scholars, and its OE expressiveness indirectly taken from the hermeneutic style.

Gretch’s views of Standard Old English (SOE) also comports with her aims to relate developments in language to political and cultural contexts. As for the deliberate formation of SOE, she observes that it anticipated efforts in other vernaculars by several centuries and that it took Medieval Latin as an exemplar. Those who spirited the formation of SOE gathered about King Edgar (957–75), principally Bishop Æthelwold. What motivated the king and the bishop to advance standardization was a program to regulate social and religious practices throughout Anglo-Saxon England. In about 973, the issuance of the *Regularis Concordia* helped to initiate reform in English monasteries by instituting a regulated form of liturgy and a normative pattern of living. In the same decades, political rule, including a uniform currency, spread under Edgar throughout all England. The emergence of SOE in this atmosphere pertained almost entirely to writing.

Gretch summarizes some of the linguistic characteristics particular to SOE. Phonologically, SOE retains the spelling of inflections, although unaccented syllables such as <a>, <e>, <o>, and <u> had in spoken form become an “indistinct /ə/”. This attention to a regularized orthography persisted from the late tenth to early twelfth century. Morphologically, SOE retained an inflectional system no longer found in spoken forms of OE. Curiously, the spelling of vowels in stressed syllables proved less consistent in SOE than in inflections. Gretch concludes her valuable overview by attributing to Alfred’s rule and legacy the impulse for the developments of the Winchester vocabulary and Standard Old English.

Attila Starčević, in “Old English Stress – from Constituency to Dependency,” *The Even Yearbook* 8: 1–57, offers a threefold approach to theoretical and descriptive issues. His analysis first explores concepts of

constituency and dependency; second, it describes “major threads” that account for OE stress; finally, it examines secondary stress and high vowel deletion. As examples of these approaches, Starčević aims to explain why *hierede* (<**hæaridæ*), with one heavy stress, has an alternate *hierde* but why *fremede* (<**fremidæ*) does not have a co-occurring ***fremde*. Likewise, he discusses unstressed vowels and syncope in words such as *hēafode* (alternate *hēafde*) and *rēafōde* (not ***rēafde*). Part of Starčević’s purpose is to provide theoretical grounding for Campbell’s statement that “originally trisyllabic [words] with a long root syllable syncopated an originally short middle syllable before inflectional endings ...” and to explain why those “with a short root syllable did not normally syncopate.” The explanation Starčević offers stems from a consideration of two concepts—constituency and dependency—that differ theoretically on the nature of OE stress. In his view, constituency is a theory that, despite long acceptance, is inadequate; dependency, however, shows much promise. Constituency, as a theoretical concept, assumes that stress in a word or phrase derives its place from structures of constituents in a hierarchy headed by the syllable. Yet this assumption is suspect since phonologic analyses have for some time determined that neither the syllable nor the hierarchical structures determine the assignment of stress. In place of a hierarchical scheme, several recent analyses propose a “non-hierarchical and non-branching representation” that consists of “alternating consonantal and vocalic positions.” Consonants and vowels, arranged in sequences, have relationships described as licensing and government. Relationships of licensing and government are, furthermore, central to the concept of dependency. Instead of hierarchical arrangements, dependency incorporates lateral relations that show how patterns of consonants and vowels underlie occurrences of stress. Government in a framework of dependency comprises a set of procedures that determine exceptions to presupposed strings of consonants and vowels in particular sequences. For example, in sequences such as /ma:vəl/ (CVCVC) and /ma:vliŋ/ (CVCCVC), a governing procedure apparently triggered by VC /lŋ/ accounts for the absence of schwa in the participle. Applying the idea of licensing to *fremede*, Starčević argues that the sequence *freme-* (CVCV) retains its second vowel (unstressed), owing to the following CV sequence *-de*. Unfortunately, this explanation seems somewhat *ad hoc*, since as he says, “[OE has a] general tendency ... to syncopate unstressed vowels.” In the instance of *hēafde* this tendency obtains, but *hēafode* is also a well-attested alternate. In this

alternation, *hēafde* exemplifies the tendency to syncopate, and *hēafode* with its three vowels has a pattern like that found in *fremede*. As for *rēafōde*, the absence of a syncopated form impels further explanation. In a footnote on this form, there spelled *rēafode*, Starčević supposes that OE “at some state of its recorded history” alternated short and long vowels “in non-primary stressed positions.” Yet historical evidence, even if attested, to support a theory that should apply free of temporal considerations compels him to argue that “[d]iachrony is simply a succession of synchronic events.” Although not explicitly argued, the implication is that somehow the absence of *rēafde* is an anomaly. At this point, the need for caveats, even with an initial three examples, weakens any confidence in the power of the posited theory to bring new light to OE stress. One hopes that further consideration may lead to a theoretical analysis less encumbered by mistakes and caveats.

Nils Århammar’s “Diphthongierung Nach Palatal: Eine Altwestsächsisch-Altinselnord-friesische Parallele?” *NOWELE* 54/55: 309–48, presents an analysis of Luick’s view that fundamental differences preclude determining a demonstrable relationship between the languages. The approach taken is a fresh exploration of data from Old Island North Frisian (ains.-nfr.) and from West-Saxon (w.-s.), details set out in the essay’s Appendix. The three dialects considered include Föhr-Amrum (f.-a.), Helgoland (helg.), and Sylt (sy.). One limitation to the analysis, however, is that almost all the evidence available has no recorded history earlier than the eighteenth century. A second consideration is that Århammar’s approach mostly involves a critical review of extant scholarship on diphthongization after palatals.

He begins with Otto Bremer’s studies of 1887 and 1900 by noting posited instances of diphthongs evolving into f.-a. *s’üer* ‘shears’ < **skiār* < an earlier **skeār* (w.-s. *scēar*). This development points to Germanic *a* > *ea*, lengthened before *r* + voiced consonant. A second development attributable to Bremer is that of Germanic *e* as in **jeva* ‘to give’ > **jēva* > **jīve* > f.-a. *jiw* (w.-s. *giefan*). Theodor Siebs’s studies follow (1889, 1901, and 1931). Unlike Bremer, Siebs regards palatalization as not localized to specific dialects but rather widespread, extending to East Frisian and due also to borrowings from Danish. In this regard, Århammar cites Nielsen’s skepticism (1998) toward premises that regard palatalization as a development intrinsically linking forms in OE and Frisian dialects. Thereafter, works published after Siebs’s come under review. The first two, those of Tedsen and Selmer, receive short shrift. Tedsen brings

no fresh insight to phonological history of the dialects under study and proffers no other contribution worth considering. Selmer overlooks much in his phonological study of the Sylt dialect, and he fails to undertake historical scholarship.

Guided by the posthumous publication of Hermann Möller's studies in 1938, under the editorship of Peter Jørgensen, revealing analyses of Island and Mainland North Frisian bring fresh perspectives. These analyses are thorough and contain valuable inferences on sound change. Möller is among the first to posit an intrinsic link through *i*-mutation of OE and ains.-nfr., so that an early * \bar{a} > *a* in Island North Frisian (written *e* in OE). Examples of posited analogs include *juar* 'year' (Island dialect \bar{A} mring = amr.), *juàr* (helg.) < **jar* (ains.-nfr.), related to *zeār* (OE) < * $\bar{z}\bar{e}r$; also, *s'uaz* 'boundary' < **sciāðe* (ains.-nfr.), related to *sceāþ* (OE) < **sk'īþiā-* (Germanic). In these examples, *i*-mutation is due to the influence of palatal sounds following directly after the diphthongized vowel. In Möller's analysis OE *eā* is a rising diphthong. The review of Löfstedt's work (1939/40) adds nothing to an OE-OFrisian connection. Peter Jørgensen (1946), though the editor of Möller's studies, does not accept an intrinsic linkage between OE-OFrisian based on an analogous diphthongization of vowels. A brief paragraph on Krogmann (1957) and Hofmann (1959) again omits reference to OE. Århammar discusses his own work, dividing it in three sections—1959, 1969, 2001. None of these summaries contains any reference to OE. In a brief paragraph on Nielsen's work (1981, revised 1985), the possible relation of OE to OFrisian reappears. A statement from the 1981 *Old English and the Continental Germanic Languages: A Survey of Morphological and Phonological Interrelations* argues against an intrinsic affinity between West-Saxon and North Frisian. The basis of the argument is that Frisian diphthongization occurred regardless of which consonants preceded the vowels affected. In Nielsen's 1985 edition, however, this stance is somewhat modified, although Århammar does not fully explain the change. Nonetheless, in his conclusion, he proposes that the question mark in the title of his article should be replaced with "Negation."

Does the term "Anglo-Frisian" refer to a past actuality? This term, the title of Frederik Kortlandt's essay in *NOWELE* 54/55: 265-276, announces the existence of a common ancestry for Old English and Old Frisian (OF). This argument has five subdivisions: Stiles's negative findings; Fulk's support of a common ancestry; Kortlandt's explanatory model; an analytic summary of the issues discussed throughout; and

a socio-linguistic perspective. Stiles's study argues against realizing an "exclusive common relative chronology" for vowel changes, losses of nasality after lengthened vowels, palatalization of velar consonants, and a uniform plural ending in conjugations. Kortlandt's critique finds a need for a uniform plural ending irrelevant to the issue of a common ancestry, since this inflection occurred earlier in Old Saxon. As for palatalization, Kortlandt regards it as irrelevant as well because its history traces its development to unrelated circumstances in OE and OF. Similar considerations remove developments in vowels due to breaking and the occurrence of W.S. \bar{a} < * \bar{e} from the issue of a common ancestry. Fulk's argument for a common ancestry emerges from his study of the Northumbrian dialect of OE. His analysis applies to developments in vowels, the palatalizing of certain consonants, and some aspects of nasalization and nasal consonants. Moreover, the developments explored occur in two stages: the earlier period shows a common evolution from West Germanic, while the later focused on separate tracks taken in OF and OE dialects. Kortlandt's dissatisfaction with this chronological scheme is that unexplained, comparable processes in vowel change appear in Fulk's earlier and later stages. In particular, Fulk ascribes the backing and fronting of vowels to both the earlier and later stages, yet does not explain the recurrence of these two processes.

In search of a persuasive motivating mechanism that both brings coherence to sound change and supports Anglo-Frisian as a distinct linguistic period, Kortlandt offers the concept of structural pressure. In brief, structural pressure is a mechanism initiated "in the field of ... long vowels" and subsequently applied "in the field of ... short vowels." The Proto-Germanic asymmetry among its low vowels (between \bar{a} and *a*) pressured a change from *a* > \bar{a} in Anglo-Frisian and that of \bar{a} > \bar{a} in other Germanic languages (except for Gothic). The workings of structural pressure, as Kortlandt describes them, also affected other changes in vowels. At the "Saxon" migration into Britain, the short vowel fronting *a* > \bar{a} preceded breaking, as in *æld* > *eald*, and second palatalization **kaupo-* > *cēap-* (here in contrast to OF *ald* and *kāpia*). Also, *io*, *ea*, *ea* emerge as counterparts of *īo*, *ēo*, *ēa* (results of breaking). These fifth-century changes—fronting and breaking—precede the replacement of reduplication by a vocalic infix. Kortlandt ascribes reduplication to a period before the sixth-century "Anglian" arrival in Britain. This replacement proceeds as **ea* > * \bar{e}_2 in Anglo-Frisian (and elsewhere). In the seventh class strong verb, it occurs before the root vowel of the

present tense, where **ea* initially marks the preterit: **feall*, **hleaup*, **speann*, **heait*. In OE the monophthongization yields *eo*, as *fēoll*, *hlēop*, *spēonn*, *hēt*.

On palatalization, Kortlandt's studies have determined that an Anglo-Frisian development occurred first, later followed by a separate OE innovation. This result, premised by a belief in a gradual spread of palatalization from one environment to others, differs from Hogg's idea that a spreading change is less likely than "simultaneous" changes. In detail, Kortlandt supposes that palatalization in Anglo-Frisian affected *k* and *g* before front vowels. In yet another development of the sixth century, "Anglian" pronunciation, as in Frisian, included $\bar{e} > \bar{e}$ (the same change in Kent goes as a "local development"). The idea of structural pressure and its usefulness in accounting for a variety of historical sound shifts work best for Kortlandt in substituting his own for Fulk's phonological chronology. But this idea does not enter as a motivating element for the array of phonologic features identified with an Anglo-Frisian linguistic period, presumably before the "Saxon" migration. Kortlandt mostly lists developments and qualifications without supplying motivating forces. Here follows an outline of the early features that give Anglo-Frisian its identity: (1) rounding of * \bar{a} , **a*, * \bar{a} ; (2) centralization and unrounding of * \bar{o} in the endings * $\bar{o}n$, * $\bar{o}ns$, thereafter in stressed syllables; (3) West Germanic stressed **e*, **o* + nasal > *i*, *u*.

The analytic summary condenses Kortlandt's review of Stiles and Fulk (with comments on Nielsen's chronology), as well as his own exposition. The explanatory notes offer further evidence for Kortlandt's support of an Anglo-Frisian linguistic period. The concluding section of Kortlandt's essay centers on sociolinguistic perspectives that help uphold his own views. A central concern is his distinguishing an earlier "Saxon" migration from a later "Anglian" arrival in England. To escape mere speculation, Kortlandt refers to Ptolemy's second-century account of Saxons dwelling between the Elbe and the Weser, including the Angeln district (still so-called) in eastern Schleswig. He finds Bede inconsistent in referring to Angles and Saxons. He also relies on Kenneth Jackson's chronologic and spatial survey of inroads from the Continent. Finally, Milroy and Milroy provide a perspective on demographic data that underlie rapid innovation. This essay masterfully synthesizes wide and thorough learning, fresh thinking, and efficient exposition.

Markku Filppula, Juhani Klemola, and Heli Paulasto's *English and Celtic in Contact* (New York: Routledge) is an outstanding resource. The book's three divisions set forth perspectives revealing contact

before the late Middle Ages, from the 16th century on, and concludes with a broad assessment of Celtic influences in English. The topics addressed in each division concern syntactic, phonologic, and lexical issues, accompanied by succinct reviews of cultural, social, and demographic history. The span of coverage hardly stops with the possibility of Celtic influence (carefully construed as due to the features of Brythonic, Cornish, Irish, Manx, Scots-Gaelic, and Welsh). Also included are possible sources of influence, chiefly from Continental languages (among them French, Latin, and Old Norse) and the likelihood of internal development for the same issues. The approaches taken in assessing influence, Celtic or otherwise, incorporate demographic, dialectal, ad-/sub-stratal, structural, and typological considerations. Among the grammatical topics of particular pertinence to Old English, this book examines the verb *be*, clefts, external and internal possessors, intensifiers, and relative clauses. On phonology, there is a fresh approach centered on preservation of sounds, such as the interdental fricatives and the weakening or loss of unstressed vowels, as somewhat due to Celtic contact. On lexis, the paucity of recorded borrowings, outside place names especially in western areas, goes duly noted. Yet as with some aspects of syntax, as in lexis, the authors are cognizant of distinctions between oral practices and conservative, written evidence. The book's concluding division reviews the scope of scholarly methods, past and current. The authors reaffirm their premise that the traditional view of Celtic contact as having scant impact requires thorough rethinking. One unstated but valuable suggestion that they offer the field is to revisit syntactic features by considering possibilities of Celtic contact.

In "*Nu Scylan Hergan* (Caedmon's Hymn, 1a)," ANQ 21.4: 2-6, Alfred Bammesberger questions the accepted view that *we* is the unexpressed subject of the opening clause. In its place, the noun *uerc* of line 3a stands as a plausible candidate. The difficulty of accepting an unstated *we* is that it does not visibly occur anywhere in the hymn, an omission that weakens its candidacy as the subject pronoun of line 1a. The possibility of substituting *uerc* (West Saxon *weorc*) for *we* is due to the noun's functioning as a plural nominative form. Further, Bammesberger suggests the following translation as a reasonable alternative to one that includes *we*: "the works of the Father of glory shall praise the Guardian of the heavenly kingdom, the powers of the Lord, and His strong thinking." One difficulty, however, in adopting this alternative translation lies in its syntax. Nowhere else in OE does the

sequence adverb–verb–triple object–subject appear. Nor does the sense of this putative translation seem fitting for *Caedmon's Hymn*. Dissatisfied with *we* and *uerc* as subjects of the verb, Bammesberger suggests a fresh syntactic analysis. He proposes that the half-lines 1b, 2a, 2b, and 3a serve as compound subjects for the verb. To accept this revision, however, requires accepting *hergan* as a passive infinitive—'be praised'. Although Latin distinguishes passive and active forms of the infinitive, no Germanic language does. That OE infinitives may have passive functions is a still unverified possibility. Bammesberger cites one other OE context in which an infinitive forms invites, but does not require, passive interpretations: *Beowulf* 1365–1366a. To support this syntactic restructuring, this translation follows: "Now the Guardian of the heavenly kingdom, the powers of the Lord, and the thinking of his Mind, the work(s) of the Father of Glory must be praised." Bede's Latin *debemus*, however, for *scylan* works only as a first person plural, not as either first or third person in the OE verb. What does not enter this analysis is the frequent omission in OE of subject pronouns.

EG

In "Negative Contraction and Old English Dialects: Evidence from Glosses and Prose: Part I," *NM* 109: 275–312, and "Negative Contraction and Old English Dialects: Evidence from Glosses and Prose: Part II," *NM* 109: 391–436, Linda van Bergen applies a detailed analysis of pre-verbal negative contraction to the Lindisfarne Gospels gloss, the Durham ritual gloss, the Vespasian Psalter gloss, Farman's gloss of Matthew in the Rushworth Gospels, the Salisbury Psalter gloss, and a number of West Saxon prose texts. Bergen zeroes in on the major deficiency of Samuel Levin's 1958 and Richard Hogg's 2004 studies of negative contraction as a dialect indicator in Old English: neither Levin's nor Hogg's studies consider in any depth the possibilities that the Latin texts could have exerted some influence on the patterns of negative contraction observed therein. The long-held basic dialectal explanation of pre-verbal negative contraction has been that it is a regular feature of West Saxon but is found infrequently in Anglian. Bergen carefully examines the Old English glosses in comparison with the Latin text and confirms Levin's general conclusion that negative contraction is much less frequent in Anglian than in West Saxon, although her study reveals that Levin was wrong in certain details. Bergen demonstrates that the Lindisfarne and Durham ritual glosses may have been influenced in their rates of negative contraction by forms found in the Latin text,

although she concedes that the Latin influence was limited (293), and she notes that evidence from the Northumbrian gloss on the Rushworth Gospels adds little evidence for negative contraction. Under Bergen's scrutiny, the Mercian glosses support the conclusion that negative contraction is less frequent here than in West Saxon, although, again, her careful study reveals some details not previously noticed, such as that contraction with *is* in these Mercian texts is almost as regular as in West Saxon and that past tense forms of *beon* remain uncontracted in Mercian more often than present tense forms, which is not the case in the Northumbrian glosses. Bergen then goes on to consider the Salisbury Psalter gloss since Hogg had used the text to argue that in its variety of West Saxon, non-contraction was quite common. But Bergen demonstrates that non-contraction in the Salisbury Psalter gloss is likely the result of glossing practice, where contraction is completely regular when glossing Latin verbs with affixed negative particles, like *nescire* and *nolle*, while elsewhere (and in far greater numbers) uncontracted forms render Latin negative constructions with *non*. The author turns her attentions to a number of West Saxon prose texts (393) and finds that: (1) contraction is rare for the 1sg and 2sg present tense forms of *beon*, and, in the case of the 1sg form, contraction is actually less frequent in West Saxon than in Anglian; (2) Alfred's and Ælfric's language frequently show non-contraction in the *hu ne* construction; and (3) non-contraction with *agan* was common in Alfred's language. Ultimately, what all of this adds up to is support for the generalization made much earlier by Levin that non-contraction appears most often in Anglian texts while contraction is most regular in West Saxon texts. Even so, Bergen's work does not amount to a reinvention of the wheel. As she states, "generalisations about negative contraction like the one made by Levin or those usually found in the handbooks may be helpful in some respects, but it must be kept in mind that they are over-simplifications" (426). Indeed, Bergen's work ferrets out many details of negative contraction in Old English texts that have simply been overlooked, and it serves as something of a model for how equally discerning and meticulous scholars might revisit some of the old half-truths of Old English dialectology.

In "Transitional Areas and Social History in Middle English Dialectology: The Case of Lincolnshire," *Neophilologist* 92.4: 713–27, Juan Camilo Conde-Silvestre and Maria Dolores Pérez-Raja consider some social factors that may have resulted in the mixed dialectal character of the region. Though the article focuses on Middle English and draws most of its

data from *LALME* and from Kristensson's 1967 survey of the northern counties and Lincolnshire, the authors' general approach of considering some of the known extra-linguistic conditions of the area as possible explanations for the linguistic evidence naturally has some salient extensions to the Old English period, principally as linguistic features in Lincolnshire are seen to correlate with geographical and historical circumstances. Lincolnshire was effectively halved in the Anglo-Saxon period with its northern province of Lindsey, which was intermittently under Northumbrian control, and its southern districts of Kesteven and Holland. These two halves were physically divided from one another by the river Witham. The authors suggest that a number of Middle English dialectal features fall along this boundary, and they further describe how some southern, western, and, later, northern features could have diffused into Lincolnshire. The evidence seems rather contradictory, but the authors suggest that it is the kind of evidence one might expect in a transitional area, a zone in which some features peter out while others pick up steam. The sociologies of transitional area dialects naturally work to help explain the variability on the ground, so Conde-Silvestre and Pérez-Raja turn to some sociolinguistic speculations that may account for Lincolnshire as a transitional area. They suggest that social networking played a key role in Lincolnshire as its population became more and more concentrated in nucleated villages with common fields after its inhabitants had earlier been dispersed among relatively isolated farmsteads. A situation in which previously isolated speakers are drawn together in a region with features arriving from other areas may well have promoted a period of dense dialect mixture as speakers negotiated the adoption or abandonment of competing forms. Based on *Domesday Book* recordings and extrapolation from its figures, the authors suggest that Lincolnshire had one of the densest populations in the North and in the East Midlands, and they reason that Lincoln itself gained a boost in urbanization due to its function as the center of royal government in the region. Increasing urbanization correlates with social mobility, and the authors believe that the weakening of some social networks and the extension of weaker ties in others attendant to social mobility are, in modern sociolinguistic analysis, the bridges along which features diffuse. The authors also borrow from the historical record of Lincolnshire to suggest that the relatively elevated number of *sokemen* and free men indicated by *Domesday Book* may suggest that "a high percentage of free, prosperous, independent peasants, who enjoyed

opportunities to prosper and, accordingly, to become mobile individuals in a more open and dynamic society" (724) helped condition the linguistic variability of Lincolnshire. There is no doubt that so-called historical sociolinguistics now dominates discussion of early English dialects, but some linkages of history, sociology, and linguistics are more persuasive than others. Could Conde-Silvestre and Pérez-Raja's explanation be correct? Of course it could—after all, the authors base their conclusions on widely-accepted notions of language variation observable in present-day speech communities. On the other hand, there is nothing completely unique about the conditions in Lincolnshire in the early Middle English period that the authors put forward as explanations for the county's linguistic record—many parts of medieval England with far more regular linguistic records than Lincolnshire's also experienced increasing urbanization and social mobility, so these factors alone are rather less persuasive than they would be otherwise. While historical sociolinguistics has added an important dimension to the study of language change and variation in the past, the kind of evidence that the discipline engages renders its conclusions highly conjectural in a way that, in this observer's opinion, diminishes the robustness of historical linguistics.

In "Towards a History of Northern English: Early and Late Northumbrian," *SN* 80: 132-59, Julia Fernández Cuesta, Nieves Rodríguez Ledesma, and Inmaculada Senra Silva gather together some of the features observed in early northern Old English texts as a summary of the early stages of a project on northern varieties of British English from the beginning to the present. The article simply lists the material, textual and epigraphic, thought to be evidence of "Old Northumbrian" and describes the phonology and morphology of the language of each of these. There is usefulness to having this information in one place, but, certainly, no new ground is broken here. For example, the authors identify among their conclusions a list of features that early and late Northumbrian texts have in common and a list of features that they do not share. But these matters have been known to scholars of Old English for a very long time, and the authors have nothing fundamentally new to say about Old English dialects or dialectology. Reviewing and synthesizing the handbook tradition is not without some value to those interested in Old English language, but these activities do nothing to advance the field. The authors assert that their goal is a history of northern English, but they seem unaware in this article of how they are simply recapitulating part of the intellectual history

of Old English dialectology. Recently, there has been a fairly radical reassessment of the evidence for dialect in Old English texts as scholars increasingly view the kinds of variation found in them as far from straightforward expressions of narrow phonological and morphological facts, so the authors' reliance on the handbook tradition—which almost never challenges the basic assumption that graphic variety imputes linguistic variety—strikes a note rather out of tune with current scholarship on Old English dialects.

R.D. Fulk looks into “Anglian Dialect Features in Old English Anonymous Homiletic Literature: A Survey, with Preliminary Findings,” *Studies in the History of the English Language IV: Empirical and Analytical Advances in the Study of English Language Change*, ed. Susan M. Fitzmaurice and Donka Minkova (New York: Mouton de Gruyter), 81-100. Fulk observes that accounts of Late West Saxon almost always rely on the language of Æthelwold and Ælfric, although the bulk of extant Late West Saxon prose is found in anonymous homilies in a form of Old English that often markedly differs from that of Æthelwold and Ælfric, displaying a number of Anglian features rarely or never found in their works. The author examines some 149 texts, identified by *Dictionary of Old English* short title in Appendix B (88-96), for the presence of thirty Anglian features (86-88). Fulk concludes from his survey that Anglian features register much more frequently in the anonymous homilies than has usually been observed; that there “is great variability in the number of features discoverable” (86) in this corpus of texts; and that many of the texts evince a variety of types of features—phonological/graphemic, morphological, syntactic, and lexical. All of this points to a refrain that has been building among scholars of Old and Middle English language for the last ten years or so—namely, that our texts are, upon closer examination, much more linguistically indeterminate than has generally been recognized by our editions and handbooks. And yet Fulk's approach to Old English dialectology is a highly conservative one built on the notion of Old English dialects found in the handbook tradition, which proceeds from an essentialist view of the evidence of written texts. As Richard Hogg states in his short response to Fulk's essay (see below), “[s]urely the time has come for us all to recognise that the traditional terminology is based on a framework which was established in the late nineteenth century” (58), and he suggests that the framework is no longer very useful. Indeed, the Anglian features surveyed in Fulk's corpus are mostly taken as linguistic facts instead of textual contingencies, and this will surely strike some readers

familiar with the current methodological emphasis on the relative ambiguity of the linguistics of medieval texts as rather at odds with the facts of medieval textual production and copying. But Fulk's survey is by his own admission a preliminary attempt to organize further study of a body of relatively neglected texts; variants from different manuscripts of the same texts are not taken into consideration, an activity that may later shed significant light on differences due to language and those due to textual practices, nor is the language of any single text treated in detail beyond the list of thirty presumed Anglianisms. Fundamental questions about the plausibility of “Anglian features” or about the meaning of “Anglian” and “Late West Saxon” aside, Fulk's contribution is valuable in spite of its use of a somewhat creaky philological apparatus because, whatever one takes variants in these texts to represent, the whole of the survey demonstrates the extent of variation from so-called Late West Saxon standards. Ultimately, it matters very little if we refer to a set of co-occurring features as “Anglian” or as something else entirely without any imputation of regional origins at all until the evidence is properly assessed at a level of detail that may show real differences between linguistic and extra-linguistic causes for variation, as Fulk suggests is the case with the absence of syncope in the 2nd and 3rd person singular present tense of strong verbs and long-stemmed class 1 weak verbs and in the past participle of class 1 weak verbs with stem-final dental stops. So while Fulk's article may appear to reinforce certain questionable orthodoxies in its vocabulary and general approach, it is nonetheless directionally correct in its methods and details of analysis that support the overall current variationist approach to the study of the language of medieval texts.

Statistical analysis has never really played more than a supporting role in the study of Old English language—the evidence for Old English is so thin on the ground that thorough-going statistical methodologies simply cannot gain much traction. Linguistic computation in Old English texts frequently involves no more than a handful of tokens. Alexander Hinneburg, Heikki Mannila, Samuli Kaislaniemi, Terttu Nevalainen, and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg offer advice on “How to Handle Small Samples: Bootstrap and Bayesian Methods in the Analysis of Linguistic Change,” *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 22.2 (2007): 137-50. The article explains the different methods of bootstrapping and Bayesian analysis and provides a test case to demonstrate how these methods can produce different results. Bootstrapping is a straightforward

form of re-sampling through the creation of new data sets from the original data that results in a calculation of the degree of uncertainty of some parameter. Bayesian analysis, however, takes the uncertain parameter as a random variable and derives its probability distribution. The two methods provide some avenues of approach to small sample sizes in which normal statistical inference is rendered inoperable, and the two methods can produce different results, as the authors demonstrate. The test case examines the introduction of the historical object pronoun *you* into subject distributions, which occurred ca. 1450–1600. They apply bootstrapping and Bayesian methods to data drawn from the *Corpus of Early English Correspondence* and find that the results “obtained for this case study confirm our previous findings in that they show how rapidly the second-person pronoun *you* replaced *ye* in the subject function” (148). The authors never address any aspects of Old English; but since bootstrapping and Bayesian statistical analysis measure confidence, they suggest that these methods offer possibilities for the advancement of the plain inductive reasoning of the kinds of philological investigations that have always formed the backbone of the study of Old English language.

Richard M. Hogg offers some assessment of essays by Traugott and Pintzuk and Fulk in the same SHEL volume in “What’s New in Old English?” *Studies in the History of the English Language IV*, 55–60. He manages to raise some important questions about both essays in his very brief comments. First, with respect to Traugott and Pintzuk’s paper on “Coding the *York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose* to Investigate the Syntax-Pragmatics Interface,” Hogg suggests that “there is some danger in this hectic advance [of electronic corpora] of being lost amidst the historical mists of time” (56). What Hogg is talking about is how the intellectual history of scholarly disciplines evolves and perpetuates narratives of explanation quite apart from whatever facts on the ground may be found. Hogg was certainly keenly alert to the ways that the intellectual history of the study of Old English has fashioned narratives of explanation passed on as received knowledge that tend to wear thin under close scrutiny; he cautions that corpus linguistics, as a relatively new discipline that is still in the early stages of its development, is in need of a historical accounting of itself as it evolves to guard against unintentionally reinforcing received knowledge. That caveat would be constructive for any discipline, although the recognition of idea-making usually only comes in hindsight. Hogg also expresses concerns with how compatible the

various parsing strategies of different corpora are with each other and whether or not their use can produce apples-to-apples comparisons. Of Fulk’s paper, while Hogg suggests it is pioneering in its attention to some relatively ignored Late West Saxon homiletic texts, he also says that its rigidly traditional use of the terminology of Old English dialects restrains its potential contribution to the field. Hogg insists, rightly, that terms like “Anglian” and “West Saxon” simply perpetuate nineteenth-century constructs that have outlived their usefulness, although he adds that “Fulk himself is more than aware of the problematic issues which the traditional terminology presents us with” (58).

In “Topics in Old English Dialects,” *A Companion to the History of the English Language*, 172–79, Lucia Kornexl briefly describes some of the areas on which the study of Old English dialects has focused traditionally and some of the problems the study of Old English dialects presents. Of the four-part division of Northumbrian, Mercian, Kentish, and West Saxon, Kornexl writes that “[t]he ongoing critical discussion about the aptness of the conventional designations and their territorial significance has nevertheless helped sharpen the theoretical outlook of the discipline and enhanced its critical potential” (174). That is, perhaps, a bit too optimistic, and Kornexl’s language closely mirrors that of Alistair Campbell’s famously agnostic pronouncement in his *Old English Grammar* that he uses terms like “Mercian” or “West Saxon” “practically without claim to territorial significance” (§256). Discussions of the “aptness of the conventional designations” really has occurred at least since Campbell; the conventional designations persist because almost all scholars who work on Old English dialects recognize that terms like “Mercian” or “Northumbrian” are a convenient shorthand for the convergent frequencies of possible linguistic variants in written texts and that there appears to be no evidence for more than four constellations of convergent variant frequencies. Still, Kornexl achieves a prudently judicious posture toward the thoroughly constructed field of Old English dialectology, explaining its different facets with appropriate detachment from any strong commitment to its various epistemologies. The author then briefly describes “The Origin of the Old English Dialects,” “The Character and Distribution of the Surviving Materials,” “Defining Old English Dialects on the Basis of the Available Evidence,” “Old English Word Geography,” and “The ‘Dialect’ of Old English Poetry.” In her section on the evidence for Old English dialects, Kornexl touches the bottom of this dark lake when she points out that we impute a massive amount of

linguistic (especially phonological) meaning to texts produced in a system of transmission that naturally significantly obscures linguistic meaning from our comprehension: the critical assumption is that scribes actively recorded Old English as they would have spoken it, even when their exempla conflicted with their instincts. And, of course, there just is not much extant Old English in the first place. The unhappy outcome of the dearth of evidence is that we lack the copiousness we require to establish a self-reinforcing matrix of data, such as that used in the *Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*. Kornexl manages to convey this hopelessness while still making the ponderousness of Old English dialectology sound interesting.

Donka Minkova tackles "Prefixation and Stress in Old English: In Memoriam Richard Hogg (1944-2007)," *Word Structure* 1.1: 21-52, with characteristically equal parts meticulousness and certitude. The greater portion of Minkova's significant contribution to the study of Old English language has focused on stress, stress assignment, and prosody. In this article, she turns her attention to the prosodic behavior of prefixes in Old English, and she addresses conditioning due to prefixes' lexical forms and the morphosyntactic nature of the bases to which they attach, the present-day reflexes of Old English prefixes, and stacked prefixes' sensitivity to the morphology-phonology interface. As has become Minkova's custom in recent years, she expresses her observations on stress patterns through the terminology and apparatus of Optimality Theory, which is appropriate here since Optimality Theory has had the most success in its power to describe prosodic conditions. The first part of the paper surveys the evidence for prefixal stress as well as criteria for prefixhood. As is well known from the handbook tradition, some prefixes appear strictly as bound morphemes—some always stressed, others never stressed—some prefixes appear as bound or free morphemes, and some appear in allomorphic "strong" and "weak" pairs, like *andwyrdan* 'to answer' and *ongin* 'beginning'. Minkova also considers whether or not Old English prefixes could attach to bound roots (such as in Present Day English *subsequent*), as well as the preservation or non-preservation of the phonological integrity of the prefix and the semantic independence of the prefix as "a useful correlate of its phonological and prosodic shape" (30). The author finds that wordhood, boundedness and separability, attachment to bound roots, allomorphy, phonological integrity, semantic independence, and category-changing properties cannot account for prefixal stress in Old English. Minkova points out that previous accounts of prefixal stress in

Old English either tend to combine factors of a different nature or to cobble together idiosyncratic analyses to explain differences, and the next section of the paper offers a unified account of prefixal stress within an Optimality Theory framework. Since the central insight of Optimality Theory is language features' sensitivity to limited violability within a ranked hierarchy of constraints, the model would appear to work well in explaining the variable stressability of prefixal elements in Old English. Minkova's analysis finds that the interaction of the morphological and prosodic structure of prefixes in terms of alignment constraints explains part of their behavior, but she also identifies two kinds of prefixes in terms of their ability to form independent Prosodic Words: "[p]refixes incapable of forming Prosodic Words are always unstressed, while prefixes capable of forming a Prosodic Word get stressed in accord with the grammatical nature of the base" (41). All but those steeped in the latest optimality-theoretic cant will find Minkova's article a severe challenge, so in the end it can be difficult to assess how much light the paper casts on Old English. Some readers will find the application of such an abstract, non-falsifiable linguistic model to data from the contingent survival of early medieval manuscripts produced by a system of manuscript transmission that obscured even basic linguistic facts to be rather absurd. But as is so often the case in heavily theoretic accounts, the purpose almost imperceptibly shifts from explaining data to supporting theory.

The industry that produces large, expensive introductory compilations continues apace with *A Companion to the History of the English Language*, edited by Haruko Momma and Michael Matto (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell). Intense self-focus on disciplinaryity is a pervasive concern of early twenty-first century humanities research; the "summative instinct," aided and abetted by eager publishers, is a natural feature of disciplines with long histories and with abiding pedagogical imperatives, so the study of the history of the English language is particularly appropriate for inclusion in Wiley-Blackwell's voluminous series of scholarly companions. The editors have employed the expertise of fifty-nine scholars, including many of the field's leaders. This rather extreme division of labor makes for a tremendously varied book—not only are the areas of traditional focus within the study of the history of the English language covered but so, too, are many topics brought into the scope of the discipline that have received little or no play in the past, such as a section on literary Englishes right up to the present day and essays on colonial and post-colonial Englishes.

The editors explain that the volume's intended audiences are non-specialist students and scholars of literature and culture, and the book gathers the essentials of the history of the English language and packages them in mostly easily digestible chapters. In fact, the constituency most likely to benefit from the volume's strategy of tremendous breadth and shallow depth are graduate students studying English literature, history, and culture who do not intend to take a formal course in the history of the English language but who nevertheless wish to acquire some fundamental knowledge base on the subject. In that regard, instructors of English literature and history who have never studied the history of the language would do well to procure the volume for themselves, too. As the editors say in the volume's first essay, "given the tendency since the middle of the last century for students of English studies to focus on criticism of modern literature, contemporary theory, and cultural phenomena ... [o]ur aim is to offer those working with literary and cultural material a fuller perspective on language" (3). It is a laudable motivation since profound ignorance of the basics of language is endemic among those who focus on English literary and cultural studies, but given how many of them actually wear and display that ignorance as something of a loyalty pin, one cannot help pondering the obvious Berkeleyan question: if you publish a book for the members of a specific audience and none of them reads it, does it make a sound?

The contents of the volume vary between the traditional information associated with the basic history of the English language and matters not usually encountered in the subject as it is narrowly construed, an arrangement suggested by the volume's design for non-specialists focused on literary and cultural studies. Part I is a general introduction and includes essays on "History, English, Language: Studying HEL Today" by Michael Matto and Haruko Momma; "History of the History of the English Language: How Has the Subject Been Studied?" by Thomas Cable; and "Essential Linguistics" by Mary Blockley. Part II, "Linguistic Survey," conveys something of the internal history of the language and shrinks the topics that are normally of the greatest interest to scholars of the history of the English language to less than ten percent of the volume: "Phonology: Segmental Histories" by Donka Minkova and Robert Stockwell; "History of English Morphology" by Robert McColl Millar; "History of English Syntax" by Olga Fischer; "A History of the English Lexicon" by Geoffrey Hughes; and "History of English Prosody" by Geoffrey Russom. Part III, "English Semantics and Lexicography," would

more reasonably be titled "Lexicography," since formal semantics really does not figure in the essays gathered here: "Dictionaries Today: What Can We Do with Them?" by Reinhard R.K. Hartmann; "English Onomasiological Dictionaries and Thesauri" by Werner Hüllen; and "Johnson, Webster, and the *Oxford English Dictionary*" by Charlotte Brewer. Part IV outlines the "Pre-history of English" with "English as an Indo-European Language" by Philip Baldi and "English as a Germanic Language" by R.D. Fulk (see above). Part V, some 200 pages on "English in History: England and America," epitomizes the editors' approach to the subject as driven primarily by social and cultural history. In their introductory essay, the editors suggest that "the usefulness of 'internal' and 'external' as defining conceptions within HEL may have run its course" (8), and that may be true for scholars, who have long recognized that the barrier between endogenous and exogenous linguistics is highly permeable, but the usefulness of foregrounding internal language change remains pedagogically critical because, while students easily grasp that historical "events" may result in language change, they require in-depth instruction in the laws and principles that result in systematic changes in languages over time. But the balance of the volume is heavily weighted toward external matters, no doubt at least partly in concession to the strong dislike of formal linguistics prevalent among students and scholars of English literature, history, and culture. So Part V comprises six sections, on "Old English in History (Ca. 450-1066)"; "Middle English in History (1066-1485)"; "Early Modern English in History (1485-1660)"; "Modern British English in History (1660-Present)"; "American English in History"; and "Topics in History." The essays of these six sections are: "Early Old English (up to 899)" by Daniel Donoghue; "Late Old English (899-1066)" by Mechthild Gretsch; "Topics in Old English Dialects" by Lucia Kornexl (see above); "Early Middle English 1066-ca.1350)" by Thorlac Turville-Petre; "Late Middle English (ca. 1350-1485)" by Seth Lerer; "Varieties of Middle English" by Jeremy J. Smith; "Early Modern English (1485-1660)" by Terttu Nevalainen; "Varieties of Early Modern English" by Jonathan Hope; "British English in the Long Eighteenth Century (1660-1830)" by Carey McIntosh; "British English Since 1830" by Richard W. Bailey; "The Rise of Received Pronunciation" by Lynda Mugglestone; "American English to 1865" by David Simpson; "American English Since 1865" by Walt Wolfram; "American English Dialects" by Gavin Jones; "Early Modern English Print Culture" by John N. King; "Issues of Gender in Modern English" by Deborah Cameron; "Class, Ethnicity, and the

Formation of 'Standard English' by Tony Crowley; "The Transplantation of American English in Philippine Soil" by Br. Andrew Gonzalez, FSC; "English, Latin, and the Teaching of Rhetoric" by Michael Matto; and "English in Mass Communications: News Discourse and the Language of Journalism" by Philippa K. Smith and Allan Ball.

Part VI of the volume, "English in History: English Outside England and the United States," collects brief essays on each of the major English speech communities around the globe. "Section 1 British Isles and Ireland" comprises "English in Wales" by Marion Löffler, "English in Scotland" by J. Derrick McClure, and "English in Ireland" by Terence Patrick Dolan. "Section 2 English in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand" includes "English in Canada" by John Edwards and "Australian and New Zealand English" by Pam Peters. "Section 3 Colonial and Postcolonial English" is likely to be of the greatest interest to the volume's planned audience since post-colonialism and internationalism enjoy prominence in English studies at the moment and therefore attract the greatest number of those studying literature, history, and culture. The essays one finds here are: "South Asian English" by Kamal K. Sridhar; "English in the Caribbean" by Donald Winford; and "English in Africa" by Alamin M. Mazuri.

Part VII, on "Literary Languages," collects nine essays on English literary history from *Beowulf* to Toni Morrison. As Matto says in his short introduction to this section of the volume, these essays "exemplify the many kinds of literary analyses that can be performed within the framework of HEL" (434), but this certainly suggests more of a theoretical coherence than the essays in the section actually evince and more of a formalism in a "framework for HEL" than actually exists. It is enough to say that these essays consider their topics from the viewpoint of linguistic self-fashioning and highlight some of the ways that these literary works explore language as a historically and culturally contingent system of signs. The essays in the section are: "The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Tradition" by Fred C. Robinson; "In swich englissh as he kan: Chaucer's Literary Language" by John F. Plummer; "Shakespeare's Literary Language" by Adam N. McKeown; "Jane Austen's Literary English" by Mary Poovey; "Joyce's English" by Laurent Milesi; "Faulkner's Language" by Noel Polk; "Twixt the Twain: East-West in Rushdie's Zubaan-Tongue" by Tabish Khair; and "Toni Morrison: The Struggle for the Word" by Justine Tally.

Part VIII of the volume, "Issues in Present-Day English," takes variation as its theme, which is a cogent strategy since measuring and theorizing linguistic

variation has become a dominant activity in the history of the English language. The essays here are: "Migration and Motivation in the Development of African American English" by Mary B. Zeigler; "Latino Varieties of English" by Robert Bayley; "Teaching English to Native Speakers: The Subject Matter of Composition (1970-2005)" by Mary Soliday; "Earning as well as Learning a Language: English and the Post-colonial Teacher" by Eugene Chen Eoyang; "Creoles and Pidgins" by Salikoko S. Mufwene; and "World Englishes in World Contexts" by Braj B. Kachru. Part IX, the volume's final part, collects four short essays on "Further Approaches to Language Study": "Style and Stylistics" by David L. Hoover; "Corpus-Based Linguistic Approaches to the History of English" by Anne Curzan; "Sociolinguistics" by Robin Tolmach Lakoff; and "Cognitive Linguistics" by Dirk Geeraerts.

The amount of territory covered in the volume is stunning, but it is clear that part of the editors' motivation is to help make HEL relevant to the larger project of contemporary English studies. The strategy requires a trade-off: linguistics is a scientific discipline whose "scientism" many students and scholars of English literature and culture read as just another essentialist construction, so the disciplinary rigor of formal linguistics is exchanged for more delicate—but more familiar—ways of talking about language. In one sense, though, there is a fundamental distance between English language scholarship and English literary scholarship that can never be bridged, and some of us (perhaps furtively) wish that scholars of the English language would simply stop trying to charm their more numerous, if not more popular, colleagues: modern linguistics is fundamentally about narrowing potential meanings while the modern study of literature and culture is fundamentally about multiplying potential meanings. These are not compatible intellectual worldviews, and scholars are naturally attracted to discourses that validate and confirm their most basic intellectual notions. Consider, for example, the impact of Ashley Crandell Amos's *Linguistic Means of Determining the Date of Old English Literary Texts* (1980) on the field of Old English studies. Before her book, linguistic and metrical criteria for dating were considered largely unassailable objective criteria for arranging a relative chronology of verse texts in Old English. But in the larger field of English studies, such reductions of texts to a set of "criteria" had already been considered, for more than a decade, profoundly out of tune with the dominant way of thinking about literature as radically indeterminate and highly contingent cultural productions: Amos's book confirmed

and validated a building “anti-philological” sentiment among many recently trained Old English scholars whose general training was already steeped in post-structuralist ways of thinking, and so many scholars of that generation and, subsequently, their students believe the book to be the final word on Old English as it *used to be practiced*. The result has been that even in the sector of English studies where philological reasoning is most obviously critical—the study of Old English—hostility to philology as a reductive and

old-fashioned way of thinking is now the dominant paradigm, in spite of the efforts of a small number of scholars to demonstrate that philology matters and that Amos’s book was not, in fact, a damnation beyond reproach of all things philological in Old English. So while I commend Momma and Matto’s efforts to provide some *entrée* to the discipline for non-specialists, I have to be pessimistic about the volume’s impact on an audience that is not likely to read past the title on its cover.

CC

4. Literature

a. General and Miscellaneous

Mary Dockray-Miller assesses the development of feminist thought from 1998 to 2008 in her bibliographic analysis “Old English Literature and Feminist Theory: A State of the Field,” *Literature Compass* 5/6: 1049–59. In the earliest stages of feminist scholarship, women in medieval literature were perceived as either silent or exceptional figures, not as agents of cultural production. In response to this restricted view, feminist scholars articulated their discourse in a highly theoretical postmodern idiom to break readers away from traditional paradigms. Feminist studies has reached its richest realization through new forms of inquiry and empirically-based interdisciplinary research. For example, in his 2002 study of Old English elegies, Berit Aström urges scholars to consider “a multiplicity of co-existing interpretations” rather than vie for a single solution to solve questions of female authorship and voice (1053). More significant to Dockray-Miller’s analysis is the increasing diversity of the interdisciplinary approaches to the study of women’s cultural production, prompted by the pivotal 1992 study by Stephanie Hollis, *Anglo-Saxon Women and the Church*. Study of the devotional practices of women and of women as readers in exclusively female settings has invigorated new fields of inquiry. These studies, which center on the religious foundations in which women lived, include scholarship in archeology, manuscript illustrations and marginalia, hagiography, history, theology, and art (1053–57). Dockray-Miller calls for further interdisciplinary research into feminist studies in the early Anglo-Saxon period in the form of collections and monographs.

In his 2008 dissertation, “The English Inheritance of Biblical Verse” (U of Toronto, *DAI* 71A [2010], AAT NR58050), Patrick McBrine describes his study as an exploration into the transmission of late antique Latin

biblical poetry to England and its later development in vernacular poetry. It is “the first study to explore the stylistic and thematic affinities between Latin and English traditions” in several close readings (ii). The earliest biblical epics integrate poetic conventions from the heroic poetry of Vergil with biblical narratives. Close reading of the range of texts highlights several stylistic features and rhetorical devices that Vergil’s *Aeneid* shares with the works of the Latin biblical poets, such as polyptoton, alliteration, rhythmic internal rhyme, verbal echoes, and thematic correspondences (19–27). These rhetorical strategies influence Anglo-Latin poets and provide them with a fund of poetic allusions, which transform the poetry into “a learned game ... as Christian poets consecrate pagan literature for use in a secular world” (14). The study focuses on Latin writers whose works were popular in the Anglo-Saxon curriculum. Extant manuscript evidence indicates that the following works were widely circulated and copied: Juvencus’s *Evangeliorum Libri Quattuor* (ca. 330); Cyprianus’s *Heptateuch* (fl. 400); Prudentius’s *Cathemerinon* (written before 405); Sedulius’s *Carmen Paschale* (425–50); Avitus’s *De Spiritalis Historiae Gestis* (fl. 507), and Arator’s *Historia Apostolica* (fl. 554). Chapter two is dedicated to analysis of the earliest poets: Juvencus, Cyprianus, and Prudentius. This is followed by analysis of the later Latin poets and their appropriation of earlier works: Sedulius, Avitus, and Arator. In the final chapters, McBrine examines Anglo-Latin and Anglo-Saxon adaptations of these works in the poetry of Aldhelm, Bede, and Alcuin. His study concludes with analysis of the resonances of this tradition with Anglo-Saxon biblical poetry.

In the first section of his study, McBrine finds that the works of Juvencus, Cyprianus, and Prudentius adhere closely to the source text while Sedulius, Avitus, and Arator achieve “greater stylistic freedom and incorporation

of biblical exegesis" into their works. Sedulius's poetry has the most powerful influence upon Anglo-Latin poetry (9). In his examination of Juvencus's preface to his *Historia Apostolica* with its Vergilian counterpart, McBrine examines the shift in tone from praise of the heroic to one of Christian humility. While both texts share common rhetorical devices, the moral message in the Christian preface is to shun earthly glory in order to live piously and be worthy of salvation (24). Cyprianus integrates diction from Vergil and Juvencus into the conventional meter of his poetry (33–42). While Cyprianus adheres closely to the text of Genesis, his style becomes more expansive in his treatment of Exodus as a heroic narrative with even greater elaboration on the canticle (Exodus 507–515). Prudentius's *Cathemerinon* or "Daily Round" is a series of twelve lyrical poems that correspond to the hours of the day. Prudentius includes biblical scenes, many of which reveal the stylistic poetic influences of Juvencus and Cyprianus and anticipate the *Carmen Paschale* of Sedulius (44). In his analysis of the poem "Hymn for Epiphany," McBrine focuses on the scene of the Gift of the Magi and finds a network of correspondences that recall phrases from Juvencus and Cyprianus in their treatment of the same biblical scene (48–50). The verbal echoes merge the three works into one motif rich in "intertextual vibrance" (49). Another motif that resonates in the works of the three authors is that of the Crossing of the Red Sea, which Prudentius renders with heavy symbolic meaning. The intertextual echoes in the works of all three authors establish the Crossing of the Red Sea as a rich motif from which later writers draw (50–51).

The next section of the study presents the poetry of later medieval Latin poets: Sedulius, Avitus, and Arator. McBrine focuses on Book One of Sedulius's *Carmen Paschale* because elements of the first book appear most often in later poetry. McBrine includes his translation in a bilingual edition of Book One as an appendix to his study (205–17). Stylistic features that ornament the Biblical episodes include double-entendre, paronomasia, polyptoton, and alliteration (59–60). This chapter is accompanied by a list of instances of polyptoton to Book One of Sedulius's work (218). In the opening lines to Sedulius's preface, the poet invites readers to partake in the *Carmen Paschale* as a "mystic feast," which recalls Prudentius's "Hymn before Eating" (*Cathemerinon* 3.16–17). Sedulius expands the motif into sixteen lines to further display his rhetorical artistry (61–63). The next series of lines stylistically imitate Juvencus's *Evangelia* with rich echoes of Vergil (63–66). A close reading of the figural significance and heroic poetic diction in the three miracles in Exodus follows (66–70).

In contrast to his Christian predecessors, Sedulius adds his own commentary to the Gospels (72), to his treatment of the Lord's Prayer (73–74), and to his versification of Christ's miracles (75–80).

Avitus and Arator enlarge upon the figural and mystical significance of the biblical narrative. In his *De Spiritualis Historiae Gestis*, Avitus provides expansive commentary on the figural significance of the episodes in the Old Testament in comparison to Sedulius (84–89). For example, in his treatment of the crossing of the Red Sea in imitation of Cyprianus, Prudentius, and Sedulius, Avitus adds further commentary on the figural significance of the scene with additional speeches (84–86). Arator's rendition, his *Historia Apostolica*, relates the narrative in its mystical sense as it echoes previous Christian writers (90). Arator's work parallels Sedulius's work most closely (95–100). McBrine concludes that Sedulius's work is a "creative tour-de-force in which the author gives free rein to his imagination" as a model for later writers and preachers as they interpret the acts in the Bible (100). Avitus is the freest in his poetic elaborations while Arator is the most didactic (100–01).

In Anglo-Saxon England, the school curriculum and the strict schedule stipulated by the Benedictine Rule promoted intensive study of Latin poetry. To highlight the method of studying Latin poetry, McBrine provides an example of a text transcribed from Juvencus with lexical glosses and notations for translating the passage (106–07). He cross-references this page with the facsimile reproduction in Appendix 5a to the preface as it appears in the manuscript context of Cambridge University Library G.g. 5.35. McBrine then assesses the popularity of the works in this manuscript by examining the range of verbal echo from each author in later works of Aldhelm, Bede, and Alcuin. Readers will appreciate the notes to this chapter, which provide unpublished manuscript evidence and booklists in addition to a broad range of published scholarship.

An examination of the first 250 verses of Aldhelm's *Carmen de Virginitate* exposes several stylistic echoes of the opening verses of Sedulius's *Carmen Paschale* (130). Aldhelm's poetry is a creative imitation of Sedulius's work in its grammatical patterns, formal repetitions, metrical patterning, and alliterative style (121–30). These imitative features, many of them aural, "force the reader's ear" to recall Sedulius's work with Aldhelm's (124). In his analysis to the preface of Bede's *Vita Sancti Cuthberti*, McBrine finds influences from Aldhelm, Sedulius, and Arator. He determines that Arator's work is most pervasive in verbal echoes and parallel syntactic patterns. The discussion of Juvencus's imagery

in Bede's preface clarifies Bede's otherwise enigmatic descriptions for modern readers (138–41). Finally, McBride finds numerous resonances with the opening of Alcuin's poetry to the works of Sedulius, Bede, Arator, and Juvencus (142–44). McBride concludes: "Poets like Aldhelm, Bede and Alcuin do not simply insert scattered words or lines of biblical verse into their narratives; they intently and carefully model their texts on particular passages from the earlier genre ... to participate in the established tradition and raise the literary status of their own works" (144).

In his examination of Old English biblical verse in the works of *Genesis A*, *Exodus*, and *Daniel*, McBride considers Latin sources as well as the liturgy. The biblical epic poetry from the New Testament as well as the Old Testament provides stylistic models for *Genesis A* (156). The vernacular author negotiates "scriptural and secular values" in a manner consistent with Juvencus and Cyprianus (175–76). Further, poetic variations of heroic diction correspond to "the classical practice of *rhetorical variatio*" (161). The liturgy is a significant source for *Genesis A*: specifically, the Canon of the Mass corresponds to the symbolism in the preface to the poem. This allusion in turn recalls Hilary of Arles's *Metrum in Genesin*, a connection first noted by Bernard Huppé. McBride deepens the source investigation when he identifies Sedulius's *Carmen Paschale* as a possible source text for Hilary of Arles's work. As a result, the Anglo-Saxon poet of *Genesis A* relies on Hilary of Arles's text, which in turn captures allusions and phrasing from Sedulius's preface. These Sedulian echoes resonate in *Genesis A* (167). Poetic formulas in the description of the expulsion of Adam and Eve correspond to those in non-Christian exile poetry (171). Other motifs and elements of those motifs examined are the figural nature of the sacrifice of Isaac (174–75); the heroic tone of the poem *Exodus* and its resonances with Cyprianus's *Heptateuch* and Prudentius's *Cathemerinon* (179); the "dreadful journey" and its resonances in the works of Prudentius and Avitus (181–82); and the baptismal significance of Crossing the Red Sea in the works of Cyprianus, Prudentius, and Sedulius (182–83). Finally, the poem *Daniel* operates within the tradition of *Genesis A* and *Exodus*. All three works have in common a versified narrative shape, and they echo liturgical sources (190–92).

In *The Translation of Religious Texts in the Middle Ages: Tracts, Rules, Hymns and Saints' Lives* (Bern: Peter Lang), Domenico Pezzini focuses on three types of translated works, mainly from the later medieval period: texts for religious instruction (Chapters 1–8); liturgical hymns and religious poetry (Chapters 9–11);

and hagiographical narratives (Chapters 12–14). He analyzes translation strategies in Anglo-Norman, Middle English, Italian, and Old English (*Life of Gregory the Great*). Throughout his analysis of translation styles, Pezzini asserts that the role of the translator ranges from "author, scribe, translator, compiler, interpreter" to glossator (16). The approach the translator assumes and the techniques he applies depend largely upon the demands of his audience. The translator views his source text as a rich quarry, which he recasts in content and style to inspire the devotion of lay men and women (79). Throughout his study, Pezzini defines translation strategies that create the shift from the sophisticated theological discourse for a monastic readership into emotive, meditative texts for private reading and oral performance in sermons for a later medieval audience of lay men and women. In each chapter, Pezzini presents the historical context and the literary tradition that frames the translator's work and follows with close readings of the original text in comparison to its counterpart in the later translations.

In the first section, Pezzini dedicates six of the eight chapters to the study of texts written for the cult of St. Birgitta of Sweden and her cult in England and Italy. In his study of Birgittine tracts in fifteenth century England, Pezzini examines the *Liber Revelationum Celestium* (hereafter, *Rev.*), the book of revelations of St. Brigitta that was central to the English cult of St. Birgitta. Three tracts, *Rev.* VI,65; *Rev.* VII,5; and *Rev.* II,16, attest to the general translation practice of excising smaller passages from longer passages in the source text and adapting them for the general reader (44). The text is reshaped into a meditative work designed for oral delivery through additional techniques (45). Such techniques include forms of parallelism, inversion and chiasmus through repeated words, phrases, and sentences in *Rev.* VII,5. In *Rev.* II,16 he examines rhetorical figures such as anaphora, epistrophe, epanalepsis as forms of parallelism in the translations (43–44). The compilation of meditations, tracts, and other Christian texts includes the *Rev.* VI,65 of St. Birgitta. Pezzini studies the techniques of revision in doctrinal changes and shifts in tone that heighten the emotional intensity of the translated texts in comparison to their sources. The stridently moral tone reflects the "missionary attitude" of the reviser (210).

In his overview of prose translations of English Birgittine tracts and meditations, Pezzini breaks the forms of prose into five categories: the first category consists of quotations and short passages found on a flyleaf to a book of hours as a literal translation. The second area focuses on single chapters that appear in self-contained

units as meditations on the life of Christ. These chapters are creatively reworked, which suggests to Pezzini “the possible use of these texts for spiritual reading in a context of oral delivery” (48). He then analyzes large compilations characterized by him as free translations of the source text. A fourth category is the anthologized selection of single chapters. Finally, he offers two full text translations intended for study which he characterizes as economical translations that adheres closely to the source text. Pezzini compares two other translations of Book IV of the Birgittine *Revelationes*: the Middle English version in London, BL Harley 4800 and the Italian version in Florence, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana 27.10. Close readings of these texts reveal each translator’s use of variety and repetition (58–62) and reduction or amplification (62–65). Analysis of the vision of the Passion in the same works focuses specifically upon the translators’ sentence patterns which may retard or accelerate the pace of reading to guide the reader’s meditation on the text (66–73). In his examination of the organization of the Italian compilation in Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale MS II, II 391, Pezzini asserts that the rubrics present the translator’s interpretive expansions to the original source text (180–85).

Exploring further varieties of translation practices, Pezzini analyzes two Middle English translations of Aelred of Rievaulx’s *De Institutione Inclusarum* in two manuscripts housed at the Bodleian Library in Oxford: the Vernon manuscript from the end of the fourteenth century and Bodley 423. Bodley 423 provides a summary translation written for an audience similar to the readership of the source text. In contrast, the text of the Vernon manuscript expands upon the source text to create an emotional and meditative effect elaborated in its “figurative and affective details” (91).

In the second major section of his work, Pezzini discusses the innovative Middle English translations of Latin hymns in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In contrast to the Old English translations of the hymns, which serve as glosses, the Middle English translations are poetic acts: they vary in stanzaic forms and appear in rhyme. Further, they are “put to new destinations, which are neither the choir nor the classroom, but the pulpit of the preacher, the closet of the devout, and possibly extralitururgical singing” (217). Pezzini examines works of the Franciscans William Herebert, James Ryman and the anonymous author of the *English Hymnal*. Herebert’s works, designed for use in sermons, display an immediacy that reflects the preacher’s preference for concrete nouns and visually strong adjectives with which he moves his audience (223). Pezzini examines hymns as forms of meditation in his study

of the *English Hymnal*. Examples of translations of the hymns such as *Vox Clara, Veni Redemptor Gentium, A Solis Ortus Cardine* reveal a thematic pattern of the “theology of salvation” that emerges in the celebratory tone in later medieval affective piety (237).

Marian antiphons and hymns celebrate Mary’s central role within the broader context of salvation in later medieval culture. Herebert’s preference for “simple and affective imagery” over complex theological statements indicates that he adapted his translations for sermons (250). The translator remains faithful to his source while he strengthens the meditative quality (255). The translations are accompanied by additional poetry to aid meditation. Repeated lines from the Latin source text serve in some cases as hymn refrains, and in others the original lines inspired “the creation of new ones, often in the form of sequences (266). In his translation of the hymns *Vexilla Regis Prodeunt* and *Christe Qui Lux Es et Dies*, John Lydgate retains the theological import, adds devotional imagery, and raises the tone of exaltation (269–89).

In the final section, Pezzini examines hagiography. The translator of the Old English *Life of Gregory the Great* structures his work around three major areas: Gregory’s birth, pontificate, and death; the epitaph containing his eulogy; and the story of the young slaves. The chronicle of Gregory’s life is essentially a gloss that adheres to the source text and makes use of doublets to clarify its meaning. The eulogy preserves the rhyme and rhythm of the original text in a “lexically simplified” rendition (307). The anecdote of the young slaves contains many verbs of speaking and asking to indicate oral delivery (309–11). The reduction of text produces a “medallion in which different linguistic genres are combined to honor the saint: annalistic prose, celebratory poetry, and a narrative including dialogue” (303).

Marian doctrine in the life of St. Birgitta by a fifteenth-century translator is found in Oxford, Bodl. Lib. Rawlinson C. 41. In this compilation of passages from the *Revelations* of St. Birgitta, the English translation relates the meditative narrative of the mysteries of Jesus and the Virgin (328). The contrasting emotions of joy and pain shape the narrative into a rhythmic pattern that exalts Mary and presents her as a model of imitation (326). In his comparison of this translation with its Latin counterpart, Pezzini suggests that the English rendition is designed to be read aloud based on the translator’s heavy use of doublets (329). Other inventive techniques reassemble the text in three ways: inversion of the sentence sequence, conflation, and dismemberment of the original chapters into different parts of the saint’s life (330–31).

In his study of Aelred of Rievaulx's *Vita Sancti Edwardi Regis et Confessoris* (composed 1161–1163), Pezzini examines Aelred's version in comparison to two translations that precede his, Osbert of Clare's *Vita Beati Eadwardi* (1138) based on an earlier *Vita Ædwardi* by an anonymous clerk (1066–1067). In his analysis of these versions, Pezzini traces the progression from a strictly historical presentation to an increasingly hagiographical portrait of Edward. The reductions and additions of the three authors emphasize the political aspirations of Aelred of Rievaulx in his treatment of the saint's life. In conclusion, Pezzini re-evaluates the notion of translation, not only in terms of its literal or figurative treatment of the source text but as a "creative reworking of the source text" (375). This involves reduction, expansion, omission, literal and free adaptations (376–77). Pezzini posits that the act of medieval translation not only serves the audience but also aids the creative life of the translator himself as a practice that develops language facility between reading and writing (378).

In *The Sea and Medieval English Literature* (Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer), Sebastian I. Sobecki analyzes the literary depictions of the sea that define English identity and its changing relationship with the Continent in medieval imagination. The time frame begins with the earliest writers of the Anglo-Saxon period and concludes with the end of pre-modernity. Sobecki summarizes the major historical conceptualizations of English identity and the sea in his epilogue on Shakespeare's inheritance of these traditions. Through "a network of close readings and contextualisations of the sea" in this diachronic study, Sobecki demonstrates the ways "English writers employ the sea to generate literary meaning" and negotiate the fields of "myth and connectivity" between English Christian identity and the sea (4). According to its earliest literary conception, the sea is a hostile, chaotic and animistic force that separates human and divine realms (11). After the Conquest, the sea is imagined in new ways: first, the topos of the Christian pilgrimage across the sea is gradually replaced by the romantic quest characteristic of Norman literature. Secondly, the sea is viewed in terms of property rather than as a mytho-poetic force that transcends human ownership. Throughout his study, Sobecki asserts that the literature of the sea was formative in the medieval concepts of the sea as reflected in maps, histories, and travel literature. For example, Christopher Columbus states that he was influenced "not by any maps" but by the writing of Isidore, Bede, Strabo, Petrus Comestor, Ambrose, and Duns Scotus (82). Study of the literature of the sea can provide a wealth of information to scholars across disciplines.

Early Christian writers envision England at the outermost border of the west and near the end of the temporal realm. Origen is credited as the first authority to establish the "sea as the world" motif and establish the Christian journey over the sea as the individual's challenge to suffer worldly strife (36). From the fourth century onward, the term *abyssus* signifies the sea as the primeval force and is associated with the seat of the devil in works of Jerome, Hilary of Poitiers, Augustine, Tertullian, Isidore of Seville, and Gregory the Great (38). In his theology of geo-history, Paulus Orosius envisions the British Isles "on the frontiers of salvation" (10). This view of England at the edge of world is echoed by Gildas, Wace, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Richard Higden, Leonardo Bruni, William of Malmesbury, and later writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (79). This view of the westward expansion into spiritually fertile geography also signifies the end of time, for Britain borders the temporal end of the world in Hugh of St. Victor's *De Archa Noe Morali* (78). Travel literature operates within this time-space continuum and affirms the belief that western routes across the sea might lead travelers to the earthly paradise (82). In early Irish Christian tradition, the sea is transformed into a place of purification, a "monastic substitute for the desert" (41).

The next two chapters address the transition and changing views of the sea. To highlight the major shifts in thought in the later period, the author examines the literary tradition of two works, and each early Irish version is compared to its later Norman rendition: *The Life of Saint Brendan* and the Tristan legend. Comparisons between the pre-Conquest *Navigatio Sancti Brendani Abbatis* and the post-conquest Anglo-Norman *Voyage de Saint Brandan* by Benedeit reveal significant shifts between the Irish monastic vision of Brendan's holy life and the romanticized elements of the Norman version. The sea as a "religious desert of patristic and Irish spirituality" transforms into "a landscape of adventure," which signals the Norman assimilation to English culture (55–56). In his analysis of the Tristan legend in early Irish tradition, Sobecki analyzes the topos of the *peregrinatio pro amore Dei* according to its major phases: the desire to abandon earthly things; leaving one's country on a quest to a remote island; the longing associated with traversing the religious desert and suffering isolation and temptation in the sea; and the exile's battle with fear and despair in imitation of Christ's spiritual battles with Satan in the desert (49–50). As one of the earliest works of romance literature, the Tristan poems reveal shades of Irish influence in such works as the late twelfth-century poem by Thomas of Britain, the thirteenth-century Old Norse translation prepared

by Friar Robert, and Gottfried von Straßbourg's early thirteenth-century version. Gradually more romantic elements appear in the legend to document its significance in the formation of the genre (64).

Turning from romance literature to political poetry, Sobceki explores the emergence of the politicized sea as territorial waters, a view that is most fully realized in the later middle ages. Two factors incite legal war over the sea as property. First, the concept of *regalium* is discussed: an "a priori legal and political privilege bestowed on a ruler" to claim the sea as property and the fundamental change in lawmaking in the thirteenth century (143). Fourteenth-century interpretations of Justinian's *Corpus Iuris Civilis* influence legal practice by defining the sea as a territory. In 1406, Henry IV includes the sea as a district under his rule (144). In Anglo-Saxon England, King Edgar is the first ruler to claim the sea as part of his territory in 964, as cited by William of Malmesbury (147). The highly influential poem in *Libelle of Englyshe Polycye* (1436–1437) argues for English rule over the English Channel as a water highway protected by the King as a subject under his rule and established the historical precedent set by Kings Edgar, Edward III, and Henry V (156). Likewise John Capgrave's *Liber de Illustribus Henricis* (1453) is another agent of epistemological shifts (159).

Benedicta Ward dedicates her devotional book *Christ within Me: Prayers and Meditations from the Anglo-Saxon Tradition*, 2nd ed. (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications) to the Cistercian order. As she notes in the dedication, the Cistercians were the first to commemorate Bede as a saint. As editor and translator, Ward has designed the book to engage the reader through meditative texts and images from the age of Bede. Quoting Bede, Ward follows his method of teaching "by word and example" as she pairs texts with images of people in devotional acts (11–12). Readers opening the book will find that one page bears an image of manuscript artwork from manuscripts in the British Library, while the facing page presents a corresponding passage. The book contains sixty devotional passages, mainly from Bede's literary corpus; readers will appreciate the thoughtful resonances between language and Anglo-Saxon art.

KJL

Michael Alexander's translations of Old English poetry will be familiar to most Anglo-Saxonists, as they were first published in 1966, and again, in an expanded version, in 1991. His *The First Poems in English* (London: Penguin) adds, to the eyes of this (and I suspect most) Anglo-Saxonists nothing remarkable for its novelty.

Alexander's translations are, for the most part, excellent. His choice of doing verse translations (as opposed to prose), though controversial in the abstract, is well justified by the actual product. He has chosen a wide and representative selection of OE poetry to translate, and with most of his selections he does as good a job as I have seen. Some criticism is in order though. One feels that the inclusion of selections from *Beowulf* is perfunctory, and the volume would, I feel, be more rounded and complete if, instead of selections from *Beowulf*, he had chosen instead something like *Judith*, or some of the metrical charms, or perhaps more Exeter Book riddles.

Of the riddles, I also have a particular criticism of his translation of Riddle 25 (the onion riddle), which he presents early in the section of riddles and, in the discussion, has only this to say about the double entendre: "The Anglo-Saxons liked heroic poetry, but they could enjoy the wit of a riddle about an onion" (13). Since the first modern editions of the riddles appeared during the Victorian period, it is hardly surprising that the double-entendre was not explicitly discussed back then; but in the twenty-first century, it's time to make the discussion explicit. Alexander translates the line and a half *stapol min is steapheah; stonde ic on bedde/ neopan ruh nathwær* as "I am set well up, stand in a bed, have a roughish root" (12). I have always thought there was only one way to translate this line and a half, namely, "my stem is stiff, I stand in bed, and am hairy down below." It is, at any rate, difficult to resist translating OE *ruh* with its attested meaning of "hairy," given the obvious double-entendre. Onion roots do after all resemble hair, in a way, and *stem*, *stiff*, and *stand* all preserve the alliteration of the original: one of Alexander's stated goals. I think it's time a translator make explicit that though the answer to the riddle is "onion," "penis" is another obvious answer.

And there is another double-entendre in the riddle that I have never seen remarked upon: the final half-line of the riddle is *wæt bið þæt eage*, which Alexander translates as "moist is her eye!" If the Anglo-Saxons used the word *wet*, we should too; "wet will be her eye" would be my translation. Yes, cutting an onion is apt to make one cry. But that last half-line also indicates that the use of the word *eye* to refer to the female pudendum was already current about 500 years before Chaucer famously referred to Alisoun's "nether eye" in *The Miller's Tale*. The poem was written over 1000 years ago now; I think it's time we discussed its risqué aspect openly.

Like almost everything else she has written, Roberta Frank's essay "The Boar on the Helmet" is unequivocally

worth reading. It traces the well-known motif of the boar helmet through various literary, archaeological, and cultural contexts, and sheds new and interesting light on the motif. The article is short, and emphasizes—correctly, I think—the archaeological contexts for boar helmets. In reading through the discussion of boar helmets excavated archaeologically, one wishes for more illustrations beyond the very good photograph of the Wollaston helmet. Lamentably—but logically given the length of the piece—it is the only illustration of a boar helmet she favors us with.

While there is much of interest, I suspect that for most Anglo-Saxonists the most fascinating bits of “The Boar on the Helmet” will be the discussions of *non*-Germanic boars. Here Frank discusses primarily Celtic boars, and points out that to ancient writers the Germans and the Celts were indistinguishable (79). Frank observes that “literary horizons can seem boundless” (83), yet provides interesting discussions of ancient writers (*Iliad* K 261-70, Tacitus, e.g.), of Old English (primarily, of course, *Beowulf*), and Old Norse—the last of which is almost as interesting as the discussion of non-Germanic references to boar-helmets.

One laments what is missing from the piece; yet one cannot fault Frank, for she may have been working with a page limit. Yet in an article on the boar-helmet surely there ought to have been room for some discussion of what the boar symbolized to the warriors who wore a boar image—of whatever sort—on their helmets. The fact that the word *boar* (OE *bār*) is unknown outside of West Germanic suggests that the word may have been taboo—i.e., that one did not speak the name of the beast for fear of invoking its spirit. Powerful medicine is a good thing on a warrior’s gear: it is no accident that the Native Americans wore bear claws, wolf skins, and eagle feathers into battle. We know that the word *bear* was taboo, for *bear* bears (if one can pardon the pun) no relation to PIE **rktō*, and its name means simply “the brown one.” It is of course noteworthy that the three fiercest animals known to the Germanic peoples were the European brown bear (*ursus arctos*), the boar, and the wolf—*wolf* being probably the most famous example of taboo deformation of the name of a powerful animal. This deformation, like *bear*, seems indisputable: apply Grimm’s Law to Latin *lupus* and you get **lwf-*; reorder the phonemes to *wlf*, *l* becomes vocalic and yields Germanic *wulf*. So while there is no doubt that *wolf* and *bear* are taboo deformations, whether *boar* is as well must remain conjecture. While I may not be the first to make this conjecture, I can think of few people as eminently qualified as Professor Frank to honor us with some informative discussion of why

boars (as opposed to, say, hoppy-toads) appeared on the helmets of warriors distinguished for their bravery.

Shami Ghosh sets out in “On the Origins of Germanic Heroic Poetry: A Case Study of the Legend of the Burgundians,” *BdGSL* 129.2 (2007): 220-52, with the ambitious task of tracing the origins of Germanic Heroic Poetry, postulating three “stages of reception” (220) for the transmission of that poetry: 1) the people whom the poetry is about; 2) the societies that kept the legends alive between the time of the events they narrate and the time when our extant manuscripts were written; and 3) the (original) audience of those manuscripts. He focuses on the first two stages and takes the well-attested legend of the fall of the Burgundians as his primary example. Ghosh’s conclusions are of necessity hypothetical, but they do not seem unwarranted. He concludes that the legends were almost certainly kept alive by an oral tradition, but that the specifics of that oral tradition are lost and unknowable. He also concludes that the heroic poems probably originated as historical narratives.

There is much sound scholarship and many good guesses here as to the origins of heroic poetry in Germanic. Unfortunately, there is not enough evidence for very much more than guesses, so the reader who comes to this article hoping for some sort of definitive analysis based upon empirical evidence will be disappointed. So will the reader who comes to the article (as I did) hoping for something akin to the first chapter of Chambers’s *Beowulf: An Introduction*, which first appeared in 1921, for despite the many extant versions of the legend of the Burgundians written in one Germanic language or another (*Kudrun*, *the Nibelungenlied*, *Volsungasaga*, *Waltharius*, etc.), there is not a corresponding wealth of other sources dealing with the same subject. So while the Burgundians’ legend seems like a sound and obvious choice for examining Germanic heroic poetry, one does not come away with as thorough an understanding of the origins of Germanic heroic legend as one does from reading Chambers’s timeless work.

Michael Lapidge’s “Old English Poetic Compounds: A Latin Perspective,” in *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach* (see sect. 2), 17-32, contains a wealth of interesting information on the Latin tradition of poetic compounds. On this basis alone, the article is worth reading. One would, however, have liked to see some discussion of the forms of the Latin compounds. For example, is Caland’s Law operative here, or is *-i-* the compound-vowel for some other reason? Certainly few enough of the first elements of the Latin compounds are *i*-stems (there is, to be sure, a note referencing a work by M. Leumann that I have not

seen and that might well answer this question). One would also have liked to see some discussion of the fact that OE poetic compounds tend to be, like Modern English compounds, determinative—i.e., compounds where, if the first element of the compound is designated as A and the second as B, the statement “an AB is a type of B” holds true (a firelight is a type of light, a stop sign is a type of sign, a sickbed is a type of bed, etc.), whereas the Latin poetic compounds seem to be almost exclusively adjectival.

This, it seems to me, is not immaterial, because Lapidge proceeds to compare rates of occurrence of tetrasyllabic compounds in various OE poems (why tetrasyllabic? Because they are common in Latin verse: a choriamb fits well into a line of dactylic hexameter), and concludes that, because the Latin poetic compounds he focuses on tend to be tetrasyllabic (and many are indeed choriambic), those OE poems with higher incidences of tetrasyllabic compounds are more “latinate” (29) than those with lower incidences of such compounds.

Such a conclusion can at best be described as bizarre. Lapidge supposes that because the Latin compounds he discusses consist of elements with two syllables each, his methodology is only valid if he focuses only on OE compounds of elements with two syllables each. It is as though comparing apples and oranges is a valid procedure if the oranges are the same size as the apples. In fact, Lapidge's procedure makes no sense on any level, as a brief examination of his conclusion reveals. He concludes: “If Old English poetic diction had a basis in common Germanic culture, as the evidence suggests, it would seem that Anglo-Saxon poets expanded it prodigiously. Why did they do so? My answer is: that they were influenced by the Latin verse which they had studied as part of their school curriculum” (32). The first sentence of this conclusion is entirely without empirical support, for the fact that more OE verse survives than verse in any other early Gmc. language is an accident of history and nothing more. There is, quite simply, absolutely no way to know whether Anglo-Saxon poets used poetic compounds more prolifically than poets who composed verse in prehistoric OE, or in proto-Germanic, or in any other prior stage of the language (though the earliest runic inscriptions certainly contain a wealth of them). This fact is so obvious that it should not need to be stated, yet Lapidge seems to believe there is empirical evidence to the contrary. It *might* be true that Anglo-Saxon poets expanded poetic diction, and it *might* be true that they were influenced by the Latin verse they read in school, but there is not one whit of evidence for either proposition. Ultimately this article would have been much more interesting

if Lapidge had confined the discussion to Latin and Anglo-Latin and left Old English out entirely.

BRH

Patrick Conner's “Parish Guilds and the Production of Old English Literature in the Public Sphere” in *Inter-texts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach* (see sect. 2), 255–72, tests Jürgen Habermas's theory that during the Middle Ages the general populace had no public law enabling them to “step into the public sphere” (255). He argues that Habermas's theory allows one to examine the role which parish guilds played in the performance of vernacular texts in a public forum. Two principal texts examined are the so-called *Leofric Gospels* (Cambridge, University Library, MS Ii.2.11), London, BL Cotton Tiberius B.v. vol.1, fol.75, various manumissions, and a list of guild brethren found in Exeter D&C 1375, with focus on the rhetoric used in these various documents. Conner finds the legalese of the more formal documents and the homiletic character of texts related to the Kalendar Brethren indicative of a culture which calls Habermas's theory into question. Namely that the proscribed reading of guild statutes, homiletic passages, as well as the need to provide vernacular literature for attendees of guild banquets all represent situations where private citizens engage in acts within public space and create a need for the presence, if not production, of texts. Ultimately, Conner links the guild activity to the content of the *Exeter Book*, noting that the large number of female attendees would have been a fitting audience for *The Wife's Lament* and *Wulf and Eadwacer*, and a mixed lay audience would be an appropriate audience for the Riddles. The careful attention Conner pays to the guild practices of the time present a possible venue for a document produced in a monastic environment, which may not have had a necessarily monastic readership.

Rachel Kessler's Ph.D. dissertation “Reading Gnostic Phenomena in Old English Literature” [U of Toronto, 2008. DAI 69A (2009), AAT NR44797] directs Husserlian phenomenology at gnostic material in Old English. Beginning with the differentiation of proverbs and proverbial statements in chapter one, Kessler then in the next chapter turns to the application of Husserl's concepts in addressing the way in which a reader may interact with gnomes and maxims within the given context. The remaining body chapters of the dissertation are individual case-studies of gnostic statements within Old English poetry. Chapter three, for example, compares similar statements found in both *Beowulf* and *Andreas* and the statements' potential for the reader's experience of the literature. Chapter four addresses

the way in which a reader can synthesize and organize sequenced gnomic statements which at first have little recognizable order. Similarly, Chapter five turns from the investigation of the gnomic within the context of a literary work to the reader's familiarity with a literary tradition when encountering proverbial statements, using the OE *Disticha Catonis* in light of the Judgement Day Homilies as its case-study. While dealing with a large topic such as the genre of gnomic literature, however, Kessler does not seek within her dissertation a comprehensive overview of all gnomic statements in OE literature.

Robert Rouse traces the motif of a land's peaceful Golden Age as represented by the safety travelers experience on the road in "The Peace of the Roads: Authority and *auctoritas* in Medieval Romance," in *Boundaries in Medieval Romance*, ed. Neil Cartlidge (Woodbridge and Rochester, NY: D.S. Brewer), 115–28. While the romances Rouse studies are primarily from the Middle English period, *Havelock* and *Guy of Warwick*, the motif of importance here is traced back to Bede and even Bede's predecessors. In addition to these early sources, Rouse finds the motif in the *Peterborough Chronicle* entry for 1087 and later. Bede's incorporation of a *rex pacificus* in his details concerning Edwin are the primary example Rouse draws from, and he connects Bede's details of bronze cups for public use which go unmolested (a variant of the "hanging royal gold" motif). Rouse takes a twist at the end of his essay by turning his attention to the same hanging-cup motif in an early legendary account of Dracula, Vlad the Impaler. In doing so, Rouse argues that taking motifs in isolation and out of context is beset with troubles; the widespread use this motif implies usage over a greater area beyond Britain.

Jordi Sánchez-Martí's contribution, "Age Matters in Old English Literature" in *Youth and Age in the Medieval North*, ed. Shannon Lewis-Simpson (Leiden: Brill), 205–25, addresses the changes in male development, from boyhood to old age, as observed in Old English literature. Sánchez-Martí is careful not to mistake the findings for a historical reality, but rather an expression of the Anglo-Saxons' outlook on society. In examining Ælfric's translation of Gregory's *Homilia in Euangelia* and its paralleling of growth with the course of the sun, Sánchez-Martí notes that Ælfric departs from Gregory by assigning youth to terce rather than to noon, to which Ælfric assigns *fullfremede wæstm* 'full-growth'. Moreover, he remarks that Ælfric views growth as intellectual development and aging as physical decline. A passage from *Maxims I* concerning the teaching of youth suggests to Sánchez-Martí, as well as a passage

from *Precepts*, that the instruction and raising of the young was a community, rather than scholastic, obligation. These sentiments are present also in *The Wanderer* further pointing out the value Anglo-Saxons placed in the accumulation of communal wisdom. Moving to the stage of *geoguð*, Sánchez-Martí finds indications that Anglo-Saxon society viewed this age to be filled with more experiential learning and the accomplishment of deeds, supported by travelling forward in age and to other places. The journey from youth to adulthood reflects the attainment of sufficient wisdom on one's own so as to warrant being a full adult. Sánchez-Martí supports this view with selections from *Guthlac A*, *The Wanderer*, *The Seafarer*, as well as from the ON *Hávamál* and *Hrafnkels saga Freysgoði*. Presence of the *puer senex* motif in *Beowulf* and *Andreas* further support the dichotomization of youthful vigor and aged wisdom. Old age, however, with its concomitant wisdom, was not necessarily highly praised beyond the peak of adulthood, if indications from Ælfric's description of an elderly man are to be believed. The author sees accordance with this perception in the relatively less prestigious burial practices afforded the elderly dead. Although well supported with close readings of texts in Old English, supported by ON parallels, there is no indication whether Sánchez-Martí is presenting selected instances of age within the OE corpus, or if it is exhaustive.

Janie Steen's monograph, *Verse and Virtuosity: The Adaptation of Latin Rhetoric in Old English Poetry* (Toronto: U of Toronto P), seeks to identify the extent to which aspects of Latin rhetoric are to be found in Anglo-Saxon verse. One goal of this study is not only to identify Latinate features, but in doing so, to identify the presence of native aspects of Old English poetry. Throughout the work, "rhetoric" is to be understood as the broad inventory of literary devices available in the Latin tradition, whereas "native tradition" is to be understood generally as the hallmarks of the Anglo-Saxon poetic tradition of oral poetry, rather than specific literary devices (4–5). Chapter one, through an examination of book-lists, focuses on establishing what contact with Latin rhetoric Anglo-Saxons could have had. The implication is that if one can establish the presence of Roman works in Anglo-Saxon England, then one can infer knowledge of the rhetorical devices therein. Chapter two focuses more on smaller scale items, directing its attention to rhetorical patterns in both Latinate and vernacular traditions. Steen is careful to note that no tradition has a monopoly on any poetic device. The devices established in Chapter two set the stage for Steen's examination of *The Phoenix* in Chapter

three. Steen argues that the poem's source in Lactantius makes it a likely starting place to seek out Latinate rhetorical devices. The focus, however, is primarily on the "vision in the grove" and the "the phoenix's rebirth in the flames" (35). An example of the virtuosity at the outset of *The Phoenix* is the anaphoric usage of *ne* combined with native-tradition imagery in lines 11–27. This anaphora has a direct parallel in the beginning of *De ave phoenice* and its repetition of *nec*. Chapter four follows with an examination of *Judgement Day II*, which like *The Phoenix*, is a translation of a poem in Latin, *De die iudicii*. Likewise Chapter five examines and compares *Riddle 35* and *Riddle 40* of the *Exeter Book* with Aldhelm's compositions *Lorica* and *Creatura*. The sum of virtuosity is brought out in Steen's final chapter, an examination of Cynewulf's rhetorical patterns. Her attention to Cynewulf's works are mainly in relation to *Elene*, *Christ II*, and *Juliana*. Steen's goal in this chapter is to demonstrate how Cynewulf blended clusters of rhetorical devices among native imagery in order to serve the apostolic purpose of his works (111). To her credit, Steen does not simply catalogue the presence of devices such as polyptoton, homoeoteleuton, simile, anaphora, metonymy, or inexpressibility topos, rather she seeks to present a view of vernacular verse which skillfully integrates these tropes without disturbing the aural fabric to which the audience would have been accustomed.

In "Working the Boundary or Walking the Line? Late Old English Rhythmical Alliteration" (*Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach* [see sect. 2], 33–44), Joseph Trahern questions the plausibility of establishing fixed and firm criteria to distinguish alliterative poetry from rhythmic prose, an endeavor which has dogged Anglo-Saxon studies of genre for some time. Rather than putting forth a new argument to distinguish the two, Trahern prefers to argue for a gradient and fuzzier line of distinction. Building necessarily off the work of McIntosh, Pope, Momma, and Cable, among others, Trahern focuses his study on the so-called "debased" verse of the later Anglo-Saxon period and chooses to approach the later "debased" texts in light of N. Blake's notion of *rhythmical alliteration* (37–8). Texts examined by Trahern are poetic fragments from Napier 30 and Napier 49, ll.141–49 of Vercelli 21, and a passage from CCC 201 dubbed *The Judgement of the Damned*. The preference for alternating rhythm as opposed to clashing stress in the first two pieces make Trahern comfortable with identifying the passages as more characteristic of late Old English alliterative verse, as they conform to pairs of alliterating half-lines. Trahern could have also

added that both passages exhibit verse types which would count as lone hypermetric verses, e.g., *in þam hatan wylme / hellefyres* in Napier 49. The third textual passage examined, Vercelli 21, Trahern presents as a mix of all features of "classical verse," later verse, homiletic alliterative prose, and rhythmic alliteration in a format which need not be pigeon-holed into one category or the other. The remaining piece mentioned by Trahern is not examined in any great detail; Trahern admits that he has nothing to add to Stanley's analysis. Furthermore, given that T. Bredehoff's *Early English Metre* appeared after Trahern's work went to press, Trahern highly recommends Bredehoff's reanalysis of the same topic as an advance in the problem.

DPAS

4b: Individual Poems (excluding *Beowulf*)

Andreas

Two chapters in Heather Blurton's *Cannibalism in High Medieval Literature* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007) deal specifically with Old English texts; chapter one concerns the notion of "Self-Eaters: The Cannibal Narrative of *Andreas*" (15–34; chapter two is on cannibals in the *Beowulf* manuscript). In the first chapter, as in others, Blurton argues that anthropophagy in the texts she discusses often serves as a metaphor for political conquest; here, cannibalism is likened to both conquest and conversion. Further, Blurton insists that the usual identification of the cannibal and colonized is complicated by the poem, which uses the imagery of *sylfjetan*—self-eaters—to suggest "the borderlines of identity are the territory that is at stake" (16). Commonly a marker for sinfulness in medieval texts, cannibalism signals the need for conversion; however, Blurton reads cannibalism 'contrapuntally' (see Said, *Culture and Imperialism*), finding within the narrative a reading that is sympathetic to the cannibals:

Further, whereas the ethnographic tradition of representing cannibalism commonly constructs it as a marker of extreme alterity, *Andreas* refuses this move, insistently blurring the line of difference between cannibal and Christian, between Mermedonian and Anglo-Saxon (18).

She reminds us that conversion can be about the formulation of a new identity, but that it often also involves the conversion of territories; within such a conquest/conversion narrative, of course, both may occur. When

a territory was conquered, it frequently underwent conversion to the religion of the conquerors, as well as to their political system. In *Andreas*, the Mermedonians are not represented as converting to Christianity so much as capitulating to Andreas's *gumcystum* or 'manly virtues' (20). According to Blurton, "reading for the cannibal narrative brings out yet another aspect of the poem: Andreas supplements the vocabulary of hagiography with the vocabulary of political conquest.... In this formulation, the devil and Andreas struggle not for the hearts and souls of the Mermedonians, but for their land and their sovereignty" (21). She parallels Mermedonia with Anglo-Saxon England: both are island nations whose conquerors arrive from across the sea to a remote corner of the world (24). In addition, Andreas appears less as a benign missionary in this reading; rather, "arriving with a band of thanes in boat, Andreas looks very much like a Viking raider" (25). Pointing out that both Mermedonia and Anglo-Saxon England contain *enta geweorc* 'ancient work of giants,' the author suggests that this resemblance suggests an imaginary conflation of the two spaces:

The accumulation of cultural correspondences between the cannibals inside the text and the Anglo-Saxons outside of it is especially striking since the cannibal Mermedonians are described on every occasion, not in the mode of the Marvels of the East tradition—where cannibals are physically as well as ideologically monstrous—but, rather as an Anglo-Saxon war band (27).

The poet is not, then, simply translating the story of Andrew into English language or cultural terms, but deliberately creating a mental image of the Mermedonians that make them look like the Anglo-Saxons, especially when one considers the literal interpretation of the eucharist (28). "For as much as the Mermedonians are represented as constructing their identity as a people through their alimentary practices, so too does the Christian community that Andreas represents in the poem and that (assumedly) constituted the poem's audience" (28). "The narrative of *Andreas* considers political incorporation by means of a literal instantiation of physical incorporation—cannibalism—suggesting that the incorporation of one society by another is metaphorically cannibalistic. It thus represents this process as essentially monstrous. In its manipulation of the cannibal narrative of its source material, *Andreas* aptly expresses a realistic picture of the anxieties of lived experience of the emergence of a new political

formation. The poem uses the dominant cultural narrative of conversion in order to conceptualize a new kind of narrative about the cultural politics of conquest. In the political vision of *Andreas*, Mermedonia becomes England, conversion becomes conquest, and the legend of Saint Andrew in the Vercelli Book becomes an extended consideration of Danish invasion and Anglo-Saxon reaction. *Andreas* thus offers a snapshot of Anglo-Scandinavian society at a crucial moment of consolidation of subjectivity and power" (33).

Nathan A. Breen opens "What a long, strange trip it's been': Narration, Movement and Revelation in the Old English *Andreas*" (*Essays in Medieval Studies* 25: 71-79) with the claim that this apostle's journey can perhaps be seen as the inverse of a pilgrimage: Andrew is unwilling to set out, journeys to an unholy place, and converts others rather than strengthening his own faith (71). Breen further argues "that the key technique the Andreas-poet employs to create tension and drama—and more importantly, to facilitate an epiphany in the minds of the audience—is his style of narration, which is episodic and based on a system of concealing and then later revealing identities in the poem" (71). Although Andrew's journey may not be a pilgrimage, Breen suggests that the poem itself progresses like a religious journey:

The narrator does not simply and methodically describe, in mimetic fashion, the journey of Andrew from start to finish, from point A to point B. Instead, he occasionally halts his narrative to reveal an identity or an idea in order to force the audience to also pause and perceive, just as the movement throughout the church (or throughout the city of Jerusalem, in the case of the pilgrimage) is halted incrementally in order to meditate upon various episodes in the life or passion of Christ (73).

Along the way, the poem relates four instances in which the narrator reveals a previously hidden identity: "first, Christ's identity is concealed from Andrew and his followers as they travel together to Mermedonia; second, Andrew's identity is concealed from the Mermedonians as he is made invisible to them by God; third, the devil's identity is concealed from the Mermedonians until Andrew reveals it to them; and finally, the narrator's identity as storyteller is concealed from the audience until his self-revelation at lines 1478-89a" (75). Of the four, according to Breen, the narrator's self-revelation is the most crucial because it is the only one in which

the revelation is to the audience, not to a character in the poem. This revelation is meant to spur them to understand that the story has been told, not merely for entertainment, but so the audience can do the important work of actively pondering the events described—ruminating as Bede would have it—in order to come to spiritual understanding (78).

According to Lori Ann Garner, the depiction of the city of Mermedonia in *Andreas* is an unexpected admixture of predictably negative images with “unambiguously positive contexts [found] elsewhere in Old English verse” (53). In “The Old English *Andreas* and the Mermedonian Cityscape” (*Essays in Medieval Studies* 24: 53-63), Garner traces how the city moves from a negative space to one capable of fulfilling its heroic potential as a dwelling for saints. She begins by showing how the Old English version departs from most early versions of the story by portraying Mermedonia as an island, carrying with it the sense of alterity: “The Old English poet is thus translating not simply a narrative but a legendary landscape whose actual geographical location is less important than its psychological distance from the audience’s sphere of experience” (54). Adducing John Miles Foley’s theories regarding orality, she demonstrates that the architectural features in the OE version are unprecedented in the Greek text but occur elsewhere in the OE corpus: “[w]hat emerges is a distinctly Anglo-Saxon understanding of Mermedonian urban space, one more consistent with the architectural and poetic traditions that would have been most familiar to its original audiences” (55). The poet uses phrases from OE that aid the listener/reader in understanding the nature of both the city and the action of the narrative. Examples include *harne stan*, *trafu*, *burhlocan*, *heolstorlocan*, and others. Garner reminds us that since Anglo-Saxon law codes do not include imprisonment as a punishment, the descriptors of prison—here as in other OE poems such as *Genesis*, *Juliana*, *Elene*, and others—are images having more to do with atmosphere than architectural description: “Prisons are dark, filled with sadness and suffering, unclean, locked, and accompanied by evil” (58). Though these phrases do not evoke a literal image, they certainly distill the emotions associated with captivity. The phrases *storme bedrifene* ‘beaten upon by the storm’ (1494) and *enta geweorc* ‘work of giants’ (1495) demonstrate the city’s resilience and stature in the past, leading the audience to expect a potential return to similar status; the column from which water pours forth in response to Andrew’s command brings about the conversion of the Mermedonians. Further, as the pagan temples are abandoned, Andrew commands a new temple of God to be built,

using language also applicable to a heroic hall (60). “By the poem’s close, we have unambiguously positive language, with increasing imagery of heroic Anglo-Saxon halls, to describe the city and the architectural structures within it. Early in the poem we are presented with a Mermedonia that is awe-inspiring but also fraught with potential danger. Within the city we see isolated structures—columns, pillars, stone ruins—that seem to have an inherent power and the potential for greatness. Andrew uses this inherent power in isolated architectural structures to realize the heroic potential of the city as a whole. The conversion of the city’s people from cannibalistic heathens to saintly Christians is thus marked by a shift in the descriptions of Mermedonia from a ‘renowned city’ of potential greatness to one of ‘unequivocal heroism’” (61).

MKR

The Battle of Brunanburh

In “*Eorodcistum* in *The Battle of Brunanburh*,” *Leeds Studies in English* 39: 1–15, Paul Cavill notes that most critics, when interpreting the seemingly straightforward compound *eorodcistum*, generally break it down into two elements: *eoh* ‘horse’ in the first element and *cyst*, from *ceosan*, ‘to choose’, in the second—a practice that he challenges (1–2). (He acknowledges that some scholars believe the second element is derived from *ci(e)st*, ‘company’.) Cavill shows that in two of the four poems where the term appears, *The Phoenix* and *The Panther*, it does so without military connotation, which suggests that the compound enjoyed a broader range of possible meanings than has usually been considered. In these two poems, respectively, *eorodcistum* refers to a community of birds and of people drawn together from a variety of places and stations, with no mention of horses or of being chosen. The occurrence of *eorodcistum* in *Elene* refers to a group of warriors—a troop of foot-soldiers (*fedan*) preparing to cross the Danube (6)—but there is no sense of their having been specifically chosen for this duty, and they are by definition not on horseback. Cavill finds that in *The Battle of Brunanburh*, *eorodcistum* likewise refers neither to horses nor to “picked men,” but, as in the other poems, to a gathering of individuals “*en masse*” (7, 9), which he believes should prompt a reconsideration of the accepted definition as reported in various dictionaries, translations, and the *Old English Thesaurus*, all of which promote both the equine aspect of the compound, and also its possible connection to *ceosan*. This impulse is especially dangerous for analysis of *The*

Battle of Brunanburh, Cavill argues, because it has led scholars to “draw entirely erroneous conclusions about the location of the battle” (11). “What the poem actually says,” Cavill suggests, “is that the West-Saxons *en masse* harried the fleeing troops from behind for the whole day. This seems to be something much more like a process of ‘mopping up’ after the first onset and breaking of the ranks than the headlong chase over substantial distances deduced by some writers” (12).

In “Where English becomes British: Rethinking Contexts for *Brunanburh*,” *Myth, Rulership, Church and Charters: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks*, ed. Barrow and Wareham (see sect. 2), 127–44, Sarah Foot builds on the work of Nicholas Brooks, who argued that the Anglo-Saxons recognized English identity as encompassing “the whole island of Britain” (127). In doing so, she revises her earlier claim that, because it showed unity between Angles and Saxons, *The Battle of Brunanburh* should be understood as an expression of a shared Englishness. Foot complicates that argument here by placing the battle at Brunanburh in its wider political and geographical contexts, which extended beyond the solely English. Specifically, she refers to “the realm that was at stake” in the battle: “Æthelstan’s hegemony over the whole mainland of Britain—the Celtic kingdoms of Cornwall, Wales and Scotland as well as the old Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Northumbria” (133). She concludes by suggesting that the depiction of Æthelstan in the poem serves as a testament to the reach of his power to places outside of his Anglo-Saxon territory: “With all the Celtic rulers of the mainland of Britain acknowledging his lordship, Æthelstan was not just king of the English: he was truly *rex totius Britanniae* and he and those around him used imperial language and imagery to reinforce that notion of an empire of Britain” (144).

In a brief note, “A Hawk from a Handsaw: A Note on the Beasts of ‘The Battle of Brunanburh,’” *ANQ* 21: 9–11, Scott Herring addresses the controversy surrounding the translation of *gūþ-hafoc* (64a), which does not fit neatly into the beasts of battle motif present in *The Battle of Brunanburh*. Unlike those critics who understand the term to refer to an actual hawk, Herring believes that, since hawks do not partake of carrion as the bird in the poem does, that the compound should be interpreted as referring to the eagle (*earn*) of the previous line, as Alistair Campbell suggested in 1938.

The Battle of Maldon

In “Norse-derived Terms and Structures in *The Battle of Maldon*,” *JEGP* 107.4: 421–44, Sara Pons-Sanz

challenges a widely-held claim made by Fred Robinson and others, that the *Maldon*-poet uses words and structures borrowed from Old Norse as a means of characterization, specifically to distinguish between Viking and Anglo-Saxon speakers. To determine the validity of this proposition, Pons-Sanz first divides all words and structures in the poem believed to have Norse origin into two primary categories: those that appear in the direct speech of Viking characters and those that do not. She then provides an overview of existing scholarship regarding each of these terms, accompanied by her own original analysis, and ultimately concludes that, of the nearly two dozen words and structures on the list, only four can be safely assumed to have a Norse origin: *ceallian*, *dreng*, *eorl*, and *grið*. *Grið* is the only one of the four to appear in the Viking messenger’s speech of lines 29–41, though it occurs near its OE synonym *frīð*. And since both words are in an alliterative position, Pons-Sanz suggests that “the *Maldon*-poet may have selected the two synonyms, not because of their different etymologies, but because they allowed him/her to introduce some variety in the alliteration” (440). As for *dreng*, *ceallian*, and *eorl*, Pons-Sanz believes that they might have been chosen to mark the Viking host as separate from the Anglo-Saxon, or possibly that they had already “become integrated into the poet’s dialect” (441). She suggests that their inclusion in the poem might help establish its place of composition as farther north than has been previously believed, perhaps in Ramsey. But ultimately, Pons-Sanz concludes that these words “cannot be taken as a clear indication of the *Maldon*-poet’s ‘artistry’ or dialectal origin” (444).

GD

Cædmon’s Hymn

Despite the title given to it, *Cædmon’s Hymn* is rarely analyzed as an actual hymn. In “Hymnody, Graphotactics, and ‘Cædmon’s Hymn,’” *Philological Review* 34.2: 1–27, Rochelle Altman examines the poem as a song, first by situating it in the context of early hymnody and then by scrutinizing it according to the formal structure of hymns of its period and graphotactic analyses of the manuscripts, “a methodology of primary importance to a composer because the numerical patterns of letter-string formation carry rhythmic information” (1). Altman reminds us that Christian congregations were singing hymns from at least the second half of the fourth century CE; hymnody more broadly defined dates back to antiquity. She begins with Sumerian worship practices, pointing out that the songs of Enheduanna, Sargon I’s daughter and high priestess, “served

political and social ends as well as religious ones" (2). She then traces hymnody through the ancient Hebrews and into the Christian era. Altman gives the elements necessary for a song to be considered a hymn in modern terms: "First, a hymn must be metrical; second, the stanzas/verses must be equal in length, that is, in the number of lines to a stanza/verse; third, the syllable count must be constrained and not vary too much in equivalent lines. To these we may add a fourth, that there must be a refrain that can be sung by the congregation in antiphonal responsive liturgies; and a fifth, that the structure of the hymn must be balanced—the final, or closure, should mirror syllabically the opening line" (4). At first glance, then, *Cædmon's Hymn* would appear not to be a hymn in this modern sense; Altman spends the remainder of the essay explaining how *Cædmon's Hymn* does indeed fit this definition, from a recognizable refrain to syllabic mirroring of the first and final lines, though she is obliged to recreate the "original" version of the poem to make the analysis work.

In "*Nu Scylun Hergan (Cædmon's Hymn, 1a)*," ANQ 21: 2-6, Alfred Bammesberger suggests a reading of the first half line of the poem that omits the first person plural *we*. For example, he writes, "If the authorial version is indeed *Nu scylun hergan* without the personal pronoun 'we,' then *uerc* in line 3a can theoretically function as the subject of the predicate *scylan hergan*" (3). Bammesberger rejects this reading because "the word order seems unprecedented and the resulting meaning is hardly convincing." Instead, he suggests reading the infinitive *hergan* as passive, so that the poem would read, "Now the Guardian of the heavenly kingdom, the powers of the Lord, and the thinking of His mind, the work(s) of the Father of glory must be praised" (4-5).

In "The Semiotic patterning of *Cædmon's Hymn* as a 'hypersign,'" in *Language, People, Numbers: Corpus Linguistics and Society*, vol. 64 of *Language and Computers: Studies in Practical Linguistics* (Amsterdam: Rodopi), 99-128, Wolfgang Kühlwein uses Peircian semiotics to argue that *Cædmon's Hymn* "presents itself as an interlace of the intricate network of the dyadic interrelationships between 'God and Creation,' 'Creation and Mankind' and 'God and Mankind.' However, it is God's act of GIVING that elevates it above a mere accumulation of dyadic patterns" (99). Kühlwein begins by laying out the eighteen half-lines of the poem, briefly summarizing some representative critical reactions to them, and then explaining the three correlates of Peirce's conception of triadic relations (102-104). He writes,

Semiotically God's bestowal of the Hymn to Cædmon reaches beyond random factuality

(=Secondness), the relationship between the giver and the recipient rather turned out to be a rule-governed one, involving a law, i.e. semiotically the mind. This elevates the act of giving beyond a sum of two factual dyads, (1) "God gives to Cædmon" and (2) "Cædmon receives from God" to the level of a semiotic triad involving (3) the recipient's responsibility as to his future appropriate use of the gift, and this is exactly what Bede subsequently expounds: arisen from Cædmon's pure feeling (Firstness), raised to an appeal (Secondness) to kindle the listeners' minds to turn to the continuous quest for heavenly bliss (Thirdness). (105)

The balance of the essay carefully details the poet's interweaving of lexical relationships to mirror the relationships of God to Creation and to Cædmon, the recipient of the divine gift of poetry.

Christ III

According to Thomas D. Hill, one of the fundamental problems for moderns attempting to understand the Middle Ages is less the "alterity" of the period than the historical problem that we cannot put aside our knowledge of intervening years. In "The Baby on the Stone: Nativity as Sacrifice (The Old English *Christ III, 1414-1425)*," *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach* (see sect. 2), 69-78, Hill reminds us that our understanding of the Nativity has been profoundly influenced by "the more affective tradition of Christian devotion often associated with St. Francis" (69), with feasting and family and the crèche—in all, a joyous occasion. "But in the early medieval world," Hill writes, "[T]here were other ways of understanding the Nativity, and this paper is concerned with a specific Anglo-Saxon/early medieval 'reading' of the Nativity as a dark moment of sacrifice that anticipates the death of Jesus on the Cross and his entombment" (70). Turning to depictions of the Nativity from the period, Hill describes numerous instances in which the infant Jesus is shown lying, not in the usual manger, but on a stone, suggesting an altar and evoking the twin associations of sacrifice and eucharist: "[t]he beginning and end of Jesus's earthly ministry are in effect conflated—just as the language of the poem suggests by anticipation the entombment of Jesus after he suffered on the Cross. Thus the Nativity becomes an appropriate topic for the *improperia*, since it anticipates the final disposition of the body of Jesus in the tomb" (75).

Christ and Satan

In “*Metod, the Meteorologist: Celestial Cosmography in Christ and Satan*, lines 9-12a,” *Leeds Studies in English* 39: 17-32, Miranda Wilcox notes that the poet diverges from the biblical creation account and instead incorporates material from the sapiential books of the Bible, notably Psalms and Job: “the cosmic structures in the prologue are imagined according to a model of the universe in the hybrid cosmology developed by patristic exegetes who syncretized Hebraic scriptural accounts of creation with Hellenistic astronomy and physics” (17). Christ, the creator, inhabits heaven, which is distinct from earth but not so distant that Christ cannot see the terrestrial regions and control their weather (18). Wilcox argues that “the manuscript reading ‘grundas in heofene’ in line ten provides the key to recognizing lines nine through twelve as a perfectly sound explanation of the transparent firmament and the celestial ocean, two key elements in patristic cosmography. The firmament or *grundas* was imagined as a solid spherical boundary that separated the celestial waters or *sæ* from the earth’s atmosphere and prevented the earth from being flooded by celestial waters except when Christ permitted rain to fall as described in lines eleven and twelve” (19). According to her reasoning, the convention to emend *heofene* to *geofene* [ocean] need not be followed for the lines to make sense. Citing Ambrose, Augustine, Bede, and others, the balance of the essay explains analogues to this reading of the firmament as a boundary through which water can pass as rain. Wilcox cites a number of liturgical texts, including *Inmense caeli conditor*, that echo the cosmography evident in *Christ and Satan* and demonstrates that this view of creation was current during the composition of the poem and may account for the vexing crux in these lines.

Deor

Paul S. Langeslag in “Boethian Similitude in *Deor* and *The Wanderer*,” *NM* 109: 205-222, argues that, while it is impossible to disprove fragmentary borrowing, neither the *Deor* nor *The Wanderer* reflects the central message of Boethius’s *De consolazione Philosophiae* (205). According to Langeslag, the correspondences between the poems that scholars have noted “are of too general a nature to warrant influence” (206); these congruencies seem natural to any text dealing with the changeability of fortune or, more broadly, with the theme of adversity. Langeslag deals carefully with the arguments of each scholar in turn, showing how their reasoning or evidence is flawed in one way or another. He concludes:

[d]espite a century of comparisons between *De consolazione Philosophiae* and Old English poetry, no firm link has been established between the Latin treatise on the one hand and either *Deor* or *The Wanderer* on the other. Indeed, there is an essential discrepancy between the respective world-views of the works: while *The Wanderer* departs from the *Consolatio* in gathering its treasures in heaven, *Deor* betrays its dependence on fortune in its failure to gain independence of worldly goods, thus demonstrating that it subscribes to a tradition essentially at odds with that of the Latin work. While piecemeal borrowing cannot be disproved, there is no reason to favour it over the possibility of polygenesis. Since neither of the Anglo-Saxon poets has worked the essence of Boethius’s message into his poem, polygenesis is the most natural explanation of the views of fortune expressed in *Deor* and *The Wanderer*. (219)

Descent into Hell

“Is the Title of the Old English Poem *The Descent into Hell* Suitable?” asks M. R. Rambaran-Olm in *SELIM* 13 (2005-2006): 73-85. She answers herself, arguing that this editorial title is misleading because it suggests a closer affinity with the story as told in the apocryphal *Gospel of Nicodemus* than the poem actually exhibits. She insists that “a new and more appropriate title ... would function then as part of the text itself in a way, essentially, to indicate what exactly is at the core of the poem, while welcoming readers to begin their journeys through the text, as opposed to distracting them from discovery and meaning” (83). She suggests “John the Baptist’s Prayer,” “John’s Prayer of Praise and Thanksgiving,” “John’s Prayer,” or “John’s Song” as possible alternatives.

Dream of the Rood and The Ruthwell Poem

In “Reading the Cross: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Teaching *The Dream of the Rood*,” *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 15.2: 95-125, Marcia Smith Marzec presents her approach to teaching the poem in two courses: a survey course of Old English literature designed for undergraduate majors and an English/History special topics course, “Retrieving the Anglo-Saxon Past.” Marzec positions *Dream of the Rood* in both its heroic and elegiac contexts, beginning

with an initial reading of the poem “New Critical style” (96), guiding the students in their discovery but purposely leaving the interpretation open. After this first reading, students are asked a series of questions about the poem that help them rethink and refine their initial ideas (98). Once the students have proffered multiple interpretations, Marzec introduces questions of authorship, manuscript context, and historical factors, especially the history of crucifixion iconography; students examine images from a variety of sources, including manuscripts, pectoral and altar crosses, and carvings. They then investigate the theological question of the nature of redemption and atonement and its history and various interpretations, especially those ascendant during the Anglo-Saxon period. Once students understand the two major versions of atonement, they return to the crucifixion images they have been shown to explain which vision of atonement each image seems to portray; they then return to the Ruthwell Cross and its verse that corresponds to portions of the *Dream of the Rood*. After firmly grounding the poem in its context, Marzec allows the students to apply the theology and art history they have learned, which leads them to see *Christus triumphans* in the poet’s description (111). They also search for evidence of *Christus patiens*, finding it in the characterization not of Christ but of the Rood. Once the students have finished the unit, they are asked to write a paper arguing for their interpretation of the poem; Marzec’s goal throughout is to demonstrate to students the complexity of interdisciplinary study.

“Who Then Read the Ruthwell Poem in the Eighth Century?” asks Éamonn Ó Carragáin in his essay from *Aedificia nova: Studies in Honor of Rosemary Cramp*, ed. Karkov and Damico (see sect. 2), 43-75, though the paper begins more as defense of Cramp’s ideas regarding the runic inscriptions on the Ruthwell Cross than of medieval reading practice (43-52). In the face of Cramp and Ó Carragáin’s clearly reasoned arguments regarding the inscriptions—their dating, placement, and orientation—criticisms that the runes were an afterthought, not intended to be integral to the design, carry little weight, as does the objection that the text is too difficult to read to have been planned in the original design. Ó Carragáin points out that part of the difficulty lies in the fact that the design is unique among surviving runic inscriptions (45). Then, citing work by Ute Schwab and others, he demonstrates that such design is not unique in non-runic inscriptions that survive in places Anglo-Saxons would likely have seen them (pilgrimage sites in Rome, for example). Through Ó Carragáin’s painstaking discussion of early medieval

attitudes toward reading, particularly of *tituli*, the second section of the essay serves to bolster Cramp’s argument for the symbiotic relationships among the text, the scenes depicted, the decorative elements, and the shape and texture of the stones themselves. He concludes,

arguments that separate the poem from its iconographic context or that view its layout as absurd provide no evidence whatever that at Ruthwell the runic *tituli* to the vine scrolls were added later, nor that the lower stone was already erected when the *tituli* were inscribed. ... To lay out the *tituli* in columns of *scriptura continua* made sense within the Byzantine and Roman traditions identified by Ute Schwab. The layout was consonant with the many other reminiscences of the liturgy on the cross. The layout was also eminently practical. It ensured that later, when the lower stone was erected, the runes would be the right way up. It coped excellently with the problem that the borders of the lower stone grew broader from top to bottom. It made sense within an early medieval monastic context, in which texts were regularly chanted and interpreted with reference to communal liturgical actions regularly performed, and thus familiar to all members of the community. The Ruthwell designer provided all the major panels with *tituli* that recalled intoned lections and well-known chants, in Latin and in English. Scholars may proceed with confidence on the sensible hypothesis to which Rosemary Cramp has always held: that the vine scrolls and their runic verse *tituli* formed from the beginning the central element in the design of the Ruthwell Cross, the symbolic heart of the monument. (68, 75)

Elene

In “Language, Power, and Holiness in Cynewulf’s *Elene*,” *Medievalia et Humanistica* 34: 23-41, Laurence Erussard begins by explaining why the poem has not fared well among modern critics: firstly, because both the poem and the title character can be seen as anti-Semitic and unpleasant, and secondly, because *Elene* is unlike the stereotype of a holy woman as a young, virginal woman who is martyred after enduring physical and spiritual suffering. “On the contrary,” he writes, “*Elene* is an older woman, an impressive, powerful, ubiquitously respected, feared and obeyed queen” (23). Erussard explains that her status as Constantine’s

mother gave her both political and spiritual influence; her status as a “pillar of the Church” is reflected in the “static, formal, insensitive, unemotional depiction of Cynewulf’s female hero,” who “stands like an icon, towering over the Jews” (24). Furthermore, he suggests that Elene’s language reflects this characterization of her, as her speech demands information, states rules, and inflicts punishment and even torture in a detached, impersonal tone. He writes that “[t]his attitude can be explained by the fact that Elene acts as instrument of her son Constantine’s mission, but her linguistic style is also an iconographic expression of holiness, which will be adopted by Judas upon his conversion. By the end of the poem, Judas and Elene’s common hieratic and impersonal style stands in drastic contrast with the devil’s personal language” (24). Erussard spends the remainder of the essay discussing this linguistic patterning and showing how it serves to underscore her social role and holiness. In addition, he points out that “Elene’s speeches and the poem itself reproduce iconographic designs and conventions used in art forms. The very structure of the poem is twofold. Duality is basic for two intertwined reasons. First, the poem articulates the difference between the Christian *cwen* and the Jews and, consequently, between two ideologies and their symbolic emblems, the Christian Church and the Synagogue. Second, the poem is actually a double hagiography. In the beginning Elene is the only saint, but at the end, she has converted Judas, who becomes the second holy character,” though he partakes only in Elene’s Christian status, not her imperial position (26). Judas’s speech becomes impersonal like the *cwen*’s as he moves from praise to petition to thanksgiving, showing that he has become like her and unlike the devil, whose speech continues to be a personal complaint (36). Erussard concludes that “the negation of the self is one of Cynewulf’s main points, which explains that the language of the holy ones is systematically structured and impersonal but seems as stable and organized as the stones used to build a church; it leaves no room for personal desire and expression, but it celebrates the timeless and Divine” (37).

Fates of the Apostles

In “The *siðgeomor* Speaker and his Sources, in Cynewulf’s *The Fates of the Apostles*,” *N&Q* 55: 119–22, Nicole Marafioti acknowledges that critical opinion has long held that, as there is no identifiable direct source for the poem, Cynewulf’s knowledge of his subject may have been drawn from his experience with the liturgy, perhaps supplemented by private readings

of hagiographical texts (119). In this paper, Marafioti investigates the possible nature and source of those supplementary readings. She notes that the introductory lines may provide a clue because “while professions of weakness and mortality are typical in the conclusions of Cynewulf’s poems, only *Fates* introduces these themes in its opening lines.” This may indicate that the speaker of the poem’s reference may be more than metaphorical: he may in fact be referring to physical illness (119–20). She concludes that “[i]f the speaker’s travel-weariness and sick heart are understood as bodily infirmities, then his claims to have *fand* ‘discovered’ and *sammode* ‘collected, gathered together’ his song suggest a particular setting for the poem’s composition: a monastic infirmary, where a recovering patient would have been exposed to the hagiographical sources needed to compile a poem about the deaths of the apostles” (120).

MKR

The Finnsburg Fragment

In “*The Finnsburgh Fragment, and Its Lambeth Provenance*,” *N&Q* 55: 122–24, Jane Roberts proposes that we look beyond the two usual suspects, MSS Lambeth 487 and 489, when trying to determine the origin of the *Finnsburgh Fragment*. Instead, she suggests MS Lambeth 427, into which were bound fols. 210 and 211, two leaves “from an early eleventh-century manuscript of dimensions that could convincingly accommodate the text of the *Finnsburgh Fragment*” (123). She notes that editions of these two leaves and the fragment in question, whose original is now lost, reveal that all three contain comparable numbers of words, letters without word space, and letters with word space, which Roberts points to as potential evidence of shared origin. Roberts thus concludes that “[i]t is at the very least possible that the *Finn* leaf at one time belonged to the manuscript from which ff. 210 and 211 of MS 427 survive and that all three leaves came to Lambeth Palace with its haul of Lanthony books” (124).

GD

Genesis A

In “OEng. *Scūrboga* and the Provenance of *Genesis A*,” *N&Q* 55: 2–3, W. B. Lockwood suggests that a word meaning ‘rainbow’ may help scholars identify, in broad outlines at least, the origin and dating of the poem. He argues that in line 1540 *scurbogan*, literally ‘shower bow’, a *hapax legomenon* in Old English and a form without cognate in any Germanic language, does have an analogue in Old Irish, *túag* or **stúag fraisse*, that may be

the form underlying this unique instance of 'shower bow.' If Lockwood's conjecture is correct, "[w]e may then reckon with the possibility that *Genesis A* was composed in Northumbria during the period of Celtic ascendancy, a matter also of some interest for the dating, if not the provenance, of the related pieces *Daniel* and *Exodus*, to say nothing of *Beowulf*, all of which in style, vocabulary, and metre closely resemble *Genesis A*, widely regarded as the earliest of these works" (2).

MKR

Gnomic Poetry

Building on the work of T.A. Shippey, who argued that Old English gnomic verse expresses an interest in things *deop*, *deorc*, *dygel*, and *dyrne* ('deep', 'dark', 'secret', and 'hidden'), Rafał Borysławski, "Wordhordes Craeft: Confusion and the Order of the Wor(l)d in Old English Gnomic," *The Propur Langage of Engliche Men*, ed. Krygier and Sikorska (see section 3b), 119–31, explores how this difficult-to-classify genre oscillates between two poles: "that of enigmatic wisdom and that of a dark threat" (120). Specifically, he suggests that "[t]he two naturally converge in a philosophic outlook on the world, where the mystery of wisdom flows out of a threatening vision of the world, and where the threatening universe is, in fact, the source of that very wisdom" (120). The primary textual focus of Borysławski's essay is "The Order of the World," which the author recognizes as an important witness to the understanding of wisdom in Anglo-Saxon England; *Maxims I* and *Precepts* are also discussed. Borysławski recognizes the representation of Old English wisdom in these poems "as built upon the necessity to understand the apposition between that which is possible and desirable and that which is impossible and which is to be dreaded," which he argues leads to "frustratingly unanswerable or even threatening questions about the limits of wisdom and cognition" (125). As a possible source for this complex brand of wisdom, the author looks to the Neoplatonic tradition, and in particular Pseudo-Dionysius's *On Divine Names* and Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy*. Consideration of the latter text leads Borysławski to corroborate the link other scholars have made between Old English wisdom poetry and Alfred's court. This link, he states, would mean that "the gnomes represent also a poetic version of a stoic philosophy in turbulent times" (130).

In "The Gnomic Collection of Verse in the Exeter Book," *Philological Review* 34.2: 51–78, David Robert Howlett undertakes a careful examination of "several forms of artifice previously undetected in the work

generally known as the 'Gnomic Verses' or 'Maxims I'" (51). These forms of artifice include the ordering of the six different types of verse line the poet employs, the three-part structure of the poem (which the author suggests was meant to echo the Book of Proverbs), and the word, syllable, and letter count of each of the poem's three sections, which, Howlett argues, all work together to produce a careful prosodic unity that invokes a number of biblical themes. The careful attention the poet has paid to these features prompts Howlett to conclude that the poem was likely composed during Æthelstan's reign, since "[e]very phenomenon we have considered in the Gnomic Verses can be paralleled in other works associated with the court of Æthelstan" (71).

Yoon-hee Park's essay, "The Meaning of the Cotton 'Wulf' Maxim in the Context of Anglo-Saxon Popular Thought and Culture," *Medieval and Early Modern English Studies* 16.2: 247–63, is interested in placing the *wulf* gnome of *Maxims II* (*wulf sceal on bearowe, / earm anhaga*, l.18b–19a) in its cultural contexts. The author engages in close analysis of each of the major words in this short passage, but focuses primarily on the passage's sole verb, *sceal*. This verb, as others have noted, can be interpreted in at least two ways: first, following Patrick L. Henry, as "typically express[ing] the notions of customary action or state, inherent quality and characteristic property," and second, after Paul Beekman Taylor, as indicating "what should be, how things should function" (256). Having determined that the Anglo-Saxons recognized wolves as dangerous and treacherous creatures that should be hunted, Park argues that the second of these two interpretations is the more culturally relevant.

Guthlac

In "Too Much of Too Little: *Guthlac* and the Temptation of Excessive Fasting," *Traditio* 63: 89–127, Sarah Downey argues that "food asceticism" and "resistance to demonic admonitions of fasting" (90), though they have not received much attention by readers of Anglo-Saxon texts in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, were of paramount importance to both Felix, *Guthlac*'s earliest biographer, and also to his contemporary audience. Of particular interest to Downey is the speech that the tempting demons make as they try to convince *Guthlac* to stray from his normal behavior by engaging in an extreme form of fasting. This speech, she argues, "effectively translate[s] the false admonitions of Anthony's demons into full narrative form," and "could presumably be quite convincing to an auditor less discerning than *Guthlac*" (98). The translator of Felix's

work into Old English was also apparently drawn to the demons' exhortation: in a departure from his or her usual practice of trimming source material, this passage is reproduced not only with its original rhetorical complexity, but in some cases, even enhanced. This attention, Downey suggests, is evidence of the importance of the subject matter, which she also indicates holds well beyond the Anglo-Saxon period, since both early and later Middle English renditions of Guthlac's life preserve the homiletic character found in Felix's version of the demons' speech, and specifically its interest in fasting and temptations surrounding the consumption—or lack of consumption—of food. In the final section of her essay, Downey identifies places in the corpus of Anglo-Saxon hagiographic texts where authors articulate their anxiety about excessive fasting, including Bede's *Life of Cuthbert*, Alcuin's anonymous *Life*, and Ælfric's *De Oratione Moysi*. She notes that *The Seasons for Fasting* “also includes a strong admonition against accepting foreign fasting practices” (124). This poem in particular, since it questions Celtic monastic practices, provides a useful corollary to Felix's text, which expresses a similar concern about the influence of the British, and as such “might constitute a form of Anglo-Saxon Christian nationalism” (126).

David F. Johnson's essay, “Spiritual Combat and the Land of Canaan in *Guthlac A*,” *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach*, ed. Blanton and Scheck [see sect. 2], 307–17, aims to connect two of the most written-about aspects of the poem: the role played by topography, specifically the placement of Guthlac's *beorg*, and the temptations the saint faces at the hands of a group of demons determined not just to challenge his piety, but to physically displace him, as well. He does so by asking two related questions: “In what sense do the demons possess the ‘beorg’ before Guthlac arrives to claim it, and how and why does Guthlac's presence threaten their possession of this *locus*?” (311). Unable to locate any of *Guthlac A*'s immediate sources that contain information that might be helpful in answering these queries, Johnson turns to the Old Testament, where he finds a possible lead in the story of Israel's entry into and eventual occupation of the land of Canaan. This section of the Bible was read allegorically in late antiquity and throughout the Middle Ages in a way that Johnson believes is relevant to the study of *Guthlac A*: “the historical struggles of ancient Israel against her national adversaries were moralized as the inner struggle of individual Christians against spiritual adversaries” (315). By choosing to feature a battle for occupied territory, the *Guthlac A*-poet “was exploiting a rich biblical theme which an extensive

tradition of allegoresis had invested with appropriate symbolic meaning” (315).

GD

Judith

With the publication of the eighth edition of the *Norton Anthology of English Literature*, *Judith* is available in three of the most widely used anthologies. (Others are published by Longman and Broadview.) Erin Mullally addresses the challenges of teaching *Judith* to a broader audience in “The New Girl in School: Teaching *Judith* in a Survey Course,” *Jnl of Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 15: 127–140. She points out that, while the inclusion of *Judith* allows for interesting discussions of gender in Anglo-Saxon society, it also allows students to err in oversimplifying the text as proto-feminist (127–28). To combat such reductive readings, Mullally suggests reading *Judith* in the context of the other readings in the Norton “that will allow students to see the literary and social conventions working in the poem: through the gendered conventions of the Anglo-Saxon peace-weaver, through theories of gift-exchange and material culture, and through concepts of translation in Anglo-Saxon England” (128). She acknowledges that students will read through whatever framework of enquiry instructors construct, which is limited by the contents of the anthology, the critical apparatus available, course goals, and simply the time available to interrogate a work or cluster of works. Given the other Old English selections, *Judith* functions as “an English verse adaptation of a Latin prose narrative, a pseudo-saint's life, a monster story with a militant hero (one not forced into exile), and a vivid contrast to the lamenting wife. The versatility of the poem's genre, along with the clear intertextual comparisons it affords, suggests a multiplicity of approaches to it” (129). Mullally reads *Judith* as contrasting the helpless passivity not only of the *Wife's Lament* but also of the peace-weavers of *Beowulf*: *Judith*'s ability to act decisively corrects students' mistaken assumptions about women and their roles in Anglo-Saxon England. At the very least, *Judith*'s is like the lives of saints such as Juliana, Margaret, Elene, and Mary of Egypt: heroic in their faithfulness to God. Because the *Dream of the Rood* and the story of Cædmon are also included in the anthology, students can compare these accounts of faith witnesses to the power of God working in their communities and realize that *Judith* fits comfortably in the hagiographic tradition. It also fits well in the heroic tradition, which she takes up in the next section of the essay; she argues that *Judith*'s receiving Holofernes's war-gear marks her as a martial

figure like Beowulf because “given the conventions of gift-exchange in Anglo-Saxon culture, the gift of sword and shield presupposes future military endeavors” (135). Finally, because *Judith* is a translation (one might say “adaptation”) of the biblical story of the same name, the poem opens up discussion of the importance of translation as well as the blurry distinctions between translation and interpretation and the role of cultural context in assessing a translation. She concludes that “[u]ltimately, the Old English *Judith* allows contemporary educators a complex text through which to disentangle the nuanced representations of women in the Old English corpus” (138).

In “The *Ides*, the Goddess, and Female Identity In Anglo-Saxon England,” *In Geardagum* 28:1-15, Alexandra H. Olsen strains to connect *Judith* (both the biblical figure and the eponymous heroine of the Old English poem) to the Sumerian goddess Inanna.

MKR

Physiologus

In “A Note in Defense of ‘The Partridge’ [Exeter Book 97v],” *Neophilologus* 92.4: 729–34, Valentine A. Pakis takes issue with Michael Drou’s 2007 claim that the *fugel* in the final, fragmentary *Physiologus* poem be identified as a phoenix. To support the refutation, Pakis defers to the “vast *Physiologus* tradition,” spanning many centuries and countries, which casts the unidentified bird instead as a partridge (729). The author then lists numerous examples of the *Physiologus* tradition that preserve the same three-part structure that is likely present in the OE text: panther-whale-partridge. None of the extant manuscripts contains a phoenix, and so the author concludes that Drou’s hypothesis is unsupported, and, while we cannot know for certain the author’s intent, that the bird was likely intended to be a partridge.

Resignation A

Mechthild Gretsch’s aim in “A Context for *Resignation A?*” *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach*, ed. Blanton and Scheck [see sect. 2], 103–18, is not to “[salvage] the reputation” (105) of the *Resignation A*-poet, but rather to propose a hypothesis to account for the long-recognized “lexical and stylistic peculiarities” that have led to its disrepute (109). One feature of the poem that Gretsch finds most noteworthy is its use of “an exuberant variety of expressions for God, only a minor portion of which occurs more than once in the poem” (108). Gretsch finds a similar

“flair for words”—that is, an interest in using explicitly poetic discourse—in the poet’s description of things besides the divine, as well, evident in the use of terms like *wuldordream* and *bealudæd* (109). The use of these obviously poetic terms seems to clash, Gretsch notes, with other aspects of the poem that suggest the poet’s lack of facility with “basic poetic and stylistic techniques” (111), including the placement of alliterative stress on pronouns, adverbs, and prepositions, “awkward repetitions of individual words,” and “the joining of two verbs, nouns, or adjectives by *ond*” (110). In an attempt to reconcile these two apparently contradictory aspects of the poem, Gretsch proposes that *Resignation A* might be a “seminar paper” of a student who had been set the task of producing a versified prayer in the penitential tradition, therein employing as many epithets for God as he could think of, and embellishing his diction by the use of choice words and phrases and a generous amount of sound effects” (111). While she admits that it is impossible to prove her hypothesis, at least at this time, Gretsch wonders if the composition of vernacular poetry “could have been part of the curriculum of some Anglo-Saxon school or schools” (112), and points to similarities between *Resignation A* and several other poems, such as *Gloria I* and *The Lord’s Prayer II* and *III*, as evidence that “it is entirely conceivable that all these poems saw light as tasks set to classes of mature students” (115).

Riddles

Mark Griffith’s “Exeter Book Riddle 74 *Ac* ‘Oak’ and *Bat* ‘Boat,’” *N&Q* 55: 393–96, responds to John D. Niles’s proposed double solution for Riddle 74: “oak/boat.” Griffith argues for a singular solution to the riddle, *ac* ‘oak,’ which, as seen in the *Rune Poem*, can represent both tree and boat. *Ac* also appears in both masculine and feminine forms, “which uniquely combines the genders indicated by *fæmne* and *rinc*” in lines 1a and 2a (395). Griffith further notes that one benefit to simplifying the solution in this manner is that it underscores a possible link with the previous riddle in the collection, most often solved as *æsc* (‘lance’ or ‘spear’), another word associated with the runic alphabet. Finally, this proposed solution, since it imagines one term simultaneously representing two objects, supports the phrase *on ane tid* (‘at one time’) in line 2b, a verse that Griffith argues Niles’s response does not account for adequately.

In “The Talking Dead: Resounding Voices in Old English Riddles,” *Exemplaria* 20: 123–42, Mary Hayes focuses her analysis on four Riddles—26 (“Bible”), 48 (“chalice/paten”), 59 (“chalice”), and 67 (“Bible”)—that

participate in an act of “ventriloquial” performance, during which the reader speaks for the non-speaking: “these objects reflect on the circumstances under which they each acquire a voice: when a reader vocalizes the text inscribed on the object or, in a more immediate sense, the text of the riddle itself” (124). In doing so, the reader can enact not only the voice of the inanimate objects these riddles describe, but the voice of their authors, as well. The term “ventriloquism” perhaps embodies its most literal meaning when performing this last duty: “the dead author will speak when the reader ventriloquizes his words, a performance whose full significance transpires when recalling the traditional sense of ‘ventriloquism’: the pagan practice of conjuring the dead” (126). In the last section of the essay, Hayes demonstrates how this specific type of vocalization has implications for Christian devotion and theology, specifically regarding the invocation of Christ’s voice, the consumption of Eucharist, and the acknowledgement of the soul’s superiority over the body.

Carol A. Lind’s dissertation, titled “Riddling in the Voices of Others: The Old English Exeter Book Riddles and a Pedagogy of the Anonymous” (Illinois State U, DAI 68A, AAT 3280905), constitutes a student edition of the Exeter Book *Riddles*. Unlike existing editions, which Lind argues often privilege “the middle-class values of the academy,” hers embraces working-class students as well, in particular by distancing the authorial and authoritative voice of the editor and instructor (1). Lind accomplishes this goal in part by omitting proposed solutions to the riddles, generally included in other editions, to promote “more lively debate among students working with them,” and to “[encourage] students, particularly working-class students, to have a one-on-one relationship with any text without feeling the need for an authoritative intermediary to guide their reading” (29). Authority is thus shifted from instructor to reader, which allows students new to academic discourse a “safe arena for scholarly deliberation” (29). In the Introduction to the edition (Chapter II), Lind offers her student readers information about the religious, literary, and cultural contexts of the Exeter Book *Riddles*, which includes a lengthy discussion of monastic life in late Anglo-Saxon England and overviews of *Rule of St. Benedict* and the *Rule of Chrodegang*. This chapter also offers an examination of different types of riddles and their possible cultural functions. The next chapter (Chapter III) provides a brief sketch of the grammar of Present Day English and Old English and a section on the pronunciation of Old English; it also includes exercises for students to complete. The final chapter (Chapter IV) is an extensive glossing of all

of the Exeter Book *Riddles*, which includes a parsing of all derived forms of the words that appear in the text. While the act of glossing is inherently an interpretive one, and thus might undermine the stated goal of her project, Lind offers numerous possible definitions for Old English words whenever possible, which mitigates the problem to some degree.

Brian McFadden opens his essay “Raiding, Reform, and Reaction: Wondrous Creatures in the Exeter Book Riddles,” *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 50: 329–51, with a question about the contents of the Exeter Book: “why would monks who very carefully explained and clarified the Christian message in the texts they chose for this manuscript include the riddle collection, which invites multiple interpretations?” (329). To answer this question, McFadden places the riddles in their political, military, and religious contexts to show how they “challenge the reader to penetrate the wondrous veil around the ordinary objects they describe” (329). In doing so, they allow readers to gain some control, however fleeting, over their environment at a time marked by the political unrest following the death of King Edgar, the renewed threat of Viking incursions, and the after-effects of the Benedictine Reform. Not all riddles resolve themselves so easily, however, which McFadden recognizes as “an awareness that some situations are beyond the reader’s or interpreter’s control” (329). McFadden focuses in particular on the “wonder” riddles in the collection, since the interpretation of wonders in a broad context preoccupied many authors writing in the late tenth century. These riddles, he explains, “enact both the cause and relief of anxiety; they present an ambiguous and potentially dangerous being to the reader, but allow him or her to contain the uncertainty through a single, authoritative solution” (333). Riddles with multiple possible interpretations, however, rather than provide solace, instead “consciously or unconsciously reflect the uncertainty of the late tenth century” (333). Having established his argument, McFadden proceeds to examine briefly those twenty-five riddles that “explicitly describe a thing as a wonder or a marvel, not a sign” (335). While many of these riddles support a solution intended to “reduce the wonder of the riddles,” “a touch of anxiety still remains in the text,” often indicated by suggestions of violence, which McFadden interprets as a possible representation of the Viking threat (340).

In “‘*Feorran Broht*’: Exeter Book Riddle 12 and the Commodification of the Exotic,” *Authority and Subjugation in Writing of Medieval Wales*, ed. Ruth Kennedy and Simon Meecham-Jones (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), 71–84, Peter Robson begins his study of

Riddle 12 by acknowledging its division into two distinct sections: the first a “reasonably unremarkable” first-person riddle and the second a purportedly double entendre riddle (72). These two parts, he argues, are not only compatible, but in fact work together as they “[draw] jointly on discourses of gender, class, ethnicity, and sexuality” (73). Each section of Riddle 12 makes reference to *wealas*, a word which Robson examines in some detail. He finds that this term might have had distinctly sexual overtones in Anglo-Saxon England, and also perhaps a more general association with the exotic, both of which complicate its more standard definition as “foreigner/slave,” or “Welsh slave” more specifically. Critics should take these possibilities into account when reading this riddle, Robson suggests: “Whether the word first means Welshman or slave, and thus whether Welshmen are slaves, or slaves Welshmen, becomes colored by the possibilities of meaning offered by other instances of the term in compound usage” (75). This understanding leads Robson to study the riddle from a “colonialist perspective,” which he argues is a more effective way to determine the type of cultural work the text could have performed for its original audiences (81). The “hidden, furtive, and compulsive” sexual behavior of the foreign slave in the second half of Riddle 12, who has been revealed as ethnically distinct from and inferior to the Anglo-Saxon subjects the poem invokes, thus “would seem to correspond as well to a thesis of objectification and erotic fantasy as to one that suggests the use of the figure to express hidden desires on the part of the audience” (82).

GD

The Ruin

Andy Orchard's contribution to *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach*, ed. Blanton and Scheck (see sect. 2), takes on a daunting task: “Reconstructing *The Ruin*” (45-68). Through characteristically painstaking research, Orchard first demonstrates the elegant patterning and structure of the damaged poem, especially features such as double alliteration; assonance, echoing and other sound-play; tense shifts; compounding (especially involving *hapax legomena*); and verbal repetitions, which are also listed in Appendix II (63-65). Orchard then uses the patterns he has meticulously described in conjunction with these formulaic phrases to create a tentative reconstruction of the poem (Appendix III: Restructured Text and Translation, 65-68). Although the reconstruction cannot be verified, given that the poem survives in only one, badly damaged copy, Orchard's reconstruction

provides tempting answers to generations of questioners. Although he does not attempt to reconstruct the entire poem—some sections are so damaged as to offer no clues whatsoever to the scholarly sleuth—he does offer possible readings for lines whose content is suggested by surviving whole and partial words; the result is consistent with the patterning he ably describes in the body of this essay.

The Seafarer

In “An unlikely treasure hoard: The Beginning of Ezra Pound's Poetics and the Conclusion of ‘The Seafarer,’” *N&Q* n.s. 55: 469-74, Ce Rosenow argues that Pound's translation of *The Seafarer* presents “one of the first articulations of his poetics and an early expression of a central characteristic of modernist poetry” (469). Pound's translation appeared in 1911 in *The New Age* as the first of twelve installments grouped under the heading “I Gather the Limbs of Osiris.” This version differs from earlier translations in omitting the final twenty-five lines, ending at line ninety-nine and thereby significantly altering the meaning of the poem. Critics have long remarked on the apparent division into two sections of the poem: “the first section describes the hardships of life at sea, while the second emphasizes the need to praise God” (469). For this reason, many believe that different authors wrote the two sections or that the sections indicate two different speakers. Pound neatly sidesteps the problem by excising most of the second, more Christian section. In this way, rather than move from the suffering on the sea to a vision of God's greatness and the need to live a righteous life, Pound is able to recast the notion of treasure, omitting the concept of future reward for righteousness and focusing instead on the treasure that is the bodies of the dead—and by extension, according to Rosenow, the corpora of writings these dead have left behind. In this way, the act of translation becomes a treasure hunt (470). Rosenow explains that Pound's decision to end the poem at line ninety-nine rather than elsewhere especially allows him to conclude his poem before the following lines of the Old English poem that suggest the treasure mentioned in line 99 is useless (472); instead Pound wants to suggest that this treasure, the corpora should be mined for jewels: “Pound's goal is to model a new approach to literary scholarship by recovering literary works he considers jewels and to present them, with short essays, in *The New Age*” (473). Rosenow concludes that “[t]he unusual final lines Pound crafted for ‘The Seafarer’ to emphasize bodies-as-treasure instead of gold-as-treasure, and Pound's use of this translation to initiate

the 'Osiris' series, suggest that 'The Seafarer' is much more than Pound's attempt to recover the pre-Christian version of the poem. The conclusion ... represents an early and conscious expression of his later poetics that he models in the translation and in the publication of the poem itself" (474).

Another essay examining more modern responses to *The Seafarer*, "No Tidal Bore at All: Teaching *The Seafarer* to Maritimers," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 15.1: 55-65, discusses the general challenges of introducing students to medieval literature. Andrea Schutz begins by explaining the necessity to become familiar with one's students and their backgrounds, cultures, and communities in order to help contextualize the learning experience. Although students increasingly come from varied backgrounds, Schutz examines an experience teaching students who grew up in the maritime provinces of Canada and consequently bring to the poem the experience of living in a maritime culture. She remarks, "This thousand-year-old poem was alive for them, was theirs, as it was not for me, even though I can handle the language. I am neither a Maritimer nor a Newfoundlander. I am a foreigner to this poem" (58). These students understood that the vacillation of the Seafarer in describing his relationship with the sea echoes the tides themselves, an insight Schutz had never had, though it seemed obvious to her students. Similarly, the independence of spirit and desperate loneliness of the Wanderer, cut off from community, spoke to her students. It was their poem in a way it had never been hers; it was "their experience, their fears, their voices, their loneliness, their alienation" (59). Schutz draws parallels between the attitudes of the Wanderer and Seafarer with those depicted in songs popular in the maritime provinces, including "Salt Water Joys," and remarks that her students' connection to these Old English poems "was neither with the poems as poems nor with puzzles of tongue and time, but with the human being inside the work" (61).

The occasion of *The Seafarer*, Sebastian I. Sobecki reminds us, has often been interpreted as a sea pilgrimage; however, in "The Interpretation of *The Seafarer*—A Reexamination of the Pilgrimage Theory," *Neophilologus* 92: 127-39, he challenges the identification of the action with this type of *perigrinatio pro amore Dei*, even though "the pilgrimage theory supplies a plausible theme with the capacity to embrace the entire poem" (128). Sobecki contends that the seafarer is neither an exile to the sea nor an exile across the sea: he is not seeking an eremitic life at sea for spiritual reasons nor is he traveling to a place of exile (131). Further, there is

no sense of penitence on the part of the Seafarer: "suffering is mentioned (ll.8b-12a) but it is not linked to sin or penance, that is, cause or purpose" (135). Sobecki examines archeological evidence of fishing communities, finding that, although river fishing was most common during the Anglo-Saxon period, there is good evidence for sea fishing, especially for herring, which is caught off the British coasts during the winter months and is described in the poem (137-38). Based on his analysis of the text and this evidence, Sobecki suggests that the Seafarer is a fisherman.

Solomon and Saturn I

Digitizing manuscript images is leading to exciting discoveries in textual studies, especially with regard to cruces caused by illegibility. In "A Note on *Solomon and Saturn I*, Lines 107B-108A," *N&Q* 55: 260-62, Heide Estes reexamines these lines in a magnified, high-resolution digital image of the page; this view shows that the usual reading of line 108A, "N, [O] s(am)od," which was most recently confirmed in Robert J. Menner's edition of *The Poetical Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn* (New York, 1941), is a misreading. Instead of 'n,' Estes explains that the letters are actually 'ii,' which makes more sense of "getuinnas" [twins] in line 107B (261). Only Julius Zupitza has suggested this reading before, and that uncertainly, in "Zu Salomon und Saturn," *Anglia* 3 (1880): 527-31 at 528. According to Estes, the letter following 'ii' is "a straight line with slight serifs at top and bottom: that is, a runic or Roman capital 'I'" (261). The other crux cannot be so easily resolved, as it springs from a hole in the manuscript between 's' and 'od,' which was emended as "*samod*" by John Mitchell Kemble in *The Dialogue of Solomon and Saturnus, with an Historical Introduction* (London, 1848), and most subsequent editors have concurred. Estes, however, suggests that the hole is large enough to account for three or even four letters, offering "*swiðmod*" as a solution. This emendation does not entirely solve the cruces; as Estes points out, how the passage could read does not necessarily indicate how it should read. Although the high-resolution images do clarify the ink on the page, they do not in this case provide any more insight into potential scribal error than before.

Soul and Body II

Glenn Davis reminds us of the *Soul and Body* poems' didactic and eschatological message: do not live a life like the owner of the bodies described, lest you meet a similar end. In "Corporeal Anxiety in *Soul and Body*

II," PQ 87: 33-50, Davis points out the extreme corporeality of the poem's insistence on the gruesome details of decaying flesh. He asserts that, while later texts are often this specific, "in an Anglo-Saxon context, this invocation of the fragmented, mortified body is all but unique among treatments of the body and soul theme, and within the corpus of Old English literature more generally" (33). Although Allen Frantzen has discussed physical suffering in the context of penance, Davis argues that critics have otherwise not attempted to understand the functions of these descriptions of decay beyond simply exciting disgust and fear (34). This essay suggests that the decaying body depicted in the poem should also be viewed in the context of Anglo-Saxon medicine, "which is concerned with the restoring and maintaining the health and well-being of the physical body ... separate from the Christian focus on corporeal abnegation that is central to Frantzen's argument" (34). In their description of ill and damaged bodies, the four major Anglo-Saxon medical treatises emphasize prophylaxis and remediation of injury or illness (35). "The bodies represented here," Davis explains, "are not intended to be read as metaphor, but rather as flesh and bone constructions whose owners wished to keep them free from pain.... Thus, the poem's use of graphic bodily imagery can be understood as a sophisticated response to a prevalent cultural anxiety about the health and integrity of the human body." (36). Davis draws parallels between the *Lorica of Laidcenn* in *Lacnunga* and *Soul and Body II*, suggesting that the catalogue of body parts speaks to the need for defense and demands to be read through the eyes of an enemy that would target such vulnerable parts of the body (38). He then examines the homiletic texts that take up the soul and body theme, demonstrating that, while each addresses the corrupted state of the bodies that the souls once inhabited, "none shares *Soul and Body II*'s gruesome vision" (39). Also unlike the homiletic texts, the poem avoids referring to the body as whole but instead focuses on fragmentation, dissolution, and decay, to the extent that the entire body becomes disarticulated and all of "the pieces of the disarticulated body become individual witnesses of transgression" (42). While individual parts have metaphorical significance in the poem (like a tongue that may have spoken falsely), they are also anxiety-producing because of the physical suffering such disintegration entails (45). An exception, perhaps, would be the bodies of saints: "those without sin need not be concerned with the trials of the physical body, nor about death itself, no matter how grotesque the means, since their souls are guaranteed entrance to heaven" (46). Given that most Anglo-Saxons likely did not share the

confidence of a Guthlac or other saints, their anxieties about physical suffering served as a constant reminder of their spiritual and physical vulnerability.

The Wanderer

In "*Swa cwæð snottor on mode: Four Issues in The Wanderer*," *Neophilologus* 92: 559-565, Melissa J. Wolfe asks what she calls four basic questions—which are distinct from a number of rhetorical questions posed in the first paragraph that are never addressed. In answer to the first of the four (how many voices speak in the poem?), she argues that the only voice heard is that of the *scop*, who adopts the persona of the Wanderer but is not distinct from him. Shifts in time and perspective, she says, are explained by the performative nature of the text, which answers her second question: with whom or what is the *wis wer* [wise man] contrasted? If the poem is understood as a performance, the *scop* begins by describing his earlier self (the *snottor*-Wanderer persona), which he then contrasts with his present self, one who has become wise through suffering (561). Wolfe points out that the *scop*-Wanderer never identifies his *goldwine*; this omission saves him from having to remember details manufactured for the occasion of the poem or to face questioning about an actual patron. After a discussion of the *scop*'s dual identity as developed in the middle lines of the poem, Wolfe then tackles the third issue: how to reconcile the virtue of reticence with the existence of the poem, in other words, how can the *scop* speak his poem—and thereby his suffering—without foregoing the very virtue he praises? Wolfe suggests that the compromise is for the wise man-*scop* to use the poem to praise restraint in speech and exhort listeners to "put energy into moving toward God and the permanence in heaven rather than the transience of earthly things" (564). She argues that the grace anticipated in the opening of the poem enables the Wanderer to become "a contemplative man who realises the impermanence of the world and concludes that he must place his faith and energy in heavenly things; ... it is grace that heals and rescues the sufferer" (564).

MKR

Works not seen

Paul Cavill, "The Site of the Battle of *Brunanburh*: Manuscripts and Maps, Grammar and Geography," *A Commodity of Good Names*, ed. Padel and Parsons [see sect. 2], 303-19.

Howlett, David R. "A Corrected Form of the Reconstructed *Ruthwell Crucifixion Poem*." *SN* 80 (2008), 255-57.

Patrick J. Murphy, "Dark Tracks: The Poetics of the Exeter 'Riddles,'" (Ph.D. Diss., U of Wisconsin, Madison, DAI 68A, AAT 3278773).

4c. *Beowulf*

Text, Language, Meter

In *Klaeber's Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*, 4th ed. (Toronto: U of Toronto P), the editors R.D. Fulk, Robert E. Bjork, and John D. Niles offer a complete revision of what many scholars regard as the standard edition of the poem, essentially unchanged since its third edition of 1936, though supplemented in 1941 and 1950. The editors supply the text of the poem preserved in folios 129 *recto* through 198 *verso* of London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A.xv, with an updated apparatus of variant readings offered in other editions and a thoroughly revised and expanded introduction, commentary, appendices, glossary, and bibliography. Helen Damico provides a brief but moving Foreword on Klaeber's career at the University of Minnesota and difficult final years after his retirement to Germany in 1931 until his death in 1954. In addition to new figures and maps, the Introduction includes sections summarizing the plot of the poem, a description of its manuscript, "The World of Monsters and Myth," "The World of Humans," "Christian and Heroic Values," "Structure and Unity," "Method of Narration," "Mood, Tone, and Style," "Some Trends in Literary Criticism," "Language and Poetic Form," "Date, Origin, Influences, Genre," and a guide to "The Present Edition." Following Kiernan (1981), the editors silently omit line 2229 from the printed text as a dittograph, although "for the sake of congruity in lineation with other editions and with studies of the poem, lines 2230–3182 have not been renumbered; the poem now simply lacks a line 2229" (xxix). A full commentary by line reference is supplied for both *Beowulf* and *The Fight at Finnsburg*, followed by several appendices: "Parallels (Analogues and Illustrative Passages)," "Index of References to Early Germanic Culture," "Textual Criticism," plus the texts of two related poems with translation: *Waldere* in Old English and the *Hildebrandslied* in Old High German. A single glossary to both *Beowulf* and *The Fight at Finnsburg* is followed by a lexicon of proper names that appear in the two poems. The volume concludes with a list of works cited in the introduction, commentary, and other notes, which effectively serves as

a comprehensive bibliography of the most important scholarship on *Beowulf* to date.

As in the third edition, modern punctuation has been added, but altered from Klaeber's more German style to contemporary British usage. The editors use italics to indicate the alteration of words by emendation, square brackets for the addition of letters or words, parentheses for conjectural readings of obscure letters, and subtended points beneath the letters of words present in the Cotton Vitellius text but of dubious authenticity for syntactic or metrical reasons. They continue Klaeber's practice of indicating etymologically long vowels with a macron above the letter (e.g., \bar{o}), whatever length of pronunciation might have obtained at the time the extant manuscript was copied ca. 1000. On the other hand, the editors put a raised point above some consonants (\acute{c} , \acute{g}) to mark palatalization of *g* and affrication of *c* before front vowels in the late West Saxon dialect of the two Cotton Vitellius scribes. This practice is helpful as a general guide to pronunciation but also obscures alliteration on what must sometimes have been a velar "back" *g* or *c* in the dialect of the poet. For instance, in the opening line of the poem, the initial *g* of the first stressed syllable in the b-verse—the alliterative "king-pin" *gear- 'yore'*—is marked with a palatalization point, even though this consonant must have been pronounced somewhat further down the throat by the poet, so as to approximate the necessarily velar *g* of *Gar- 'Spear-'* in the a-verse. Similarly, the *c* of *ceol 'keel, ship'* in line 38b, is marked with an affrication point, blocking its alliteration with the hard *c* of *cynlicor 'more comely'* in line 38a. We do not know, of course, how the Cotton Vitellius scribes would have read these lines orally, whether they simply would have ignored alliteration on palatalized *g* or affricated *c* as a kind of assonance, or whether they would have adopted a more conservative pronunciation for the elevated register of archaic alliterative poetry. The two scribes presumably had their own individual preferences in pronunciation as they read these words aloud or sounded them silently in their heads, since, in addition to using different scribal hands in transcribing their exemplar, they also preferred somewhat different spellings of the same words and spelled some words inconsistently. The pronunciation of these pointed consonants, then, like that of the etymologically long vowels, is often uncertain and open to the reader's own judgment and taste.

More significantly, the editors have not attempted to restore the authorial version of the text in their emendations—that is, the "archetype" or first manuscript of *Beowulf* that was the ultimate basis of the Cotton Vitellius text through an unknown number of copyings.

They merely seek to correct whatever obvious changes must have been made to this original text during the process of its transmission, if these “can be identified with relative certainty” (321), whether the errors were introduced by carelessness, misapprehension of the original form in a scribe’s exemplar, or hypercorrection, that is, a scribe’s mistaken attempt to improve upon the text he found before him. Except for the actual name of God, pronominal and substantive references to the deity are not capitalized. Fulk offers a full explanation of the principles adopted in producing this fourth edition in “The Textual Criticism of Frederick Klaeber’s *Beowulf*,” in *Constructing Nations, Reconstructing Myth: Essays in Honour of T.A. Shippey*, ed. Andrew Wawn et al. (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 131–53, summarized in *YWOES* 2007. The “production values” of this new “Klaeber” are high, maintaining an excellent standard of typographical accuracy and bibliographical reference; subsequent reprintings will require only a few small corrections. The editors should each be warmly thanked for their scholarly expertise, scrupulous care, and palpable devotion to making this much-loved text of continuing value and freshness to students of *Beowulf*.

Luis Iglesias-Rábade addresses the question of “Editorial Punctuation in *Beowulf*: Dependent Constructions Introduced by *Wolde*, *Wende*, *Wiste* and *Cwæþ*,” *Mediaevalia* 29.2: 75–90. These preterite forms of *willan* ‘to wish, desire’, *wenan* ‘to expect, think’, *witan* ‘to know, understand’, and *cweðan* ‘to speak, say’, often “introduce a subordinate adverbial clause of reason,” according to the author, rather than an independent clause in apposition or “asyndetic coordination” with the clause that precedes it (76). For instance, Iglesias-Rábade disapproves of the punctuation of lines 1790b–92a maintained in the new *Klaeber*: *Duguð eal aras; / wolde blondenfeax beddes neosan, / gamela Scylding* “The veteran warband all arose; the old grey-haired Scylding wished to seek his bed.” Iglesias-Rábade feels that this punctuation disrupts the rhetorical flow of the passage by creating a misleadingly stiff parataxis. He sees the second clause of this sentence in verse 1791a as clearly dependent upon that of 1790b: “the reason why ‘all warriors arose’ is prompted by the contingent circumstance that their leader wanted to go to bed” (78). This clause should thus be separated from the one preceding it by a comma rather than a semicolon, which “lighter pause” could itself be translated by a subordinating conjunction: “The veteran warriors all arose *because* the old grey-haired Scylding wished to seek his bed” (my italics). The author thus recommends to editors a lighter form of punctuation in such circumstances to avoid an overly paratactic or static rendering of the text.

In “To Fall by Ambition—Grímur Thorkelín and his *Beowulf* Edition,” *Neophilologus* 92: 321–32, Magnús Fjalldal presents a discouraging assessment of the character and career of the first editor and translator of *Beowulf*, the Icelander Grímur Jónsson Thorkelín. Fjalldal examines Thorkelín’s 1815 text and translation of the poem into Latin, the published reviews of his work at the time, and other documents relating to his life. Thorkelín was born out of wedlock in Iceland in 1752 and promoted his identity as a Danish subject with such vehemence that Fjalldal feels that “seldom, if ever, has an Icelander appeared to have been more ashamed of his real nationality” (324). Thorkelín graduated from the Law School of the University of Copenhagen, edited and published numerous texts and translations, and rose in the world of scholarship in a way that was “nothing less than spectacular” (322). He aspired to the position of Keeper of the Royal Privy Archives, traveling abroad for five years on a grant to find previously “undiscovered documents relating to the history of Denmark” (322). It is still unclear whether Thorkelín knew of the existence of the *Beowulf* manuscript before his arrival in England, but Fjalldal argues against his having discovered or “rescued” the Cotton Vitellius text from oblivion, since it was already safely ensconced in the British Museum. Thorkelín’s main contribution is his two imperfect transcripts of the poem, Thorkelín A that he commissioned to an unknown amanuensis and Thorkelín B that he did himself. These transcripts preserve many readings from the margins of the deteriorating Cotton Vitellius text, perhaps 2000 letters, that are now lost. In addition, Thorkelín brought this neglected poem to the attention of much abler editors. Fjalldal concludes that “Thorkelín was essentially a fraud as a scholar, a fact not lost on many of his contemporaries, and much of his advancement had been through ingratiation rather than scholarly achievement” (321).

Tom Shippey also examines the motivations of Thorkelín and other early editors and interpreters of the poem in “The Case of *Beowulf*,” in *Editing the Nation’s Memory: Textual Scholarship and Nation-Building in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, ed. Dirk Van Hulle and Joep Leerssen (Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi), published as a special issue of *European Studies* 26: 223–39. Shippey observes that from its first appearance in published form, *Beowulf* was “a contested site for nationalist scholarship” (223), but in a way inspired more by the personal identity issues, ethnic predilections, and regional loyalties of individuals than by the territorial claims or ethnic chauvinism of larger polities or states. For instance, the Old English epic has never really managed to engage the “national imagination”

in England (238), despite several recent film versions and television programs. Like Fjalldal, Shippey finds it significant that the first editor of *Beowulf* was an expatriate Icelander ambitiously seeking preferment in Denmark. Thorkelín called his 1815 edition a *Poema Danicum Dialecto Anglosaxonica* “A Danish Poem in the Anglo-Saxon Dialect,” implying that Old English was variety of Old Norse, of which Thorkelín himself, “as an Icelander, could claim to be a native speaker” (225). The next editor was the pro-German Englishman John Kemble (1833), who followed Jacob Grimm in classifying the language of *Beowulf* as belonging to the northernmost branch of West Germanic—that is, German—rather the southernmost branch of North Germanic, or Norse. Something of this view would be accepted by most scholars today, but Kemble ended his life “clinically insane” (231), believing that the original deeds of a monster-slaying hero named Beowa, divine progenitor of the Anglo-Saxon or “Northalbingian” race, had been unfairly co-opted by the Nordic hero Beowulf in ancient times, leading to the poem’s subsequent misappropriation by Scandinavian scholars in his own day. In contrast, two of Kemble’s fellow-Englishmen, George Stephens teaching at the University of Copenhagen and Benjamin Thorpe, who had studied there, remained resolutely pro-Danish in their assessment of *Beowulf*’s origins. A German scholar, Karl Müllenhoff, teaching at Kiel and Berlin, came to dominate *Beowulf* studies in England “for the best part of forty years, approximately 1844–84” (233). Shippey was struck to discover that Müllenhoff “believed, or wanted to believe,” that the watery Grendelkin of the poem were intended to personify the dangerous North Sea storms and coastal floods of his native Dithmarschen in Holstein, making the language “it sprang from” a precursor of his own native tongue, “as it were Proto-Plattdeutsch” or “Alt-Nieder-Deutsch” [Old Low German] (234). Shippey’s own view of these questions has been strongly influenced by the runologist Hans Frede Nielsen, who has studied the earliest representations of Germanic language in the Jutland peninsula (2000). Nielsen observes, in Shippey’s summary, that the Old English of *Beowulf* “is the only Germanic language with two complete present tense paradigms for the verb ‘to be’” (236), the conjugation of OE *wesan* closely resembling that of ON *vesa* (later *vera*), while OE *bēon* shares parallel forms with Old Saxon: OE *beo(m)* = OS *bium* ‘(I) am’ and OE *bist* = OS *bist* ‘(you) are’ (sg). Shippey concludes from this fact “that while a majority of the fifth- and sixth-century emigrants to Britain were speakers of Anglian, or Saxon, from the south of what would become a linguistic boundary [between Old

Norse and Low German], a large minority were Jutes, from the north of the boundary” (236–37). These adjacent language communities “influenced each other, as English and Danish would do again in later periods” (237), thus helping to account, wherever the poem was first composed in Anglo-Saxon England, for the presence of both Anglian and Scandinavian features in its language and narrative.

J. R. Hall examines “*Beowulf* 1741a: *weþ* ... and the Supplementary Evidence,” *ANQ* 21.1: 3–9. This damaged reading occurs at the end of line 10, folio 168 *recto*, of the Cotton Vitellius text in the middle of Hrothgar’s sermon in lines 1700–84. The Thorkelín transcripts A and B from the late eighteenth century both record the full word as *waxed*, still visible at that time on the margin of the scorched manuscript, in which form it appears in the first edition of the poem published by Thorkelín in 1815. Conybeare corrected his copy of Thorkelín’s edition two years later by collating it with the MS in the British Museum, in this case crossing the ascender of the final letter *d* of *waxed* to create an *eth*, yielding *waxed* ‘grows’. Hall states that Conybeare “always acted on the authority of the manuscript” (6) when making this common correction, thus confirming the accuracy of the usual editorial reconstruction of the now partially missing word to produce an intelligible reading of lines 1740–41a: *oð þæt him on innan oferhygda dæl / waxed ond wridað* “until a measure of arrogant thoughts grows and flourishes within him.” Conybeare’s cross-stroke of *d* in Thorkelín’s edition is the only credible historical evidence we have that the MS once read *waxed* instead of *waxed*.

Alfred Bammesberger reanalyzes the speech in which “Hrothgar Bids Farewell (*Beowulf*, 1870 ff.),” *NM* 109.2: 199–203, noting that line 1875a simply reads *þæt he seoðða* in the manuscript at folio 179 *recto*, after which three or four letters are missing at the end of the line. This verse is normally emended, as in the new *Klaeber*, to *þæt h[i]e seoðða(n no)* “that they [would] never again,” but Bammesberger finds the emended line to be preferable without the addition of a negative adverb, yielding the more optimistic reading “that they [would] again.” He thus translates the whole sentence in lines 1873b–76a: “For [Hrothgar], an old and very wise man, there was the expectation of two things, of one more strongly, (namely) that they would have the opportunity to see brave men in council” (203). Bammesberger argues further that *beorn* in line 1880a, normally taken as a third person singular preterite of *byrnan* ‘to burn’ and emended to *born* in the new *Klaeber*, should instead be retained as a regular third person singular preterite *bearn/beorn* of *be-irnan* ‘to

run (into), occur'. This analysis yields for lines 1878–80a, not “deep in his heart-strings an inner yearning for the beloved man burned in his blood,” but rather “in his innermost heart a hidden longing for the beloved man firm in fetters of thought occurred against his blood.” This reading suggests a sudden pang of “separation anxiety” in the old king’s heart at his parting from the hero, despite his more confident expectation that they will live to see each other again *modige on meþle* “(as) brave men in council” (line 1876a) or, as Bammesberger suggests by removing Klaeber’s comma at the end of line 1875b, retained in the new edition, that both king and hero “will live to see further glorious meetings of warriors” (203).

Bammesberger also comments on “Grendel’s Ancestry,” *N&Q* 55.3: 257–60, arguing that since *geosceaft* ‘former creation, that which has been determined of old’ appears as an independent compound in line 1234a, the usual interpretation of the phrase in lines 1265b–66a, *fela geosceaftgasta* ‘many a spirit sent by fate’, should be reanalyzed as *fela geosceaft gasta* ‘the great former creation of spirits’. Bammesberger argues that the noun *geosceaft* ‘ancient creation’ is modified by an adjectival use of the undeclined pronoun *fela* ‘much, many’ = ‘large, great’, with a genitive plural object *gasta* ‘of spirits’. The phrase *fela geosceaft gasta* thus refers to the begetting of a whole race of monsters by Cain, “an immense procreation of demons,” which is lexically contrasted, through the formulaic variation of *-sceaft* compounds, with God’s earlier *frum-sceaft fira* ‘original creation of human beings’ of which Hrothgar’s *scop* sings in line 91a.

In “The Ambiguous or Polysemous Compounds in *Beowulf* Revisited: *æscholt* and *garholt*,” in *Historical Englishes in Varieties of Texts and Contexts*, *Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature* 22, ed. Masachiyo Amano, Michiko Ogura and Masayuki Ohkado (Bern: Peter Lang), 143–55, Hideki Watanabe follows up his earlier study of the same topic (2005) by examining two compounds containing the base noun *holt* ‘wood, forest’. The first of these is in line 330a, *æscholt ufan græg* “a forest of ash-shafts grey at the top,” parallel to *garas stodon, / sæmanna searo, somod ætgædere* “spears stood all together, war-gear of seamen” in lines 328b–29b, referring to the spears that the Geats stack under guard outside Heorot. The second compound, *garholt* in line 1834b, is more ambiguous. It has been understood as a *Doppelform* or tautological compound meaning the “spear-wood” or “spear-shaft” that Beowulf himself will carry to Hrothgar’s aid should hostile neighbors ever threaten to attack him (lines 1826–35). Watanabe follows Heyne (1879)

and Robinson and Brady (independently in 1979) in preferring a metaphorical interpretation of this compound as “spear-forest” or “host of spears.” Watanabe argues that the term should be taken in apposition to the *þusenda þegna ... / hæleþa to helpe* “thousands of thegns, heroes to help,” which Beowulf promises to bring Hrothgar in lines 1829–30a. Watanabe also notes that in lines 437a and 2518b the hero represents himself as normally “bearing” (< *beran*) a chieftain’s sword rather than a soldier’s spear as his characteristic weapon (when he is not using his bare hands). And finally, Watanabe believes that the *garholt* ‘forest of spears’ that Beowulf promises to bring to Denmark if necessary deliberately recalls the *æscholt* ‘forest of ash-shafts’ that his men brought to Hrothgar’s aid when they first arrived at Heorot, creating an envelope pattern through this formulaic variation: “at the arrival and departure of Beowulf’s party at Heorot, the image of a forest of spears appears, enclosing the narrative parts of Beowulf’s two great fights in Denmark” (150).

In the same volume, Yookang Kim examines “The Prenominal Prefix *ge-* in *Beowulf*” (49–61). The Old English prefix *ge-* is normally understood to be perfective in semantic force when applied to verbs, denoting action to be completed, as in *gewinnan* ‘to obtain by fighting, win’ from the more general *winnan* ‘to fight, contend’. When applied to nouns and pronouns, the *ge-* prefix has been taken to be either meaningless, as in *gewidre* ‘weather, storm’ and its synonymous simplex *weder*, or to add a collective or associative sense, as in *geþræc* ‘pile, heap (of items)’ from *þrec* ‘power, might’. Kim finds 38 nouns and 3 pronouns with the prefix *ge-* in *Beowulf*, most of which appear only once and a quarter of which have no simplex counterpart at all. A statistical analysis reveals that in only 19.5% of these cases is the *ge-* prefix without meaning, that is, synonymous with its simplex form. In the vast majority of cases (80.5%), the prefix denotes the result or cause of an action, often with a verbal counterpart, as in *geþinge* ‘agreement, result, outcome’ from *þing* ‘meeting, condition’, paralleled by the verb *geþingan* ‘to decide, appoint, intend’. Most of these *ge-* nouns are abstract and singular, and 17.1% also convey the collective or associative sense illustrated by *geþræc* ‘pile, heap’ noted above. Kim concludes that the semantic force of the *ge-* prefix on nouns and pronouns was “transparent” to speakers of Old English when a simplex form was also available in their lexicon, but that grammaticalization or “semantic bleaching” of the prenominal prefix *ge-* had already begun in Old English, a process that was essentially complete by the end of the Middle English period in the fifteenth century.

Kazutomo Karasawa offers “A Note on *egesan ne gymeð* in *Beowulf* Line 1757,” *MP* 106.1: 101–08, taking the noun *egesa* ‘horror, anxiety’ in a more particular sense, as the source of fear, which in this case are the terrible lies of the *bona* ‘slayer’ (line 1743b) or *werga gast* ‘accursed spirit’ (line 1747b), which mislead the successful man by provoking dissatisfaction and anxious thoughts about the future. This man, Hrothgar suggests, will someday be replaced by another who is much more generous with his wealth, who *egesan ne gymeð* “heeds no fear” (line 1757b), which Karasawa would prefer to render more specifically as “does not succumb to the dreadful deception.”

Scott Gwara offers an alternative reading of “*Beowulf* 3074–75: Beowulf Appraises His Reward,” *Neophilologus* 92: 333–38. He follows Tanke (2002) in taking *goldhwæte* in line 3074a as accusative singular of the feminine noun *goldhwatu* ‘gold-luck’, but used here in a positive sense, meaning “(good) luck with gold.” Gwara translates the parallel phrase *agendes est* in line 3075a not as “God’s favor,” as it is usually rendered, but as “an owner’s graciousness,” that is, “a rich lord’s generosity,” referring more generally to the gift-giving capacity of any possessor of great wealth. Gwara would then translate the main verb of this sentence, *gesceawod* in line 3075b, in its normal intensive sense to mean, “observed closely, looked eagerly upon,” on the model of *hæl sceawedon* “[they] studied the omens” in line 204b. Thus, as the dying Beowulf looks upon the treasure that Wiglaf has brought him from the dragon’s hoard, the poet observes that the old hero, who has so often been rewarded with rich heirlooms in the past, “never before gazed more intently upon his good luck with gold, an owner’s generosity.” In this reading, Beowulf carefully assesses the value of the treasure he has paid for with his life, prompting a similar assessment on the part of the poem’s audience, who must now contemplate the validity of the hero’s motivation in seeking out the dragon and whether the exchange of his life for its treasure has been worth the price. (The substance of this analysis is reproduced on pages 280–85 of the author’s monograph, *Heroic Identity in the World of Beowulf*, described below.)

J.D. Thayer includes an examination of the same lines in “Resolving the ‘Double Curse’ of the Pagan Hoard in *Beowulf*,” *The Explicator* 66.3: 174–77. Thayer sees two separate curses on this treasure: (1) in lines 3047–57, the last survivor of a lost race lays a curse on the treasure that he buries a thousand years before Beowulf’s time; and (2) in lines 3069–75, the Geats themselves place a curse on the treasure taken from the dragon’s hoard that they rebury with their dead king

in his barrow (lines 3163–68). Thayer understands the twelve *æpelinga bearn* ‘children of princes’, who ride their horses around Beowulf’s burial mound in lines 3169–70, perhaps as part of a “protective spell” (177), to be the same *þeodnas mære* ‘famous chieftains’ who are earlier said to place a curse on the hoard intended to last until Doomsday (lines 3069–70). Thayer suggests that the *agend* ‘owner’ in line 3075a is not the “Ruler” of the world—God—nor even a generic human giver of treasure, as Gwara argues, but rather the undead Beowulf himself, who is imagined as a hoard-protecting mound-dweller, similar to Kár the Old in the Icelandic *Grettissaga* (ca. 1300).

Following her own recent studies of archaic diction in the poem (2005 and 2007), Roberta Frank considers Latin-Old English glossaries and other texts found “Sharing Words with *Beowulf*” in *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture*, ed. Blanton and Scheck [see sect. 2], 3–15. Frank strongly resists the argument, made by Cronan (2004), that the appearance of certain specialized or rare terms both in *Beowulf* and in these glossaries (at least one dated to the turn of the ninth century) constitutes proof of the poem’s early composition. She suggests instead that the poet deliberately and artistically cultivated an old-fashioned poetic lexicon to give a patina of antique northern grandeur to his narrative, using these words to re-create the image of an ancestral world in *geardagum* ‘in the old days’ (line 1b). She marshals evidence for this view in a color-coded scheme: blue, gold and white. (1) In the first category, Frank takes an “abused glossary word” she feels has been beaten “black-and-blue” to yield evidence of *Beowulf*’s early composition (6). This is *suhtriga* ‘brother’s son, fraternal nephew’ with variant spellings, which appears as the first element of the *dvandva* or copulative compound *suhter(ge)faederan* ‘brother’s son and paternal uncle’ in line 1164a, referring collectively to Hrothulf and Hrothgar. Frank points out, by way of comparison, that another exotic word in the poem, *bune* ‘drinking cup, libation vessel’ (lines 2775b and 3047b), occurs in the same early glossary as *suhtriga*, but also in *Judith* and *The Wanderer*, poems which most scholars would confidently date to a much later period, perhaps the middle of the tenth century. Such words may have been old, Frank acknowledges, but for that very reason chosen by later poets for their air of antiquity (2). Alluding to John Donne’s “A Valediction: Forbidding Mourning” (1611), Frank offers the image of “gold foil . . . to airy thinness beat” for those refined poetic simplexes, which she feels have been similarly pressed too hard for their early dating implications (6). Among these she includes *fær* ‘ship, vessel’, used in

this sense only of Noah's ark in *Genesis A* and Scyld's funeral ship in line 33b of *Beowulf*; *umbor* 'infant, child' in lines 46b and 1187a of the poem; words with "a strong Old Norse flavor" like *missere* 'half-year, season'; *pengel* 'prince, lord'; *eodor* 'king, lord'; *ful* 'cup'; and *heoru* 'sword' (*passim*). Far from revealing linguistic age or even conservatism, Frank suggests the poet's use of these words in old-fashioned senses is "radical" in that he invokes their "roots" (11), as when Milton uses the word "error" in a non-pejorative Latin etymological sense to mean simply "wandering, strolling" in the pre-Lapsarian garden of *Paradise Lost* (1667). And finally (3), Frank offers the color "off-white for background noise, that is, white noise," for language that the poet and his audience took for granted, and that too often modern readers have as well. For an old poem, "*Beowulf* kept interesting company," Frank observes (6). She means that the poem shares certain phrasal constructions with Alfred's prose translation of the psalms in the late ninth century, versions of the mid-tenth-century Benedictine rule, the Salisbury Psalter (ca. 975), and both the Blickling homilies and those of Ælfric from the later tenth century. Frank suggests that the stylistic juxtaposition of contemporary homiletic language and that the invoking of the distant pagan past was an exciting, even chic effect that "must have given someone pleasure, even if we no longer catch our breath at the places where breath used to be caught" (15).

Sources and Analogues

Earl R. Anderson discusses "Beow the Boy-Wonder (*Beowulf* 12–25)," *ES* 89.6: 630–42, arguing that both father and son of Scyld—Scaef and Beow, respectively—are "English inventions" (631), since they are unknown in Scandinavian sources except for a genealogy in the Icelandic *Langfeðgatal* (twelfth-century), used by Snorri Sturluson in his *Edda* of ca. 1220, which is obviously derived from various extant Anglo-Saxon king-lists. Anderson suggests that the story of Scyld's arrival in Denmark as a child "most likely derived from an Anglian oral tradition about Scaef, rather than Scyld," since Æthelweard's late tenth-century *Chronicon* says that the father, not the son, "arrived as a child by boat in a sea-isle called Scani, was adopted by the people there, and later was elected king" (631). William of Malmesbury adds a detail in the twelfth century that the founding was called *Scaef* 'Sheaf' from "a handful of grain [that] was placed at his head when he was discovered asleep in his boat" (631). Scaef is thus a fertility figure, perhaps formerly a god, associated with the peace and

prosperity he brings to the land of his adoptive people. Anderson suggests that the *Beowulf* poet develops this motif more explicitly in the next generation, making the strong, protective Scyld 'Shield' beget a son named Beow 'Barley', a doublet of his grandfather, who thus personifies the fertility of the land which follows upon the peace brought by powerful "warrior-kings" like Scyld. Anderson agrees with Frank (see above) that the poet sometimes plays on older meanings of the words he chooses, as line 18b. There an earlier sense of *blæd* 'agricultural abundance, the fruits of harvest', derived from *blawan* 'to blossom, yield fruit', is invoked in punning resonance with the term's later, more generalized sense of personal "power, vigor, vitality, glory, renown," yielding for lines 18–19: *Beow wæs breme—blæd wide sprang— / Scyldes eafera Scedelandum* in "Beow [Barley] was famous—his renown/abundance sprang up far and wide—Scyld's offspring in Scandinavian lands." Among the Geats, Anderson sees Hygelac as a kind of battle-leader comparable to Scyld, one who similarly arrives out of the blue to rescue "the Geatish army from certain destruction" at Ravenswood in his very first act as king (639). This protective capacity, despite Hygelac's later fall in Frisia, explains Beowulf's "lifelong affection and admiration for his maternal uncle and sometime king" (640). According to Anderson, both Scyld and Hygelac make possible the long reigns of their wise and prosperous, but somewhat less distinguished, successors.

Scott Gwara discusses "The Foreign Beowulf and the 'Fight At Finnsburg,'" *Traditio* 63: 185–233, reprinted as Chapter Two in his *Heroic Identity in the World of Beowulf* (see below).

Carl I. Hammer asks if we might not find reflexes of the names "Hoc and Hnæf in Bavaria? Early-Medieval Prosopography and Heroic Poetry," *Medieval Prosopography* 26 (2005): 13–50. He notes the appearance of a father and son, *Huoching* (= Hoc) and *Nebi* (= Hnæf), in Thegan's ninth-century genealogy of Hildegard, Charlemagne's third wife and mother of Louis the Pious, as well as a concentration in Frankish sources for eighth-century Bavaria and Alemannia of names that occur in *Beowulf*, the *Finnsburh Fragment*, and *Widsith*. These include *Hrodolv* (= Hrothulf), *Sigimunt* (= Sigemund), *Fitale* (= Fitela), *Hamminc/Hemmin/Chammingo* (= Hemming), *Offo/Offa* (= Offa), *Kermunt* (= Garmund), and once *Eomer*, as well as the deutertheme *-drud/trut* 'dread, threat' in *Plectrud*, *Regentrud* and *Guntrut* (= Thryth). *Hoc/Huc/Chucus* was a very popular name in western Francia, equivalent to Hugo or Hugh, but also appears in Austrasian variants as *Hucco/Hucbert/Huoching*. Frankish *Dai-grammi/Dagaramnus* is equivalent to Dæghrefn, who

is noted in lines 2501b–02 of *Beowulf* as a champion of the *Hugas*, possibly an ethnic plural derived from *Hoc* or *Huc*. Hammer derives the name *Hnæf* from Old Norse *hnefi* ‘fist’, noting that it “has no cognate in Old High German (or in Old English)” as a common noun (27), but seems to appear as *Nebi/Nevo* in Bavarian records, where we also find *Hiltipirc* (= Hildeburh), *Folcholt* as a variant of Folcwalda, and a place-name *Finninga* (< Finn). Hammer asks how these names from northern heroic tradition might have found their way into the onomastic practices of ducal families in southern Germany and concludes that they must have been brought there by the Anglo-Saxon missionaries Wilfrid, Willibrord, and Boniface, all of whom in the late seventh and early eighth centuries had first spent time in Frisia, with Willibrord visiting *Forsitesland*, probably Helgoland, and southern Jutland as well, from which he returned with thirty Danish youths. Hammer suggests that these churchmen recounted in the form of short lays the legendary deeds of Frisian, Anglian, and early Danish kings, the names of whom were then adopted by southern ruling families in fashionable emulation of their antique glory in the absence of comparable heroic traditions of their own. These lays corresponded “to some later portion of the first ‘Fit’ from *Widsith* (ll. 27–49), Alcuin’s ‘pagan and forgotten kings listed by name,’ and to two artistically self-contained episodes from *Beowulf*: (very faintly) ‘Finnsburh’ (ll. 1063–1159); and (more audibly) the last portion of the lay of Queen Thryth, which describes her reform under Offa’s benevolent influence (ll. 1944–62)” (44). The prosopographical evidence for heroic legend in southern Germany in the earlier eighth century thus reflects direct contact with an “Anglian phase” of heroic tradition, the insular variants of which were later reworked with other material in *Beowulf*.

Joël Vandemaele writes on *Het Beowulf-epos: Angelsaksisch of Fries-Saksisch erfgoed van omstreeks 500 uit Frans-Vlaanderen* [The *Beowulf* Epic: An Anglo-Saxon or Frisian-Saxon Legacy from around 500 AD in French Flanders] (Gent: Mens & Cultuur, 2006), in Dutch. The author places the composition of the main narrative of *Beowulf* very close in time and place to its one verifiable historical event, the defeat of Chlochilac (= Hygelac) by Theodebert, son of Theuderic, king of the Franks from 511–33. Vandemaele takes the date of Hygelac’s death as 521, which allows him quite literally to calculate the year of *Beowulf*’s birth as 495 and of his journey to Denmark as 515, when the hero was 20 years old—“after a turbulent youth” (191). However, Vandemaele believes that Grendel was the only very large opponent that the hero ever had to face: the other

two monsters are fictional elaborations of a life-long struggle between *Beowulf* and his nemesis, which was not finally concluded until *Beowulf* himself was an old king. His place of burial is said to be on *Hronesnæss* ‘Whale’s Headland’ (lines 2805b and 3136b). Since whales are often grey in color, the author asks whether this promontory might not be an earlier name for Cap Griz-Nez ‘Cape Grey-Nose’ on the northwestern coast of France. Vandemaele connects many other place-names in Frisia and northwestern Francia with those of the peoples and persons mentioned in the poem, supplying a detailed map and index. He further offers a comparison with the Middle High German *Kudrun*, whose main narrative is also believed to have originated among early oral North Sea sagas.

In “Grendel’s *Glof*: *Beowulf* Line 2085 Reconsidered,” *PQ* 87.3/4: 209–35, Andrew M. Pfrenger rejects the widely accepted claim by Laborde (1923) that this piece of apparel, used as a food bag by the giant Skrymir in Snorri’s *Edda*, is a common feature of Nordic folk tradition. Pfrenger argues instead that the glove in this passage is “more likely a literary invention of the poet himself,” in fact, a metaphoric reference to Grendel’s “hanging belly, now swollen with the recently ingested Hondscioh, whose name also conveniently means ‘glove’” (210). This stomach is protected by “something like a coat of mail” or “strange looking skin” (224), resembling that of a dragon (line 2088b), a mythically hard substance, which renders the monster impervious to the blows of iron weapons (lines 794b–805a).

Janice Hawes explores “The Monstrosity of Heroism: Grettir Ásmundarson as an Outsider,” *Scandinavian Studies* 80.1: 19–50, noting similarities between this Icelandic saga hero and the Old English *Beowulf* first remarked by Vigfússon (1873 and 1878) and elaborated by Panzer (1910), Chambers (1921), Richard Harris (1973), Jorgensen (1973), Joan Turville-Petre (1977), Wachslar (1985), Liberman (1986), Stitt (1992), and Fee (2001). Fjalldal (1998) finds these parallels merely coincidental rather than derived from a common Germanic bear hero as proposed by Panzer and followed by many others. Hawes agrees with Fjalldal that “Grettir differs from *Beowulf* in a very important way: the saga hero is outlawed in his story while *Beowulf* becomes the leader of his people” (30). In addition, Grettir shows strong anti-social tendencies from early childhood and becomes increasingly rash and violent after his encounter with Glámr, in accord with that revenant’s curse upon him, while *Beowulf* is precociously mature and praised for the restraint with which he exercises his great strength. Hawes thus follows Chadwick (1959) and Arent (1969) in arguing for

an even greater similarity between Grettir and Grendel, both of whom are depicted with a certain sympathy as tragic outcasts from a human society that is itself depicted as by no means free of venality and violence.

C. Scott Littleton considers "Theseus as an Indo-European Sword Hero, with an Excursus on Some Parallels between the Athenian Monster-Slayer and Beowulf," *Heroic Age* 11 (online). In particular, Littleton suggests the two heroes form a subset of an Indo-European sword-hero complex, part of a larger category that includes the Arthurian legend of the sword in the stone and that of the Ossetian (= Alano-Sarmatian) hero Batraz. In the Theseus-Beowulf subset, both figures "come from afar, enter dangerous, underground realms, and slay ravenous monsters with magical swords," and in both cases, "the monster's mothers play significant, albeit disparate roles." Though Beowulf, like Arthur and Batraz, finds the supernatural sword with which he dispatches Grendel's mother in a "rocky context," neither he nor Theseus "feels constrained to insist that his weapon be consigned to a body of water before he dies."

Reprising his doctoral dissertation of this year at the University of Toronto, "A Comparative Study of the Hero in Medieval Ireland, Persia, and England" (*DAI* 69A, AAT NR40012), Connell Raymond Monette compares "Heroes and Hells in *Beowulf*, the *Shahnameh*, and the *Táin Bó Cúailnge*," *Jnl of Indo-European Studies* 36.1: 99–147, examining in detail the Anglo-Saxon, Persian, and Irish heroes' encounters with magical monsters, involving intimate physical grappling, tearing off of limbs, and finally beheading. In each narrative tradition, the young hero functions as a mediator between the human and an underworld or Otherworld, incorporating in the process some supernatural powers into his own identity. Monette concludes, "the purpose of the otherworldly combat motif is to establish the primacy of the hero within his tradition, placing him above lesser heroes who, however capable, lack the gifts necessary to enter the chthonic realm, wrestle its denizens, and return again to the land of the living" (147). The author postulates a common Indo-European origin for this narrative pattern, but also suggests the more specific influence of classical legend, in particular that of Hercules, on the later medieval stories, noting many parallels between descriptions of Hell in medieval literature and the lairs of monsters depicted in these works.

Hülya Taflı points out a number of similarities and differences in the expression of "Number, Colour and Animal Mysticism in *Beowulf* and *The Book of Dedem*

Korkut," *Turkish Studies* 3.1: 96–120. In both cases, the use of these images derives primarily from pagan, that is, pre-Christian or pre-Islamic traditions. Taflı does not attempt to explain the origin of the parallelisms he finds in the two works, the Old English poem being composed in Anglo-Saxon England sometime during the second half of the first millennium AD and the Turkish epic most likely first finding written form in the Azerbaijani Caucasus of the fifteenth century, but whose earliest extant manuscripts date from the sixteenth. The author highlights the significant repetition of the numbers three, nine, forty, and fifty in the two poems; the similar associations of the colors black, white, red, and yellow; and the "mystical" significance of the serpent, wolf, stag, raven, and boar in Germanic tradition (with the horse, swan, and whale more neutral or prosaic in connotation), compared with the symbolism of the deer, horse, camel, and pigeon in archaic Turkic belief systems.

Jan Cermák offers in Finnish "Runous ei hylkää menneisyyttä: *Kalevalan* ja *Beowulf*in rakenteista [Poetry Does Not Forget the Past: The Structure of the *Kalevala* and *Beowulf*]," in *Menneisyys on toista maata* [*The Past is a Different Country*], ed. Seppo Knuuttila and Ulla Piela (Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 2007), 221–33. In particular, Cermák offers a detailed typological comparison between the two works under several themes: (1) the sea as epic space, where both heroes—Väinämöinen and Beowulf—come into the power of the sea and prevail by superhuman swimming, thereby demonstrating superior courage, endurance, and devotion to their people in this dangerous element, even though the Old English hero actively seeks out challenges whereas his Finnish counterpart is simply caught up in them without trying; (2) events in the *Kalevala* are all narrated in the present tense and transpire in a mythological but concrete landscape and seascape, where everything is in the foreground and nothing is hidden; in *Beowulf*, on the other hand, much of the topography of the poem is obscure and its narration, even in the historical present of the poem's action, fragmentary and allusive, sometimes provoking partial memories of an even more distant past rather than offering a connected sequence of events through time; (3) characterization in the *Kalevala* is flat or horizontal, in the sense that all figures enjoy the same religious status (or no precise confessional identity at all), whereas characterization in *Beowulf* is layered and vertical, revealing the poet's consciousness of a difference in spiritual condition between his pagan characters, however noble, and his Christian audience; and (4) the most effective

human force in the *Kalevala* is intelligence and magic, where enemies are finally vanquished not by desperate force as in *Beowulf*, but by wise words and a knowledgeable awareness of the natural order of things. (Many thanks to James Cathey, Professor Emeritus of German and Scandinavian Studies, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, for help with this essay).

Brent Nelson explores the “Cain-Leviathan Typology in Gollum and Grendel,” *Extrapolation* 49.3: 466–85. Following categories developed by Frye (1965 and 1971), Nelson analyzes the characters Grendel in *Beowulf* and Gollum in Tolkien’s *Lord of the Rings* (2nd ed., 1965) less as types of tyrannical monstrosity, like the dragon in the poem or the sea-monster Leviathan in the Bible, and more as accursed human beings modeled on Cain. Cain was a human brother before he became a monstrous outcast and thus inspires some sympathetic horror at the psychopathology of a person torn between desire for acceptance, jealousy of others, and shame for his crime. More specifically, Smeagol’s, that is, Gollum’s, murder of his cousin Deagol for the ring of power recalls Cain’s killing of Abel. Nelson suggests that Tolkien saw in Cain and his offspring Grendel a type of the “divided self” or “monster within” that he used to create Gollum, motivating the pity that Gandalf and Frodo show to the wretched creature.

In chapter three (55–88) of her *Ou to eiyu no ken—asa o beorufu yamatotakeru: Kodai chusei bungaku ni miru isaoshi to kokorozashi* [*Swords of Kings and Heroes—Arthur, Beowulf, and Yamato Takeru: Great Deeds and Lofty Aspirations in the Literature of Ancient and Medieval Times*], Kanto Gakuin University Research Institute for Cultural Science Series 29 (Tokyo: Hokuseido), Yuko Tagaya compares Beowulf’s first and last monster-fights with that of Yamato Takeru no Mikoto against the god of Mount Ibuki-yama in *The Book of the Sword*. In this Japanese legend, which survives in many versions from the thirteenth century on, the hero destroys his monstrous opponent with his bare hands, just as Beowulf kills Grendel, but then loses his life as a result, as Beowulf does after he kills the dragon. Tagaya cites another analogue to the Old English poem in which an inland water-monster, Yamata no Orochi, to whom sacrifices were once made, is destroyed by the hero Susanoo no Mikoto, just as Grendel and his mother are destroyed by Beowulf. These monstrous figures can be interpreted as old gods demonized by a later age. In chapter six (167–227), Tagaya gives special credit to Hisamoto Shimazu (1929), building upon an earlier study by York F. Powell (1901), for observing and accurately charting the similarities between *Beowulf* and the legend

of Watanabe no Tsuna in the fifteenth-century Noh song *Rashomon*. These parallels include: (1) a water monster who was once a human being; (2) the taking of the monster’s arm by the hero as a token of victory; (3) the hero’s confrontation with two similar monsters, one of whom is female; (4) the hero’s fight with one monster in the human realm and the other in the monster’s own lair; (5) the trail of blood which leads to the monster’s den; and (6) the redemption of the hero’s honor after his earlier disparagement by others. Even though Shimazu did not completely discount the possibility of foreign influence upon the legend of Tsuna summarized here, Tagaya concludes that these parallels between *Beowulf* and Japanese folk tradition most likely occurred coincidentally. (Many thanks to Yuko Tagaya of Kanto Gakuin University for help with this précis of her work).

Criticism

In *The Narrative Pulse of Beowulf: Arrivals and Departures* (Toronto: U of Toronto P), John M. Hill describes the organization of the poem as a fluctuating series of movements in and out of scenes by human and monstrous characters, which is concomitant to the way the meter of the poem swings back and forth between alliterating half-lines. This systole and diastole, sometimes syncopated by lesser arrivals and departures, generates the “narrative pulse” of the poem. Each entrance and exit carries with it many possible outcomes, and it is the unpredictable nature of these shifting potentialities that produces much of the story’s restless drama. For instance, Beowulf’s arrival on the coast of Denmark is fraught with uncertainties. He could be, as he says, coming to help Hrothgar rid Heorot of “I know not what kind of evil ravager” (line 274b), or he could have his own designs upon the hall. He might be rebuffed at any point by one of his Danish interlocutors or otherwise thwarted as he approaches one barrier after another in pursuing his quest. Through this serial scrutiny, the hero’s character and motives are uncovered, his “ethical stance” toward the Danes clarified (25). At each examination, Beowulf reasserts his commitment to help Hrothgar while communicating that his ultimate loyalty lies with his own king Hygelac. The narrative pulse of this first part of the poem is upbeat, filled with positive expectation, as the hero surges forward like a wave, laps back calmly under questioning, then pushes on again toward his goal of coming to grips with Grendel. With each pause, Beowulf grows more impressive until he has finally convinced everyone that he alone has any chance of delivering Heorot.

Hill explores the hero's character further in the next chapter, not by means of Kaske's famous distinction between *sapientia et fortitudo* 'wisdom and strength' (1958), but through a parallel dichotomy between *gravitas* and *celeritas* adduced by Sahlins in his description of the two styles of traditional chieftainship in Fiji (1985). Hill contends that Hrothgar, far from being weak in character or enfeebled in strength, illustrates *gravitas*, a weighty authority and stable perseverance through time, even throughout the twelve long years of Grendel's relentless persecution. The king wisely observes the natural limitations placed upon him by his advanced age, but retains his powerful role as a "sitting" monarch to whom others bring gifts and offers of assistance, which he can then deploy to protect his people. The young hero, on the other hand, is characterized by *celeritas*, that is, brisk initiative and impatient dispatch of all obstacles standing in his way. Beowulf strikes out angrily against any threat that presents itself, even until his dying day, when he single-handedly confronts a fire-breathing dragon. Hill believes Beowulf is uninterested in Hrothgar's sedentary kind of kingship, politely side-stepping that king's offer of adoption as heir to the Danish throne, which Hill sees as Hrothgar's attempt to forestall the pending conflict between his nephew and his sons. The Geatish hero prefers a more direct and summary approach to difficulties. He simply refuses to involve himself in the internal politics of the Danish royal family, but promises to return if the king should ever need his help against *foreign* enemies.

Beowulf departs as abruptly for his own country as he first came to Denmark, arriving in Hygelac's hall at a "victory trot" (66), rather than with the paced dignity of a hero's triumph. Yet Beowulf's homecoming is just as fraught as that which accompanied his landing in Denmark, though now it is his uncle who anxiously interrogates him to see if his nephew's loyalties or ambitions have shifted during his sojourn abroad. The hero in these scenes is a master of reassuring self-representation, who obscures Hrothgar's attempt to recruit him as heir and quickly offers to Hygelac and Hygd those mighty heirlooms with which the Danish royals have rewarded him. Hill thus disagrees with Biggs (2005) that Beowulf intimidates his uncle into granting him joint rulership, finding instead that the king's anxiety is calmed by the hero's repeated pledges of affection and gratitude. Hygelac repays this loyalty with heirlooms of his own, as well as land, a hall, and a princely throne. These gifts transform the king's relationship with his sister's son into one of deep mutual confidence rather than coerced sharing of power.

Hill's final chapter is on the dragon-fight, where the hero's impulse, even as an old man, is to move out briskly against all threats, hoping for the same "special luck" (83) that saw him through such hazards as a young man. Here, the narrative pulse of the poem intensifies to a drumbeat of destruction, but then weakens and wavers as the old king expires and the retainers creep out to gaze upon their dead lord and, even more uncertainly, upon Wiglaf who is desperately attempting to revive him. Then the young man stands up, rebukes the Geats for their cowardice, snaps out orders, commandeers gold from the dragon's hoard, and issues a not uncritical assessment of their fallen king. Wiglaf is in charge now, Hill argues, as a new kind of king, one revealing both the staunch perseverance of Hrothgar and the bold alacrity of Beowulf, reconciling within himself the alternative ideals of *gravitas* and *celeritas* that have ebbed and flowed throughout the poem to create a complex chord of moral leadership at its end.

Hill takes a different approach to describing the artistry of the poem in "Episodes Such as the Offa of Angeln Passage and the Aesthetics of *Beowulf*," *Philological Review* 34.2: 29–49. He follows Leyerle (1967), Stevick (1975 and 1994), and Hull (2003), among others, to suggest that Old English poetry shares several aesthetic impulses with the visual arts of the Anglo-Saxon period seen in the illuminated carpet pages of the Lindisfarne Gospels. Two principles can be observed: (1) *horror vacui* or the urge to fill completely all available spaces within a predetermined numerical or geometric scheme; and (2) what Hill calls "transparent complexity" in the refinement of parallel or recursive patterns at both macro- and (especially) micro-levels of organization. This second principle finds poetic expression in the various digressions and asides that the *Beowulf* poet uses to reflect upon his main narrative. The more complex and precisely suggestive these allusions, Hill finds, "the better, so long as their meaning is clear" (33). He illustrates his point with the poet's recollection of a female figure from heroic tradition (lines 1931b–62), variously understood to be named Thryth, Modthryth or Fremu, the last possibility of which, accepted by Hill, is argued by Fulk (2004). Unfortunately, the legend of this character is as uncertain as her correct name, but the main thrust of the poet's reference is certainly contrastive; Hygelac's mature and generous young queen Hygd is nothing like the cruel and spoiled princess, that is, until she married Offa, the noble king of Angeln who inspired her reformation. But Hill believes the poet has even further points to make by comparing these two figures from heroic antiquity. They also reflect

subtly upon Hygelac and the hero himself, who has just arrived home from Denmark after willfully disregarding his uncle's reservations about his journey. Hill labors to unpack as many implications as possible of this complex foiling of five different characters—two from the past (Offa and Modthryth/Thryth/Fremu), three from the present of the poem's action (Hygelac, Beowulf, and Grendel). These reflections are both positive and negative in different ways, not all of which have been as clear to prior readers of the poem as Hill's critical ingenuity can make them. How many will have seen a parallelism between the impetuous Geatish *ætheling* and the imperious princess of old or, conversely, suspect that Offa's "taming of the shrew" is meant to resonate with Beowulf's own taming of the violence represented by Grendel and his mother? The possible meanings of this digression may indeed be complicated and finely wrought, but they are by no means "transparent," even upon considerable reflection. Nonetheless, Hill is surely correct in his larger thesis that contemplating these multiple suggestions in detail can be as pleasurable as tracing the minute intricacies of the manuscript illuminator's art. Hill concludes that rich complexity of strikingly recursive detail is an aesthetic ideal to which the Anglo-Saxon poet aspired, providing a culturally sensitive criterion for evaluating the artistic quality of his poem, whether it is considered "section by section" or "in its full, epic sweep" (47).

In "Measuring *Beowulf*: The Bookarts Analogy," *Philological Review* 34.2: 111–221, Thomas E. Hart undertakes a further exposition and defense of Stevick's comparison of the structure of the poem with the design of the Lindisfarne Gospels (1980, 1992, 1994, and 2004), with particular reference to Eadfrith's illuminated carpet page preceding Matthew (folio 27). Just as the painter fills the interstices of his larger geometrical program with recursive patterns—a cross within a rectangle—so too does the *Beowulf* poet include "chronologically unordered" (116) recollections and anticipations within his main narrative of three monster-fights, sharply and schematically split by a fifty-year gap between lines 1999 and 2000 into the hero's youth and old age, and framed as a whole by Scyld's elaborate funeral at the beginning of the poem and Beowulf's own at the end. Hart summarizes Stevick's arguments as follows: (1) the poet was inspired by the mathematical proportionality of Hiberno-Saxon visual art "when setting out the material properties" of his poetic text, primarily the number and length of fitts; (2) the poet "applies these principles with a degree of ambition and attention to detail comparable to that

observable in [the illuminator] Eadfrith's designs in line and color"; and (3) "the poet did not content himself with relatively obvious large-scale effects alone, but also arranged even particulars of his poem's verbal and topical organization in carefully measured patterns, notably by locating repeated words (collocations, formulaic phrasings) at intervals of verse lines that are no less mathematically regular (by equality or proportion) than the fitt boundaries and narrative junctures (or, for that matter, than the patterns of meter and alliteration in his verse lines)" (112–13). Detailed numerical analyses and figures are provided in lengthy appendices (165–221), which tabulate these measured intervals and calculate their mathematical rationale. Hart believes that "the *Beowulf* poet would not have labored so hard to create" these precise numerical sequences unless he thought they were significant. Not only did he develop his design for the poem by studying the geometric "bookarts" of the period, Hart argues, but the poet may have also encountered more theoretical discussions of mystical harmonies and numerological hermeneutics in authors like Augustine and Boethius.

In an "Absent *Beowulf*," *Heroic Age* 11 (online), Daniel M. Murtaugh recalls a review essay by Umberto Eco on *The Amazing Adventures of Superman* (1972), in which that author observes a disjunction between the superhero's effectiveness as a defender against imaginary villains in a timeless Metropolis and his complete absence from the crises of contemporary history, like the German invasion of Poland in 1939, an event in which his "super powers ... would certainly have been decisive." In like manner, as the strongest man on earth in his day, Beowulf can save Denmark from the monsters Grendel and his mother, but not his own uncle Hygelac from the Hetware, nor even the Danes themselves from Hrothgar's son-in-law Ingeld. Beowulf "could not save Hygelac on the banks of the lower Rhine because he wasn't there. Likewise, he could not save Heorot from Ingeld because he wasn't there." Beowulf is equally ineffective in supporting his cousin Heardred on the throne of Geatland and ultimately in defending his own people against their historical enemies, the Swedes. A superhero is only good against supernatural enemies. Beowulf thus emerges as an uncontaminated "principle" of protective courage, a legendary monster-slayer like Sigemund to whom he is explicitly compared, rather than a real player on the stage of history, a plausible historical personage like the other human characters in the poem. Beowulf resembles in this sense the monsters he confronts. He is "unsullied" in his symbolic "purity," the best king in the world (line 3180b) who never was.

In “Beowulf and the Emergent Occasion,” *Literary Imagination* 11.1: 83–98, Andrew Scheil analyzes the structure of the poem not as a series of narrative pulses like Hill, nor as set of mathematical proportionalities like Hart, nor as a radical disjunction between symbolic presence and historical absence like Murtaugh, but as a string of precisely calculated but totally unexpected eventualities. For Scheil, the *Beowulf* poet anticipates his successor John Donne who, in his *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions* (1624), similarly ponders those circumstances that are “unprevented for all our diligence, unsuspected for all our curiosity” (quoted 98). Scheil notes, in particular, those instances in the poem “when an awareness of imminent change rises to a self-conscious point; when the inevitability of transition gathers itself and the rhetoric of [the] narrative pauses to survey past, present, and future in a moment of temporal narrative simultaneity” (84). Such “a moment of pregnant pause” occurs the morning after Grendel’s mother’s attack as Hrothgar mourns the loss of his old friend Æschere (lines 1296–1309), remembering him as a young “shoulder-companion” when they defended each others’ heads in battle (lines 1326–27), while Beowulf, who has slept in another place, strides cheerfully in to ask if the king “had a pleasant night according to his desires” (lines 1319b–20). In this extraordinary scene, Scheil finds that both ignorance and knowledge, expectation and outcome, and the absent past and unknown future are all brought together in a single suspended moment of dire consequence. Scheil shows how the poet deepens his mutability theme by focusing on the different ways his characters perceive and process the mystery of what happens to them “in the entropy of time and change” (98).

In a second study, “The Historiographic Dimensions of *Beowulf*,” *JEGP* 107.3: 281–302, Scheil stresses the similarity between the *Beowulf* poet’s view of history and that of other late antique and early medieval narrators of history in verse and prose, including Paul the Deacon, Jordanes, Æthelweard, the *Brunanburh* poet, Polybius, and Orosius. He points out that the *Beowulf* poet uses the rare term *edwenden* ‘turnabout, reversal’ (lines 280a, 1774b, and 2188b), as well as *edhwyrft* ‘return, change’ (line 1281a), to describe the sudden reversals of expectation that befall his characters. It is somewhat surprising in this context that Scheil never once discusses *wyrd* ‘turn of events, what happens, destiny’, which is most plausibly explained as a nominalized past participle of the verb *weorðan* ‘to happen, turn out, come about’, since the poet so frequently invokes this term to describe “the entropy of time and

change” Scheil remarks upon in his other essay. In any case, the author sees the poem as a vernacular adaptation or “diminution” of the kind of national history found in Virgil’s *Aeneid* (298), just as Bede adapts to the *gens Anglorum* ‘nation of Angles’ Eusebius’s history of the universal church, King Alfred trims the world history of Orosius to his own West Saxon point of view, and Old English biblical poems and prose homilies anachronistically domesticate Israelite history within Anglo-Saxon cultural and poetic forms. Despite the monstrous or fabulous aspects of *Beowulf*, then, Scheil argues that the poet is really a historian interested in “how humanity reacts to change and deals with it, how history records and remembers such occasions” (286). He thus resists Sisam’s 1953 notion, followed by Orchard (1995), that *Beowulf* and the other Cotton Vitellius texts comprise a *liber de diversis monstris, anglice* “book of various monsters, in English.” Rather, he suggests, this compilation can more accurately be described as a *liber de diversis historiis, anglice* ‘book of various histories, in English’ (302), that is, a “historical miscellany” (299), of which there are several other examples in later Anglo-Saxon England. Even though our poem has been known as *Beowulf* since Kemble’s edition of 1833, Scheil suggests it might just as accurately have been titled, “Ancient Deeds of the North,” serving as an appropriate companion to the *Wonders of the East* and the *Letter of Alexander to Aristotle*, since it significantly expands in a northerly direction the geographic and temporal coverage of the Cotton Vitellius collection.

In the festschrift for Paul Szarmach noted above [see sect. 2], Helen Damico considers the historiographical dimensions of the poem as an “historical allegory” (210) in the various parallels she sees between “*Beowulf*’s Foreign Queen and the Politics of Eleventh-Century England” (209–40). In particular, Damico adduces multiple parallels between the poem’s *mæru cwen* ‘famous queen’ Wealhtheow (line 2016b) and that of the *regina famosa* ‘famous queen’ Emma of Normandy, so described in the *Encomium Emmae Reginae* ‘Eulogy for Queen Emma’ composed in 1041–42. Damico interprets the name *Wealhþeow* to mean “Norman captive,” selecting among various possible translations of its two themes: *wealh* ‘occupant of former Roman territory, Celt, Briton, Gaul, Norman, Italian, foreigner, slave’ + *þeow* ‘servant, slave, captive’, though one not necessarily of servile status by birth. Damico thus understands the poetic queen’s name as a cryptic allusion to Emma’s capture and marriage to King Cnut of Denmark in 1016, both women functioning as a *frīðusibb folca* ‘peace-maker between peoples’

(line 2017a). In addition, both queens went on to serve as “co-rulers of the realm, directing its dynastic succession,” revealed in speeches where the “verbal resonances” between the poem and the *Encomium* seem to Damico “less than accidental” (215). For instance, Wealhtheow’s speech thanking God for Beowulf’s arrival to deliver Heorot from Grendel (lines 620b–28a) can be compared to a passage in the *Encomium* about Emma’s joy and consolation at the homecoming of her son Harthacnut. The Danish queen in the poem recruits support for her sons through a generosity (lines 1216–31) that resonates with Emma’s own self-presentation as the bountiful “originator of a dynastic line” (240). Damico further notes that all the scenes in which Wealhtheow appears lie within the first two thirds of *Beowulf*, copied by the first scribe through line 1939 in an eleventh-century hand and recalling Kiernan’s (1981) dating of the composition of the poem and production of its manuscript to some time after 1016. If Damico is correct that the earlier part of *Beowulf* is responsive to the characterization of Emma in the *Encomium* of the early 1040s, she has offered the very latest possible date for the poem’s composition known to this reviewer. With regard to the characterization of the hero himself, Damico finds that in “Beowulf, the poet’s supreme fictive creation, are found all the exemplary attributes of the ideal Anglo-Danish prince, be it Cnut or Harthacnut” (239).

Scott Gwara finds a far more deeply ambiguous protagonist in *Heroic Identity in the World of Beowulf* (Leiden: Brill), one who more closely resembles Grettir in the Icelandic *Grettissaga* (ca. 1300), episodes of which contain some of the poem’s closest literary analogues (see summary of Hawes, above). In Chapter One, “The Wisdom Context of the Sigemund-Heremod and Hunferð Digressions,” and Chapter Two, “The Foreign Beowulf and the ‘Fight at Finnsburg’” (appearing with the same title as a separate article in *Traditio* 63: 185–234), Gwara argues that the poet has introduced figures from heroic legend—Sigemund, Heremod, Unferth, and Hengest—not as negative foils to the noble hero, but rather to highlight a comparable moral ambiguity in him. Chapter Three analyzes “The Rhetoric of *Oferhygd* in Hroðgar’s Sermon,” the poem’s most overt reflection on what Gwara calls the “*oferhygd* complex,” in which the Danish king shrewdly observes that leaders who succumb to this failing do not realize the diabolical source of their own overweening pride and may even convince themselves that they are acting in their followers’ best interests. This lack of self-knowledge comes to a head in “Beowulf’s Dragon Fight and the Appraisal of *Oferhygd*” (Chapter Four), where the

hero rejoices in having won the ancient treasure for his people, not realizing that his desire to possess it is really not so very different from the dragon’s own determination to protect it. Beowulf has succumbed, in Gwara’s opinion, to what Hrothgar long before warned him about, that is, to *oferhygda dæl* ‘a share of overly presumptuous thoughts’ (line 1740b), which have similarly brought other heroes like Heremod to both personal destruction and ruin for the very people they were supposedly trying to serve. In Chapter Five, Gwara compares the characters “King Beowulf and Ealdormonn Byrhtnoð,” the protagonist of the *Battle of Maldon*, to argue the same point. What the *Beowulf* poet calls *oferhygd* ‘presumption, arrogance’, the *Maldon* poet terms *overmod* ‘over-confidence, excessive zeal’ (line 89b). Gwara points out that this failing is not necessarily the Christian mortal sin of *superbia*, culpable ‘pride’ *per se*, but it proves equally deadly for over-ambitious heroes. However, their blind investment in their own heroic identity, Gwara contends, is more misguided and tragic than incorrigibly wicked. Wiglaf clearly admires Beowulf, while explicitly deploring his beloved lord’s refusal to listen to advice and just leave the dragon alone in its lair until the end of time (lines 3076–83). The Geats, too, appreciate their lord’s superlative kindness and generosity, but also acknowledge, in the closing adjective with which they describe him—*lofgeornost* ‘most eager for renown’—that his strongest desire was to win fame for himself as a hero (line 3182b).

J.A. Burrow examines the same question in his chapter “Old English, especially *Beowulf*,” in *The Poetry of Praise*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 69 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), 29–60. Burrow pays “particular attention” to our poem for two reasons: (1) it “is so rich in the language of praise” or *auxesis*, the rhetorical amplification of a subject’s importance through repetition and variation, and (2) “its representation of the hero has provoked disagreement among modern critics, some of whom detect ironies and reservations where others see just praise” (31). Burrow reminds us of Aristotle’s *dicta* that “every poem and all poetic utterance is either blame or praise” (quoted 43) intended “to urge men on to certain actions ... and to dissuade them from others” (quoted 49). This didactic function is sometimes explicitly signaled by the *Beowulf* poet in his use of the formulaic exhortations *Swa sceal* ‘So must ...’ (lines 20a, 1534b, and 2166b) and *Swylc sceolde* ‘So should ...’ (line 2708b), and in many other instances of explicit praise or blame in his own voice or that of characters in his poem. Burrow acknowledges that the poet allows some criticism of

his hero's determination to confront the dragon to be voiced by his loyal kinsman Wiglaf in lines 3077–86, but follows Garmonsway (1965) and Shippey (1978) in seeing this lament more as an expression of dismay at the outcome by a speaker who himself is “so far from unheroic” (60) that his words ultimately redound to the further praise of the hero for remaining true to what Wiglaf calls in the same speech Beowulf's *heah-gesceap* ‘exalted destiny’ (line 3084a).

Andrew James Johnston offers a “deconstructive” analysis of the poem's tensions in his chapter “*Beowulf* and the Mask of Archaism,” in *Performing the Middle Ages from “Beowulf” to “Othello”* (Leiden: Brepols), 23–90. Johnston's larger thesis is that a modern nostalgia for the Middle Ages is inspired in part by a nostalgia for even earlier times expressed in medieval texts themselves, especially for the glamour and moral simplicity of a bygone heroic age. Yet, the most powerful of these texts, including *Beowulf*, “interrogate” their own nostalgia “in a highly self-conscious manner” (13). Far from simply idealizing the heroic past, the *Beowulf* poet dramatizes one of its chronic drawbacks, rivalry between eligible pretenders to royal authority, often revealed by mothers who manipulate a system of reciprocal gift exchange in favor of their own offspring. For instance, following Davis (1996), Johnston notes that while the poet seems to celebrate the generosity and effectiveness of the Danish queen Wealhtheow, he also shows her aggravating, possibly even provoking murderous tensions within the royal family by trying to exclude both her husband's nephew, the senior *ætheling* Hrothulf, and the newly “adopted” Beowulf from the succession. In particular, she tries to buy Beowulf's support for her sons with a gift of the fabulous neck-ring of the Brosings, which effectively trumps the Scylding heirlooms just given to him by Hrothgar. However, heavy hints from the poet insinuate that Wealhtheow failed in her efforts. The young Geatish queen Hygd, on the other hand, uses a more cunning and successful approach, Johnston believes, when she explicitly offers the throne to her husband's nephew Beowulf against the claim of her own son Heardred. It is unclear whether the queen is even authorized to make this magnificent offer, Johnston notes, but he takes her apparent generosity to be a brilliant ploy in the poem's culture of gift-exchange: “As Hygd's renunciation of her son's claim to the throne constitutes the greatest gift possible, such an act of generosity can be equaled only with a similar renunciation ... In order to maintain his standing, Beowulf has to refuse the Crown, precisely because it was *offered* to him” (author's emphasis, 78). Following

Biggs (2005), Johnston believes the hero himself had earlier practiced a similar ploy on his uncle Hygelac by giving him the royal treasures of the Scylding dynasty in order to force the counter-gift of Beowulf's installment as senior *ætheling* or junior co-ruler. Yet Johnston imagines a sudden pang of anxiety on the part of the poet that he has, in showing Hygd beat Beowulf at his own game, made a “marginal” woman far too clever in manipulating his male hero: “If Wealhtheow is the only woman whose voice we actually hear, then Hygd is the only female operator we see achieving her goals. In contrast to Freawaru or Hildeburh, she does not conform to the stereotype of the failed peace weaver, nor does she, like Modthryth, to whom she is compared directly, represent a woman whose independence is eventually curtailed and who is, ultimately, subjected to male domination” (83). Just as Offa once tamed Modthryth in the old days, the poet must now tame Hygd, which he does by constructing a factitiously disinterested reason for her to have acted as she did; that is, a red herring: “she did not trust her son, that he would be able to hold the ancestral seats against foreign peoples” (lines 2370b–72a). Johnston does not consider that Hygd might have been sincere in her reservations about her son's youth and inexperience, fears justified in the event by his rapid failure as king. Instead, he insists that the poet manipulated his own authority as omniscient narrator to mislead the reader in an explicit subterfuge designed to obfuscate what he has just pointedly revealed by implication. Why Johnston should then declare *Beowulf* “a daring analysis” of heroic culture is unclear, since in this reading, the poet nervously tries to cover up his own revelation of that culture's “secret means of manipulating its own unwritten laws” (88). In any case, Johnston believes the *Beowulf* poet pays a price for his prevarication in two ways. (1) He loses the depth and incisiveness of his story, in the end sending his aging hero out to fight a fire-breathing dragon the old-fashioned way, head to head: no stealth, no strategy, no womanish tricks, only mutually assured destruction. (2) Women in the poem are now back to where they were before, or worse. While Beowulf at least gets to die like a man, he leaves behind not a politically savvy and competent Hygd, nor even a dynamic if unsuccessful Wealhtheow, but a reassuringly anonymous and dependent Geatish woman, weeping disconsolately by her hero's pyre, missing her strong masculine protector, and soon be effaced from the world of the poem entirely like the other tragic females of heroic convention.

Linda Marshall similarly considers the gendered subtext of the poem in “Grendelsmere as a *Vagina*

Dentata: Grendel's Mother and the Fear of Woman's Power," in *The Image of the Outsider in Literature, Media, and Society II* (Pueblo, CO: Society for the Interdisciplinary Study of Social Imagery and Colorado State University-Pueblo), 90–92. Marshall believes Grendel's mother embodies a deep-seated fear of women in the masculinist society of Anglo-Saxon England, in particular, fear that if women step outside their traditionally subordinate and peace-making roles, the privileges of male dominance and the traditional bonds of society that depend upon it "will disintegrate" (90). Following Kiessling (1968), Marshall takes Grendel's mother as a kind of *succubus* or demonic seductress, who takes sexual possession of men to destroy them. Her violent penetration of Heorot becomes, in effect, "a rape" of the men within (91). After this feminizing humiliation, Beowulf must find a way to reassert his manhood with a reciprocal rape of his own. He penetrates the female monster's watery, womb-like mere, which bristles with dangers reminiscent of the ancient image of the *vagina dentata* 'toothed vagina', which symbolizes male fears of emasculation during intercourse (Raitt 1980). The creatures of this uterine realm tear at Beowulf's prophylactic mailshirt with their *hildetuxum* 'battle-tusks' (line 1511a), just as the earth mother herself mounts him in a close embrace, trying to penetrate him with her own phallic *seax* or long knife (line 1545b). Standing up for all Anglo-Saxon males, the hero throws off this threat of female domination and decapitates the smothering mother. He thereby defangs male fears of envagination, that is, sexual engulfment by women who dare assert their female sovereignty over men.

In "We've Created a Monster: The Strange Case of Grendel's Mother," *ES* 89.5: 503–23, Wendy Hennequin goes even further to suggest that the monstrosity of Grendel's mother is not a feature of the Old English poem at all, but a fiction of modern scholarship. She invokes the contemporary gender theorists Fausto-Sterling (1992), Butler (1999), and Wilchins (2004) to argue that gender identity consists in the performance of certain learned cultural behaviors. Women who behave outside these norms, like Grendel's mother, are thus perceived to be monsters. However, since only women can perform the biological act of bearing children, the poet himself stresses the essentially feminine identity of his character by calling her "simply Grendel's mother" seven times. For his six remaining references to this character in the poem Hennequin shows in a chart on page 520 how various translators—Kennedy (1940), Heiatt (1967), Donaldson (1975), Swanton (1978), Greenfield (1982), Crossley-Holland (1999),

Heaney (2000), Liuzza (2000), and Morgan (2002)—have each chosen to stress the monstrous or demonic nature of this female character in a way not justified by a literal rendering of the sometimes masculine pronouns and epithets used of her in the text. Hennequin concludes that critics and translators of *Beowulf* have "treated Grendel's mother as a monster—indeed, *re-created* her as a monster—because she is not clearly a queen or a peaceweaver or a matriarch or a saint, the types of Anglo-Saxon women for which Old English literature provides examples" (author's emphasis, 519). *Æschere* is not dragged off into the night and beheaded by a monster, we should realize, but by a woman, a human mother, who is acting out her feminine character in a way different from what scholars and translators (or, indeed, *Æschere* himself) might have expected. Hennequin does not compare Grendel's mother's performance of her gender identity with that of Judith in the following poem of Cotton Vitellius A.xv, a woman who also steps outside the boundaries of conventional expectation to behead a man in revenge for harm to her kin, though the Hebrew heroine does so without compromising her human, not to say her feminine and heroic, identity in the minds of readers of the poem. The types of positive female character to be found in Old English poetry may not be quite as limited as Hennequin has insisted.

On this very point, however, in "Manuscript Matrix, Modern Canon," in *Middle English*, ed. Paul Strohm (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007), 7–22, Carol Symes argues that modern prejudices—masculinist, nationalist, and/or imperialist—rather than the vagaries of manuscript preservation or inherent literary quality, have been the deciding factors in establishing the canon of medieval classics of which *Beowulf* is the preeminent example in Old English poetry. In comparing the "canonicity" of *Beowulf* to that of *Judith*, for instance, Symes asks us to consider how the "intellectual bigotry of many generations" has privileged the one text over the other: "Why, and with what justification, do we still adhere to these standards?" Conflating the poems with their main characters, she answers: "*Beowulf*—manly, self-sufficient, bold, warlike, folksy, and complete—was a hero worth the having by any emerging nation-state defined by a Germanic language; *Judith*—feminine, derivative, duplicitious, elfin, Judaeo-Christian, and fragmentary—was a dangerous hybrid" (12). In reaching this conclusion, Symes seems to be unaware of two things: (1) the high regard in which *Judith* has long been held by most scholars of Old English poetry, who have been signally blind to its dangers and read it as complementary to, rather than in competition with,

its companion poem in Cotton Vitellius A.xv; and (2) the very minimal role our Geatish hero has ever played in the emerging national consciousnesses of any of the Germanic-speaking nations of Europe ever since the poem first came to public attention in Humphrey Wanley's survey of ancient texts in English libraries appended to George Hickes's *Thesaurus* in 1705. It was over a century before the poem found a competent editor in John Kemble (1833) and another before it was included in the specialist curricula at universities, more for its linguistic information than its literary qualities or political import. In fact, the international renown of *Beowulf* as a widely familiar classic of world literature is a "postmodern" phenomenon, emerging only in the first decade of the twenty-first century after its prize-winning translation by Seamus Heaney in 1999.

James Phillips, "In the Company of Predators: *Beowulf* and the Monstrous Descendants of Cain" *Angelaki* 13.3: 41–51, suggests that Grendel is not an unfortunate outsider, who is merely misunderstood and demonized by the Danes. His monstrosity is a deliberately chosen and "performed identity" (41). Anxious to assert his difference from the Danes whom he categorically rejects, the monster compulsively re-enacts the primal fratricide with which his ancestor Cain had similarly set himself apart from the rest of humankind. Grendel and his mother feel themselves to be superior to the Danes, refuse to recognize their consanguinity with them, and thus come to symbolize a kind of primal chauvinism or "humanity at war with itself" (41). The reptilian dragon seems even less human than the Grendelkin, Phillips notes, but possesses, as in the legend of Prometheus, one quality which humans use to distinguish themselves from animals: the ability to use fire. The dragon's "fiercest weapon" against the people of the poem is thus ironically its most human faculty. With this destructive tool, it seeks genocidal revenge against creatures it construes as utterly alien to itself. *Beowulf*'s confrontation with this monster, like the crew of the *Pequod*'s with the white whale in Melville's *Moby-Dick* (1851), comes to symbolize a political contest for control of the world between an inclusive human community and an exclusive monstrous tyranny: "[w]here Grendel, as a descendent of Cain, can contest with the Danes for the dominion that God has bestowed on Adam, the white whale *Moby-Dick*, in the sickness of an age that makes of whiteness a title to supremacy [in slave-owning America], can declare himself a rival for the highest power: with both Grendel and *Moby-Dick*, arguments for [mankind's] dominion over nature

come back to bite human beings, with monstrous literalness" (50). Phillips argues that both novel and poem dramatize an intractable problem for human societies, whether the democratic republic of Melville's nineteenth-century America or the embattled kingdoms of the Anglo-Saxon poet, that is, how to maintain an open and pluralistic society, while at the same time defending against those who categorically reject that ideal, and seek either to dominate that society themselves or to destroy it completely. Both authors portray a people besieged by relentless predators with whom they cannot make peace, but must somehow come to terms. The complete extermination of these enemies would merely re-inscribe the principle of monstrous exclusiveness they themselves represent, yet "blanket accommodation" to their lust for dominance would leave the community vulnerable to those who do not share its values (50). There are no easy solutions to this dilemma, Phillips regrets to say, but there is one thing he is sure of: defining "humanity" by its mastery of fire-power, symbolized by the dragon, reveals the "the monstrousness" of all exclusionary definitions of "us" and "them" (50).

Eileen A. Joy is more hopeful in her contemplation of the determined enemies of society in "Exteriority is Not a Negation but a Marvel: Hospitality, Terrorism, Levinas, *Beowulf*," in *Cultural Studies of the Modern Middle Ages*, ed. Eileen A. Joy, Myra J. Seaman, Kimberly K. Bell, and Mary K. Ramsey (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 237–68. In particular, Joy recruits the philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas (1969 and 1987), assisted by Jacques Derrida (1999 and 2000), to argue that the idea of "hospitality," in the sense of radical openness to the Other, can help us to understand the identity and significance of "enemy combatants" like the female Chechen suicide bombers in contemporary Russia or the character Grendel in *Beowulf*. In both cases, Joy argues, the societies against which these putative "terrorists" commit acts of violence have collectively perpetrated even more dire kinds of "aggression and murder for which they have devised legalistic and other justifications" (241). Counter-attacks by partisans willing to sacrifice their very lives are so threatening to these societies because the self-immolating Others radically upset their confidence in their own justice and morality: "While both the Chechen women and Grendel are viewed in their respective cultures as figures of exorbitant exteriority, nevertheless, they are mainly terrifying for the ways in which they bring to vivid life (and death) the obscene violence at the interior heart of states that mark the places of supposedly more ethical communities" (241).

Quoting Levinas, Joy suggests these desperate outsiders enact a “deadly jump” over the abyss that separates the present from death,” so that they “thereby enter the horizon of the ‘not-yet,’ which is ‘more vast than history itself’ and ‘in which history is judged’” (241). This impending but impartial judgment of a potential future on the historical present is caught in the silent gaze of both Grendel’s severed head in Heorot and that of Æschere on the bank of Grendel’s mere, and likewise glimpsed in the 2003 photo of the dead Zulikan Elikhadzhiyeva, the twenty-year-old Chechen rebel who detonated her explosive at a Russian rock concert, killing herself but no others (that achievement was left to her companion who took fourteen concertgoers with her). Joy believes the sightless eyes of these dead Others are “watching and warning” us against all exclusionary and totalizing forms of state sovereignty. They should be seen not as demoralizing symbols of a self-destructive divisiveness at the heart of human society, but as wondrous totems of a yet-to-be-achieved pluralism “without which peace can never be accomplished” (258).

In “*Beowulf et le barbare*” [*Beowulf and the Barbarian*], *Études Irlandaises* 33.1: 25–41, Jessica Stephens reprises some of Seamus Heaney’s thoughts on the poem expressed in the introduction to his 1999 translation. She believes the poem was put into written form in the eighth century and sees it as the product of a society hovering between stateless barbarity and incipient civilization. The young hero confronts in Denmark two monsters who are demonic counterparts of his own barbaric self. With their lack of restraint, inability to communicate, and propensity to violence, these monsters represent a barbarism that still haunts a poem that celebrates order, cohesion, and civilized discourse, an ideal yet to be achieved in Anglo-Saxon England at the time of its composition.

In a similar vein, Fabienne L. Michelet considers “The Centres of *Beowulf*: A Complex Spatial Order,” in her *Creation, Migration, and Conquest: Imaginary Geography and Sense of Space in Old English Literature* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006), 74–114. Michelet notes that the concentration of political power in Heorot creates a landscape polarized into center and periphery, effectively conjuring the extramural forces of Grendel and his mother who are hostile to royal authority. They thus invade the great hall at the center of the realm and challenge its claim to supremacy. Kings’ halls and monsters’ lairs are shown to be mirror images of each other, categorically opposed centers of accumulated wealth and power. However, these spaces are supplanted by a different kind of place, the hero’s tumulus

on the headland, which marks the limit of the old king’s rule both in space and time, recalling not only Scyld’s funeral ship, but also the dragon’s barrow as a marginal edifice, the structure where a dead or sleeping king rules over the wealth of nations. Such liminal spaces—ship, lair and tomb—mark not an impermeable frontier between opposite kinds of place—living and dead, human and inhuman, civilized and monstrous, “us” and “them”—but rather the point of their inevitable conjunction. The *Beowulf* poet thus invokes the spatial categories through which Anglo-Saxons conventionally viewed their world only then to blur and complicate comfortable distinctions between them.

James Cahill challenges an influential interpretation of the poem in “Reconsidering Robinson’s *Beowulf*,” *ES* 89.3: 251–62. Fred Robinson had proposed in *Beowulf and the Appositive Style* (1985) that the poet’s varied collocations of pagan and Christian terms are not designed to suggest their approximate or notional equivalency, but rather the opposite, that they indicate by their obvious incompatibility a great gulf fixed between the Christian believers of the poet’s audience and the unbaptized pagans of his poem. Robinson believes we must assume that the poet held to a theologically consistent Roman Catholic orthodoxy, so that the use of Christian language in contexts where it is anachronistic must be understood not as co-optive, but as ironic, as signaling by its patent incompatibility the categorical difference between pagan and Christian religious worlds. In this way, the poet inspires a poignant regret for the good people in his poem ignorant of Christ’s vicarious atonement and thus separated forever from the possibility of eternal salvation, according to strict Roman Catholic doctrine. The poet reveals this distance explicitly when he laments the plight of the Danes who were forced to seek help from the *gastbona* ‘soul-slayer’ (line 177a), the very source of their distress, reflecting an Augustinian view that the pagan gods are really just devils in disguise. The poet then expresses relief that in his own time it is “well for him who may seek the Lord after his death-day and hope for protection in the Father’s embrace” (lines 186b–88). Cahill believes that Robinson has projected the elegiac perspective of this one particular passage upon all other passages in the poem, even where familiar formulaic language is being used in a conventional rather than an ironic sense. For example, Robinson reads *Beowulf*’s expression of gratitude for the treasure he has won from the dragon as both misguided and necessarily offered to a pagan deity. The hero gives thanks in two parallel phrases, *frean ealles* ‘to the lord of all’ (line 2794b) and *ecum dryhtne* ‘to the eternal

lord' (line 2796a), phrases which invoke the omnipotence and eternity of God, respectively. Since the audience of the poem would have immediately recognized the inappropriateness of applying these epithets to a mortal Germanic deity to whom a pre-Christian hero must necessarily be praying, Robinson believes they must have tweaked in their minds the usual sense of *eal(l)* 'all' and *ece* 'eternal' to mean something rather less extensive in space and time. Yet *ece*, for instance, is never used elsewhere of a pagan divinity in Old English verse, Cahill notes, but does clearly appear as an epithet of the Christian God ninety-three times in the poetic corpus. The poet, he believes, is simply ignoring or finessing the fact that his hero is a pagan in this scene in order to imbue him with a piety that the Christian audience of the poem would have felt appropriate and identified with. Cahill thus concludes that Robinson's argument about the deliberately distancing effect of the appositive style is a learned over-reading in many instances. Rather than taking words to mean "what they appear to mean" according to established usage (261), Robinson has assumed a rigidly consistent perspective on the part of the poet and then by circular argumentation adduced the rhetorical technique of ironic apposition to demonstrate it.

Graham D. Caie considers "*Ealdgesegenas worn* [A Great Multitude of Traditional Tales]: What the Old English *Beowulf* Tells Us About Oral Forms," in *Oral Art Forms and their Passage Into Writing*, ed. Else Mundal and Jonas Wellendorf (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum), 109–20. Caie uses Bede's story of Cædmon to illustrate how Old English poetry derives from traditional techniques of oral composition, that is, the repetition and variation of a formulaic vocabulary later imitated by literary poets to give their works "the *gravitas* or authority that comes with age" (116). The *Beowulf* poet, too, imitates an oral-traditional style, according to Caie, and stages several oral performances in his poem: (1) the *scop*'s song in Heorot celebrating the creation of the world (lines 89b–98); (2) the celebration of Beowulf's victory over Grendel (lines 867b–915), in which he specifically mentions the "great number of old stories" that the singer remembers in his extemporaneous composition of a new song (lines 869b–70a); and finally (3) the Finnsburh lay performed later that evening in the hall (lines 1063–1160a). Caie notes that the interjection *Hwæt*, which opens the poem, is often thought to be a feature of oral performance, "a call to gain silence" (117). Yet, it also begins a number of hagiographical or biblical poems that were clearly composed in written form: *Juliana*, *The Fates of the Apostles*, *Judgment Day II*, and especially *Andreas*,

whose opening lines are so similar to those of *Beowulf* that they bear quoting: *Hwæt! We gefrunan on fyrndagum / twelfe under tunglum tireadige hæleð, / þeodnes þegnas* "Listen! We have heard tell in olden days of twelve famous heroes beneath the stars, thanes of the Lord" (*Andreas*, lines 1–3b), and *Hwæt! We Gardena in geardagum / þeodcyninga þrym gefrunon, / hu þa æþelingas ellen fremedon* "Listen! We have heard tell in olden days of the majesty of the Spear-Danes, of the kings of that people, how the princes performed courageous deeds" (*Beowulf*, lines 1–3). Furthermore, the two longest Old English poems purporting to recount oral tradition, *Beowulf* and *Widsith*, survive in late Anglo-Saxon manuscripts as written "artefacts ... compiled not long before the Norman Conquest. They are books to be read or at least recited from and the *Beowulf* manuscript contains scholarly works such as the prose *Letter of Alexander to Aristotle* and the prose *Marvels of the East*, as well as the Old English poem *Judith*. Many Old English works translated from Latin, such as *The Phoenix* and *Metres of Boethius*, contain identical formulas and stylistic features as those found in poems which are often considered orally composed" (118–19). *The Battle of Brunanburh* survives in four manuscripts of *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, celebrating a victory of AD 937. It contains "a patchwork of kennings and formulas, variation and repetition, intended to invoke the oral poetry of the heroic age" (111), while at the same time supporting its claims for the importance of the battle by adducing what *us secgað bec, / ealde uðwitan* 'books tell us, old authorities' (lines 68b–69a). Caie suspects that if we had not been able to date *The Battle of Brunanburh* so "precisely, we would undoubtedly be claiming a much earlier date" for its composition because of its oral-traditional style (111). The oral art forms of *Beowulf* are thus no evidence for early composition, nor do they imply that the poem was created in an oral-traditional context. Caie concludes: "It is impossible, and I believe unproductive, to attempt to distinguish between rhetorical devices which suggest oral creation and those which either help make the poem appear archaic or are intended to aid oral *delivery* rather than oral composition" (author's emphasis, 117).

Miquel Aguilar Montero explores more generally the "Fundamentos Teóricos de la Épica Universal en la Literatura Germánica Altomedieval ["Theoretical Fundamentals of the Universal Epic in Early Medieval Germanic Literature"]: El Poema de *Beowulf*," *Espéculo: Revista de Estudios Literarios* 40: 89–108, arguing that a comparison of heroic poems and prose narratives from around the world reveals a cluster of

common motifs, which suggests that epic has been recognized as a unified and distinct literary genre in virtually all of the periods and cultures that have produced it. Through an analytic reading of *Beowulf* and a comparison of its conventions with those of other epics, Aguilar Montero sees the poem as representative of medieval Germanic epic in particular, wending a middle path between northern paganism and Roman Christianity in its depiction of the death of Beowulf and the demise of the Geats, but at the same time sharing features with other works of world literature, including the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, the Hebrew Bible, the Indian *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana*, Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Virgil's *Aeneid*, the French *Song of Roland*, the Russian *Prince Igor*, the Spanish *El Cid*, Malory's *Le Morte Darthur*, the Japanese *Kojiki*, Melville's *Moby-Dick*, and twentieth-century fantasy novels. The conventions of the epic genre that *Beowulf* shares with these other works are itemized as follows: (1) the hero is contrasted with a leading antihero who illustrates the antithesis of the hero's virtues; (2) the hero's deeds are seen as an initiation test and public confirmation of his worth; (3) supernatural beings intervene in the affairs of humans and prophecies prove potent predictors of future events; (4) epic poets employ an elevated discourse and rhetorical hyperbole; and (5) epic heroes always exert their power in some way toward a national purpose or religious cause.

Edward L. Ridsen focuses on the third of these features in "Beowulf and Sub-liminal Epic Epiphany," in his *Heroes, Gods and the Role of Epiphany in English Epic Poetry* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland), 64–74. Ridsen defines epiphanies in epic poems as "meetings with divine beings, crossings of significant liminal boundaries, or encounters with pure manifestations of essential aspects of nature ... to provide their characters (and thus audiences) access to information or power" (64). The epiphanies of *Beowulf* differ from those of other epics, however, in that the supernatural beings the hero encounters "are exclusively monsters," who may be more powerful than humans in some respects, but "fall below us" in ontological dignity on the "Great Chain of Being" (65). Meetings with such monsters are thus "sub-liminal" rather than sublime or "superliminal," according to Ridsen. They are designed to communicate the poem's themes by example rather than revelation, here, "the need for steadfast courage, the glory of devotion to duty, immortality through *lof* and *dom*, praise or fame and glory. The poem's lack of insistence upon salvation intensifies those themes," Ridsen believes: "one behaves well because duty and honor require it, not for any tangible gain" (65–66).

Britt Mize compares "Manipulations of the Mind-as-Container Motif in *Beowulf*, *Homiletic Fragment II*, and Alfred's Metrical Epilogue to the *Pastoral Care*," *JEGP* 107.1: 25–56. The mind as an enclosure of thoughts and emotions is a common metaphor in Old English poetry, appearing in the compound *breosthord* 'breast-hoard' in *Beowulf* at lines 1719a and 2792a. It is also often intimated by verbs of opening, as when Hrothgar invites Beowulf *onsæl meoto* 'unseal [your] thoughts' (line 489b) or when Unferth *onband beadurune* 'unbound battle-brooding, revealed hidden hostility' (line 501a). Both of these phrases depict the release of thought from prior confinement. Mize argues that Hrothgar's homily in lines 1700–84 should be considered in a similar light, as the offering of mental treasure in return for Beowulf's physical gifts of Grendel's head and the giants' sword-hilt: such wisdom "stands in place of the material gift-giving that might have been expected at this moment" (35). Mize finds Beowulf's last words—"wyrð has swept away all of my kinsmen to their appointed end, warriors in their strength; I must follow them" (lines 2814b–16)—as yet another implicit juxtaposition of both literal and figurative hoards, this time suggesting an equivalency between the two kinds of treasure, the dragon's physical wealth rusting in the ground and the king's life and moral leadership that he has just given for it. Both treasures are now equivalently *unnyt* 'useless' to the doomed Geats (line 3168a).

Valentine Anthony Pakis explores "The Meaning of Æschere's Name in *Beowulf*," *Anglia: Zeitschrift für englische Philologie* 126.1: 104–13, noting that the name appears four times in the poem, the first three during Beowulf's visit to Denmark at lines 1323b, 1329b, and 1420b, and once again at line 2122b during Beowulf's report to his uncle Hygelac back in Geatland. As a personal name Æschere appears twice in *Domesday Book* (1086), with analogues in medieval German records, but the compound is only found once elsewhere in Old English verse. This is as a common noun in the *Battle of Maldon* at line 69b, where it refers to the *æschere* 'ash-army' of Vikings, a poetic circumlocution alluding either to these characters' collective spear-shafts (the usual wood from which such weapons were made) or possibly to their fleet of wooden ships. Pakis suggests that in his re-narration of Æschere's death to Hygelac the hero plays upon the meaning of this character's name as "ash-army," but in a way unrelated to "its *Maldon* homograph" (105). Instead, Pakis offers two possible analyses in this context for the compound "ash-army": (1) "multitude of ashes," that is, what is left over after the burning of a corpse on a

pyre, and (2) “destroyer of ash trees,” that is, the “fire” that would consume such a corpse in ancient funeral obsequies. In both cases, Pakis sees an ironic observation on the part the hero that the Danish people were not able *bronde forbærnan* [*Æschere*], *ne on bel hladen leofne mannan* “to cremate [“Pile of Ashes” or “Fire”] with fire nor to place the beloved man on a pyre” (lines 2126–27a), because he had already been completely absented by Grendel’s mother beyond their reach. In the very same speech the hero alludes to another singular victim of a monster’s attack, *Hondscioh* ‘Hand Shoe’, whose name recalls the dragon-skin *glof* ‘glove’ (line 2085b) into which Grendel sometimes put his prey, though in this case the monster simply devours Beowulf’s unfortunate retainer on the spot, down to both his feet and hands, so that there was nothing left at all of “Glove” to put into Grendel’s “glove,” the kind of garment into which the just eaten hand would normally be put. In each case, the victim has been wrongfully dispatched by monsters in a way that prevents the proper disposition of their bodies in death, a fact pointed out, according to Pakis, by the hero’s heavy punning upon the literal meaning of their names.

Raymond P. Tripp, Jr., considers “Beowulf as Benedictine *Mynstres Hordere*: A Note on *Hordweard Hæleþa* (*Beowulf* 1852a) and *Dryncfæt Deore* (2254a),” *In Geardagum* 28: 49–59. In his parting words to Beowulf, Hrothgar says that if Hygelac should die, the Geats could do no better than to choose him for their king, their *hordweard hæleþa* ‘hoard-guardian of heroes’. The importance of such a treasure-guarding trust would have been immediately apparent to the monastic readers of the poem. The Benedictine Rule singles out the *cellerarius monasterii* or *mynstres hordere*, monastery’s treasurer, as an officer who [*e*]alle *mynstres fata and spede ... sceal beseon, swylce þa gehalgedan fata þæs weouedes* “must guard all the foundation’s vessels and wealth, just like the sacred vessels of the altar” (Chapter 31). In many prior studies, Tripp has argued that the dragon is really a human “prince gone bad” (56)—in fact, Heremod—who stole the sacred cup among other treasures in ancient times and was transformed into a monster through greed. It is Beowulf himself who penetrates the dragon’s lair, not a runaway slave, to retrieve the *dryncfæt deore* ‘precious drinking vessel’ or sacred chalice of his people, thereby provoking the dragon’s anger. The uncharacteristically dark thoughts that well within the hero’s breast after the dragon’s attack are simply just wrath for the damage done to his hall and to his people against *ealde riht* ‘the old law’ or proper order of society (line 2330a). Beowulf thus “feels duty-bound to

depart from his customarily peaceful behavior, to take revenge in God’s behalf, and to recover the national treasure” (56), which Tripp seems to assume, without argument, that the dragon has stolen back during its rampage.

‘Beowulf’ and Material Culture

In “*Beowulf* and Archaeology—Revisited,” *Aedificia Nova: Studies in Honor of Rosemary Cramp*, ed. Karkov and Damico [see sect. 2], 89–105, John Hines extends an argument made long ago in the honorand’s classic 1957 study recalled in his title. Hines suggests not only that the physical artifacts uncovered by field investigators can help illustrate more precisely terms for material objects in the poem, possibly helping to locate the time and place of its composition, he also argues that a disciplined archaeological approach to *Beowulf* can offer insights into the cultural relations it depicts and thus the poet’s development of his themes. Hines reads the poem as an archaeologist would interpret the various kinds of physical remains uncovered during an excavation, that is, not merely “as a collection of exotic and valuable artifacts but as evidence of a highly meaningful system of material culture” (104). To illustrate his method, he examines three scenes in *Beowulf* where physical objects can be seen to have special significance. (1) When Beowulf arrives in Denmark, Hines notices that the helmets and mailcoats of the newcomers—their body armor—is taken to be more expressive of their identity and status than the weapons they carry. By rejecting not only the use of weapons in confronting Grendel, but his armor as well, the hero definitively moves the conflict beyond the world of social relations to a more elemental struggle between competing value systems. (2) The hero returns from the mere bearing two tangible trophies. One, Grendel’s head, provides physical evidence that Beowulf has indeed fulfilled his earlier vow to kill the monster or die trying, at the same time reminding the Danes of the terror they once suffered and securing a grim recompense, according to the strict law of the talion, for the severing of *Æschere*’s head. The second trophy, the hilt of the giants’ sword, functions as the physical “equivalent of a literary artifact” (100), which Hrothgar then proceeds to read, “like a poet” himself (100), in his commentary to the hero. Hrothgar reminds Beowulf of the promising Heremod, who later became greedy and arrogant, a warning which thematically foreshadows the hero’s confrontation with the dragon as an old king. (3) The poet twice describes the dragon’s hoard as *hæðen* ‘heathen’ (lines 2216a and 2276b). This material wealth from a lost pagan people

has a palpable appeal to the dying hero, who studies it carefully, just as Hrothgar had scrutinized the old giants' hilt, and rejoices in having won it for his people (lines 2792b–2801). However, the Geats rebury the tainted treasure with Beowulf's ashes in his funeral mound (a heathen practice itself), *þær hit nu gen lifað* "where it still remains," the poet says, *eldum swa unnyt swa hyt (æro)r wæs* "as useless to men as it was before" (lines 3167b–68a). As a memorial of the pre-Christian past remaining into the present, the continued presence of pagan gold in Beowulf's burial mound thus materially expresses the poet's own residual ambivalence toward the old world it symbolizes, a cultural regime that he both regrets for its spiritual ignorance and pride, but also admires for the courage and generosity of its heroes that is "still needed" in his own day (104).

In "The Boar on the Helmet" (76–88), in the same festschrift, Roberta Frank offers a "footnote" to Cramp's article on "*Beowulf* and Archaeology" (77). Just as the royal standards of Edwin and Oswald of Northumbria were intended to imply an inheritance of Roman-style authority, Frank suggests, the images of boars on early seventh-century helmets from Benty Grange, Sutton Hoo, and Wollaston were designed to invoke Romano-Celtic emblems of martial zeal. In *Beowulf*, on the other hand, the boar-helmets point "not to Rome," but to the pagan North, where "such hats accessorize nicely with the pagan sacrifices, cremations, drinking rituals, and auguries of these beefy breakers-of-rings" (82). "The emphasis on boar power in the first part of the poem is deliberate," Frank argues, "as is the setting in *fyrndagum*, in old heathen times" (82). She believes the boar-helmets of *Beowulf* are not "fossils"—part of the poet's repertoire of conventional images—but rather a signal of "the temporal and cultural distance between the pagan Scandinavian past ... and the England of the poet's day" (82). Davidson (1968), Hines (1984), Newton (1993), Webster (1998), and Nielsen (1999) have all taken these images as evidence for an early dating of the poem sometime in (or within close memory of) the seventh century. Frank disagrees. She shows how boar-helmets were common features in much later skaldic poetry in Old Norse, composed in the tenth and eleventh centuries, often with clear connections to Anglo-Saxon England. For instance, around 961 Eyvindr skáldaspillir 'despoiler of skalds' composed a poem in praise of Hákon the Good of Norway, who been fostered in England by King Æthelstan. Frank notes that Eyvindr is not only the first skald on record to use the image of a boar-helmet, he is also the first to allude to the Scylding characters of *Beowulf*, as well as to Swedish figures

in the poem, like Áli (= Onela) and Adils (= Eadgils). Frank concludes: "The boar-helmets of *Beowulf* are rooted, like the heads they cap, in a North Sea culture," which the late poet invokes to recreate his vision of a long-gone pagan past.

John D. Niles agrees with Frank's general perspective on the material culture of the poem in W.W. Norton's reissue of Seamus Heaney's 1999 translation, *Beowulf: An Illustrated Edition* (New York). Instead of juxtaposing the Old English text *verso* with Heaney's rendering in modern English *recto*, as in the first US edition published by Farrer, Strauss, & Giroux (2000), Niles here illustrates Heaney's translation on the right with 104 photos, drawings, computer-generated reconstructions, manuscript illuminations, and other figures on the left. In "An Afterword: Visualizing *Beowulf*" (213–55), Niles suggests that the poem was composed in its current form sometime during the century or so preceding its copying in Cotton Vitellius A.xv, ca. 1000. This means that the Anglo-Saxon audience of *Beowulf* would have been in no better position than modern readers (and probably even a worse) to visualize accurately the material world of ancient Scandinavia half a millennium earlier: "Those people lived hundreds of years after the time when Beowulf and Hrothgar are imagined to have lived. They were separated from the poem's Scandinavian setting by hundreds of miles of open sea as well, at a time when spatial distance mattered far more than it does today. Toward the end of the first millennium AD, the English inhabited a well-organized nation. They worshipped the God of the Old and New Testaments in churches built through an elaborate ecclesiastical hierarchy. They defended their land through a system of military obligation that was regulated by law and custom. They knew no more than we do now of ghoulish, flesh-eating demons or of flying, fire-breathing dragons. They may never have seen with their own eyes objects like the high-end luxury goods of which the *Beowulf* poet speaks, even though today we may gaze on such things in museums thanks to the achievements of modern archaeology" (213). In these circumstances, Niles suggests, the poet intended his words to speak for themselves, to conjure in the minds of his audience visions of a by-gone era, which must necessarily be individually inflected, just like responses to the poem's characters and themes. Nonetheless, images of material artifacts and physical landscapes can help direct and enhance that imaginative response to the poet's language, so Niles has sought representations that might approximate those familiar to Anglo-Saxon audiences in the tenth century. Some of these they may have only known by hearsay, like the

great Viking age halls and topography of Lejre in Denmark, traditional seat of the Scylding monarchs. Others, like the Viking ships or Visigothic brooches from slightly later or earlier periods, are chosen to replicate objects similar to those that the audience of the poem may have seen in their minds' eyes. But Niles also recognizes that some readers of *Beowulf* are interested in the poem as "a window" on an earlier period, that is, the time of the poem's setting around 500 AD. He thus offers a review of what we know about many of the physical objects mentioned in *Beowulf*: halls and their furnishings, ships, weapons and armor (mail-coats, swords, helmets, daggers, spears, shields, bows and arrows), treasure hoards, harps, saddles, bridles, tapestries, runic inscriptions, bracteates, and human bodies executed or sacrificed (221–38). He also discusses the supernatural creatures of the poem—Grendel and his mother, the dragon, and other kinds of monster (238–40)—and concludes with a consideration of the physical setting of *Beowulf*, including Grendel's mere and the dragon's barrow, as well as the hero's own burial mound on *Hronesnaess* 'Whale's Point', illustrated with photos from the coast of Bohuslän in southwestern Sweden and the mound Skelhøj in northern Zealand, even though "at least some Anglo-Saxons seem to have conceived of the Geats as a people who had once lived in Jutland, close by the ancestral home of the English" (243). Niles reminds us that the places and objects in the poem are products of the poet's own creative imagination: "Beowulf's ashes will not be found" in Jutland or Bohuslän or Zealand or "or anywhere else" in the world (244). The images he supplies are designed to free the reader's imagination to generate for itself a richer and more deeply informed response to the poem.

Murray McGillivray asks of line 168a, "What Kind of a Seat is Hrothgar's *gifstol*?" *SP* 105.3: 265–83. He explores the five other appearances of this compound in Old English (including one in *Beowulf* at line 2327a), the twenty-three instances of the simplex *stol* 'seat', and the many more compounds of which *stol* constitutes one element. Following Wülker (1878), McGillivray concludes that this "gift-seat" refers not "to a throne at all, whether God's or Hrothgar's, but instead to the hall Heorot" itself (266), the more generalized "seat" of the Scylding monarch in which he shares out "to young and old everything that God had given him" (lines 71–72). It is this royal hall that God will not allow Grendel to *gretan* 'approach, harm' (line 168b) for the twelve long years before Beowulf's arrival, though the monster later shows himself quite capable of doing so when he rips apart the doors (lines 721b–24a) and when

the poet marvels that the building could still withstand the damage wrought upon it during Grendel's fight with Beowulf in lines 771–82a and 997–1000a.

Dissertations and Theses

Tatjana Silec examines the figure of the jester and his relationship with the royal court, especially the king himself, in "Le fou et son roi dans la littérature anglaise de *Beowulf* à *King Lear*," (Ph.D. Diss., U of Paris-Sorbonne). Hrothgar's "fool" is Unferth, his *pyle* 'orator, spokesman, official entertainer' (lines 1165b and 1456b). Even though the Christian poet undermines the motives of this authoritative figure from pagan Germanic tradition, Unferth is nonetheless depicted as a useful if aggressive *agitateur* 'agitator' (182) in helping Hrothgar's court deal with a foreign visitor and dangerous potential enemy. Unferth's job is to provoke the hero through his unfriendly account of Beowulf's swimming match with Breca to clarify both his purpose in coming to Denmark and his commitment to helping the Danes against Grendel. The positive effects of the verbal contest Unferth initiates is revealed in the general laughter and friendly words that follow his tart exchange with the hero (lines 611–12a). Unferth thus anticipates the fool of later medieval and Renaissance literature, an ambiguous person attracting both admiration and blame, but serving to generate a more explicit awareness of the behavior expected of those who wish to be leaders in the royal community.

Sandra M. Hiortdahl writes on "*Grendel*: John Gardner's Reinvention of the *Beowulf* Saga" (Ph.D. Diss., Catholic U of America, DAI 69, AAT 3310024), demonstrating the extent to which the 1971 novel parallels the three monster-fights of the poem in three movements that reflect the monster's "development from innocence to depravity" (i). In particular, Hiortdahl considers the degree to which Gardner's philosophically precocious character can be interpreted as an expression of the author's critique of postmodern skepticism and anomie in his later treatise, *On Moral Fiction* (1978). She concludes that Gardner's *Grendel* is a defense of moral art offered "both as an ironic counterpoint" to *Beowulf* and as an oblique celebration of that poem's ethical purpose.

Anthony Adams writes on "Heroic Slaughter and Versified Violence: A Reading of Sacrifice in Some Early English and Carolingian Poetry of War," (Ph.D. Diss., U of Toronto, DAI 69A, AAT NR39882). He argues that medieval poets of the ninth and tenth centuries in England and France "actively looked (and called) for signs of heroic sacrifice in their own times"

(ii). Yet, Adams shows that these poets also sometimes dramatize a kind of death by violence or “traumatic sacrifice” that seems to have no positive redeeming value, only “dislocating and disruptive effects” (200). Such a demoralizing death is recalled by the hero Beowulf just before he confronts the dragon. His grandfather Hrethel, whose one son Herebeald was slain by another Hæthcyn, dies of the emotional confusion generated by this *feohleas gefeoht* ‘inexpiable violence’ (line 2441a), which provokes the epic simile of an old man who must watch his son hang on the gallows without recourse or remedy from the king’s justice. Though he does not make his point explicit, Adams seems to imply that the poet is offering a similar attitude toward the death of Beowulf against the dragon, a sacrifice which is certainly traumatic for his people the Geats and which, far from saving them, is predicted four times in the poem to lead to their certain demise at the hands of their enemies.

Bonnie L. Fox studies “Paradox and Balance in the Anglo-Saxon Mind of *Beowulf*,” (M.A. Thesis, U of North Texas), observing that foremost among these balanced contraries in the poem is the continuing influence of the past upon the present, both the earlier past upon the lives of the characters living *in geardagum* ‘in the old days’ (line 1b) of the poem’s primary action, and the past of the poem upon the present of the poet’s own world. This temporal “paradox” is further reflected in a tension between light and darkness, symbolizing the conflict between the poet’s contemporary Christian faith and the pagan beliefs of his ancestors. And finally, a binary between land and sea replicates in a spatial dimension the other paradoxes of the poem and illustrates the *Beowulf* poet’s desire to find balance within the ongoing tensions of his world.

Translations and Translation Studies

Reclams Universal-Bibliothek offers a reprinting of Martin Lehnert’s 1986 *Beowulf: ein altenglisches Heldenepos* (Stuttgart), whose opening lines are rendered in German as follows:

Wahrlich, von den Taten der Dänen in Tagen der
Vorzeit,
Von ruhmreichen Königen, ward viel Kühnes
erzählt,
Wie diese Edlen Abenteuer bestanden.
Oft entzog Schild-Schefing den Scharen der
Feinde,
So manchen Mannschaften, die Metbänke.
Er ängstigte die Krieger, nachdem er einst völlig

Hilflos aufgefunden ward. Doch Heil wurde ihm
dafür zuteil,
Er wuchs unter den Wolken an Wertschätzung,
Bis jeder einzelne der Umwohnenden
Ihm über die Walfischstraße hin willfährig war
Und Abgaben zahlte. Das war ein echter König!

Conor McCarthy offers a chapter-length study of Heaney’s “*Beowulf*” in *Seamus Heaney and Medieval Poetry* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer), 86–126. McCarthy notes that while for some critics, the poem is buried “so deep in the foundations of English literature as to be lost from sight,” the Irish translator “has no such doubts about the poem’s foundational status in English ... or, for that matter, its place in world art” (88). Echoing Ezra Pound’s notion that “literature is news that stays news” (1934), Heaney believes that *Beowulf*’s depiction of human life on earth is just as relevant as ever to our own experience of ethnic and sectarian violence in the modern world, including that of his own native Northern Ireland. The poet-translator invents a distinctive idiom in his rendering of the Old English text as a movement not against but through the language of his country’s oppressor to break “down the otherness that has been constructed between the Irish and the English” (93) and to claim *Beowulf* as part of his own “voice-right” as an English-speaking Irishman (90). By mingling terms of Anglo-Saxon origin like *thane* ‘retainer’ and *tholed* ‘suffered’ with those from Gaelic like *sept* ‘clan’, *brehon* ‘judge’, and *bawn* ‘cattle-pen, fortified enclosure’, Heaney stresses a far deeper affinity between the two societies in their earlier organization, attitudes, and material culture than was later recognized. Heaney’s “Hiberno-Anglo-Saxon” *Beowulf* makes “the blood and tears behind [the poem] less remote, closer to home” (126), McCarthy argues, suggesting that the Irish poet sees, even in its sad themes, a cause for hope, in that it was born from the same kind of violent loss that has afflicted all human groups, now as then, his own as well as others. Heaney’s *Beowulf* thus offers an expression of common human experience and a model of endurance that can be shared across boundaries of time and political grievance, even between the bitterest of former enemies.

In “*Beowulf* and the Icelandic Conquest of England,” in *Det norrøne og det nationale: studier i brugen af Islands gamle litteratur i nationale sammenhænge i Norge, Sverige, Island, Storbritannien, Tyskland og Danmark* [*Norse and Nationality: Studies in the Use of Iceland’s Medieval Literature in National Contexts in Norway, Sweden, Iceland, Britain, Germany and Denmark*], ed. Annette Lassen (Reykavík: Stofnun

Vigdísar Finnbogadóttur í erlendum tungumálum), 262–86, Pétur Knútsson revisits Halldóra B. Björns-son's 1983 translation of the poem into Icelandic as *Bjólfskviða* 'The Lay of Bjólfr'. He notes the interesting fact that while Halldóra was deeply familiar with medieval Icelandic versification, she had only recently come to the study of Old English with Klaeber's 1950 edition of *Beowulf*, which she used by itself to translate the poem into Icelandic without the help of an English translation or Old English grammar. In spite of Halldóra's complete "ignorance of the Old English corpus her text seems fully to partake in the diction of Old English" (281), Pétur observes. For instance, she instinctively rendered an Old English formula such as *ellen fremedon* 'performed valor' (line 3b) by an Icelandic variant, *örlög drygðu* 'performed [their] fate' from *Völundarkviða* 'The Lay of Völundr [= Weland]' (3.10), not realizing that such variation of the phrasal formula "is well attested *within the Old English corpus, which she did not know* [Andreas, line 460; Genesis, line 1288; Riddle 58, line 1; and *Judgment Day I*, line 29], *but not in the Icelandic corpus, which she knew well*" (282, author's emphasis). Pétur finds this fact "surely somewhat of a vindication" (282) of Nile's 1983 suggestion that a "hypothetical Icelandic or Norwegian poet setting out to retell the Old English story of *Beowulf* could probably have done so without overwhelming difficulty" (quoted 264) because of the many shared features of a common Germanic oral-formulaic syntax, poetic lexicon and alliterative prosody. Halldóra's *Bjólfskviða* thus also vindicates for Pétur the medieval Icelandic First Grammarian's assertion in the twelfth century that "we are of one tongue [with the English], even though one of the two has changed greatly, or both somewhat" (quoted 275).

Jennifer Anh-Thu Tran Smith discusses "Fidelity in Versification: Modern English Translations of *Beowulf* and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*," in *Studies in the History of the English Language IV: Empirical and Analytical Advances in the Study of English Language Change*, Topics in English Linguistics 61, ed. Susan M. Fitzmaurice and Donka Minkova, (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter), 121–54. For the Old English poem, Smith compares the verse renderings of Kennedy (1940), Raffel (1963), Alexander (1973), Chickering (1977), Lehmann (1988), and Heaney (2000). For the Middle English poem, she compares Stone (1959), Borroff (1967), Tolkien (1975), Harrison (1983), Finch (1993), Vantuono (1999), and Merwin (2002). Smith evaluates the translation of two passages from *Beowulf*—the entrance of Grendel into Heorot on the hero's first night in the hall (lines 710–36) and the scene of Beowulf's death

(lines 2694–2723). She scans the Modern English verse for metrical and alliterative deviations from the Old English original, which she itemizes and tabulates in an Appendix (141–49). Smith finds that the translator most faithful to the prosody of the original poem is Lehmann "by a large margin ... followed by Alexander, Kennedy, Heaney, Raffel, and finally Chickering" (132), who "does not have any lines without violations," while Raffel "only manages one" (135). For renderings of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, on the other hand, all translators produce some lines that are free of prosodic deviation, with Tolkien as the most accurate, diverging in only 12 percent of his lines. Smith finds that these results comport generally with the priorities that the different translators express in their introductions, noting that an earlier ideal of prosodic imitation has yielded in recent years to a more "liberal" and "personal" approach to recapturing the poetic quality of these texts. In particular, Heaney (2000) and Merwin (2002) both try to recreate the dignified familiarity of the poem's language by recalling the speech of relatives, Heaney's in rural Northern Ireland and Merwin's in the Welsh mining community within Scranton, Pennsylvania.

Giosuè Musca writes on "Tradurre il *Beowulf* [Rendering *Beowulf*]," *Quaderini Medievali* 58 (2004): 284–304, quoting at length from but very briefly categorizing the translations into Italian of Giusto C. Grion (1883), Anna Benedetti (1916), Federico Olivero (1934), Cesare G. Cecioni (1959), Ludovica Koch (1987 and 1992), and Giuseppe Brunetti (2003).

Dongill Lee describes his "Korean Translation of *Beowulf* [1998]: Variety and Limitation of Archaic Words," *Medieval and Early Modern English Studies* (Korea) 16.1: 19–42. The translator regrets that the lexicon of Korean is unfriendly to recapturing the alliteration of the Old English poem, but finds a comparable lexicon of heroic terminology derived from both early Chinese influences and his own country's tradition of the Hwarangdo or warrior society of the Unified Shilla kingdom of ancient Korea. Lee illustrates his method by analyzing several key terms in the Old English poem to describe how he found "their appropriate Korean equivalents" (22), often challenging in the process the standard Modern English interpretation of these words and phrases. For instance, for *heard under helme* 'hard' or 'hardy under helmet' (line 2539b), Lee compares the other uses of the same formulaic phrase in lines 342a and 404a to find a more elaborate Korean rendering that means, "emitting a grim (heroic resolve) under his helmet" (26). For the infinitive verb *mapelian*, commonly used to introduce

direct discourse in the 3rd preterite singular *mápelode* '[he] spoke, said, proclaimed', Lee recalls its nominal counterpart *mepel* 'assembly, council, speech, address'. He attempts to capture the public dignity of this verb quite literally with renderings like "made a speech" or "made a formal speech." And finally, Lee resists the suggestion of arrogance or rashness implied by a series of nouns associated with the hero, even when these are used invidiously by Unferth. Thus, Lee prefers "high-spiritedness" to "foolish pride" for *wlenco* in line 508a and "audacious boasting" to "foolish boasting" for *dolgilp* in lines 509a. Even the dangerous *oferhygd* of Hrothgar's sermon (line 1740b) Lee would prefer to understand more heroically, that is, as "daring presumption" rather than "overbearing pride."

Performances, Films, and Other Adaptations

Martha Baranda Torres offers a prose retelling of the poem in Spanish for students and young adults in *Beowulf* (Mexico City: Grijalbo/Random House Mondadori), with a glossary of names, places, and peoples. She begins her narrative as follows:

En opulenta nave de ricos avíos llegó el pequeño Scyldo el Sceafo de su solitaria travesía después de ser abandonado a merced de las olas del mar. En opulenta nave, repleta de tesoros, se marchó de nuevo, ya convertido en un envejecido cadáver, cobijado por los honores de sus nobles y el entristecido corazón de su pueblo, al cual se unieron muchos otros pueblos lejanos y cercanos (13).

Gabriel Dean translated and adapted passages of the poem in *Beowulf: A Short Drama* (New York: Play-scripts), with an acting length of 45–60 minutes requiring a "minimal" set. It opened in September 2003 at Actor's Express Theatre in Atlanta, Georgia, directed by its author, and toured through 2005 directed by Michelle Johnson. The setting of the play is the "mind of the poet on the cusp of silent unconsciousness" (6), beginning with the final conversation between Beowulf and Wiglaf moments before the king's death and returning to this moment after many flashbacks to the past by the end.

The Shotgun Players, in collaboration with a performance collective, Banana Bag and Bodice, satirized the cultural authority and relevance of the poem in a musical "send up" or "song-play," entitled "*Beowulf: A Thousand Years of Baggage*," which ran from 14 May to 22 June at the Ashby Stage in Berkeley, California,

written by Jason Craig, scored by Dave Malloy, and directed by Rod Hipskind. The production received the Glickman Award for Best New Play in 2008.

Ashley Crownover offers a debut novel in *Wealtheow [sic]: Her Telling of Beowulf* (Nashville, TN: Iroquois P), which opens with the Danish queen's recollection of her marriage to Hrothgar many years before when she was fifteen years old and continues through the hero's return to Geatland after killing Grendel's mother. The Danes worship Odin, the Allfather, and the other Norse gods. Grendel is not a descendent of Cain, but the deformed offspring of a human noblewoman Ginnar, friend of Wealtheow's own mother Freda, who refuses to expose him as an infant according to the custom of her people and so consequently flees into the wilderness with the baby as an outcast and increasingly embittered witch. Wealtheow recognizes the weaving of a cloth that Beowulf brings back from the mere with Grendel's severed head and realizes, with sympathy for the monster and his mother, that they were made into enemies by her own people's ignorance and intolerance: "The people had destroyed her [Ginnar, Grendel's mother], and so she destroyed the people" (188). When Eir, the wife of the slain Esher [Æschere], gives birth to a frail posthumous baby boy, Wealtheow prevails upon King Hrothgar to let him live.

A film version of the poem, *Beowulf: Prince of the Geats* (David Garrison Productions), 94 minutes, written and directed by Scott Wegener, was acted by volunteers to raise money for the American and Norwegian Cancer Societies. It takes a village to raise a hero, and Beowulf's father Ecgtheow turns out to be an adventurous African fisherman who travels north to Geatland where he begets a son played by Jayshan Jackson as a young man and Damon Lynch III in old age. As a boy, Beowulf is accused of being "a risk to the tribe," not because he was different in appearance or that his father had provoked a potential war (as in the poem), but because the noble African Ecgtheow was simply trying to broker peace with the enemies of the Geats. The wise Hrothgar protects father and son, but Beowulf's rejection by his people gives him a complex. Full of self-doubt, he must keep proving to himself and others that he is not weak for wanting to use words first, and so he hastens to help out wherever he hears of need and oppression. Beowulf's tale is told in retrospect by a terribly sun-burnt Unferth, a former rival won over by the hero's kindness and generosity. Unferth has sailed from the north through seas replete with icebergs and other arctic effects to tell the communitarian Africans the story of their own hero in the

north. Some animation techniques crank up the intensity of the monster-fights, but the very low budget of this not-for-profit film has resulted in poor production values. In this reviewer's estimate, an unrehabilitated Grendel's mother is the most effective character of all in the swift and feral danger she poses to her human enemies. In "Beowulf: Prince of the Geats, Nazis, and Odinists," *OEN* 41.3: 26–32, Richard Scott Nokes reports on the angry emails received by David Garrison Productions for casting a black Beowulf, including the query: "What would the reaction be if Bruce Willis was chosen to play Martin Luther King?" (30). However, despite his progressive social values and protective skin-melanin, this sad-sack Beowulf is unlikely either to antagonize whatever Geat supremacists there may be in the world or to capture the imagination of many other audiences, black or white.

Paul D. Storrie as writer and Ron Randall as illustrator offer a graphic *Beowulf: Monster Slayer, A British Legend* (Minneapolis, MN: Graphic Universe), including a glossary and pronunciation guide; list of further reading, translations and websites; and a short index.

Henriette Barkow has retold and Alan Down illustrated an unusual graphic adaptation of the poem, with an original text written apparently in English prose, but in this volume translated into two other languages: Somali by M. F. Bulale, as *Beowulf iyo sidii uu ula dagaalamay Grendel: waa khuraafaad Anglo Saaksakanku leeyihiin*, and Danish by Jakob Kjær as *Beowulf og hvordan han bekæmpede Grendel: et angelsaksisk epos [Beowulf and How He Fought with Grendel: The Anglo-Saxon Epic]* (Copenhagen: Mantra Lingua, 2004). Text and images cover the hero's first two monster-fights in Denmark, concluding with his return home to Geatland.

Teaching Beowulf

In allusion to Robert Fulghum's *All I Really Need to Know I Learned in Kindergarten* (1989), Ruth R. Cailouet observes that "Everything I Need to Know about Teaching I Learned from *Beowulf*," *English Journal* 98.1: 42–46. She describes how she uses the poem as a template or "life map" "to encourage students to remember key moments in their own heroic journeys" (42). In addition, she believes the poem offers a series of lessons which, *mutatis mutandis*, are an aid to boosting the morale and effectiveness of teachers: (1) honor the king and queen, by which she means supervisors and administrators; (2) never underestimate heritage and reputation, by which she means share one's commitment to learning with fellow teachers; (3) beware the

Grendels, who can on different occasions "be an administrator, a troubled student, the paper load, or even standardized tests"; (4) beware the Grendel's mothers even more, by which she means the parents of students; (5) "make ready the battle gear," that is, develop "good resources, sound strategies, a breadth of knowledge, and a strong belief in the importance of what we are doing"; (6) choose one's battles, that is, recognize one's limitations; (7) gather a cohort of fellow warriors, i.e., supportive colleagues; (8) be a good leader and pass on as teachers of English literature the charge to interpret texts with sensitivity, knowledge, and insight; (9) know when to quit, that is, basically, "keep [one's] weekends precious"; and (10) find one's Wiglaf, a friend who can encourage and remind you of your strengths (43–44).

(With thanks to Shannon Rossi for her help with parts of this review.)

CD/SR

Works Not Seen

Denslow, Sarah G. "Until the dragon comes': Good, Evil, and the Nature of the World in 'Beowulf' and 'Judith.'" Honors Thesis, Brown U, 2008.

Krdzalic, Safet. "Assimilation of Christianity and Germanic Mythology in 'Beowulf.'" M.A. Thesis, Univ. of Ljubljana, 2008.

Shedd, Christopher Blake. "A Critical Analysis of German Translations of 'Beowulf,' 1904–2005." M.A. Thesis, U of Mississippi, 2008.

Stav, Arie. *Beyovolf*. Tel Aviv: ha-Kibuts ha-meuhad, 2008. 437 pp. ill. [translation of *Beowulf* into Hebrew]

d. Prose

Alfredian Translations

Irmeli Valtonen presents an impressively learned study of *The North in the Old English Orosius: A Geographical Narrative in Context* (Helsinki: Société Néophilologique). Her introduction reviews previous scholarship (in several languages), defines terms, and outlines her methods. Valtonen argues against assuming either deep or poor knowledge of classical and Christian Latin learning in Anglo-Saxon England, and she cautions against presuming that we have full modern equivalents for early geographical and people-names. Her second chapter surveys texts from the Greeks to ninth-century Carolingian writers, concluding that the north appears as "local knowledge," experienced in comparison with each writer's own society. For medieval writers, geography was part of history or

ethnography, not a separate discipline. The third chapter examines the north's appearances in Anglo-Saxon literature (both Latin and vernacular) and the Cotton World Map. Bede's *Historia* and Old English poetry reveal a sense of connection to the Continent, though the poetry provides "a sense of place, rather than a map or geographical directions or descriptions" (203) and "a homeland or stage for ancient heroes" and origins (253). The fourth chapter turns to the *Orosius* itself. To the geography of the Latin source text are added descriptions of *Germania* and the accounts of Ohthere and Wulfstan; Valtonen reads these not as three separate accounts, but as textual interventions by one author (probably working with notes from interviews of the travelers). She elucidates each northern people or place mentioned in the *Orosius*, often incorporating recent archaeological work. She finds that the OE writer is more interested in peoples than in places and that the sea seems omnipresent. Land is defined where it meets the water. Wealth and social rank matter greatly in the travelers' accounts, as do names: "Naming produces spaces, makes them familiar, and creates historical significance" (479). The fifth chapter sets the *Orosius*'s north into an Alfredian political and literary context. Similarities between Anglo-Saxons and other northerners make peace and alliance seem possible. Other, roughly contemporary works also emphasize the Anglo-Saxons' continental roots: 'Geat' appears in Alfred's genealogy, and Asser asserts that Alfred's maternal grandfather was a *Gothus*. The travelers' accounts offer three major foci: northmen, whose existence makes Britain more central to Europe; Danes, now occupying the ancestral land of Angeln; and *Este*, in the lower Vistula region. The inclusion of details makes these places real and normal to Anglo-Saxon audiences. One major difference, religion, still separates Christian Anglo-Saxons from pagan northerners. Incorporating the north into the *Orosius* necessarily recognizes these peoples as part of God's plan. Valtonen suggests that Alfred saw the conversion of these distant relations as a way to peace and Christian unity. A short conclusion pulls together some major threads of the argument in a sixth chapter. The nearly six hundred-page study provides many insights that this brief survey cannot begin to relate. An eighty-page bibliography and indexes of people and of places close the book. A general index would have been useful as well; readers cannot look up terms such as "TO maps" or "chorography." That lack is a minor flaw in a study valuable for those interested in geographical thinking or in Viking lands around the time of Alfred.

M. R. Godden considers "King and Counselor in the Alfredian Boethius," *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon*

Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach, ed. Blanton and Scheck [see sec. 2], 191–208. In the *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, Boethius recognizes Theodoric as *rex* and explicitly blames the Senate and other Romans, as well as a couple of Goths, for his downfall. The Carolingians who revived the *De Consolatione* celebrated Theodoric, except for his persecution of Catholics—which itself responded to Justinian's persecution of Arians. Starting in the ninth century, new accounts accused Theodoric of tyranny. Godden examines early *vitae* of Boethius that circulated with the *De Consolatione*. The earliest version (and the one with the most extant copies) portrays Theodoric as a tyrant but not a religious persecutor. This *vita* also makes Boethius a conspirator, though in the *De Consolatione* he denies conspiring. The second and third *vitae* vilify Theodoric without implicating Boethius in the revolt, and the fifth makes Theodoric a "destroyer of Roman law and liberty" (197). All remark on Boethius's consulship, an honorary office held in 510 only, and say little or nothing of his position as Master of the Offices in 520, perhaps because that role served Theodoric. Some *vitae* seem to idealize the consulship as a republican institution. Some glosses also portray Boethius as a defender of Roman law and liberty. The opening of the Alfredian *Boethius* gives "a very much fuller and more imaginative version" than the *vitae* (200). The translator of *Boethius* then omits all of *De Consolatione* Book 1, Prose 4, which tells of Boethius's fall. The Anglo-Saxon author emphasizes religious conflict and paints Theodoric as a tyrant undeserving of power. The idea that bad kings could be deposed appears in the *Chronicle* for 755 and 1014, but Godden finds it unlikely that Alfred himself, a real king, would show such sympathy for a rebellious counselor. Godden closes with an edition of *Vita 1* from Paris, BnF lat. 16093, fol. 68v., a version that matches the OE more closely than any other but had not previously been edited.

NGD

Nicole Guenther Discenza contributes to the field of Alfredian attribution studies with "Alfred the Great and the Anonymous Prose Proem to the *Boethius*," *JEGP* 107.1: 57–76. In this study, she presents "linguistic and stylistic evidence" (60) that the anonymous prose proem to the Old English *Boethius* was not composed by Alfred, but rather was produced by "an associate or an admirer, working in Alfred's lifetime or shortly thereafter, with or without the knowledge and permission of Alfred" (60). The proem is not, however, closely mimetic: "The imitator has certainly borrowed from Alfred, but he cannot disguise a different vocabulary,

style, and tone. Nor did he need to disguise those traits. There is no evidence he ever meant anyone to believe he was Alfred" (61). Discenza uses vocabulary and diction as evidence, comparing words and phrases in the proem to the other Alfredian prefaces and prologues and the wider Alfredian corpus generally. She sifts the evidence in various ways and finds nothing to support the idea that King Alfred wrote the proem and more evidence that he did not. For example, she observes, "The writer of the Prose Proem seems unwilling to use the more common synonyms that Alfred and his contemporaries use so freely elsewhere" (62–63). Discenza concludes that the author was in the Alfredian circle and had read other works in the Alfredian canon: "I suggest that our anonymous Proem writer has recently finished reading the *Boethius* and has even more recently read the Preface to the *Pastoral Care*. He shows heavy but uneven influence from Alfred's style, the way a student who has spent too much time with a particular secondary source may echo certain word choices, constructions, and occasionally specific phrases, not in an attempt to plagiarize, but purely from having drunk too deeply at the well of a single author" (70).

AS

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle

In "'These Things We Have Written about Him': The Portrait of King William in 'The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle' 1086E," *Anglo-Saxon* 1 (2007): 239–68, Malasree Home focuses particularly upon the poem about William the Conqueror. The prose annal provides "a compelling portrait of a king" (243) with a coherence that the poem disrupts. The poem reiterates blame but adds nothing new except attacks on William's forest management policies. Its criticisms are subtle and rely on commonplaces, where the prose provided particulars and balanced praise and blame. Generic differences would not produce such great discrepancies in style and attitude; Home thus rejects conventional wisdom that the same author composed both prose and poetry. Both parts were translated into the Latin *Annales de Wauerleia*, so the poem must have been added at least two stages before the E text now extant. Home then broadens her gaze to other Northern Recension poems. The A, B, and C texts contain more tenth-century, "canonical" Chronicle poems, while D and E have more later poems and rhetorically heightened passages. The D and E verses contain more blame and seem more topical, and some do not fit or even disrupt the narrative logic of their entries. Home compares them with Middle English satiric and occasional verse, which similarly

employs commonplaces and the language of preaching. She suggests that some Chronicle verse may have begun as marginal commentary on prose entries. Later incorporation into the main text "ensure[d] their survival before the age of broadsheets" (268).

Biblical Translation

See also Tristan Major, "Rebuilding the Tower of Babel," and Richard Marsden, *The Old English Heptateuch and Ælfric's Libellus De Veteri Testamento Et Novo*, both under Ælfric, below; and Angela Beth Fulk's "'On Anginne,'" in *Miscellaneous*, also below.

Michiko Ogura's "Variant Readings in the Two Manuscripts of the *West Saxon Gospels*: MSS CCCC 140 and CUL Ii.2.11," *Historical Englishes in Varieties of Texts and Contexts*, ed. Amano, et al. [see sec. 3], 109–20, classifies the variants between the two manuscripts named in the title, giving examples and statistics for each kind. The study includes variations too numerous to list here in lexicon, prepositions, prefixes, function words, verb forms, negative contractions, element order, and miscellaneous "other differences" (116). Ogura concludes that MS A (CUL Ii.2.11) probably postdates MS Cp (CCCC 140), though both derive from a now-lost common ancestor. A makes no systematic or "drastic reform" of its exemplar (119).

Valentine A. Pakis investigates "Inclusive Counting and the Number of Disciples in Some Old English Translations of Mark 16.14," in *Geardagum* 28: 31–42. Glosses in the Rushworth and Lindisfarne Gospels, and four manuscripts of the Old English Gospels, render a passage about Christ appearing to the Eleven after his death with a form of *twelf* where the Latin Gospels clearly have eleven. This apparent miscounting is so rare in Greek and Latin texts that Anglo-Saxons are unlikely to have encountered faulty source texts. Pakis notes that Old English and other Germanic languages favor inclusive counting, particularly for groups of people. The different scribes and writers did not all make a mistake but conceived counting differently than we do: they included Christ in the number of the company to which he appeared.

Maria Caterina De Bonis traces "L'Evoluzione della Prosa di Elfrico nella Traduzione dei Testi Biblici al Volgere del Primo Millennio," *A. I. O. N. Sezione Germanica* 12 (2002): 19–44. She dates Ælfric's First Series of *Catholic Homilies* and the start of his translation of Genesis early in his literary career, and his Second Series and translations from the rest of the Hexateuch later. Ælfric always sought clarity and faithfulness to the Scriptures, but De Bonis finds an evolution from simple prose with

some alliteration to increasingly alliterative prose with rhyme and parallelism. Examining scriptural passages that Ælfric rendered once in translation for the Hexateuch and once for quotation in his *Catholic Homilies*, De Bonis finds that in the early phase 41% of the translated passages and 44% of the quotations contain alliteration; in the later, 68% of translated passages and 56% of quotations contain alliteration. She quotes some passages from both translation and *Catholic Homilies*, along with the Latin Vulgate sources, to analyze further alliteration, rhyme, and parallelism. Her examples of alliteration are not all equally convincing, however, and several of the rhymes involve nouns with the same case endings, where parallelism almost of necessity produces rhyme. More convincingly, De Bonis infers that Ælfric did not believe in one style for translation and another for works in which he simply quoted the Bible.

Maria Caterina De Bonis also makes “Osservazioni sulla Morfologia e la Sintassi della Versione in Inglese Antico della *Genesi* del MS Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201,” *A. I. O. N. Sezione Germanica* 12 (2002): 101–24. The word order of Genesis in CCCC 201 (MS Co) diverges many times from that of other *Hexateuch* manuscripts. Among the most striking differences are Co’s tendency to VS order even in subordinate clauses where the other manuscripts often have SV, and Co’s SOV order where the others have SVO. Co has some other inversions, but it is not always consistent in its own ordering nor in following Latin order. Verb constructions also vary. In one instance, Co forms the past with *hæfde* where the other manuscripts use *wæs*, matching a Latin pluperfect. Perhaps most interestingly, Co sometimes uses a modal + infinitive where the other manuscripts employ simple verbs. For all examples, De Bonis quotes the Co text, the other manuscripts, and the Latin; the examples show that where Co has modals, the Latin usually does not contain simple indicatives but instead imperative, subjunctive, future, pluperfect, or ablative absolute constructions. She concludes that the scribe of Co felt more confident and less bound to the Latin source text and traditions than the other scribes, and that at least one author besides Ælfric worked to develop an independent vernacular prose style in this period. A couple of her examples do not work (in one case, a clause identified as SOV is actually S IO V DO), and quantifying her results would have made them more useful. Nonetheless, De Bonis notes some significant discrepancies, particularly the use of periphrasis to produce more complex verb tenses than Old English customarily offered.

In “Translating the Texts Where *et Verborum Ordo Mysterium Est*: Late Old English Idiom vs. *Ablativus*

Absolutus,” *Journal of Medieval Latin* 18: 217–29, Olga Timofeeva reverses a common method. Instead of finding absolute participial constructions (APCs) in translations and comparing them with the source texts, she identifies 181 Latin APCs in the source texts for the *West-Saxon Gospels* and Ælfric’s *Genesis*, then analyzes how translators handle them. The *West-Saxon Gospels* tend to render them literally, turning Latin ablative absolutes into OE dative absolutes. Ælfric never uses this technique but substitutes prepositional phrases, second predicates, coordinate clauses, and temporal clauses. Occasionally, he simply omits an APC. Some scholars believe that the *West-Saxon Gospels* used existing glosses, so the translator’s techniques may not always have been conscious choices. Moreover, Roy Liuzza has argued that the audience of the *Gospels* was probably limited to clerics; the translator may have expected readers to know some Latin and handle Latinate constructions. Ælfric, however, emphasized simplicity and clarity in translations for audiences who did not have the Latin at hand and might hear rather than read the English. Timofeeva closes by contrasting Asser’s praise of the OE *Dialogues*, which used absolutes and other Latinate constructions, with the early eleventh-century’s “more conscious attitude towards the vernacular” (228). While her data are striking, Asser and Ælfric are both too singular to take as exemplars of their times.

Saints’ Lives

Cassandra Green explores the *vitae* of saintly virgins in “King, Mother, Soldier, Whore: Multiple Performances of Virginity in Anglo-Saxon Prose Saints’ Lives: The Heterogeneity of an Ideal,” (Ph.D. Diss., U of Manchester, 2007). *Index to Theses* 58 (2007) summarizes, “This thesis examines prose lives of virgin saints produced in Anglo-Saxon England between the late seventh and late tenth centuries. Specifically, through readings of Aldhelm’s *De Virginitate*, the *Old English Martyrology*, Rudolf’s Latin *vita* of Saint Leoba, Ælfric’s *Lives of Saints* and the anonymous *Life of Saint Margaret*, it investigates the multiple performances of virginity within these narratives. Whilst chastity and virginity has, in Anglo-Saxon scholarship, tended to be considered in relation to female virgin martyrs or the small group of chastely married saints, this study finds that the ideal of spiritual virginity and the virginal saintly body has a much more heterogenous representation in the Anglo-Saxon hagiographic corpus” (4043). According to the abstract, Green uses Judith Butler’s concepts of gender performance to investigate how male/female oppositions sometimes break down in lives of virgins;

she examines both male and female virgins and even “virginal abbatial motherhood.” “The heterogenous performances of virginity identified in this thesis challenge linear development models and so the conclusion also re-evaluates the currently perceived chronology of virginity narratives” (4043).

In “Wonder, Derision, and Fear: The Uses of Doubt in Anglo-Saxon Saints’ Lives” (Ph.D. Diss., Ohio State U, 2007), Sarah Joy Adams asks why a saint’s life would admit doubt at all, partly in response to Michael Goodich’s 1988 article “Miracles and Disbelief in the Late Middle Ages” in *Mediaevistik* 1. Examining both Latin and Old English lives, Adams distinguishes among motivations and types of doubt in her introductory chapter, though she finds every kind answered by a display of power. In her second chapter, observers question the sanctity of Cuthbert, Guthlac, and Wulfstan in assorted lives. Adams argues that authors used doubts in these lives to address particular historical circumstances for each cult, and that these questioners are not harshly punished. Her third chapter focuses on enemies who sinfully accuse Dunstan and Wulfstan. The writers identify themselves or their communities with the saints, “imply[ing] their own future vindication” (179), while attacking accusers’ motives and showing readers which side to choose. Accusers are condemned as tools of the devil and sometimes suffer in the stories, but those misled by accusers can still redeem themselves. The fourth chapter highlights moments of self-doubt by Æthelwold, Dunstan, and Wulfstan; these incidents call attention to the lives’ writers and reveal the grace and power of God working even through doubts. The fifth chapter details “postmortem derision”; conflicts ranging from personal to national spark such doubts, but miracles meet every failure of belief. Adams concludes that Anglo-Saxon hagiography shows much more variation in uses of and responses to doubt than Goodich found. Doubt is not always sinful, and even sinful doubt is not always punished. Before the establishment of formal canonization processes, individual saints’ lives reveal much about the context in which they were written.

NGD

Ælfric

See also De Bonis, “L’evoluzione della Prosa di Elfrico,” and Timofeeva, “Translating the Texts,” both in *Biblical Translation*, above.

Aaron J Kleist provides a concise description of a worthy project in “The Ælfric of Eynsham Project: An Introduction,” *Heroic Age* 11 (online). This brief and

nicely organized précis argues for the influence and afterlife of Ælfric’s works, and notes that although much has been accomplished in editing Ælfric over the last thirty years, there is still much basic work to be done: “at least twenty-one [texts] remain unpublished or scattered throughout incomplete nineteenth- or early twentieth-century editions.” According to Kleist, the Ælfric of Eynsham Project “will provide printed and electronic editions of key works ... that remain unpublished, partially published, or scattered throughout out-of-print texts, making them accessible to non-specialists as well as to scholars, and promoting a heightened appreciation for this pivotal figure of early English literature.” The project aims to produce “*A Word for All Seasons*, an edition and translation of four unpublished, ten partially published, and six out-of-print texts by Ælfric from some thirty four manuscripts” as well as “*The Electronic Ælfric*, an edition and translation published online and on CD-ROM of a core section of perhaps Ælfric’s most influential work: his *First Series* of Old English homilies.” However, *The Electronic Ælfric* will go beyond a simple reproduction of homilies from the First Series: “*The Electronic Ælfric* will examine a crucial set of eight homilies for the period from Easter to Pentecost, tracing their development through six phases of authorial revision and then through nearly 200 years of transmission following Ælfric’s death: twenty-four sets of readings or strands of textual tradition found in twenty-eight manuscripts produced in at least five scriptoria between 990 and 1200. Accompanied by introductions, commentary, and translations, these editions will make Ælfric’s work accessible to non-specialists while providing detailed analysis for scholars—promoting in the process a heightened appreciation for this pivotal figure of early English literature.” Kleist’s summary includes a brief discussion of “Ælfric’s Impact and Importance,” the “Challenge of Materials to be Edited,” and then an “Overview of Materials to be Edited.”

In “Punishing Bodies and Saving Souls: Capital and Corporal Punishment in Late Anglo-Saxon England,” *The Haskins Society Journal* 20: 39–57, Nicole Marafioti investigates the nature of capital punishment and execution in late Anglo-Saxon England, mostly in the writings of Ælfric and Wulfstan. After first noting the use of Sutton Hoo as a killing ground where the souls of men were probably condemned after death (as indicated by their internment in unhallowed pagan grounds), she unfolds the predicament of capital punishment. It was a necessary tool for secular authority (which increased in power and scope in the late Anglo-Saxon period), but it posed a conundrum for ecclesiastical authorities: capital

punishment of the Sutton Hoo sort (or execution without penance) was a punishment of body *and* soul and thus an encroachment of secular power upon ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Marafioti explicates Ælfric and Wulfstan's attitudes toward capital punishment: they wrote in different contexts and thus had slightly differing views, but both argued "that a person condemned by human justice could be fully absolved of his sins if he repented with true contrition before his death—a view that was inconsistent with secular authorities' apparent attempts to deprive deviants of Christian salvation" (42). Hence the conflict and dilemma as both writers tried to balance a pragmatic secular need for capital punishment with Christian dogma. Through an analysis of the *Life of St. Edmund* and other texts, Marafioti argues that Ælfric asserted that clerics should not be involved in secular capital punishment at all, given the spiritual danger to clergy should they be involved in the shedding of blood. Ælfric did, however, support capital punishment if it were carried out by laymen; for Ælfric, it would be better if sinners and criminals repented, yet secular justice, in the end, had a right to remove the unrepentant from society. Ælfric concludes that executioners would not be guilty of killing the innocent, even if there were a last-minute repentance, because God would sort things out in the afterlife. Given his public position and proximity to royal power, Wulfstan had to confront the problem of capital punishment more directly; he thus "aimed to align the king's penal system with principles of Christian mercy" (51). Wulfstan advocated for milder punishments that would keep order and justice, yet not endanger souls. For example, he preferred a punishment of mutilation rather than death; the pain would serve a "penitential function" (53) and thus "by means of a single sentence, [a criminal's] soul could be saved and his crime punished" (54). Both men believed that God was the final arbiter of a soul's fate: Ælfric believed that the fate of the soul was in the hands of the individual sinner rather than the state and thus individual repentance was all that mattered; Wulfstan attempted to construct a secular system of punishment that would encourage Christian penance and save the soul through the institutional system.

AS

In "Temperance as the Mother of Virtues in Ælfric," *N&Q* 55: 1–2, Mary Clayton discusses an identification of temperance that Ælfric makes in *Lives of Saints* I.1 and the opening of *De Octo Uitiis et de Duodecim Abusiis Gradus*—if in fact the opening is by Ælfric, which is debated. The source of Ælfric's statement regarding

temperance has proved elusive, as has the origin of his assertion that *Omnia nimia nocent* ("all excessive things are harmful"), though Malcolm Godden notes that the latter appears in Alcuin's *Grammatica* and has the "air of a proverb." Clayton traces the phrase to Anthimus in the early sixth century, where indeed it was already being described as ancient (*ab antiquis dictum est*). She also points out further appearances elsewhere in Alcuin and Abbo of Fleury, though one is hard pressed to determine which, if any, might have been Ælfric's immediate source. As regards temperance, Clayton states that discretion was more commonly known as the mother of virtues—an identification made, in fact, by two texts well known to Ælfric, the Benedictine Rule and Cassian's *Conlationes*. Another of Ælfric's main sources, however, Haymo of Auxerre, twice equates *discretio* with *temperantia* before describing the latter as the mother of virtues (an assertion he erroneously attributes to the Bible, if that is what he means by *Scriptura*). While Haymo likely provided the inspiration for Ælfric's statement, therefore, Ælfric himself appears responsible for contrasting temperance with excess.

Mark Faulkner considers one of Ælfric's more unusual choices of saints in "Ælfric, St. Edmund, and St. Edwold of Cerne," *Medium Ævum* 77.1: 1–9. Of those few Insular saints about whom Ælfric wrote, some (Cuthbert, Alban, Æthelthryth, and Oswald) he drew from his authoritative source Bede, while others (such as Swithun, patron saint of Ælfric's *alma mater*, Winchester) reflected perhaps a more personal connection. Faulkner posits that St. Edmund, a seeming incongruity in this list, might well belong to this latter category. Faulkner traces the foundation and early history of Cerne (Ælfric's first post), reviews the surviving evidence for the monastery's adoption of the cult of St. Edwold (Edmund's brother), and suggests that Ælfric's knowledge of the cult may explain his willingness to write a life of Edmund—even while characteristically distinguishing between those documented miracles appropriate to a saint's life and the popular stories that appear to have been in oral circulation. Indeed, Faulkner concludes, "it is not overly implausible ... that Ælfric is likely to have had some involvement in the management of the cult of St Edwold at Cerne" (5).

Rebecca I. Starr's "Ælfric's Gendered Theology in the 'Catholic Homilies,' the First Series" (Ph.D. Diss., U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), seeks to show that Ælfric, in striking contrast to his contemporaries, intervenes in his writings to "eras[e] the significance of the feminine from Christian faith and practice" (2). Examining the First Series because it is directed "at the least educated among the laity ... over whose educations

Ælfric could have exerted the most control" (13), she concentrates on Ælfric's treatment of Mary, Eve, and the resurrected body. Regarding Mary, first of all, he circumscribes her perceived importance, claims her as a model of obedience and virginity (both monastic traits), and reduces her status in ways that may have been evocative of Æthelred's mother Ælfthryth (18–19). From Eve, he removes any essential role in the Fall: "both agency and culpability for the first human sin belong to Adam," so that "Adam alone stands in as the normative human being" (19). As to the resurrected body, Ælfric speaks of the sinless physical forms that humans will receive in heaven, but offers only "male subjects for the process of meriting heaven" (20). Throughout, Starr affirms, Ælfric delimits the actions and role of women and "casts men as the potent actors in a world in which merit is a necessary condition for salvation" (17). In short, she concludes, "No other male Anglo-Saxon Benedictine of his period writes gender into theology so comprehensively and in such a bifurcated and hierarchical fashion" (20).

In her word study on "*Hnescnys*: Weakness of Mind in the Works of Ælfric," *Intertexts*, ed. Blanton and Scheck [see sec. 2], 79–90, Rhonda McDaniel considers the relationship of the Latin *mollis* ('soft, weak'), the etymological root for *mulier* ('woman, female'), with the Old English *hnesce*, used to translate it in Ælfric's *Grammar* and other Anglo-Saxon glossaries. Used of men, McDaniel notes, the Latin term often conveyed "moral deficiency, a lack of *virtus* or moral strength as well as masculine virility" (80). While Bosworth and Toller define *hnesce* as 'effeminate' as well as 'soft,' however, McDaniel's study of some 113 instances of the term in Old English suggests that it may not have had gendered connotations. Two-thirds of the time, it referred to the physical quality of softness or pliability. In fourteen cases, it entailed physical infirmity, the weakness of children, or (positive) spiritual gentleness. Thirteen times, however, it involved "soft clothing or soft beds associated with wealth or ease or to the preference for a luxurious life"—that is, *luxuria*, one of the capital sins delineated by Gregory the Great, which characterized those who cared more for bodily pleasure than for the health of the soul (83–84). In none of these cases did *hnesce* specifically associate these qualities with women or effeminate men—even among those translating from Latin who might have associated *mollis* with effeminacy. McDaniel concludes: "The Old English term indicated the physical traits of weakness, sickness, or infirmity and the spiritual trait of moral weakness, a tendency to yield to temptation or turn away from devotion to Christ, but it did so without resorting to

the connotations of gender present in the Latin *mollis*" (90).

Gabriella Corona applies a subtle eye for linguistic nuance to the study of "Ælfric's (Un)Changing Style: Continuity of Patterns From the *Catholic Homilies* to the *Lives of Saints*," *JEGP* 107.2: 169–89. Where John Pope and Malcolm Godden have pointed to the Second Series of the *Catholic Homilies* as the point where Ælfric began to develop his rhythmical prose style, Corona argues that the "dominant characteristics" of Ælfric's rhetoric that "transcend" the boundaries of rhythmical and non-rhythmical style are already present in the First Series (*CH* I) and may be profitably compared to those in the *Lives of Saints* (*LS*) (170–71). One point of comparison she uses is a scene involving Julian and Basil in *CH* I.30, which Ælfric revises in *LS* I.3. Corona identifies strong alliterative and rhythmical patterns in the former that Ælfric develops in the latter, employing similar word choices even as he experiments by rearranging syntax. *CH* I.30 may be a more slavish translation of the Latin source, but it displays an array of stylistic techniques that anticipate his later prose (181). The same principle holds true elsewhere in Ælfric's work. Echoing Mary Clayton, Corona suggests that when Ælfric re-writes earlier material, many of his changes "involve alliteration, lexical variation, and word-order to suit the requirements of his rhythmical line, and that a number of adjustments are made around an already alliterating form" (175). At the same time, she warns that Skeat's incomplete and problematic edition of the *Lives* obscures the evidence; consequently, she considers orthographic and lexical variants from manuscripts not collated by Skeat that may more accurately reflect Ælfric's stylistic choices (171). It is not simply to later First Series homilies that Corona compares the *Lives*, however; going back as far as *CH* I.1, she shows that "the ornamental patterns most characteristic of his diction"—that is, "alliteration, paronomasia, repetition, and contrast"—"appear already in his very first homily" (172). Corona underscores that it is not simply quasi-poetic rhythm that is in view; rather, "In Ælfric's work words and sounds are repeated with astonishing regularity in ways that seem altogether more consistent than his use of rhythm" (188). Indeed, she avers, in light of phonological and lexical analysis, not only does greater continuity appear between Ælfric's early and later work, but "in fact, the distinction between Ælfric's non-rhythmical and rhythmical phase blurs away" (188).

In "Ælfric and Haymo Revisited," *Intertexts*, ed. Blanton and Scheck [see sec. 2], 331–47, Joyce Hill turns again to a theme she has cogently examined since

perhaps 1992: the immediate sources of Ælfric's homilies. The first pages of the study provide an excellent introduction to her work in this regard, showing how Ælfric relied on the work of Paul the Deacon, Smaragdus, and Haymo of Auxerre to provide patristic exegesis to his Anglo-Saxon audience. Granted, the means by which these intermediaries transmitted patristic works varied: Paul the Deacon named the authors of the sermons that he anthologized, Smaragdus noted authors' names in the margins of the extracts that he wove together, and Haymo blended patristic material freely into original (if derivative) compositions. Nonetheless, Hill avers that all three sources played an important role in Ælfric's composition: "Ælfric must have constantly consulted Haymo, having him to hand just as readily as the other two, and looking across to that manuscript just as often as he looked at Paul the Deacon or Smaragdus" (336). Hill underscores, however, that the manner in which Ælfric used Haymo was necessarily different: not as a mine for attributable patristic material (since Haymo did not identify sources), nor for longer passages (since "this would have produced a disjunction in style and approach"), but for explanatory detail and supportive quotations which "sometimes prompted Ælfric to develop a related point for himself" (336). Earlier source study by Cyril Smetana suggested that Ælfric's use of Haymo was "rather extensive," but closer examination of the examples adduced both by Smetana and Malcolm Godden reveal "short, scattered, and not definite" evidence (339). It is for this reason, Hill states, that Ælfric in his first preface says that he uses Haymo *aliquando* ("sometimes")—an adverb, she concludes, that is carefully and aptly chosen.

Joyce Hill's 1996 Toller Memorial Lecture, "Translating the Tradition: Manuscripts, Models and Methodologies in the Composition of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*," *Textual and Material Culture in Anglo-Saxon England: Thomas Northcote Toller and the Toller Memorial Lectures*, ed. Donald Scragg (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2003), 241–59, discusses concepts of translation in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*. Ælfric's "translations" of patristic exegesis, Hill notes, involved adaptation and synthesis as well—a task made the easier by the intermediate Carolingian sources on which he relied: the homiliaries of Paul the Deacon, Smaragdus, and Haymo. The last two, compiling patristic material into collections that circulated under their own names, Ælfric acknowledged explicitly in his Latin preface to his First Series of homilies. In the case of Paul the Deacon, by contrast, Ælfric named the patristic authorities anthologized by Paul rather than the anthologizer himself—both because of the greater weight of the former

and, Hill argues, because Ælfric's copy of Paul the Deacon may well have lacked the latter's name. The three intermediaries were complementary resources: "they were rubricated and organized alike; they were similar in their lections; [and] they stood within the same tradition of patristic exegetical authority" (251). A similar exegetical approach characterized much of this material, moreover: Ælfric's copy of Paul the Deacon was likely augmented with homilies by Gregory and Bede (who drew heavily on Gregory)—both of whom, along with Smaragdus (who drew heavily on them in turn), expounded Scripture verse by verse and phrase by phrase, Ælfric's own preferred method of exegesis. According to Hill, this practical point of correspondence, combined with the prominence of Gregory and Bede in Paul the Deacon and Smaragdus, may underlie Ælfric's greater reliance on these figures than on Augustine and Jerome. If the three intermediaries were complementary, however, they also assisted Ælfric in unique ways. Paul the Deacon provided complete patristic sermons on which to draw. Smaragdus provided "models for conflation, modification and abbreviation" of patristic material (254). Haymo provided biblical cross-references and supplementary interpretive details. Using these resources, Ælfric thus participated with them in a chain of authority; unlike them, however, his work involved "translation into a different language and a different intellectual context . . . which went beyond the rendering of word for word" (257).

Examining the tension between Ælfric's reluctance to translate Scripture and his practice of doing so in "Rebuilding the Tower of Babel: Ælfric and Bible Translation," *Florilegium* 23.2 (2007): 47–60, Tristan Major calls the monk "one of the most paradoxical figures of Old English literature" (47). Major points to three interrelated biblical episodes that may have provided Ælfric with his warrant for this endeavor: the tower of Babel, Christ's sending out of the disciples, and the gift of tongues at Pentecost. Babel, on the one hand, might seem to serve as a warning against translation: here, in Ælfric's view, people united in speaking Hebrew—the most exalted of tongues—were divided first by different languages and then by different religious beliefs. Linguistic change and theological error might thus go hand in hand. While some of Ælfric's authorities viewed Hebrew, Greek, and Latin as sacred, however, Major finds little evidence that the notion had wide currency among Anglo-Saxons. Rather, Ælfric viewed the seventy-two languages that followed from Babel as tongues to which the truths of Christ must be brought. Indeed, to this end, Ælfric associates these vernaculars with Christ's commissioning of seventy-two disciples to

go and preach the gospel. In Ælfric's view, Major claims, "On the basis of these typological correspondences, it is not only permissible but necessary to translate portions of the Bible, because the translator fulfills the task of the disciple by proclaiming the gospel to a new nation in that nation's language" (55). The miracle of Pentecost, furthermore, by equipping believers to speak in a multiplicity of tongues, demonstrates that "all languages are divinely sanctioned for communicating the message of the Gospel" (57). One result of such proclamation is the canon of Scripture itself—seventy-two books, in Ælfric's view, that may speak through the spiritual descendants of the seventy-two disciples to the seventy-two languages that have brought religious division after Babel. Such precedent, Major says, ultimately spurs on Ælfric's work of translation.

A prodigious boon to Ælfric scholarship was the publication of Richard Marsden's edition of *The Old English Heptateuch and Ælfric's Libellus De Veteri Testamento Et Novo* (London: Oxford UP). The volume replaces S.J. Crawford's earlier EETS edition, which was subsequently supplemented by Neil Ker (London, Oxford UP, 1969). Like Crawford, Marsden reproduces Ælfric's preface to *Genesis*, also edited by Jonathan Wilcox in *Ælfric's Prefaces* (Durham: Durham Medieval Texts, 1994), the first seven books of the Bible, translated partially by Ælfric (the first six books being printed in facsimile by C. R. Dodwell and Peter Clemons as *The Old English Illustrated Hexateuch* (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1974), and Ælfric's *Libellus de Veteri Testamento et Nouo* or *Letter to Sigeward*, a treatise on the Old and New Testaments that traces the course of Biblical history. Where Crawford bases his edition of the first six books primarily on London, British Library, Cotton Claudius B. iv [B] and his edition of *Judges* and the *Libellus* on Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud. Misc. 509 [L], Marsden uses L as his base text throughout, supplying readings from B and other manuscripts where L is defective. He chooses L "because, overall, it appears to transmit more accurately than B the archetypal text brought together at the time of the compilation of the *OEH*, of which L and B are copies" (clxxvi). While Crawford prints a Latin version of the Heptateuch at the bottom of each page, moreover—using a sixteenth-century revision of the Vulgate which he occasionally emended without authority from extant Vulgate manuscripts—Marsden reserves his analysis of the Latin text for Volume Two of the edition.

Following a discussion of previous editions, distinctive features of the present one, the manuscripts, and the relationship between them, Marsden delineates his editorial approach and conventions. He provides

biblical chapter and verse numbers (save for *Judges*, which departs enough from the Vulgate to make this impractical), supplies modern punctuation, expands abbreviations silently, and uses modern conventions of Old English word division. He notes additions and corrections made by contemporary Anglo-Saxons, by late eleventh- or early twelfth-century Latin glossators, and by William L'Isle in the sixteenth century. He also collates all divergent readings save variations between *þ* and *ð* and *i* and *y*, arguing that "the recently renewed interest in the manuscript transmission of Old English in the later eleventh and twelfth centuries justifies the full presentation of all other variants, even though many are purely orthographic"; the limited nature of the extant witnesses, he states, keeps the apparatus from being overburdened (clxxvi). In short, the whole volume provides a scrupulous and valuable update to Crawford's work. Volume Two of the edition, containing Marsden's commentary and glossary, should prove equally welcome.

Two studies focus on Ælfric's literary treatment of animals. First, in "Ælfric's Zoology," *Neophilologus* 92.1: 141–53, Emily V. Thornbury speaks of Ælfric's interest as one of his "less-known but more endearing traits" (141)—one that also gives insight into his library resources, interpretive process, pastoral concerns, and personal perspective. Using his comments on the phoenix and the silkworm, Thornbury shows how Ælfric at times goes out of his way to include zoological details from additional sources. Looking at the panther, lynx, unicorn, and griffin, she suggests that Ælfric may have encountered a bestiary based on the *Physiologus* and perhaps a collection of zoological information drawn from Isidore's *Etymologiae*. Reviewing Ælfric's explanation of such creatures, she notes that some he describes "allegorically" (with single, fixed meanings), while others he describes "symbolically" (with multifaceted layers of meaning). Saints, she observes, often command animals' obedience in Ælfric's works, momentarily reversing the primal curse and restoring the relationship of humans and animals in Eden. Even without conveying spiritual truths, moreover, animals represent important knowledge in their own right; for Ælfric, "ignorance of the true nature of the world is in some sense an impediment to Christian faith" inasmuch as it might lead to skepticism (149). On encountering mention of elephants in his account of Maccabees, for example, his audience might presume that "the introduction of fantastic elements has made the story something other than history"—a direct challenge to an individual's faith (150). Such practical considerations aside, however, Ælfric appears to have found exotic

animals interesting in themselves, “a part”—as Thornbury elegantly puts it—“of the indispensable furniture of an educated person’s mind” (152).

In the second study, “Sumum menn wile þincan syllic þis to gehyrenne’: Ælfric on Animals—His Sources and their Application,” *Transmission and Transformation in the Middle Ages*, ed. Kathy Cawsey and Jason Harris (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007), 65–76, Letty Nijhuis touches on the sources and nature of Ælfric’s comments on local and foreign fauna. For his discussion of the more than 400 animals that appear in his *Catholic Homilies* and *Lives of Saints*, Ælfric relies primarily on works by Bede, the Bible (itself referring to more than 120 different species), Isidore’s *Etymologiae*, Basil’s *Hexameron*, and Ambrose’s work of the same name (67). Ælfric teaches that nature testifies to the existence of God, that animals differ from humans in lacking souls and reason, that humans walk upright because they are designed to contemplate spiritual rather than earthly things, and that humans can nonetheless learn spiritual qualities from the animal world. For his information about animals, however, Ælfric may draw not only on secondary sources to supplement his main text, but perhaps on personal experience as well. In an episode from the *Life of Cuthbert*, Nijhuis notes, where Bede speaks of two otters which the saint encounters near Lindisfarne, Ælfric changes the animals to seals. As European otters are not sea animals, but seals abound around the Farne islands, Nijhuis argues that Ælfric may well have visited Lindisfarne and changed the text accordingly (76). Through such sources, Ælfric thus draws on his own fascination with animals (66) to provide insight into the nature of humans and their Maker.

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 Balzarotti (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), 167–88, Elaine M. Treharne argues that while a desire to sift the “fantastic” from the “factual” may drive the study of hagiography, a recognition that these are “historical narratives”—texts of intrinsic interest in their own right that reflect the concerns of the period in which they were composed—may be more productive (168–69). Examining Ælfric’s vernacular account of Swithun, she notes that the text differs from “typical” hagiography inasmuch as it deals not with the saint’s life but with posthumous miracles performed within living memory and proximity to the author (170–71). As such, it evinces to an even greater degree a quality vital to Ælfric’s works as a whole: purposeful historicity, the grounding of accounts in authenticating details. In reshaping his source, not only does Ælfric heighten the apparent

reliability and monastic relevance of the narrative by excising all non-localized events (178), but he also confirms certain details as a personal eyewitness. In addition, however, by portraying Swithun’s interventions as a direct response to and encouragement of Æthelwold’s reforming work, Ælfric positions the saint’s miracles as “a reward that set the Benedictine reform within the context of divine approbation, with some of the glory reflecting upon the author himself” (188).

In another essay, Elaine Treharne delivers a body blow to what she calls “The Canonisation of Ælfric,” *English Now: Selected Papers From the 20th IAUPE Conference in Lund 2007* (Lund: Lund UP), 1–13. Standing out in the Anglo-Saxon period as one of the most self-revealing and seemingly accessible authors besides King Alfred, Ælfric has gained further respect from modern scholars through his careful methodology, scrupulous assessment of sources, erudition, and intelligence. The praises showered upon him have recently been tempered by a recognition that Ælfric may not have been representative of his contemporaries, that some of his positions may have been idiosyncratic even within the Benedictine Reform. Treharne, however, challenges still more scholars’ perception of this figure. On the one hand, she notes, Ælfric’s prefaces do eschew affected humility topoi that draw attention to their own sophistication, such as appear, for instance, in Byrhtferth of Ramsey’s *Enchiridion*. On the other hand, examining the prefaces more closely, Treharne finds a writer who shrewdly defuses potential criticism through “a masterclass in convincing rhetoric” (9–10), one who “is eager to be well thought of and to please, and who is not entirely altruistic in his undertaking” (11), one whose “self-seeking and self-righteous mode of expression” stands in direct contrast to peers who “simply do not show the same level of self-authorisation, the same sureness that they are chosen to write on behalf of God, and the same concern for the maintenance of reputation” (11), and one who—in the vernacular prefaces, at least—perhaps “declares vatic status for himself,” claiming “his Pauline inheritance of Christ-appointed truth-speaker” when addressing less educated audiences (12). Given the persistent promulgation of texts Ælfric may have condemned, furthermore, and the tendency of others to adapt or reproduce his works without attribution, she concludes that “his reputation did not outlive him and his efforts to counter what he perceived to be ‘heresy’ or ‘dark fallacy’ did not succeed” (12). Rather than set Ælfric up on a pedestal, she maintains, attention may profitably be turned to works such as the anonymous sermons that have been obscured by his shadow.

Wulfstan

With the exception of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, as Jonathan Davis-Secord notes in “Rhetoric and Politics in Archbishop Wulfstan’s Old English Homilies,” *Anglia* 126.1: 65–96, studies of Wulfstan’s style have typically adduced pastoral rather than political or historical motivations for the archbishop’s rhetoric. Nominal compounds, however—whether clustered in lists of sins, such as *wedlogan ne wordlogan* (‘oath-liars nor word-liars’), or appearing singly in rare or unique formulations, such as *peodloga* (‘nation-liar’ or ‘deceiver of the people’)—reflect his concern with the political volatility of the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, and advance his agenda for promoting social stability. In the first place, Davis-Secord says, clusters of nominal compounds appear in Wulfstan’s exhortatory sermons as part of lists of sins to be avoided or of sinners destined for condemnation. These lists are self-contained rhetorical set pieces, practically interchangeable with one another, that seem to an extent to be independent of the sermon surrounding them. On one level, Davis-Secord observes, they may function as filler: unlike Wulfstan’s explanatory sermons which expound Christian doctrine, narrative sermons which recount Christian narratives, or legal sermons which set forth Christian codes of practice, the exhortatory sermons might have lacked substance, inasmuch as “the general reasons for decrying sin should be self-evident” (79). In addition to fleshing out the sermon, however, the compound-laden lists of sins and sinners shift the sermon’s focus from specific concerns to the larger problem of social instability. If these lists create “memorable moments without overwhelming the rest of the text” (81), moreover, so do those occasions when Wulfstan employs rare or unique nominal compounds singly: in both cases, Davis-Secord affirms, “the coupling of compactness with complexity imbues compounds with increased linguistic weight,” arresting the attention of Wulfstan’s audience and highlighting the archbishop’s call to restabilize society through repentance (89).

AK

Renée R. Trilling’s well-researched and interesting study “Sovereignty and Social Order: Archbishop Wulfstan and the *Institutes of Polity*,” *The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. John S. Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones (Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007), 58–85, examines the role of Wulfstan’s *Institutes of Polity* in the ideologies of sovereignty in late Anglo-Saxon England.

Trilling emphasizes the desire of Wulfstan to promulgate a vision of social order and notes that many of his writings, regardless of genre, speak to a desire to promote that order. She argues that there are two competing ideas of sovereignty in the period: one in which the king is the supreme authority (duly advised by counselors) and one in which the king is nevertheless subject to God, the ultimate source of divine sovereignty. The conflict between these two views is especially apparent in Wulfstan’s representation of the bishop and his duties in the *Institutes of Polity*: “the bishop, rather than the king, becomes the architect of peace, unity, and justice in a Christian kingdom, revealing a fundamental contradiction at the heart of Wulfstan’s *Polity*: the irreconcilability of divine and secular sovereignty in the administration of civil society” (60). Trilling examines the place of *Polity* in Wulfstan’s body of work, its complex manuscript tradition and its historical context. By contextualizing *Polity* in terms of political theology and legal discourse, Trilling argues that Wulfstan’s *Polity* is an “ordered and coherent meditation on the place of each individual within a Christian society” (65); the text presents a social vision, one in which the bishop is a central figure. By tracking revisions to *Polity* through successive manuscripts, she shows that the revisions betray an ambivalence and anxiety in Wulfstan’s understanding of the bishop’s role. He exhibits a growing certainty about the central “importance of bishops in national governance” (73), above and beyond secular lords. The *Polity* even implies that the king’s power should be checked or mitigated by the authority of a bishop as a source of divine teaching and instruction: “while the king may be responsible for ensuring that justice is carried out in his kingdom, the bishop is ultimately responsible for making sure that the king knows what justice is” (77). The abstract, schematic character of *Polity* (i.e. that it is not formally attached to a specific ruler or place, as a law code would be) gives it “the universality of a mode of governance independent of time, place, or monarch, based on the eternal authority of divine power and Christian teaching” (77). She concludes that *Polity* tries to mediate the competing ideologies of sovereignty: “While, on the surface, *Polity* seems to insist aggressively on the divine right and absolute power of the king, the text’s political unconscious chips away at that power by removing the authorizing name of the sovereign and by subjecting him to the educative power of the bishop” (77–78).

See also Mary Clayton, “The Old English *Promissio Regis*,” in *Miscellaneous*, below; and Nicole Marafioti, “Punishing Bodies,” in *Ælfric*, above.

Wonders of the East

Mark Bradshaw Busbee argues against postcolonial readings of Old English texts depicting India in “A Paradise Full of Monsters: India in the Old English Imagination,” *LATCH* 1: 51–72. In the (very few) postcolonial interpretations of *Wonders of the East* and *Alexander’s Letter to Aristotle*, “post-colonial theory oversimplifies what Anglo-Saxons thought and believed about an unknown, almost mythical place” (51); in his view, these postcolonial readings simply try to determine “how these texts create templates for racism” (68), a conclusion he finds wanting and anachronistic. To the contrary, Busbee suggests that these Old English texts “depict India with a sort of romantic curiosity, one characterized by awe and wonder” and that “[t]his wonder is a far cry from racial or imperial designs” (52). Busbee briefly surveys Anglo-Saxon depictions of India from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, maps, the narratives of St. Thomas, St. Bartholomew, and St. Andrew from various sources, and finally *Wonders of the East*. In his analysis of *Wonders*, he argues that the text’s illustration of monstrous races displays a “fascination with human diversity” (62) and “an interest on the part of the illustrator in the monster’s interiority and vitality” (63), rather than revulsion or horror (as a postcolonial critic might assert). To take a specific, well-known example from the text, Busbee concludes, “[t]he melancholy of the Donestre after eating the visitor seems to lessen his monstrosity and emphasize his humanity” (67–68). Overall, Busbee finds the understanding of India in Anglo-Saxon England mixed; he concludes that “these texts reveal a dual fear and desire that resided completely in the realm of the imagination” (69). India was visualized as an exotic place of danger and as a paradise. Busbee asserts that “Englishmen might have felt some sort of kinship with the denizens of another land on the edge of the world” (60). The article tries to cover a great deal of material in a small space, and thus its evidence tends to feel a bit thin; the author omits reference to some crucial scholarship on the depiction of India in the Middle Ages, e.g., Thomas Hahn, “The Indian Tradition in Western Medieval Intellectual History,” *Viator* 9 (1978): 213–234.

Eileen A. Joy delivers one of the postcolonial readings of *Wonders of the East* that Busbee would find anachronistic in “The Signs and Location of a Flight (or Return?) of Time: The Old English *Wonders of the East* and the Gujarat Massacre,” *Cultural Diversity in the British Middle Ages: Archipelago, Island, England*, ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), 209–29. Joy’s method here, however, is deliberately

anachronistic and part of the essay’s intent; she juxtaposes two disparate “events”: “the real case of a massacre in the modern state of Gujarat in southwestern India in 2002 and the imaginative case of Alexander the Great’s massacre of a race of giant women in the fantasized *Babilonia* of the Anglo-Saxon *Wonders of the East*” (210). By deliberately juxtaposing the medieval Anglo-Saxon text and the modern Gujarat ethnic cleansing, she argues that both “texts” bear analogous concerns related to race, disgust at the female sexual body, and “a very ancient and ritualized type of reactionary ... violence that is both morally condemnatory and sublimely (even sexually) ecstatic” (210). Joy’s goal is to bring an ethical perspective to both texts, one that addresses the place of the human and the place of violence in these respective cultural moments; she is “interested in tracing circuits of anxieties that have always coalesced and continue to coalesce around the multiple histories of and contestations over becoming-human” (211). She first examines the horrific Gujarat ethnic cleansing and its sexualized violence toward women, arguing that this focus on the female body is related to a desire for a pure national Hindu community: “And because the woman’s body is a *reproducing* body, it occupies a precarious position within any community that considers itself a collective ‘nation,’ one in which family is the basal unit” (214). She places the Gujarat massacre alongside an analogous moment in *Wonders of the East*: Alexander’s “ethnic cleansing” of giant women; the monstrous women in *Wonders* are category-defying, hypersexualized monstrosities and thus call forth a similar purifying violence. The women in *Wonders* “in their unruly sexuality ... threaten[] to collapse the border between same and different, self and Other” (224). The violence and sexuality traversing the *Wonders* account and the Gujarat massacre seem to be two aspects of a dark anxiety concerning the pure self and the pure community.

Blickling and Vercelli Homilies

Thomas N. Hall tracks down an exegetical motif in “The Armaments of John the Baptist in Blickling Homily 14 and the Exeter Book *Descent into Hell*,” *Intertexts*, ed. Blanton and Scheck [see sec. 2], 289–306. The homiletic motif in question is found in both Blickling Homily 14 and the Exeter book poem *Descent into Hell*: the notion that John the Baptist armed himself with weapons while still an unborn baby in the womb and prepared to fight for Christ. The source of this martial motif in Blickling 14 is a Latin sermon by Peter Chrysologus; Hall argues that these references to John’s armaments “depend ultimately on an exegetical motif most

fully developed in the Greek homiletic tradition, and that the same motif survives in a somewhat different form in [the *Descent to Hell*] where it has been subtly recontextualized" (292). This Greek and Coptic homiletic tradition of John's armaments goes back to the fifth century. Hall argues that Chrysologus had access to this motif in some form. In the enigmatic poem *Descent to Hell*, John the Baptist refers rather mysteriously to the fact that Christ armed him; the difference is that in this poem John awaits Christ in Hell, rather than awaiting him in the womb. Hall argues that the poet saw the two situations—John in the womb and John in Hell—as analogous: "To those medieval readers who were versed in the subtleties of patristic typology, John's leaping in the womb and his preaching to the hell-dwellers were intimately linked as parallel manifestations of his prophetic identity" (304). The Harrowing of Hell is a moment of "rebirth" for those saved by Christ's triumphant descent; likewise, John awaited the redeeming birth of Christ in the womb. In general, Hall argues that the puzzling details of the *Descent into Hell* can be explained if we conceive of the poet as thinking in terms of typological parallels; the poet's "depiction of John the Baptist receiving armor and weapons in hell is meant to recall the image of John seizing weapons in the womb. This parallel would have been understood only by a select group of readers with a particular command of homiletic literature, but such a group of readers would include the Blickling homilist as well as anyone who had encountered the Chrysologus sermon as a monastic lection for the feast of John the Baptist's nativity" (306).

Jane Roberts examines editorial decisions regarding Tironian *notae* in "The Fates of *and* in Vercelli Homily XVI: Some Thoughts," *Text, Language and Interpretation: Essays in Honour of Keiko Ikegami*, ed. Yoshiyuki Nakao, Shoko Ono, Naoko Shirai, Kaoru Noji, and Masahiko Kanno (Tokyo: Eichosha, 2007), 5–18. In this brief study, Roberts focuses on the eleven instances of *and* (Tironian *et*) in Vercelli XVI, comparing the treatment of this abbreviation in two editions of the homily by Paul Szarmach and Donald Scragg. The homily has "an unusually high number of possibly inappropriate Tironian signs" (15), and four of these particular *notae* might be superfluous: should editors retain them or not? In their respective editions both Szarmach and Scragg treat the abbreviations' retention and/or deletion in slightly different ways. Roberts re-visits each of these eleven instances, with particular attention to the four *notae* that Scragg and Szarmach found dubious. While Szarmach and Scragg favor deleting these *notae* or marking them as dubious, Roberts finds reason to

retain them. She argues that the editors "to a greater or lesser extent make emendations that tighten up the syntax" of the homily (13), perhaps more so than is warranted. In the end, should these dubious *ands* be retained? She finds that the "answer is mixed" (15), but concludes that she would generally favor retention over deletion.

Donald G. Scragg's succinct contribution to Paul Szarmach's festschrift, "The Vercelli Homilies and Kent," *Intertexts*, ed. Blanton and Scheck [see sect. 2], 369–80, revisits the Vercelli Homilies and their provenance, reaffirming conclusions from his earlier work that the codex originated in Kent. In this study he examines other extant manuscripts that contain copies of the Vercelli homilies (or extracts) in order "to see how far they too may be associated with the southeastern region of England, and thus perhaps to establish a library in Kent as the principal point of dissemination for the material" (369). He moves briefly through details of the twenty-one manuscripts "beginning with those the origin or provenance of which is known and track[ing] both their degree of use of Vercelli homilies and their textual closeness to the Vercelli book copies" (370). He locates each manuscript in southeastern England, in centers such as Canterbury and Rochester. He comes to two conclusions. The first is that although the scribe of the Vercelli Book drew his items "from a number of different sources, they form a homogeneous group as a whole, a group which appears to have been available to other scribes (probably in the same place) until at least the middle of the eleventh century" (379); his second conclusion is that there were "a large number of Vercelli items ... in a southwestern library until the mid eleventh century" (380), that "the evidence of other manuscripts presented here suggests that there was a library containing these materials in Canterbury for three-quarters of a century after the Vercelli book was written," and that by the twelfth century "copies of the materials had moved to Rochester" (380).

Apollonius of Tyre

Like many scholars, Melanie Heyworth finds the manuscript context of *Apollonius of Tyre* a strange puzzle and argues for a solution in "Apollonius of Tyre in Its Manuscript Context: An Issue of Marriage," *PQ* 86 (2007): 1–26. The single extant copy of the Old English translation of *Apollonius* is to be found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 201, a miscellaneous collection of penitential and legal texts described by Patrick Wormald as a "Wulfstanian primer of Christian standards." Heyworth surveys the scant scholarship on

Apollonius and concludes that one of the reasons for the text's lack of critical attention is due to the puzzle of its manuscript context: what is a translation of a late antique classical romance doing in a manuscript of stuffy religious and legal materials? (What does Wulfstan have to do with Antiochus?) Heyworth argues that the factor uniting the materials in the manuscript is an interest in marriage as a topic: "The position on marriage that is constructed in *Apollonius*—the text's marital morality—indicates a way in which it would have been acceptable to the compiler of MS 201: an examination of the marital morality in *Apollonius* suggests that this text harmonized with the manuscript as a whole. The compiler of MS 201 was demonstrably interested in the definition of lawful marriage, and the morality and legalities of extra-marital sexual relations, devoting considerable space to laws and penitentials which engaged with this problematic" (6). Heyworth gives background on ideas of marriage in Anglo-Saxon England and draws connections between the ideas about marriage in the various legal and penitential texts of the manuscript and pertinent moments of "marital morality" in *Apollonius*. For example, she notes that "Antiochus's desire to marry his daughter clearly violates the understanding of the morality and legality of marriage evident elsewhere in MS 201" (11), and that "the behavior of both Apollonius and Arcestrate embodies many of the aspects which the texts in MS 201 prescribe for people in similar circumstances" (15). Heyworth's conclusion is that "*Apollonius*, like the legal and confessional texts, is concerned to condemn incest, to promote consensual marriage, to dissuade remarriage, and to promote chastity" (18).

Miscellaneous

Thomas D. Hill provides an intriguing analysis of an understudied text in "The Conversion of Sibilla in the 'History of the Holy Rood Tree,'" *SP* 105: 123–43. The text in question is "The late Old English, or if one prefers, early Middle English *History of the Holy Rood Tree* ... the earliest extant vernacular version of the legend of the Cross in Western European literature and ... a twelfth-century redaction of a text that was first translated into Old English at least a century earlier" (124). The text is a history of the Cross from its beginning as a shoot in the time of Moses to its later maturity and growth down through history to its role in the crucifixion. The text is a baroque accumulation of apocryphal episodes and miracles; Hill focuses here on one specific episode—the conversion of Sibilla, a prostitute converted and renamed Susanna and subsequently

martyred. Although his focus is on this one episode, Hill's broader purpose is to "illustrate some ways in which modern critics can understand and perhaps even to some degree appreciate the genre of medieval Christian 'apocryphal' texts" (124). Hill argues that "the logic and the larger significance" (131) of Sibilla's conversion "depends upon relatively straightforward biblical figures and the ongoing tradition of commonplace Christian biblical exegesis as this tradition was disseminated in 'public' forms such as homilies or the liturgy" (131). Hill teases out the text's exegetical substructure by drawing parallels between Sibilla and the Rood itself: both begin their lives in a state of unsullied purity, then both are degraded (one by prostitution, the other by the crucifixion), and ultimately both are exalted (through conversion and the exaltation of the Cross, respectively). Both the woman and the wood are sterile, but bear spiritual fruit; both serve as intermediaries between God and the human community. Thus, Hill argues that "the legend of Sibilla and that of the Rood Tree involved a reenactment, as it were, of the fundamental pattern of Christian history. Man was once naturally good; he fell and was redeemed through the incarnation. His final role is, however, far more exalted than his initial one, a paradox defined by the famous definition of Adam's fall as a *felix culpa*" (137). With this basic exegetical analogy established, Hill works a few other symbolic details into the symbolic pattern (e.g., the significance of Sibilla's name). An implicit argument throughout the essay is that this is a fascinating, well-crafted and surprisingly subtle text that deserves more attention from scholars.

Katrin Rupp examines the interface of orality and writing in "The Anxiety of Writing: A Reading of the Old English Journey Charm," *Oral Tradition* 23.2: 255–66. Noting that the journey charm is characterized by "uttering magical words and drawing a shielding circle," Rupp claims these elements as evidence of "the charm's explicitly performative and practical nature" (256). She is interested in what happens when the oral and performative dimensions of the charm hit parchment, so to speak, because this state of transitional literacy begets a certain anxiety. She argues that "[t]he process of writing down the charm ... weakens its protective or healing power that is most effective when performed. Moreover, in *Journey Charm* the scribe arguably incorporates an awareness of his own disempowering activity" (256). Proceeding mainly through a close reading of the charm and reading it in its manuscript context (i.e. as a neighbor of the Old English translation of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*), she argues that "the appearance of *Journey Charm* on [sic] the manuscript bespeaks the scribe's desire to keep a balance between the oral and

literate powers contained in the poem" (262). The full contours and implications of this anxiety are not quite worked out in this essay, but it would be a good subject for a longer study.

Angela Beth Fulk's "On Anginne': Anglo-Saxon Readings of Genesis" (Ph.D. Diss., Miami U of Ohio), written under the direction of Britton Harwood, is unavailable for interlibrary loan or distribution until 2012. Reproduced below is the abstract from *Digital Dissertations*: "My dissertation focuses on the plethora of references to the book of Genesis that are found in Old English literature, easily more than exist for any other book of the Bible. The project traces both the ways that this Scriptural narrative impacted the newly-Christianized society of the Anglo-Saxons and the unique interpretations of Genesis that this culture produced. Central texts for this analysis include *Beowulf* and the *Genesis* poem, along with the illustrations of the Genesis narrative found in the Junius Manuscript and the *Old English Illustrated Hexateuch*. The methodology is modeled on current paradigms in cultural history, such as the 'contact zone' theories of Mary Louise Pratt, the research of Caroline Walker Bynum, and the comparable analysis of the *Exodus* poem published by Nicholas Howe. Section One examines the pagan religious beliefs and practices of the Anglo-Saxons, insofar as these may be ascertained by the scant surviving textual evidence and archeological relics, and demonstrates how the narratives of Genesis were used to provide a bridge for the Anglo-Saxons between pagan and Christian culture. Section Two discusses the political implications of Anglo-Saxon retellings of Genesis. Genealogies and other texts that incorporate Genesis material not only provided the Anglo-Saxons with a new sense of cultural identity based on their perceived role in history, but also served to strengthen the institution of Anglo-Saxon kingship. The discussion of the impact of Genesis on Anglo-Saxon social customs in Section Three centers on examining the story of Cain and Abel in light of the Germanic tradition of blood-feud and on considering how Anglo-Saxon concepts of gender roles shaped their interpretations of the female characters of Genesis, such as Eve."

Most of Valentine A. Pakis's "Studies in Early Germanic Biblical Literature: Medieval Rewritings, Medieval Receptions, and Modern Interpretations" (Ph.D. Diss., U of Minnesota), has already been published in journals dating from 2005–2009. Chapter One was published as "John 2.4a in the Old High German *Tatian*," in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 128 (2006): 221–50; Chapter Two as "Sharing Vessels with an *Armaz Wib*: Jesus and the Samaritan

Woman in Medieval Germanic," in *JEGP* 104 (2005): 514–27; Chapter Three was published as "Homoian Vestiges in the Gothic Translation of Luke 3.23–38," in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 137 (2008): 277–304; Chapter Four as "Inclusive Counting and the Number of Disciples in some Old English Translations of Mark 16.14," in *Geardagum* 28 (2008): 31–42 [see entry on this item above, under Biblical Translation]; Chapter Five was published as "Honor, Verbal Duels, and the New Testament in Medieval Iceland," in *Tijdschrift voor Skandinavistiek* 26 (2005): 163–85; Chapter Eight as "(Un)Desirable Origins: The *Heliand* and the Gospel of Thomas," in *Exemplaria* 17 (2005): 215–53; reprinted in *Perspectives on the Old Saxon Heliand: Introductory and Critical Essays, with an Edition of the Leipzig Fragment*, ed. Valentine Pakis (Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2010), 120–63; and Chapter Seven was published as "The Literary Status of *Muspilli* in the History of Scholarship: Two Peculiar Trends" in *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 65 (2009): 41–60. In all cases, the titles and texts of the published articles are essentially identical to the dissertation versions. The only chapter not published elsewhere is Chapter Six, "Christ the Healer and the Anglo-Saxon Charms" (176–214). Pakis's "Introduction" (1–33) briefly surveys the wide variety of texts treated in the dissertation and summarizes the arguments of the eight chapters. All of the chapters in the dissertation focus on the Germanic reception of New Testament materials. Chapters 1–4 are grouped as "Medieval Rewritings," and in these chapters "the concentration is on textual deviations or peculiarities in certain Germanic translations of the Greek or Latin New Testament, and on what might have motivated the translators to distance themselves at these points from their biblical *Vorlagen*" (7). Chapters 5–6 are classified as "Medieval Receptions" and "focus on the reception of certain aspects of eastern Mediterranean culture, as they are presented in the New Testament, in medieval England and Iceland" (7). Chapters 7–8 are designated "Modern Interpretations," and "here the aim is to address the extent to which presuppositions and ideological motivations have influenced modern interpretations of particular texts" (7). The arguments of these diverse chapters are too dense to fully summarize here; interested readers should seek out the published versions. The author states in summary that the respective themes of the eight chapters are "exegesis, gender, dogma, counting, honor, healing, *Quellenforschung*, and nationalism/orientalism" (7).

Christine Rauer reopens the question of “Old English *Blanca* in the *Old English Martyrology*,” *N&Q* 55: 396–99). Herzfeld thought the rare word *blanca* in the narrative of Marcellus’s humiliation was a misunderstanding of the Latin *plancas*, leading the OE writer to describe Marcellus sheltering a white horse where the Latin mentioned the installation of planks to make a church into a stable. James Cross rejected Herzfeld’s argument because not all Latin texts have *plancas*; some even have nonsensical words here. Rauer backs Herzfeld: the translator encountered a rare Latin word that he didn’t understand and rendered it with a very similar rare OE word in his ongoing efforts to stay close to the source text.

In “The Old English *Promissio Regis*,” *ASE* 37: 91–150, Mary Clayton offers an analysis and an edition. She describes the extant manuscript and two transcripts of the burned copy, then treats sources and analogues. The *Promissio*’s first section includes the vow itself, which it says the king placed on the altar after swearing; his action may be modeled on the professions of Benedictine monks. The OE promise corresponds most closely to the Second English Coronation *ordo*, though it has some similarities to the First; Clayton surmises that the translator had both before him. The second section tells of the rewards for the king and his people here and in the afterlife if he keeps this promise and of the punishment if he breaks it. Though the *Promissio* lacks close verbal parallels, it resembles the ninth abuse (unjust king) in the influential Hiberno-Latin *De Duodecim Abusiis* and a passage in the eighth-century Hiberno-Latin *Collectio Canonum Hibernensis* derived from the ninth abuse. The *Promissio* depicts the king as a shepherd bringing his people to the Last Judgment, where he must account for his rule. Ideas of clerical leaders bringing their flocks to Judgment, and of God judging kings’ reigns, appear in both Carolingian and Anglo-Saxon texts, but the combination is unusual. Clayton traces the third section (specific responsibilities of the king) to the ninth abuse in *De Duodecim Abusiis* or the corresponding passage in *Hibernensis*. The text returns to Judgment in a line unparalleled in the two Hiberno-Latin texts before trailing off without clear conclusion. The *Promissio* refers back to the king’s coronation, making it unlikely to have been delivered then as scholars have proposed. Rather, it reminds the king and his subjects of past promises. Clayton argues that its urgent warnings would be awkward for the king to hear; a speaker would need great authority to deliver it to king and subjects. Clayton sees the third-person references to Archbishop Dunstan as calling upon him for additional authority, not indicating he is the author.

She finds no evidence of a link to Ramsey or Byrhtferth’s known texts. The *Promissio* has often been compared to Wulfstan’s work but never before attributed to him. Clayton maintains that several words and phrases, and specific concerns, such as incest and witchcraft, are both typical of Wulfstan. Moreover, “The king as shepherd leading his flock to the Last Judgment is a memorable image that is difficult to associate with anyone but Wulfstan” (137). Some vocabulary and style are atypical of Wulfstan, perhaps because he used others’ translations of Latin sources into OE. The portion that lacks a direct source alliterates frequently and consists entirely of two-stress phrases typical of Wulfstan. Finally, Wulfstan both had access to the needed sources and the authority to deliver such an admonition. The article ends with an edition of the Old English text, a modern English translation, textual notes, and explanatory notes.

In “Aldelmo di Malmesbury Probabile Autore in Volgare: Esame della Fonti e dell’Aldelmo Trilingue del MS. CCCC 326 (Prima Scheda di un Inventario dei Testi in Antico Inglese Andati Perduti),” *Quaderni del Dipartimento di Linguistica* 13 (2003): 73–100, Giovanna Princi Braccini traces references to Aldhelm’s poetic gifts through Bede to Faritius, touching upon an apparently lost *vita* from the intervening time. Then she tracks them through William of Malmesbury and the chronicle attributed to Florence of Worcester to the anonymous poem *Aldhelm*. Along the way, she touches on Asser, suggesting that quotations from Aldhelm may have ended up in Alfred’s now-lost *Enchiridion*, to which William may have had access at Malmesbury. William stressed Aldhelm’s talent for English as well as Latin poetry. At least some of these writers surely knew Aldhelm’s work in English, although it is lost to us. Indeed, some praise him for works in three languages: Latin, Greek, and English (or, in one case, Hebrew). *Aldhelm* itself is trilingual. It uses Old English meter and alliteration, but several half-lines are in Latin. Greek words (in Latin transliteration) are scattered among both English and Latin half lines. As Hadrian’s student at Canterbury, Aldhelm surely learned Greek, an achievement honored by the macaronic *Aldhelm*. Yet the anonymous author’s choice of English poetic form gives special prominence to Aldhelm’s native tongue.

Kathryn Wymmer identifies a quotation from a now-lost poem in “De Sancto Andrea” in “A Poetic Fragment on the Soul’s Address to the Body in the *Trinity Homilies*” *N&Q* 55: 399–400. The homily “De Sancto Andrea” (XXIX in Morris’s 1873 edition) contains imagined addresses by souls to a good body and a sinful body.

The latter contains sentences that display both alliteration and rhyme, resembling the Worcester Fragments. Wymer prints the passage as poetic half-lines with varying numbers of stresses, and she concludes that they stand out so much from the surrounding material they are likely a quotation from a now-lost poem.

No edition of both manuscripts of the late Middle English *Master of Oxford's Catechism* has been published, let alone one with the prose OE *Solomon and Saturn*; Hans Sauer sketches out a prolegomenon for his intended edition of all three in "A Didactic Dialogue in Old and Middle English Versions: The Prose *Solomon and Saturn* and the *Master of Oxford's Catechism*," *Form and Content of Instruction in Anglo-Saxon England in the Light of Contemporary Manuscript Evidence*, ed. Patrizia Lendinara, Loredana Lazzari, and Maria Amalia D'Aronco (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 363–98. *SolSatP* and *MOC* are "not just partly similar, but largely identical" (364). Sauer posits a lost Latin source for not only these two texts but also the didactic dialogues *Adrian and Ritheus* (OE), *Collectanea*

Pseudo-Bedae (Latin), and *Meistari ok lærisveinn* (Old Icelandic), which all contain some of the same questions and answers. Sauer supplies information on manuscripts and editions for each. The original Latin source presumably bore no title and no names for its interlocutors, leaving translators and adapters free to supply names or do without. The Latin text drew on the Bible, Apocrypha (particularly Enoch), medieval etymology, proverbial and riddling literature, natural science, occasionally Jewish and Irish traditions, and perhaps even visual analogues. *SolSatP* also seems to borrow from Vercelli Homily XIX at a point where the Latin may have been defective. Sauer demonstrates how a Latin source can be reconstructed from his two main texts, and some of those results match items in the Latin *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*. His appendices list the questions and answers of the two main texts and their major sources and analogues, parallel material in all the dialogues listed above, and the forms of names in the different texts.

NGD

5. Anglo-Latin, Ecclesiastical Works

Aldhelm and Early Anglo-Latin

Aldhelm's status as the greatest Anglo-Saxon composer of riddles has inspired several articles this year. Rafał Boryślawski, in "Candida sanctorum sic floret gloria rerum: Aldhelm's *Aenigmata* as a Riddle of Interpretation," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 18: 203–16, argues that an essential feature of Aldhelm's riddles is a change in the riddle's traditional nature from play to philosophy. Traditional riddles suggest that an avenue to truth comes from the pleasurable "shock" of unraveling the solution, and such riddles, as represented in Old English by the Exeter Book *Riddles*, have no titles. The tradition of riddling that Aldhelm works in, a tradition in which titles contain the solution to their own enigma, suggests an essential change in purpose from the ludic to the theological. Rather than the sudden epiphanies of traditional riddles, Aldhelm, like Symphosius before him, attempts to engage his readers with the very mysteries of God's cosmos, a desire that has its roots in Pseudo-Dionysius's own postulates for seeking spiritual balance through awareness of the Logos. Boryślawski examines a number of Aldhelm's riddles in order to clarify how Aldhelm's own poetry demonstrates his particular fascination with reality.

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

20–29, also probes Aldhelm's literary purposes by taking up an older theory suggesting that the poet had combined observations from the natural world with literary techniques. She examines this theory, which was first proposed by M.L. Cameron, by a close reading of the language of *Enigma XXXVI*, whose answer is *scnifes* (OE *gneat*), a type of stinging insect. By looking carefully at his sources and also at his position within the broader literary tradition of riddling and "nature writing," Foxhall Forbes concludes that Cameron was mistaken, and that what appear to be descriptive phrases drawn from Aldhelm's observations in the field can be better understood as literary echoes. Despite some tantalizing expressions, it is unlikely that Aldhelm, even if he were referring to a specific insect known to him, would have been relying upon his memory of its appearance and behavior when he composed his riddle.

Finally, Kevin Patterson looks at Aldhelm from a classicist's perspective in his 2007 Brown dissertation, "A Christian Virgil: The Function of Virgilian References in the Writings of Aldhelm" (*DAI* 68A, AAT 3272029). Patterson studies the extent to which Aldhelm's views of power and suffering in his war narratives are markedly different from Virgil's. In this paper he examines several ways in which Aldhelm conveys these different attitudes and their effect on his artistic relationship with Virgil. He reviews Aldhelmian uses

of classical sources and then explores theories of allusion and intertext. Patterson proceeds to explore specific passages from Aldhelm that echo the language of the battlefield and address how Aldhelm's handling of this language is different from Virgil's own. Two further chapters explore Aldhelm's approach to power and suffering in his poetic texts and in particular an effect Patterson names "connotative reversal," characterized by a passage that is at odds with Virgil's own meaning, as well as its opposite, "connotative preservation." The sixth and seventh chapters further extend Patterson's discussion of how well Aldhelm knew Virgil and was aware of the allusions he was consciously adapting.

The work of Archbishop Theodore of Tarsus interests Ernst Hellgardt in "Das lateinisch-althochdeutsche Reimgebet 'Sancte sator' (sog. 'Carmen ad Deum') Theodor von Tarsus/Canterbury zugeschrieben," *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 137: 1–27. It examines the poem "Sancte sator," ascribed to Theodore, and offers a valuable transcription and edition of this Anglo-Latin poem with its accompanying Old High German glosses. Hellgardt surveys past scholarship and editorial work before discussing the poem's survival in eight manuscripts, the earliest of which is Cambridge, University Library, L1.I.10 (early ninth century). However, it is the 'E' manuscript, München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 19410, that primarily interests Hellgardt because of its interlinear Old High German glosses. He provides a transcription of "E," along with a side-by-side version of the two texts and a modern edition and linguistic commentary. Hellgardt's commentary is especially valuable.

Claudia Di Sciacca and Matthew Hussey offer two substantial pieces, a book and an article, from their ongoing research on the *Synonyma* of the early medieval encyclopedist Isidore of Seville. Though not as influential throughout the West as his *Etymologiae*, the book substantially affected Anglo-Saxon England. Di Sciacca, in her monograph *Finding the Right Words: Isidore's Synonyma in Anglo-Saxon England* (Toronto: U of Toronto P), offers an extensive analysis of this text. As Di Sciacca notes in her preface, the *Synonyma* was popular for several reasons, among these the fact that it became a model for *Kunstprosa*, especially in Anglo-Saxon England, which is the focus of Di Sciacca's book. After surveying the life and career of Isidore, she examines the transmission of the text into Anglo-Saxon England, especially its "vernacularization," or adaptation, translation, and re-use in the Old English literary canon. She notes the particular influence the *Synonyma* seems to have had on the style and motifs in Old English homilies and strives to illuminate the learned

interplay that occurred (to great effect) between the Latin and vernacular literary efforts. In her later chapters, Di Sciacca examines the extent of the text's influence on devotional literature in Anglo-Saxon England, as well as the text's adaptation for the classroom in scholastic colloquies.

Hussey's essay, "Transmarinis Litteris: Southumbria and the Transmission of Isidore's *Synonyma*," *JEGP* 107: 141–68, is a useful extension of Di Sciacca's scholarship. Tracing the transmission of Isidore's *Synonyma* to England, Hussey is able to show that the manuscript evidence indicates that the *Synonyma*'s transmission was distinct from those of Isidore's other works; additionally, it included an intriguing *Nachleben*, which illuminates aspects of Anglo-Saxon letters in the early missionary period. Because the *Synonyma* was not one of the Isidorean texts popular in early Christian Ireland, scholars must look to the continent to detect its earliest transmission. While the extent to which Aldhelm knew the *Synonyma* is unclear, Hussey detects distinct traces of the work's influence in the popularity of the *ubi sunt* motif. Boniface also echoes elements of the text. Hussey offers an extensive look at three manuscripts of the text, two of which were Southumbrian; the third manuscript was from Fulda but had ties to Boniface. The manuscripts in question are Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M.P. Th.F. 79, St. Petersburg, Russian National Library, Q.v.I.15, and Fulda, Bibliothek des Bischöflichen Priesterseminars, Bonifatianus 2 (the "Ragyndrudis Codex," CLA VIII.1 197). Hussey also examines the glosses and palaeographical features of these manuscripts.

Alcuin and the Carolingian Period

Michael Fox re-asserts the claim for Alcuin's authorship in "Alcuin's *Expositio in epistolam ad Hebraeos*," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 18: 326–45, by clarifying the ninth-century history of this text's transmission and Alcuin's own possible role in its widespread popularity. Fox offers a careful and detailed survey of the numerous manuscripts containing this text and also includes an appendix. The use of Jerome's *Epistola* 52 to Nepotianus and *Epistola* 73 to Euangelus is striking because these were two of Alcuin's favorite writings; a similar argument can be made for the inclusion of Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos* and *De Trinitate*. The presence of a certain passage from *De Trinitate* in both Alcuin's *Epistola* 307 and the *Expositio* is also particularly telling. Additionally, Fox traces numerous textual echoes between *Expositio* and known letters of Alcuin. Such signs point to evidence of Alcuin's authorship despite

the lack of a dedicatory epistle, the absence of which Michael Gorman has suggested would be enough to deny authorship to Alcuin. Fox then examines some reasons why the *Expositio* might have circulated without this dedication, chief among which is the epistle's extensive use of Mutianus's sixth-century translation of Chrysostom's homilies on *Hebrews*.

Dalia Marija Stančienė and Juozas Žilionis in "Dialogo transformacija klasikinėje ir Krikščioniškoje paideioje," in *Pedagogika* 89: 161–67, offer a phenomenological reading of the dialogue format in education from the Classical period to the central Middle Ages, including an examination of Alcuin's role in Carolingian education. Arguing that looking at dialogue this way "allows us to look afresh at dialogical values, regulative and transcendental functions in the process of personality upbringing," the authors trace the development of the Socratic method from Plato and the *polis* and especially consider the adaptation of the *paideia* by Christian writers such as St. Augustine, who was familiar with both Platonic and Neo-Platonic traditions. Augustine's own dialogues aimed at encouraging the human soul to move toward transcendence and were important models for medieval educators. In the Carolingian period, dialogues moved away from involvement with the natural world before returning through Aquinas's own melding of Aristotelian philosophy with Christian theology.

John A. Demetracopoulos, in "Alcuin and the Realm of Application of Aristotle's Categories," in *Intellect et imagination dans la philosophie médiévale: Actes du XIe Congrès international de philosophie médiévale de la Société Internationale pour l'Étude de la Philosophie Médiévale, Porto 2002*, eds. Maria Cândida da Costa Reis Monteiro Pacheco and José Francisco Meirinhos (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), 1733–42, takes up John Marenbon's claim that Alcuin was the first medieval philosopher because he innovatively understood logic as a tool for describing reality. Demetracopoulos specifically wants to interrogate an odd phrase of Alcuin's from the dedicatory verses of the *Categoriae decem* to Charlemagne. Alcuin writes that these Categories "contain everything we are able to perceive with our senses," yet Alcuin also believed that Aristotle's categories could be applied to God, a belief that was original and far more emphatic than any that can be found in Augustine.

June-Ann Greeley, in "With Paternal Concern: Fathers' Theodulf and Alcuin and the Spirituality of Carolingian Women," *Magistra* 12 (2006): 73–104, illuminates the attitude and concern expressed toward women religious by Alcuin and Theodulf. While

Greeley acknowledges that the Carolingian reforms increased outward restrictions of women's exercise of faith, she believes that Alcuin and Theodulf's poems and letters indicate that women's inward faith was not only encouraged but fostered at a high level. She offers close readings of Theodulf's poem to a certain Gisla (*Carmen* XLIII), Alcuin's letters to Gisla, the sister of Charlemagne, to his "spiritual daughter" Eugenia, and to Ædelthyda, possibly King Offa's daughter. Alcuin extols the models of both Martha and Mary in his often intimate and affectionate texts, often offering specific advice to help foster these women's spiritual lives. Greeley argues that her readings indicate that neither male writer believed in any barrier that would prevent the women from "embarking on a measure of intellectual exploration in service to faith by reading, meditating on, and reciting the Sacred Scriptures [...and] the Church Fathers."

Matthew S. Kempshall in "The Virtues of Rhetoric: Alcuin's *Disputatio de rhetorica et de uirtutibus*," *ASE* 37: 7–30, posits a new theory for the shape and content of Alcuin's dialogue with Charlemagne on the attractions of rhetoric. Through a careful reading of both the form of the text and its debts to previous works on the subject, Kempshall argues that Alcuin defined rhetoric as a specifically civic subject of study because it is what "prevents human society from reverting to a state of nature." In this move, Alcuin declares his debt to *De inuentione* and Julius Victor through their Christian interpreters Augustine, Cassiodorus, Fortunatianus, and Martius Victorinus. Alcuin perceived, Kempshall argues, that these authors had established a living connection between *eloquentia* and *sapientia* and was thus responsible, more than previously has been believed, for re-introducing an approach to rhetoric that was both Classical and Christian in its structure and subject. Rhetoric gave the wise an essential tool by which they could transmit the wisdom of the ages to the broadest possible multitude.

Hans-Werner Goetz returns to the study of spiritual friendship in "Beatus homo qui inuenit amicum': The Concept of Friendship in Early Medieval Letters of the Anglo-Saxon Tradition on the Continent (Boniface, Alcuin)," *Vorstellungsgeschichte: Gesammelte Schriften zu Wahrnehmungen, Deutungen und Vorstellungen im Mittelalter* (2007): 207–15. In his attempt to ascertain what friendship might have meant to early medieval writers, he asks four questions of the epistles of two eighth-century writers, Boniface and Alcuin. To the question, "Who is called friend?" Goetz notes that these men's friendships freely crossed boundaries of hierarchy and family. To the question of whether "friend" and

“friendship” might be different concepts, Goetz presents numerous passages that compare friendship to treasure and jewels and even declare it a necessity. Both writers seem to indicate that they would answer the question “How are friends made?” with anecdotes stressing the active nature of friendship; one might link with, or bond with, another by word or deed, but friendships did not simply happen. Both seem to share the conviction, still prominent today, that old friendships are the most valuable. Finally, Goetz considers the question, “What is expected of a friend?” and suggests that faithfulness was probably the most important element. Honesty and truth were also valued. Such abstract ideas were expected to be backed with tangible benefits; prayer, gifts, concern, and affection are mentioned in the letters as acts and characteristics expected of friends.

Kristina Mitalaitė surveys recent scholarship on theology in the Carolingian period, a period which had previously received little attention from intellectual historians, in “Bulletin d’histoire de la théologie et de la pensées carolingiennes,” *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 91 (2007): 523–61. This article will be of great benefit to any student seeking an overview of the scholarship undertaken in the past twenty or so years. Mitalaitė’s work is organized into topics, including Christian history, Orléans, history and authority, St. Martin and Alcuin, Biblical exegesis, philosophy, and “controversies,” which is further subdivided into “filioque,” predestination, and icons. Mitalaitė’s bibliography is thankfully wide-ranging, not restricted to French sources only but also including scholarship from English, German, and Italian sources. Highly recommended for students and scholars alike.

O.M. Phelan in “Textual Transmission and Authorship in Carolingian Europe: *Primo Paganus*, Baptism, and Alcuin of York,” *Revue Bénédictine* 118: 262–88, argues that the authorship of the *Primo Paganus* can be linked to Alcuin even though the text circulated without actual ascription to Alcuin. The ritual order and theological interpretations offered in the commentary closely match Alcuin’s preferences; the order corresponds to that of the monastery of St. Martin of Tours, where Alcuin was abbot and at which time he included the text in two of his letters. The text shares Alcuin’s concerns with the challenges of Spanish Adoptianism, and it incorporates citations of John the Deacon and the writings of pseudo-Augustine in a “distinctive explanation” of the meaning of the baptismal rites. Alcuin’s students and colleagues were likely to know Alcuin’s views on the significance of the rite of baptism. Surviving manuscript evidence supports this conclusion.

James LePree takes a close look at an important work once attributed to Basil the Great in “Two Recently-Discovered Passages of the Pseudo-Basil’s *De admonitio ad filium spiritualem* in Smaragdus’ *Expositio in regulam Benedicti* and the *Epistolae* of Alcuin,” *Heroic Age* 11 [online], and considers one passage from each work that seems to contain clear echoes of the *Admonitio*, arguing that these passages, hitherto unidentified, can be traced to the *Admonitio*. LePree suggests that such a discovery furthers our understanding of the importance of the text in the Carolingian period.

Francesca Sara D’Imperio in “Le fonti nella *recensio* dei commentari biblici carolingi: Alcuino lettore di Girolamo,” *Filologia Mediolatina* 15: 19–43, offers a meticulous examination of the textual transmission of Alcuin’s *Expositio in Ecclesiasten*, a text Alcuin completed in 801 or 802 while still abbot of Tours. The text is primarily dependent upon the *Commentarius in Ecclesiasten* of Jerome. Eighteen distinct witnesses to the Alcuinian text have survived, along with an epitome of the text.

In her “Organic Intellectuals in the Dark Ages?” *History Workshop Journal* 66: 1–17, Janet Nelson wonders whether “intellectual” is a term that can be comfortably and informatively applied to early medieval Europe. She begins with the notion of the “organic intellectual,” borrowed from Gramsci’s *Prison Notebooks*. Gramsci defines the organic intellectual as one who, while closely associated with a dominant class (an “elite”), remains autonomous from it, and also retains consistent cultural contact with the “simple”. Following up on Gramsci’s own admiration for certain medieval Catholic thinkers, Nelson considers St. Gregory the Great, Alcuin of York, and Dhuoda as organic intellectuals in their own right. Alcuin receives praise for the close alignment of the “virtues of hand and heart.” While Nelson admits that Alcuin was, unlike Gregory, disinterested in rustic education and betterment, she highlights his own “direct and practical teaching for the laity,” and argues for the existence of a “trickle-down effect” of education to even low-level landlords.

Michael Gorman offers, in “The Epitome of Wigbod’s Commentaries on Genesis and the Gospels,” *Revue Bénédictine* 118: 5–45, an overview and edition of one of the texts of Wigbod, an important Carolingian educator and exegete. Although almost nothing is known of his personal and professional life, scholars have begun to consider Wigbod to be the second most important exegetical writer of the period after Alcuin. Gorman details the six works that he believes can be attributed to Wigbod and offers an extensive textual consideration of his epitomes on Genesis and the Gospels,

including a summary of the sources for each text. Gorman explains why he believes these works can be safely ascribed to Wigbod; certain textual “fingerprints,” such as his inclusion of “brief phrases to create the impression that these works were genuine dialogues,” as well as certain favorite phrases are telling. Gorman provides the text of the Epitomes on Genesis and the Gospels as well as four plates.

Astrid Krüger's *Litanei-Handschriften der Karolingerzeit* (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2007) builds on her doctoral work on the liturgical roll at Lorsch Abbey (ca. 860) and offers insight into the large number of Carolingian litanies surviving in numerous ninth-century manuscripts. Extending the earlier work of Michael Lapidge and Gisbert Knopp, Krüger discusses the origins of the Carolingian litanies in the ancient *oratio fidelium* of the pre-Gregorian Roman Mass and in the penitential processions that were established in Gaulish France in the fifth century. As Krüger notes, the form of the Carolingian litanies owes even more to the eighth-century forms of the Christian processions: the *litania major* on St. Mark's Day (April 25) and the *litaniae minores* at Rogationtide, the three days before Ascension Day. Krüger details seventy-three litanies, for which she suggests three broad sub-categories: “insular litanies”; those which tend to combine lauds and litanies (such as the “Psalter of Charlemagne,” Paris, BN, lat. 13159, and the “Psalter of Montpellier,” Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine ms 409); and those from Paris, St. Amand, and St. Gall.

Bede

J. Robert Wright's *A Companion to Bede: A Reader's Commentary on 'The Ecclesiastical History of the English People'* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans) is, as the author himself states in the preface, intended for a non-academic audience. Instead, Wright hopes that his book will assist the interested lay reader to explore Bede “with understanding and insight.” Proceeding though Bede's text chapter by chapter, Wright succeeds in producing an elegant and helpful *vade mecum*, offering useful background and contextual material for Bede's easy-to-read but not always accessible history of the earliest period of Anglo-Saxon England. Rather than offering an exhaustive historical or philological commentary, Wright, who assumes that the reader is using a translated text, presents a summary of the events of Bede's narrative, occasionally explaining Bede's choice of certain words and their Latin originals. The text should find an audience among almost all first-time readers of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, whether

they be students seeking guidance or the curious seeking context.

Eric Knibbs offers a careful and extended look at the manuscript tradition of *De Octo Quaestionibus* in “The Manuscript Evidence for the *De Octo Quaestionibus* Ascribed to Bede,” *Traditio* 63: 129–83. Knibbs carefully reviews the rather complex textual and editorial history of this text, which is composed of a series of eight *quaestiones* that amount to some 3500 words. The *quaestiones* concern four of the Pauline epistles, parts of Matthew, some Psalms, and 2 Kings. Michael Gorman earlier divided the *quaestiones* into two recensions, the “St. Amand Group” and the “Bruges Group,” and noted that only the former transmits the text in a standard sequence. Knibbs, referring to texts best considered as *quaestiones* or *solutiones*, introduces a new nomenclature, calling the groups the Q-recension and the S-recension, respectively. A careful overview of all the manuscripts is provided, as well as extensive discussion of the often-archaic editions, which will be of great use for anyone undertaking a study of the text. Knibbs suggests a new stemma and reviews the evidence for and against Bede's authorship. He concludes that of all the texts, the first four *Solutiones* are “most likely to be Bede's,” due to formal textual resemblances. In an appendix, Knibbs provides an edition of the first four *Solutiones*, known by their incipits: *Interim quae-sisti, Putant quidam, Quod interrogasti, and Congregavit autem*.

In “Dissension in Bede's Community Shown by a Quire of Codex Amiatinus,” *Revue Bénédictine* 116 (2006): 295–309, Paul Meyvaert offers an interpretation of the first quire of the famous pandect from Bede's monastery. He posits a disagreement between Bede and another monk over a point of emphasis in the Codex's opening pages and illustrates a less than flattering aspect of Bede's personality. Meyvaert imagines a certain “Brother X” who, as head of the Wearmouth-Jarrow scriptorium, designed a particular arrangement for the initial quire of the Codex Amiatinus. Modeling his design after “the opening pages of Cassiodorus's Codex Grandior,” Brother X arranged the opening folia so that it would highlight the fact that this pandect would follow the order of books known as *antique translation*, which the Codex Grandior followed but which differed from Jerome's. He then supervised its binding, which followed a particular sewing procedure in which five strands of thread with ten parchment holes bound the quires to each other and to the cover boards. However, as students of the Codex Amiatinus are aware, the actual arrangement of the opening quire is different. Bede, according to Meyvaert,

interfered and made several changes that bring greater prominence to Jerome, while also ruining the simplicity and congruity of Brother X's original design. Meyvaert posits a scenario in which Bede "dethrones" the central bifolium by cutting and removing the central fold, "which now became two single leaves." Bede then introduced the Tabernacle bifolium in order to provide an anchor point for these leaves; that the Tabernacle bifolium was not part of the original design, and not part of the original binding, can be seen by its lack of the ten parchment hole arrangement common to the rest of the Codex.

Eva María Castro Caridad in "La poesía rítmica en Beda el Venerable," *La filología latina hoy: Actualización y perspectivas*, eds. Ana María Aldama Roy, María del Barrio Vega, Mario Conde Salazar, Antonio Espigares Pinilla and María José López de Ayala Genovés (Rome: Sociedad de Estudios Latinos, 1999), 627–33, reads the twenty-fourth chapter of *De arte metrica*, titled *De rithmo*, and highlights how Bede's treatment of the rules of rhythmical prosody differ from those of his predecessors. Bede calls this sort of versification "syllable-counting" and also importantly offers novel definitions of metrical and rhythmical verse: the former is *ratio cum modulatione* and the latter is *modulatio sine ratione*. Castro also examines the poems *Rex aeterne domine* and *Apparebit repentina*.

James E. Fraser reopens the mystery of the identity of Bede's *urbs Giudi* in "Bede, the Firth of Forth, and the Location of *Urbs Iudeu*," *Scottish Historical Review* 87: 1–25. While demolishing the long-standing assumption that its identity is identical to Stirling, he cautiously proposes a few alternatives and concludes that a definite answer is impossible at this time. The stronghold of *Iudeu* does not seem to have left a trace in modern place-names, and its identity has been long sought. The solution with the longest pedigree has been British harbor historian Angus Graham's 1959 proposal that the place should be considered identical to Castle Rock at Stirling; this "solution" rested upon a number of weak assumptions and an imaginative reading of Bede's *in medio sui* as "at its apex." Kenneth Hurlstone Jackson's whole-hearted support of this reading caused it to gain wide approval. Fraser wishes to eliminate Castle Rock at Stirling from the discussion and considers several other possible locations before concluding that no definite identification is possible at this time. However, he cautiously advances Carlingnose Battery as a more likely location than others, since its topography was preferred by fort-builders of the era. Black Ness and Cramond Island are also potential candidates. A map of the Forth estuary is included, as well

as a lengthy appendix discussing the phrase "usque in manu Pendae."

George Hardin Brown, in "Quotations in Bede's Exegetical Commentaries Misinterpreted as Autobiographical," *N&Q* n.s. 55: 116–17, notes that Bede's comment in *In Lucae euangelium*, which uses a first-person verb (*possideo*) to reference a wife, is not a strangely autobiographical reference but rather a near-verbatim quotation from Cassian's *Collationes*.

Arnaud Knaepen, in "L'histoire gréco-romaine dans les 'chroniques' de Bède le Vénérable (*De temporibus* ch. 17–22 et *De temporum ratione* ch. 66–71)" *The Medieval Chronicle III: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle*, ed. Erik Kooper (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2004), 76–92, studies Bede's treatment of Greco-Roman historical material in the two universal chronicles included in his chronological treatises. Knaepen first argues that Bede composed his chronicles using selections from a single primary source; Bede then added elements of Christian material likely to be of interest to his audience. Knaepen notes that Bede could have easily avoided all pagan history or disparaged it through his silence, yet he, like Claudius of Turin before him, chose not to do so. Bede sometimes uses major events of the Greco-Roman past as chronological "signposts" to help orient his Christian and Anglo-Saxon readers. Knaepen also argues that Bede's treatment of certain events reveals some of his particular interests, such as the foundations of certain cities or the lives and activities of certain great pagan artists. Still, Knaepen admits that even in these anecdotes, Bede shows some caution when selecting events and personae, depending on their relationship to Christian history.

In "Pilgrims, Missionaries and Martyrs: The Holy in Bede, *Orkneyinga saga* and *Knyttlinga saga*" *The Making of Christian Myths in the Periphery of Latin Christendom (c. 1000–1300)*, ed. Lars Boje Mortensen (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 2006), 53–82, Carl Phelpstead draws suggestive parallels between Anglo-Saxon and Old Icelandic historical approaches in order to connect them to the construction of historical memory and hagiographic traditions. After surveying medieval Icelandic historians' well-known admiration for Bede, primarily for work other than the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Phelpstead presents several descriptions of Rome as a pilgrimage site, noting that for historians of the far North, it is Rome that is considered "peripheral" and the local central. He then examines how the cult of saints "deconstruct[s] the opposition between holy center and periphery," as local sites of holy power and activity brought a part of the sacred center to the

Northern lands. Phelpstead proceeds to examine the treatment of local martyrs in Bede's work, the treatment of St. Magnús in *Orkneyinga saga*, and the treatment of St. Knútr Sveinsson in *Knýtlinga saga*.

In her Boston College dissertation, "Reading Bede as Bede would Read," Sally Shockro argues that modern readers of Bede have read him too literally and missed the "theological" aspects of his history that are essential to an understanding of the greater purpose behind the *Historia Ecclesiastica*. While such arguments will be already familiar to most scholars, who have long read Bede with such caveats in mind, Shockro does provide a useful survey of existing scholarship on Bede, the arguments in favor of at least a partially "theological" reading of medieval texts, and assembled primary sources.

Olivier Szerwiniack, in his "Frères et sœurs dans l'Histoire ecclésiastique du peuple anglais de Bède le Vénérable: de la fratrie biologique à la fratrie spirituelle," *Revue Bénédictine* 118: 239–61, offers an analysis of the different types of "brotherhood" considered in Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, along with their apparent valuation by the monk. After offering definitions of key Latin words related to "relation," such as *natura*, *cognatio*, and *gens*, as well as the tradition of "fosterage," Szerwiniack presents numerical data on the frequency of words such as "fraternity," "brother," "fraternal," and "sister." He then argues that Bede's usage of these terms reveals the negative connotations of biological fraternity and the comparatively greater value of spiritual fraternity. The former is connected to death, betrayal, anger, and jealousy and the latter to eternity, salvation, and love. While Bede does not present biological brotherhood in stark terms, Szerwiniack argues that Bede consistently underscores its precarious and unsettled nature in comparison to the nobility of spiritual brotherhood.

The use of certain late-Northumbrian spellings in certain copies of *Caedmon's Hymn* prompts Joshua Westgard in "Evidence for the Presence of M-Type Manuscripts of Bede's 'Historia ecclesiastica' in Northern England," *Revue bénédictine* 116 (2006): 310–15, to re-examine the evidence for M-Type manuscripts of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* in Britain after 800. Westgard posits a Northumbrian archetype *HE(*Y)* for the three extant Continental manuscripts of *Historia Ecclesiastica*, noting "orthographic modernization" of certain features, such as the use of *wynn* for <uu>. He also notes that there is some evidence of manuscript traffic between Northumbria and Cîteaux in the twelfth century; he points to the presence of a miracle attributed to St. Cuthbert that dates to Bede's translation in 1104 and is also found in a collection of such miracles

in Dijon, Bibliotheque municipale 574, a manuscript that also contains the *Historia Ecclesiastica* and Bede's prose work *Life of Cuthbert*. Finally, Westgard notes the probability, first proposed by Plummer and Whitelock, that the so-called "northern recension" of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* made use of an M-type manuscript of *Historia Ecclesiastica*, given the presence of annals for AD 697 and 699 that are found only in manuscripts of the M-type. He suggests that the three late Continental manuscripts of *Historia Ecclesiastica* might deserve a closer look by scholars.

In *Le calcul de la date de Pâques au Moyen Age: Analyse et commentaires sur 'De temporum ratione' de Bède* (Fribourg: Academic Press, 2004) Roland-Pierre Pillonel-Wyrsh offers Bede scholars and students of *computus* a chapter-by-chapter commentary on Bede's *De temporum ratione*. While readers will find significant overlap between this book and the earlier commentary by Faith Wallis, Pillonel-Wyrsh's volume has the advantage of being more recent and containing numerous illustrations and diagrams that provide additional insight into some of the more esoteric, yet fascinating, aspects of *computus*, such as finger counting (Bede being one of the earliest English exemplars of digital computing!). While Wallis offers essential philological commentary on Bede's language, Pillonel-Wyrsh's work has the advantage of being in many respects more readable. Serious scholars of Bede will want to own both volumes.

Gerald Michael Browne has completed an edition of Bede's *Collectio Psalterii Bedae Venerabili adscripta*, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Munich and Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 2001) that should be much appreciated by Bede scholars. Browne's work will supersede, for *Collectio Psalterii* at least, the 1955 CCSL text of the *Collectio* by Fraipont in his edition of Bede's *Opera rhythmica*. The *Collectio Psalterii* is an example of Bede as a devoted religious teacher, who collected individual verses and complete Psalms in order to assist monks at prayer. By setting Psalter verses in a specific sequence, the verses themselves could be heard and understood as one continuous prayer. Benedicta Ward has suggested that this particular method of aiding memorization while assisting serious contemplation was Bede's own contribution, although Martin McNamara posits this as particularly Celtic in origin. Browne does not engage with such controversies in his brief introduction, but offers an overview of the manuscript evidence, and a stemma that presents two traditions, one branch as evidenced in the St. Denis manuscript (Paris, BNL 1153, saec ix med.), and another represented by Cologne (Domkapitel) 106, saec ix in.,

and Paris, BNL 13388, saec ix med. Browne argues for the St. Denis manuscript (P) as the best text, although it contains some notable omissions. Browne goes on to discuss evidence for the Psalter text Bede would have consulted. The edition itself is a model of clarity and accuracy.

Tenth century

In “Eugenia Before Ælfric: A Preliminary Report on the Transmission of an Early Medieval Legend,” *Inter-texts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach*, ed. Blanton and Scheck (Tempe, Arizona: ACMRS), 349–68, E. Gordon Whatley considers the transmission of the legend of St. Eugenia in Anglo-Saxon texts prior to Ælfric’s, paying close attention to the original and earliest version of the legend (known as M) and the important early revision (known as R). He details the outlines of the story in M and also notes the new material added in R. Alterations are made to the M-version that are both stylistic and substantial, including new episodes and characters. Whatley considers these from the perspective of modernization of the legend. He then considers the two printed editions of the legend of Eugenia, BHL nos 2667 and 2666, and the pros and cons of the editions by Mombritus and Rosweyde. Finally, Whatley offers a useful analysis of a passage from the two editions, illustrating the many fine differences he has earlier summarized.

In the same volume of essays, Charles D. Wright in “Why the Left Hand is Longer (or Shorter) than the Right: Some Irish Analogues for an Etiological Legend in the Homiliary of St. Père de Chartres,” 161–68, considers a single sermon found in the Pembroke Homiliary, Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25, which notes that the left hand is shorter than the right because it was the left that Eve stretched to take the apple. Wright notes that scholars have traced this notion to the poem “Athair cáich coimsid nime” (“Father of all, Ruler of heaven”) found in the Book of Uí Maine and in a similar passage in the *Lebor Gabála Érenn* (Dublin, Trinity College MS 1296). Wright considers the Irish text in order to determine whether or not the language implies that the hand was shortened or lengthened. Particularly, the Irish *dess sech clé*, “right beyond left,” is at issue.

Starting with a single Bonifatian letter to an Anglo-Saxon king, Volker Scior discusses the transfer and reproduction of messages by messengers as well as questions of original and reproduced messages in the early Middle Ages in “Schrift und Performanz: Übertragungen und Reproduktionen durch frühmittelalterliche Boten,” in *Übertragungen: Formen und Konzepte von*

Reproduktion in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit, Trends in Medieval Philology 5, ed. Britta Bussmann, Albrecht Hausmann, Annelie Kreft and Cornelia Logeman (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 77–99. Scior concentrates his attention on Boniface’s *Epistola* 73, which is unusual for containing specific orders from the sender to the messenger concerning the delivery of the message. The content of the letter is to be modulated by the separate realms of the messenger’s speech, acts, gestures, and, generally speaking, performance. Scior argues that this suggestion of a close connection between the oral and written in the eighth century indicates that the successful delivery of a letter reproduced it as a performative act in several mediums.

François Ploton-Nicollet offers a new analysis of two texts from the ninth-century manuscript St. Gall Stiftsbibliothek 908 in his essay “*Ioca Monachorum* et Pseudo *Interpretatio Augustini*,” *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen age* 74 (2007): 109–59. The first, the *Ioca monachorum*, is, as Ploton-Nicollet states, a relatively minor genre of monastic didactic literature that was moderately popular in the Middle Ages. He considers the genre itself and then traces the specific sources of this version of the *Ioca monachorum*. The Pseudo *Interpretatio Augustini* is an unusual and quite short text that discusses the fourfold nature of the universe, including the four cardinal points, the four rivers, or Paradise, and many other phenomena. Ploton-Nicollet offers an edition of the two texts from the St. Gall manuscript and an extensive commentary.

In her University of York dissertation, “Materials for the Study of the Cult of Saint Agnes of Rome in Anglo-Saxon England: Texts and Interpretations,” Christine Phillips explores the “changing symbolism and functions of the figure of the virgin martyr” during the Middle Ages through the guise of St. Agnes of Rome. Phillips traces the reception and transmission of the legend from Italy to Anglo-Saxon Europe as well as its afterlife and reception in insular authors. She argues that the hagiographical text is particularly polysemic in the period, given the common vocabulary of the learned Christian of the period, and allowed for a rich tissue of allusions, captured in the *vitae* of the Virgin martyr. The first part of her dissertation attempts to demonstrate this through the *Passio s. Agnetis*. She then turns to the Insular adaptations of this legend, including Aldhelm’s *De virginitate*, Bede’s hymn “*Illuxit alma saeculis*,” the entry for the feast day of Agnes in the *Old English Martyrology*, and Ælfric’s version of the Agnes legend adapted in his *Lives of Saints*.

John P. Sexton, in “In the Saint’s Embrace: The Sanctuary Privilege in Medieval Religious Writing” (Ph.D.

dissertation, University of Connecticut, 2007), argues that the symbolic significance of sanctuary, which demonstrated undeniably the Church's protective power, was naturally aligned with hagiographical literature in Anglo-Saxon England. Sanctuary practice existed as a relationship between a legal tradition and a religious literature in which that tradition played a significant role. In the first part of the dissertation, Sexton establishes the conceptions of social justice in the Middle Ages, in which the notion of sanctuary flourished. The rights of sanctuary worked both to assert the spiritual power of sacred locations and the importance of the sinner's redemption and reintegration into society. Chapters two and three examine the Anglo-Saxon laws of sanctuary specifically, which demonstrate that the legal notion of sanctuary significantly influenced them, specifically equating the *mundbyrd* of a saint with that of powerful local chieftains. Additionally, Sexton details the specific power maintained by saints. In the second part of the dissertation, Sexton takes up his conceptual arguments and looks at some specific examples, St. Swithun and St. Cuthbert.

Post-Conquest Latin

In *Labbaye de Fleury en l'an mil: I. Vie d'Abbon, abbé de Fleury: Vita et passio sancti Abbonis, par Aimoin de Fleury, et pièces annexes; II. Le coutumier de Fleury: Consuetudines Floriacenses antiquiores, par Thierry d'Amorbach*, Sources d'histoire médiévale publiées par l'Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes 32, Paris: CNRS Éditions, 2004, Robert-Henri Bautier, Gillette Labory, et. al., have edited a book that significantly advances the study of Abbo of Fleury and the abbey itself. The two volumes compile an edition of the *Vita Abbonis* and *Passio s. Abbonis*, as well as the Fleury customary. It marks the first modern critical edition of the *Vita Abbonis*, a text crucial to our understanding both of Fleury and of monastic historiography in the year 1000. The text is based on three manuscripts of the eleventh and twelfth centuries: Dijon, Bibliothèque mun. 118; Montpellier, Bibliothèque de la faculté de médecine 68; and Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 12606. The customary presented here is the oldest extant from Fleury and was compiled by Thierry d'Amorbach between 1010 and 1018. The editors have also compiled appendices of monastic words as well as an *Index nominum* and *Index verborum et rerum*.

In "Did Goscelin Write the Earliest Life of Edward the Confessor?" *N&Q* n.s. 55: 262–65, Rhona Beare presents a further argument in favor of the attribution of the earliest *Vita Edwardii Regis* to Goscelin of St.

Bertin. Frank Barlow had suggested this attribution in his edition of the *Vita*, although he also had suggested Folcard and noted that the prose style of the "Anonymous" author of the *Vita* evinced certain differences from Goscelin's. Beare focuses her analysis upon the treatment of the motif of the four rivers of Paradise and also upon the phrase "Cyllenian hero," which describes a figure who helps Atlas bear up the sky. Specifically, Goscelin compares the progenitor to a *fons* and his offspring to the rivers. Concerning the phrase *Cyllenius heros*, Beare intriguingly argues that the phrase is used elsewhere only by Reginald of Canterbury, in a "context that suggests he knew the Anonymous was Goscelin."

Monika Otter, in her "Entrances and Exits: Performing the Psalms in Goscelin's *Liber confortatorius*," *Speculum* 83.2: 283–302, offers a compelling mediation on the poetics of the first-person imagination in Goscelin's late eleventh-century text written for a young female nun, Eva. Through a finely-detailed textual reading, Otter wishes to examine the "semitheatrical 'performance' of the psalms" as glimpsed in the personal and anecdotal prose of the *Liber confortatorius*. Specifically, Otter is interested in applying the notion of performance and self-fashioning to this early text, which bears many similarities with high medieval texts. She discusses the use of such performances and memory exercises to create in the "actor" *compunctio*, a type of vivid emotional stimulation that Otter identifies as, in the case of Goscelin, "frankly erotic." She compares Goscelin's language to that of the Northumbrian hermit Godric's "near-contemporary" visions reported in the *Vita*, including one of a small boy climbing in and out of the wounds of a wooden crucifix. Otter makes the key point that, whereas Godric is strictly an observer in his vision, Goscelin encourages Eva (and by extension himself) to imagine "entering the scene." The result is that a textual "I" is fashioned in the meditative process of the *Liber confortatorius*.

In "The *Vita Ædwardi*: The Politics of Poetry at Wilton Abbey," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 31 (2009), 135–56, an intriguing article on the oft-overlooked *Vita Ædwardi*, Elizabeth M. Tyler considers the text as a socio-cultural artifact, as a distinctively Latin cultural document, and also as an example of the ways in which writers at this time were adapting poetry for historical narratives. Tyler begins by offering an overview of the anonymous poet's literary methods, including his or her debt to Virgil's *Aeneid*. The subject of fictionality, broadly defined, occupies the bulk of the article. Tyler argues that the author of the *Vita* did not use borrowings strictly as metrical filler but was rather consciously adapting the verse within the art of literary allusion. Her prime

example for this is the poet's use of Dido-material in the handling of Edith's grief. Tyler also suggests that the connections of the *Vita* to Wilton need to be further explored and are suggestive of a social and cultural setting of a particularly female literacy and audience; Tyler calls Wilton the "Quedlinburg of England."

In "Correcting Sinners, Correcting Texts: A Context for the 'Poenitentiale pseudo-Theodori,'" *Early Medieval Europe* 14 (2006): 23–40, Carine van Rhijn and Marjolijn D. Saan present new findings concerning the intention and dating of the little-studied "Penitential of Pseudo-Theodore," a ninth-century penitential text of Frankish provenance. They consider the general ninth-century attitude and approach to penitentials, including the significant condemnation of penitentials in 829 and the decisions of the Council of Mainz regarding penance in 847. The text is a rather voluminous work of fifty-two chapters, incorporating many canons from older texts such as the *Excarpus Cummeani*, the *Paenitential pseudo-Bedae*, and the *Paenitential pseudo-Egberti*. They seem particularly interested in sexual offenses. The authors rarely cite the sources of their borrowings and also tend more toward extensive paraphrase rather than literal quotation. However, they reopen the dating question, and argue that it is possible to push back the composition of the text to the 820s.

Ben Novak, in "Anselm on Nothing," in *International Philosophical Quarterly* 48: 305–320, considers Anselm of Canterbury's development of three distinct meanings of "nothing" in his *Monologion* and of a fourth meaning in three later works—*De casu diaboli*, one of his letters, and his *Incomplete Work*. Novak believes that a close reading of Anselm's use and definition of "nothing" indicates that he rejected the idea of creation *ex nihilo*, arguing that creation should be defined as "coming into being," not "coming into existence." The things that God created had, according to Novak's reading of Anselm, some sort of existence before their "beingness." Anselm's later works return to the problem of nothingness, and Novak argues that Anselm advances a positive context for the concept, "since it is a term of negation only in terms of what it excludes or negates." As Novak notes, such a reading of Anselm, if accurate, would be of significant interest to modern philosophical discussions on the subject of thingness, nothingness, and being.

In "Ut sine Fine Amet Summam Essentiam: The Eudaemonist Ethics of St. Anselm," *MS* 70: 1–28, Sigbjørn Olsen Sønnesyn considers Anselm's writings from an ethical perspective in an attempt to recast him as an eudaemonist instead of a deontological ethicist. In this lengthy but cogent essay, Sønnesyn takes issue with

the interpretation of Anselm's ethics most frequent in the past century. This interpretation, carefully argued recently by Jeffrey Brower, has portrayed Anselm's ethical stance as essentially deontological and thus focused on rightness and duty, or justice, disassociated from any account of personal happiness. This is the ethical stance associated predominantly with Kant and with the medieval philosopher Duns Scotus; the portrayal of Anselm as an early proponent of such an ethics has been considered an important revisionary reading. Sønnesyn argues, in brief, that deontological readings of Anselm have erred by attempting to read his non-systematic ethics as systematic and by reading them outside their textual and historical contexts. The most difficult challenge for modern readers of Anselm lies in his equation of happiness with ascetic austerity, which has led to confusion as to the fairly traditional Augustinianism of his ethical philosophy.

In "Manuscripts médicaux latins de la bibliothèque nationale de France: un index des oeuvres et des auteurs" in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 73 (2006): 165–201, Joël Chandelier, Laurence Moulinier-Brogi, and Marilyn Nicoud have compiled an immense list of medical manuscripts contained in the Bibliothèque nationale, representing some thirty years of painstaking archival work. The article offers complete lists of both anonymous and authored texts. The authors have arranged them into useful subcategories and edited the list with great thoroughness: a cursory examination found no typographical errors. Of most interest to Anglo-Saxonists will be the various manuscripts containing the *Trotula*.

In "A Mass for St Birinus in an Anglo-Saxon Missal from the Scandinavian Mission-field," *Myth, Rulership, Church and Charters: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks* [see sect. 2], 167–88, Alicia Corrêa reconstructs traces of an Anglo-Saxon liturgical text found in fragments in Norway. Following the Reformation, numerous Scandinavian medieval service books were cut into fragments and reused as reinforcement strips, and several of these have connections to Anglo-Saxon England. About twenty of these have been found, detailed, and cataloged by Helmut Gneuss. Corrêa examines one set in particular, now Oslo Riksarkivet Lat. frag. 209, nos. 1–6, and 239, nos. 6–7. It has been suggested that these fragments can be dated to the early eleventh century in Winchester. Corrêa details the appearance of the script and contents of the manuscript based on the remaining fragments, which include prayers and lessons, as well as chants with neumes. Generally, the manuscript has much in common with the Missal of the New Minster, Winchester, written in the second half of the eleventh

century. Additionally, Corr ea posits the intriguing claim that the fragments may have been composed specifically for the use of missionary work.

In "The Cult of Michael the Archangel in Britain: A Survey, with Some Thoughts on the Significance of Michael's May Feast and Angelic Roles in Healing and Baptism," *Culto e santuari di san Michele nell'Europa medievale / Culte et sanctuaires de saint Michel dans l'Europe m di vale: Atti del Congresso Internazionale di studi (Bari, Monte Sant'Angelo, 5-8 aprile 2006)*, Bibliotheca Michaelica 1, eds. Pierre Bouet, Giorgio Otranto and Andr  Vauchez (Bari: Edipuglia, 2007), 147–82, Graham Jones surveys the presence and distribution of the cult of St. Michael in several periods of pre-modern Britain and suggests that the saint had a greater connection to lowlands and sites with significant bodies of water than has been previously acknowledged; this allowed the saint a connection with baptism. After citing the four dedications to St. Michael that can be

dated before 800, Jones compares them with the general distribution rates in Britain and finds them to be equivalent. Jones takes the reader on a tour of dedications to St. Michael found throughout Britain, offering brief details about each location, including information about the dates and circumstances of the dedications and anecdotes about the cult in each location. An examination of St. Michael's juxtaposition with other saints reveals that he was connected with Mary and Andrew. Jones concludes with an extensive discussion both of St. Michael's associations with baptism and healing and of various festivals devoted to him.

AA

Works not seen

del Mar Plaza Pic n, Francisca and Jos  Antonio Gonz lez Marrero. "Un acercamiento a los tratados del c puto de Beda." *Fortunatae* 17 (2006), 117–26.

6: Manuscripts, Illuminations, Charters

Manuscript Imaging

European libraries are moving manuscript images online in a big way. Some weeks it seems like the updates from Switzerland and Germany are constant, and it's also getting easy to find and employ images from manuscripts in the Bodleian Library—but the gold standard for British manuscripts has to be the wonderful production of the Parker Library on the Web: <http://parkerweb.stanford.edu>. To have every folio and page from every manuscript from Corpus Christi College, Cambridge within easy reach—even for those of us whose libraries cannot see the benefits of a subscription to get more advanced options—is simply a blessing. Moreover, the designers of the website have worked it out properly. Even those who browse rather than search find the descriptions detailed and annotated, starting with a pdf of M.R. James's catalogue at the click of a button, with the option to toggle back and forth with the newer and more detailed contents listed by the project team. Moreover, although the Parker web project began in 2005, was largely uploaded in 2008, and launched formally in September 2009, the project receives semi-annual updates, the most recent being 15 April 2011 (at the time of writing). This means that the project is likely to remain useful and not to suffer the broken links and failed toggles that come to afflict outdated websites. The website is clean and straightforward and fairly easy to navigate. The ancillary information about

the catalogues and the project (a joint one with Stanford University, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge and also the Cambridge University Library, whose personnel seem to have done most of the image capture) is handy without being overbearing. The images are good even without zoom, and they load quickly and without fuss. The bibliography is continually updated, and the introduction to the basic catalogues of the manuscript holdings is straightforward and helpful. There is even a lovely summary of conservation issues readily available, which makes it easy to check and determine that few of the Parker manuscripts still have their original bindings, and that the conservator was able to modify the bindings of many manuscripts in order to improve accessibility for readers and for shooting images. The tutorials are basically quite useful although they have their startling moments. At one point I was invited to look up "insipid" in the Glossary, which seemed an odd thing to do until the cursor hovered over "incipit," and I figured out my aural error. I'm also not fully acquainted with the *Ancrener Wisser*, and by the end of the last tutorial the sheer soporificity of the voice leading me through the elements of the website had me nodding, but still it was useful. Otherwise I would never have known that I've been referring incorrectly to Parker manuscripts all my life: the correct form of citation, as the tutorial explained, was "Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS. 144." Note the second comma and the full

stop marking the abbreviation of MS. This is a splendid website, and I hope it continues to be tended. I also hope the fees for access come into reach, as the perpetual access for a one-time fee of USD \$9500 with annual maintenance fee of \$480, or the annual access subscription of \$3500 both seem high—though no doubt reflecting the costs of the project.

Two volumes of the Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile Project, now continuing under the editorship of A.N. Doane with the addition of Matthew Hussey as associate editor, emerged this year. As Phillip Pulsiano said long ago when first this project was bruted, the images are “cheap” and they are “quick.” Although one hopes that most of these manuscripts will soon be available online in digital versions like those provided by the Parker Library, the ASMMF project has at the very least made manuscript librarians think about their codices and contemplate how best to produce images of them. The images provided in these two sets are as good as they can be; some folia in the Cambridge manuscript of Ælfric’s *Catholic Homilies* are thick and overcast, but they accurately reflect the manuscript at first glance (C.U.L. Gg.3.28), and the same can be said for some of the very light and equally hard-to-read pages of another manuscript of the same text in the British Library (Cotton Vitellius C.v). These manuscripts are both in vol. 17 *Homilies by Ælfric and Other Homilies*, with descriptions by Jonathan Wilcox (Tempe: ACMRS, 2008); the volume also includes the Blickling Homilies, and the *Visio Pauli* from Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Junius 85 and 86. The descriptions follow standard practice for this series, offering detailed bibliographical analyses of the manuscripts and their contents. Volume 16 is a more disparate collection, entitled *Manuscripts Relating to Dunstan, Ælfric, and Wulfstan; the “Eadwine Psalter” Group*, with descriptions by Peter J. Lucas and Jonathan Wilcox (Tempe: ACMRS, 2008). The project website will clarify the contents for those uncertain whether manuscripts they are interested in are here, because the volume includes folia from seventeen manuscripts, including some “pictorial prefaces” to psalters in the Victoria and Albert Museum and the Pierpont Morgan Library, which are the single leaves thought to have been lost from the Eadwine Psalter. Also here, however, are the fragment of Ælfric’s *Grammar* now in Bloomington but formerly in a private collection acquired perhaps from the library at Sigmaringen, and the “Annals of St Neot’s” and Geoffrey of Monmouth from Cambridge, Trinity College MS R.7.28 (770), and the Classbook of St Dunstan (Bodleian Auct. F.4.32). The descriptions in the accompanying booklet are somewhere more modern in style, with less of the

startling caps for titles and important details hidden in the technical descriptions. More information about texts and even occasional transcriptions are provided. The Eadwine Psalter and its ancillary texts (including Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale MS. lat. 8846) had preliminary descriptions by Phillip Pulsiano, updated and corrected by Peter Lucas and A.N. Doane. These are useful volumes.

Individual Manuscripts and Manuscript Studies

A genuinely delightful project in this year was the collection *Anglo-Saxon Books and their Readers: Essays in Celebration of Helmut Gneuss’s Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, edited by Thomas N. Hall and Donald Scragg (Kalamazoo: MIP), based on conference sessions in 2001 at Kalamazoo. The first three of seven papers are relevant here, beginning as one might expect with the modest comments, corrections, and cautionary statements of Gneuss himself in “A *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: Origins, Facts, and Problems*” (1-21). Gneuss begins with the story of his own career and the original development of the handlist as an internal document for himself and for his twenty-six doctoral students. He then turns to an analysis of what is in the new *Handlist* by contrast with the “Preliminary Handlist” of 1981: fifty manuscripts are out as being now firmly dated after 1100, but 300 manuscripts, mostly fragments, are in as a result of Gneuss’s further investigation of catalogues, local history journals, obscure articles and notes by various palaeographers, auction records, and probably the odd tea-leaf. I am extrapolating here: if Gneuss had indicated the sources of his knowledge it probably would have doubled the length of the *Handlist*. The entries themselves are, as he points out, concise. He discusses the changes from the “Preliminary Handlist” in the entries, and points out all the difficulties that remain: the shorter Latin poems that are undocumented, other texts which should be more fully identified than with the unsatisfactory terms “glossary” or “sacramentary,” the difficulty for eighth-century manuscripts of identifying them as insular or copied in insular centers in Germany, and the upheld choice of 1100 as the cutoff date. In order to think more usefully about manuscripts and texts that would have existed in Anglo-Saxon England, Gneuss considers how manuscripts were lost. He suggests conclusions about how the paucity of surviving manuscripts from the eighth and ninth centuries should be interpreted, the implications of the absence of patristic collections, the shifting liturgical usage in the eleventh century (and probably into the twelfth), the need for

grammar highlighted by the sheer popularity of Ælfric's *Grammar*, and he points to what must have been in the school curriculum in late Anglo-Saxon England. He concludes with some suggestions for future research: studies of the Anglo-Saxon copies of the psalms and of many other Latin texts, dialect features, thorough manuscript descriptions, detailed studies of scriptoria or modern holdings, studies of textual traditions—notably liturgical—for their evidence of libraries and intellectual life, studies of the English tradition in various fields, and more specifically consideration of the effects of Paul the Deacon's Homiliary or of Isidore's *Etymologies* in Anglo-Saxon England. None of these tasks is easy, but all will repay effort. That effort will be greatly aided by consultation of Gneuss's *Handlist*.

Donald Scragg pays his personal homage to Gneuss with a careful look at Scribe 3 in a manuscript first clarified for modern scholarship by Gneuss himself ("Cotton Tiberius A. iii Scribe 3 and Canterbury Libraries," 22-30). Scragg enumerates the stints of this scribe and studies his work in detail, noting his very frequent errors, which may suggest a lack of interest in correctly writing the vernacular. He avoids the letter <ð>, except to some extent in glosses, uses <k> regularly, and often uses <i> for palatal in such usages as *iung/geong*. The scribe also prefers *ys* to *is*, although there may be some influence of the copy-text at work in this usage. The distribution of *weoruld/woruld* spellings also varies according to the text being copied, but the scribe is unusual in showing a preference for the *-eo-* spelling—and in a particular group of texts which also match on a number of other spellings, many of them Kentish. All of this may perhaps suggest a single Kentish exemplar. Scragg then speculates briefly about possible textual links from this manuscript to other Canterbury texts to the depiction of hell in Vercelli IX, before returning to the shortcomings of Scribe 3. In short, Scragg offers a good example of the kind of work that can emerge from the database of eleventh-century script and spellings that has been compiled under his direction at Manchester.

Thomas Hall, whether knowingly or not, exactly follows one of the suggestions made by Gneuss earlier in the volume, tackling some general and other very specific issues developing from the use of Paul the Deacon's Homiliary in Anglo-Saxon England; see "The Development of the Common of Saints in the Early English Versions of Paul the Deacon's Homiliary," 31-67. This is a very substantial piece, in which Hall first identifies the ten surviving recensions of the Homiliary circulating in England through to the twelfth century, all of them varying quite liberally from the original collection. Hall rightly concludes that "several permutations"

of the collection by Paul the Deacon circulated in Anglo-Saxon England (35). More specifically, he considers the section in each of these homiliaries designated for the Common of Saints, a section of the homiliary that would ordinarily be adapted in each monastic community. A four-page table elucidates precisely what changes occurred in each of the seven relevant manuscripts, whether subtractions, additions small or large, refiguration of a given homily to focus more on a particular saint (in passing, Hall identifies an added text in Salisbury 179 that is very close to Ælfric's posited source for his homily for the first Sunday in Lent). Focusing in more tightly, Hall picks out the lections provided for the feast of All Saints, because the original homiliary had no readings for this feast, it not yet being widely celebrated. The inception of the feast may have been in eighth-century Northumbria, and Hall cites various pieces of evidence to clarify this point and to argue against the more usual ascription of the feast to Rome in the early seventh century under Pope Boniface IV—and also identifies the feast as a joint veneration of All Saints and the Virgin Mary. Where the feast appears in eleventh- and early twelfth-century homiliaries, the sermon representing it is a pseudo-Bede Carolingian one; in a second table, Hall provides the details of the occurrence of this sermon, with the incipit "Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis" in eight homiliaries. This sermon was possibly a source for several other Anglo-Saxon texts, including Blickling X, the *Old English Martyrology*, a poem by Wulfstan of Winchester, and three homilies by Ælfric. Details in a Hall paper can be dense, and here they are denser. A second sermon for the feast of All Saints appears in a few manuscripts and appears to be a ninth-century Carolingian work; the pseudo-Bede sermon refers to the Bonifacian origin, but the second sermon (which seems also to be pseudo-Bede) does not, arguing instead that the purpose of All Saints is to encourage us to join the saints in heaven. Finally, Hall notes that two homiliaries provide additional readings for this feast (and edits these in two appendices referring to CUL Kk.4.13 f. 151rv and Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 24, ff. 184-185). One of these focuses on the timelessness of Mary and her ranking in the hierarchy of saints, and the other quotes and paraphrases the first pseudo-Bede sermon for its comments on the joint dedication before engaging in an entirely original argument about the need to celebrate all the saints in a single feast. Hall concludes, unsurprisingly, in favor of further study of the eight Paul the Deacon homiliaries of late Anglo-Saxon England.

Also in this category of studying the recension of individual texts or collections in Anglo-Saxon England is

Shannon Ambrose, in “The Codicology and Palaeography of London, BL, Royal 5 E. Xiii and its Abridgement of the *Collectio Canonum Hibernensis*,” *Codices Manuscripti* 54/55 (2006): 1-26. Ambrose exhaustively details the physical makeup of the book including its variations in ink color, its Insular exemplar but copying by a scriptorium rather than a scribe, and its corrections, before providing in an appendix that forms the bulk of the article a transcription (so detailed in its textual notes that it amounts to what used to be called a diplomatic edition) of the *Collectio Canonum Hibernensis*. At the end of the article, Ambrose provides a detailed textual comparison of the principal edition of the *Collectio* by F. W. H. Wasserschleben in 1885 and this manuscript. Ambrose notes that a Worcester scribe wrote a title and list of contents at the end and provides a relatively detailed list of the contents of the entire manuscript, ranging from canonical texts such as the *Canon in Ebreica* and the *Collectio*, but also including Book III of the *Testimoniale Sancti Cipriani*, Bede’s *De Remediis*, the *Edictio* of Saint Boniface, an extract from the Book of Enoch, the *De Vindictis*, and the *Passio Secundum Nicodemum*. Although Ambrose avoids making speculative statements, the extensive corrections and alterations make it clear that the manuscript was “a living book in the Breton center in which it was produced,” that it was “re-edited in an Anglo-Saxon center after the manuscript was taken from Brittany,” and that it thereby “offers evidence of a tripartite Breton, Hiberno-Latin and Anglo-Saxon contact and further proof of intellectual commerce between the three communities” (all from p. 2).

Only one doctoral thesis falls into this category: M. J. Faulkner, “The Uses of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts c. 1066-1200,” at the University of Oxford. The abstract indicates that, focusing on reading cultures, the thesis, in seven chapters, explores the ways in which the peoples after the Conquest used, altered, exchanged, sold, placed records in, read, and lost or preserved Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. He argues for a largely trilingual classroom, and for the use by the Normans of some Anglo-Saxon manuscripts as symbolic capital, possibly for veneration as secondary relics.

John Haines has the only piece about music in this year, “A Musical Fragment from Anglo-Saxon England,” *Early Music* 36: 219-29. It’s a blockbuster, arguing that the neumes written in red ink in the bottom margin of f. 24r of the Durham Cassiodorus are Anglo-Saxon and either contemporary to the dating of the manuscript itself (most likely mid-eighth century at Wearmouth/Jarrow) or slightly later, possibly by Alcuin. Haines notes himself there is much speculation in the

argument, but the solid ground is the detailed comparison (in a very helpful chart) of the neumes themselves with those in four other musical manuscripts from later Anglo-Saxon England. Each form found in the Durham *Expositio psalmorum* also appears in an English manuscript of two centuries later, and as a group they are distinct from Continental neumes. The discovery has many implications: the earliest surviving neumes in the medieval West otherwise come from the ninth century; the twenty-seven other musical manuscripts from Anglo-Saxon England catalogued by Rankin and by Hartzell all date to the late tenth century and later so this would be a very early precursor. The discovery has implications for the general history of music, which has tended to suggest that music before the ninth century was wholly oral and aural, as evidenced by its never being written; and the neumes bring to life the exciting musical culture of Northumbria in the eighth century. Along the way Haines also notes that the Tiberius Bede, B.L. Cotton Tiberius C. II, has neumes, possibly ninth century but more likely later, as indicated by E. A. Lowe. Haines also offers a detailed discussion of the red ink used through the Durham Cassiodorus, and he speculates, following Donald Bullough, that Alcuin might have had the manuscript in his possession later in the eighth century, around 770, in York when he was developing his own approach to learning and to music.

Last in this opening category is Michelle P. Brown, “The Triumph of the Codex: The Manuscript Book before 1100,” *The Companion to the History of the Book*, edited by Simon Eliot and Jonathan Rose (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2007), 179-93. Brown surveys the shift from the scroll to the codex, the move from the reed pen to the quill, and the development of new systems of scripts more suited to the technological innovations. The chapter roams from North Africa to Ireland, from Boethius’s *Consolation of Philosophy* to the Pericope Book of Henry III, from the team of at least eight scribes producing the Book of Kells to illuminated books by Eadui Basan, possibly moving about with Cnut’s court. Bede appears frequently, as do Insular matters and manuscripts that occur in the British Library, which is to be expected. In addition to ably fulfilling its mandate, the piece also serves as a handy review of Brown’s own scholarship. There are only a few small caveats: the image of the Dagulf Psalter forced to “ooze” gold and purple seems a bit unpleasant, and at a few points Brown’s vast knowledge of the field and lively imagination lead to throwaway comments that could be disputed, such as the statement that the Lough Kinale Shrine of Ireland “was tossed into an Irish lake during the ninth century when a disappointed Viking

raider found that it contained only an old book" (190). But these are quibbles.

Charters

First here, by date if nothing else, is a reprint of Benjamin Thorpe's classic *Diplomatarium anglicum aevi saxonicum: A Collection of English Charters, from the Reign of King Aethelberht of Kent, A.D. DC. V to that of William the Conqueror* (Clark, NJ: Lawbook Exchange). This is a handsome volume, costing a regal \$150, but it's a reprint, really more accurately a re-shoot, of the original as published in 1865. Many other versions of the same thing are available on Amazon, one from University of Michigan, one from University of Toronto, and all these versions (including that of the Lawbook Exchange) appear to use the very fine images captured at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies by Liz Rodolfo in March 2007. Those images are available through openlibrary.org and other venues, and the text is more precisely described in Rodolfo's metadata as a total of 734 images, the 683 of the main text plus the introductory material. There seems little point to buying this version. However, just to set the tone for this section, I quote from Thorpe's "Preface": "These documents [Charters] of our ancient kings, prelates, and nobles impart to us information of the most valuable and interesting kind: they prove and rectify the chronology of the chronicles, and serve not unfrequently as a commentary on, and an exemplification of, the Laws, rendering intelligible many points which, without their aid, would be involved in obscurity" (xiii). Thorpe certainly conceived of his enterprise as a grand one; the book includes miscellaneous charters, wills, guild documents, and a handful of manumissions.

However, its utility even for modern scholars aware of the difficulties attendant upon using Thorpe's work seems low. I say this because in Simon Keynes's review of the historiography of the subject of Anglo-Saxon charters, Thorpe's edition merits nary a mention. This seems ominous, given the plenitude of references, the careful elucidation of each and every milestone in the field of charter editing and analysis, and the meticulous detail so characteristic of Keynes's approach. His "Anglo-Saxon Charters: Lost and Found," *Myth, Rulership, Church and Charters: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks*, ed. Julia Barrow and Andrew Wareham (Aldershot: Ashgate), 45-66, reviews the entire world of charters and their transcripts through the ages, works through those that have come to light in the last hundred years, and points out that an eighteenth-century transcript of an otherwise lost original would be quite

as wonderful a discovery for charter scholars as would yet another rediscovered original. This would be the essay to assign to a history student, or indeed any student of medieval studies, needing to learn what's what in Anglo-Saxon charters. Even a writer could use it, perhaps devising a plot in which the twenty-four charters of Lord Somers, lost since 1700 and presumed destroyed, might be found. Moreover, Keynes offers hope of work yet to be done in his listing of all the places in which charter material might be found, in caches of the notes and papers of antiquarians, estate papers, county record offices, or farflung library collections. Given the amount of material that was swishing about educated circles in the eighteenth century, and given the amount that has surfaced in the last century, Keynes concludes that these possibilities "should be quite enough to keep up the spirits" (66).

The next paper in the Brooks *Festschrift* is Susan Kelly, "Reculver Minster and its Early Charters" (67-82). Kelly, perhaps the most stalwart editor of Anglo-Saxon charters, with fully six editions published and three sets of charters currently in final preparation for publication, here offers advance information about some of the charters that will appear in the volume of Christ Church, Canterbury charters she is editing with Brooks. Reculver famously has the earliest surviving Anglo-Saxon diploma, the grant by Hlothhere to Berhtwald and the community at Reculver in 679, a work that Kelly agrees is the work of a Reculver scribe (not a Canterbury one) because of its errors of sense, syntax, and spelling. The very name itself of Reculver—the place-name *Raculf/Regulhium*, from the Old British word for "beak, hill"—suggests the problem of Reculver, which as a foundation appears to have been rather close to the cliff on the north Kent coast, resulting in the near-complete demolition in 1805 of the parish church remaining from the original buildings of the community. Kelly elucidates the modern, medieval, and Roman history of Reculver, describing the Roman garrison, the possible reoccupation in the fourth century, and the foundation—perhaps as an English response to the pope's appointment of two foreigners at Canterbury (Theodore and Hadrian)—of the minster on what may have been a substantial estate and was certainly an area on a major trading route. Along the way, Kelly determines the sources of income for the Reculver community, disentangles the Kentish kings of the seventh and early eighth centuries, considers the stone cross behind the altar in the Reculver church (perhaps from the early ninth century under Winchcombe influence), establishes the history of Reculver based on all the documents in which the minster or its monastics

are mentioned and on the handful of extant charters and diplomas generated there, suggests a resolution for the question of which king was buried in the south aisle at Reculver (Eadberht II), considers the tolls and tax-free ships at the lucrative and strategic ports of Sarre and Minster-in-Thanel, and addresses the diminution of the community by the tenth century into a landed estate, but with a brief revival as a monastic community in the early eleventh century—perhaps a group of foreign clerics, perhaps even Flemish.

Kathryn A. Lowe has two pieces on charters, the first considering the influence of Latin syntax and content on a sequence of eleventh- and twelfth-century memoranda known as Robertson 104 in Oxford, Corpus Christi College MS 197 (“Post-Conquest Bilingual Composition in Memoranda from Bury St Edmunds,” *RES* n.s. 59 (2007): 52-66). Lowe comments in detail on the language of these texts, noting some instances of inflectional loss and monophthongization both of *ĕa* and of *ĕo/ĕo* earlier than noted in Hogg and others. She discusses several of the memoranda in some detail, focusing on the more interesting elements in each. Thus, the ornate Old English of the introduction to the booklist that is Text 3, with its poetic language but Latin original, resembles Ælfric’s usage in S779 on the Ely privileges; Lowe posits that it might have been translated from a preamble concerning Bury on the appointment of Leofstan as abbot in 1045. After considering the details of some other memoranda, particularly focusing on the Latinity of the scribe or translator, Lowe concludes that while some of the memoranda were written in English, the “scribes had Latin, if not in front of them, then certainly in their mind as they were copying” (64). She suggests that some kinds of texts were still copied in Old English, including the last text, an inventory of the abbey’s possessions, and suggests that modern scholars should be asking why two of the scribes of these memoranda used Latin, rather than why the rest used English even quite long after the Conquest.

Lowe’s second paper also addresses Bury St. Edmunds, this time examining the abbey’s *Inspeximus* charters: “The Exchequer, the Chancery and the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds: *Inspeximus* Charters and their Enrolments,” *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700: Regional Manuscripts 1200-1700*, ed. A. S. G. Edwards, vol. 14: 1-26. She considers the history of the *inspeximus* charter, beginning with the explicit statement of Henry II when renewing a Battle Abbey charter about how his new clause was a better safeguard of the rights and privileges of the abbey, through to the last such confirmation at Bury, dated in 1568. Six pre-Conquest charters (two of them probably not authentic) lie at the heart

of the *inspeximus* charters, copied out in them very conservatively indeed. Lowe compares the Chancery, Exchequer and Bury cartulary texts for the treatment of *ĕo/ĕo* and the levelling of determiners, concluding along the way that the Pinchbeck Register for these texts (according to Thomson copied by Walter Pinchbeck himself), must have used not the *inspeximus* available to him, but the lost register of John of Northwold, since it avoids levelling and has indications of a different source. Love concludes that the *inspeximus* charters were self-perpetuating; when a new one was required at the beginning of a new reign, the scribes did not refer to the originals but carefully copied the versions in the previous *inspeximus*, but that Walter Pinchbeck, while explaining carefully where the *inspeximus* charters were to be found, chose to use a different exemplar—which Lowe reconstructs as much as possible. Two useful appendices list all of the relevant texts and charters. Bury St. Edmunds has done well in the modern day: cataloguing by R. H. Thomson, a doctoral thesis on the early hands by Rebecca Rushforth, intermittent study by other scholars, a series of articles by Lowe, and soon the edition of the charters by Lowe and Sarah Foot.

Charles Insley takes the study of charters in a rather different direction in his “Assembles and Charters in Late Anglo-Saxon England,” *Political Assemblies in the Earlier Middle Ages*, ed. P. S. Barnwell and Marco Mostert (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 47-59. He wants to determine the extent to which the charters, particularly their content and witness-lists, might reflect the king’s councils at which they were prepared and focuses on three groups of charters: Athelstan A, Edgar A, and the charters by Æthelred II in which he apologized for earlier decisions (six charters) or justified a current forfeiture of an estate (thirteen charters). These charters, Insley suggests, may have been carefully choreographed productions, and they “may hint at the dynamic in the relationship between the king, his leading counsellors, and the rest of the elite” (53). Charters may offer echoes of public dialogues, and when discursive may offer comments about the king’s motives and his interactions with the nobility. The Athelstan A and Edgar A charters are notable for their rhetoric and for their elaborate proems that remind of the transitory existence of humanity and argue for the giving of alms. Insley concludes with some thoughts about how the charters would have been disseminated and received, and how they might offer a sense of politics in action.

Peter Stokes works at the other extreme, in the specifics of a single charter, Sawyer 786, one of the six *Orthodoxorum* charters, in “King Edgar’s charter for Pershore (AD 972),” *Anglo-Saxon England* 37: 31-78.

There is a lot of meat here, and Stokes in his role as butcher has carved it up with great care and attention to every detail. He focuses on this *pancart*, a kind of charter listing and confirming what would appear to be all the estates held by the monastic institution, in this case the abbey of Pershore. The apparently original single sheet, crammed with the text, occasioned five copies of a part or the whole and a modern transcript of one copy made before it was damaged in the Cottonian fire. Stokes subjects these texts to a detailed comparative palaeographical analysis, then edits them, using the version in British Library, MS Cotton Augustus ii. 6 as the copy-text, with extensive notes and a translation in Appendix 1, and providing as well the quite different list of estates, bounds, and appurtenances found in British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius D. vii (a sixteenth-century transcript), and a different set of bounds for Acton Beauchamp from Hemming's Cartulary (MS Cotton Tiberius A. xiii). The two longer texts, he demonstrates, have the same core material and content, but reworked in various ways, particularly the boundary clauses, some of which have not previously been studied. Tables demonstrate this point and codify the structural elements of all six of the *Orthodoxorum* charters. Stokes then turns to Somers Charter 16, a forgery based on the Pershore charter, in order to determine which version of S786 underlies this charter in favor of Worcester Cathedral and dated 972. This charter is very obviously based on the transcript-version, to the extent of being able to provide some lost readings, particularly—by combining various technologies—the endorsement. Stokes concludes that a version of the charter was “at Worcester, probably by the late eleventh century and certainly by the mid-twelfth” (67). Finally, Stokes considers, and edits in Appendix II, two manuscripts of a letter from Godfrey the archdeacon of Worcester written in a twelfth-century hand, one of these documents being the next one in the Cotton Augustus manuscript. The letter attempts to authenticate the previous document, and Stokes adduces various kinds of evidence in support of its position and of its own authenticity. Possibly, Stokes hints in conclusion, the Augustus manuscript was a first draft, from which the charter surviving in the transcript version was developed. Alternatively, Pershore suffered a comprehensive fire early in the eleventh century, possibly necessitating a new copy of their unusual *pancart*.

Michael Jones considers the remarkable and continuing effects in modern-day Nottinghamshire of the Southwell Charter, Sawyer 659 (or, for those who prefer Cameron numbers, B15.8.311) in “The Enduring Significance of the 956 AD Southwell Charter: Change and

Continuity on the Prebendal Estates of Norwell, Nottinghamshire,” *Transactions of the Thorton Society* 111: 63-72. Jones begins with Sir Frank Stenton, a Southwell man himself, and his discussion of the establishment of the grant of land by Eadwig to Oscytel, Archbishop of York, for a minster. More particularly, Jones, following Stenton and others, notes that this is the first charter that indicates that the archbishop himself had rights of jurisdiction, a private liberty later known as the “Peculiar of Southwell” and applied as an immunity in many other church jurisdictions in England. The early development of the minster at Southwell suggests gradual development (mention appears of the community being a pilgrim shrine in 1020 and acquiring bells from Archbishop Cynesige in the mid-eleventh century), but it is with Ealdred, Archbishop of York (d. 1069) that a concern with jurisdictional rights and the canonical life becomes clear. Documents in the *Liber Albus* “White Book” provide the title deeds, charters, leases of land for the prebendaries, leases of prebendal residences and individual homesteads, and other texts that, Jones argues, suggest both “the conservatism and longevity of arrangements entered into ... over the centuries” (68). Jones argues that the leases for tenants in Norwell parish appear to be remarkably conservative over the generations, suggesting that for this one prebendal village or church village the rights and taxes, the boundaries and regulations, changed very little indeed over a millennium. The article also includes as illustration, since the Southwell Charter itself does not survive, the Darlaston charter, S602, from Stafford, William Salt Library, which is a copy from the second half of the eleventh century.

Finally, Keynes returns with “A Conspectus of the Charters of King Edgar, 957-75,” *Edgar, King of the English 959-975: New Interpretations*, ed. Donald Scragg (Woodbridge: Boydell Press), 60-80. The conspectus has four parts: in the first two, the charters of Edgar first as king of the Mercians and then as king of the English appear year by year, each one with the location, identifying numbers, recipient and purpose of the grant, and most with additional information about the particular kind of formulation; and in the last two, Keynes discusses the problematic charters one by one, then the lost or incomplete charters listed in various archives. The most significant of the latter are those that would have been preserved at Glastonbury Abbey, many of which were listed in various cartularies or in personal lists of single-sheet charters by seventeenth-century antiquaries. In the introductory material Keynes comments on the nature and distribution of the surviving 150 or so charters from Edgar's reign and clarifies the

quality of the evidence concerning the lost charters and the three clusters of Abingdon charters.

Dating and Placing

Kathryn Powell, in “Viking invasions and marginal annotations in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 162,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 37: 151-71, considers annotations by the same scribe in the margins of two homilies, arguing that they refer to Viking raids of the early eleventh century. The manuscript is a largely Ælfrician homily collection written at Canterbury or Rochester at the beginning of the eleventh century. An independent collection, it garnered many corrections and annotations over the next fifty years. The first of the relevant annotations is in the “Ash Wednesday” homily, referring to *heregangum* “invasions” suffered, and Powell works through Neil Ker’s dating system (he is the only person to have noticed and printed the annotation previously) to argue that it occurred within years of the manuscript’s writing. The term *heregang/hergung* is also, Powell argues, commonly used around the turn of the eleventh century to describe the sudden and terrible Viking raids. In the context of the Ash Wednesday homily, the annotation, intended according to Ker as an addition to the homily, may be associated with the law code *VII Æthelred*, promulgated in 1009. Powell proposes that the manuscript was being marked up by a preacher for use in a monastery or religious community, perhaps St. Augustine’s. Powell uses a second annotation argued by Peter Stokes to be the work of the same scribe, this one in the second sermon for mid-Lent Sunday, to confirm this hypothesis that the annotator is thinking about how best to deliver the sermon and revising the material as seems appropriate. A third possible addition in the margins of an anonymous homily for the fourth week of Lent may also refer to the invasions; the text itself requests help against *hæðene þeoda* “heathen peoples” and *heregungge* “invasions.” The annotation is difficult to read, and Powell works through the possibilities and suggests that one of the words is *ungyld* “excessive payment,” referring to large payments, presumably to the Vikings. The annotator generally seems to consider the relevant response to the Viking invasions is the posture of prayer and the expectation of a better life in the next world, not warlike activities in this one. Given the depredations endured in the vicinity of Canterbury between 1009-1012, Powell’s argument that these annotations were written then is speculative, but it is also logical.

Rebecca Rushforth also speculates and importantly proposes an intermediate owner for the Crowland

Psalter (Oxford, Bodleian MS Douce 296) in “The Crowland Psalter and Gundrada de Warenne,” *The Bodleian Library Record* 21.2: 156-68 with two color plates. Written for, and probably at, the Fenland Abbey of Crowland in the middle of the eleventh century (probably during the 1060s, as Rushforth adduces), in the early twelfth century the Crowland Psalter was in use at the Cluniac Priory of Lewes, with three obits of important local monastic figures added in 1109 and 1107. Rushforth suggests that the intervening figure, who moved the manuscript from the East Midlands to Sussex, was Gundrada de Warenne, a Flemish noblewoman whose husband William de Warenne fought at Hastings and later became the first earl of Surrey. The Crowland Psalter had interesting original material (including the obits of the family of Edward the Exile, as Simon Keynes has pointed out), and it had additions in several layers, including saints added to the calendar and litany in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries (Faith, Katherine, and Giles), as was a cursus of the Holy Trinity with feminine forms and only cues given for the relevant psalms. Rushforth concludes that the second user of the manuscript was an individual female well acquainted with the liturgy and aware of current changes and new additions to the calendar. Gundrada and her husband founded Lewes not long after the Conquest, on lands that were hers; Rushforth even uncovers the possibility that Gundrada was a landowner in England before the Conquest, and draws the links with her brothers Gerbod (who became a monk at Cluny after briefly becoming Earl of Chester after the Conquest) and Frederick, who was granted lands in the eastern parts of England before being killed by Hereward the Wake. Rushforth concludes with some fascinating comments about psalter usage by noblewomen in late eleventh-century England and especially about female use and alteration of Hours.

MJT

Remembering the lost is the subject of Gifford Charles-Edwards and Helen McKee’s “Lost Voices from Anglo-Saxon Lichfield,” *ASE* 37: 79-89. This investigation is a palaeographical and historical analysis of several dry-point glosses that were added to the eighth-century Lichfield Gospels held in the Lichfield Cathedral. Although features of the manuscript have undergone palaeographical and codicological study in the past, “one comparatively neglected feature of the Lichfield Gospels has been the existence of dry-point glosses—scratched with a stylus rather than written with ink—on several of its pages” (80). The dry-point writings reveal a list of Anglo-Saxon names; this study analyzes

the contents and the hand in which the names were written in an attempt to determine who may have written them. As a result of Charles-Edwards and McKee's codicological investigation, it can be concluded that the scratched glosses do not seem to share a common hand and that the personal names etched into the Lichfield Gospels most likely represent informal commemorations of nine individuals from the religious community that resided there during the tenth and eleventh centuries. Efforts to use the scratched glosses to determine an Anglo-Saxon provenance for the manuscript fell short. However, through palaeographical and codicological techniques, this analysis offers fascinating insight into the Lichfield community in the years leading up to the Norman conquest. The article will be of special interest to palaeographers, historians, and archaeologists.

MRO

Manuscript Illuminations

This year's work offers several studies that link manuscript illuminations to broad contextual issues of ideology, creativity, and the continued importance of historical studies. Though Carol Neuman de Vegvar's "The Doors of His Face: Early Hell-Mouth Iconography in Ireland," *Aedificia nova: Studies in Honor of Rosemary Cramp*, ed. Karkov and Damico, 176-97, considers illuminations in a tangential way, it nonetheless highlights the visual creativity of early Insular culture. Neuman de Vegvar's primary focus is the origin of a motif that becomes well-known in the Romanesque period and later: the door pulls in the shape of lion heads that hold, grasp, or bite humans. Found on external doors, these works in metal function as visual metaphors for the terrors of hell. Here, Neuman de Vegvar proposes that the motif originates far earlier than previously understood. She notes that the doors of the Capella Palatina at Aachen have been seen as a key source for the spread of the motif in Romanesque England (for example at Durham ca. 1133) and in central and east Europe (Magdeburg and Novograd, the former influencing a later type that appears in Cracow as well as in York and Norwich). Traditional scholarship locates the beginnings of the pictorial type in Anglo-Saxon hell-mouth imagery, and Neuman de Vegvar surveys and dismisses several potential Anglo-Saxon sources for the devouring lionhead motif, including the Repton Stone, the Carolingian Utrecht Psalter, and the Harrowing of Hell in the Tiberius Psalter (BL Cotton Tiberius C.iv, fol. 14), which are either iconographically or compositionally different from the door-pulls. She suggests

here, however, that there are earlier sources from pre-Carolingian Ireland, particularly in eighth- or early ninth-century Irish metalwork and manuscript illumination. She points to the existence of two lion-headed door-handles from Donore (Moynalty, Co. Meath). In addition, she suggests that an item from an excavation near Navan (Co. Meath), which some have described as a horse-fitting, is likely a door-pull. Neuman de Vegvar connects these other examples in various media of early Irish art showing human heads held in the jaws of beasts. This includes metalwork, stonework, and the frequent confrontations of humans and lions depicted in the Book of Kells (Dublin, Trinity College, Ms. 58). Neuman de Vegvar writes, "These examples demonstrate that the motif of the human head in the jaws of a lion was not uncommon in the preeminent media of early Irish art. The human face on the Navan handle may most probably be understood as an adaptation of a locally popular motif to the format of the leonine handle or door-pull..." (181). In addition to the visual context, Neuman de Vegvar points to potential textual parallels. While lions appear in several contexts in scripture, "explicit references to a devouring lion as the embodiment of damnation after death are predominantly exegetical rather than scriptural" (183). Reviewing the metaphorical uses of lions in various Old and New Testament sources as well as the views of early commentators on the mouth of hell, she points to the appearance of the motif in Gregory the Great's *Moralia* and *Dialogues* (Book IV). Gregory's influence was great in Ireland, and Neuman de Vegvar postulates that this source lies behind several other textual treatments of the lion motif in Irish literature; significantly, she also suggests a possible Irish origin for one offertory of the Mass for the dead, *Domine Jesu Christi*, which includes a specific call: "Libera eas de ora leonis." She concludes that the "leonine imagery of the *Domine* may well have been in circulation in eighth- or ninth-century Ireland, at the time of the production of the Navan handle" (186) and thus "one may speculate that the handles on these objects could have served as vectors of the hell-mouth handle type from Ireland to the later Romanesque..." (197).

A similar broad view of the contributions of Anglo-Saxon culture within the broader European tradition is found in the work of Maria Amalia D'Aronco, who continues her study of Anglo-Saxon illustrated herbals in "Gardens on Vellum: Plants and Herbs in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts," which appeared in *Health and Healing from the Medieval Garden* (edited by Dendle and Touwaide [see sect. 7]), 101-27. D'Aronco identifies and describes the classical and early medieval traditions

that inform the herbals made in Anglo-Saxon England; she includes an overview of the Greek tradition of plant description, as well as the intersection of late-antique transmission of this heritage with Christian learning, and pays particular attention to the early monastic traditions found in the work of Cassiodorus and in the Benedictine Rule. The latter had a significant impact on the transmission of herbal knowledge because it required attention to the care of the sick. D'Aronco places Anglo-Saxon England within this tradition, covering the important role of Theodore of Tarsus (who is cited by contemporary sources as a medical expert) and the existence of works such as Bald's *Læcboc* (Royal Ms. 12.D.xvii). Her work on BL Vitellius Ms. C.iii reinforces this view of the advanced interest in herbals and medicine in later Anglo-Saxon England; she puts forward that Winchester was a particularly important center as codicological similarities (layout, script) suggest that both the Vitellius and Harley 585 were made in one of the monasteries there in the late tenth century. A short excursus examines the use of Old English in the *Peri Didaxion* (Harley 6258B) and the Durham and Laud plant glossaries (Durham Cath. MS. Hunter 100; Laud Misc. 567).

Lest we forget some of the reasons we study history, Michelle Brown reminds us that “[w]orks of the past can affect the lives of the present in very potent ways,” in “The Lichfield/Llandeilo Gospels Reinterpreted,” *Authority and Subjugation in Writing of Medieval Wales*, ed. Ruth Kennedy and Simon Meecham-Jones (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), 57-70 at 57. The title of her article recognizes the role that two sites on opposite sides of the English/Wales cultural divide, Lichfield (in the kingdom of Mercia) and Llandeilo (in Wales) have played in the preservation of the manuscript at the heart of her study: the Lichfield or St. Chad Gospels (Lichfield Cathedral Library, MS. 1). This early gospel book is presently swept up into the same currents that have caught the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Book of Deer in “the reawakening of regional and national identities and with a developing sense of the value of such cultural artifacts as iconic rallying points” (57) that implicate the interpretation of these works in contemporary concerns of the tourist industry, the creation of jobs, and political posturing. Such concerns often focus on questions of origin—that of the work in question, as well as national, regional, and ethnic beginnings of citizens within the larger nation-state. Brown’s study here seeks to complicate that interpretation, arguing that the “biography of the book is defined by the multiplicity of places it has been and people it has known and not just by where it was born” (58). Brown proceeds to review

the biography or provenance of the book, starting with its earliest attested history in mid-ninth-century Wales, where it received annotations, which, among other items, recorded the intervention of Gelhi (Gelli) son of Arihtiud, who traded his prized horse for the book. As Brown notes, the texts inscribed in the manuscript at this time include the oldest surviving original document in Welsh as well as one of the earliest documents freeing slaves in the post-Roman world. As important as these documents are historically, it is not plausible that the book was created in Wales, Brown argues. She reviews evidence of script, decoration, and textual context that indicate that “its affinities lie firmly within the Columban orbit and indicate privileged access to the Lindisfarne Gospels on Holy Island” (64) at least a century before the appearance of the manuscript in Wales. The manuscript was taken to Lichfield by the mid-tenth century and there it has remained. Some have argued that the manuscript was made at Lichfield, and Brown explores the relationship of the manuscript with the recent (2004) discovery of the remains of the shrine of St. Chad under the crossing of the cathedral. Noting the close connection of St. Chad with the Columban orbit of monasteries, she associates the pigments used on the shrine—purple, pink, white, and black (an “unusual palette” for use on stone)—with those used in the Lichfield Gospels and the later Book of Cerne, which was at Lichfield in the early ninth century. She suggests that the relationship between shrine and manuscript raises the question of whether the similarities were by design “so that the two visible manifestations of sanctity complemented one another” (67). Brown’s study underlines that “such books were made to speak to all; they are not the sole property of any one place in which they have rested during their journeys—they transcend regional and temporal considerations and in a spiritual and cultural sense they belong to us all” (67).

Other items in this year’s bibliography focus on individual illustrations. Frederick M. Biggs, in “A Picture of Paul in a Parker Manuscript,” *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach*, ed. Blanton and Scheck [see sect. 2], 169-90, examines a group of six saintly scholars depicted in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 198. These figures, which are now found on folio iir, have not been firmly identified in previous scholarship. Biggs surveys the depiction of apostles in Anglo-Saxon art, rightly noting the difficulty in identifying the figures in Corpus 198 because of the lack of detailed physical descriptions in New Testament textual sources and the inconsistent iconographic treatments in western Christian visual traditions. However, the large key held by the

top, central figure identifies him as Peter; Biggs puts forward an identification of the corresponding central figure in the bottom row as Paul (though this figure lacks any attribute to aid in the identification). Observing that “each of the four outer figures holds one [book] while the inner two do not, suggesting four evangelists and two others” (171), Biggs argues that the composition depicts the authors of the four gospels flanking the apostles Peter (top center) and Paul (bottom). Biggs then explores contextual clues, namely “the transmission of Christ’s teaching to the two evangelists, Mark and Luke, who did not know him personally—found prominently, but not exclusively, in Ælfric’s sermon on Mark, a copy of which is preserved in this manuscript” (171). The codicological evidence for the original arrangement of the relationship of the items in the manuscript is inconclusive, in part because its contents were rearranged in the eleventh century; however, the picture and other texts in the manuscript were marked by the same red ink, and this suggests to Biggs that “the illustration, which may have traveled with the manuscript from its place of origin, was retouched when it was brought forward to the front of the volume” (177). Biggs admits that the main ideas informing the illustration, namely that Matthew and John learned directly from Christ, while Mark learned from Peter and Luke from Paul, were broadly known and appear in Jerome’s prologue to Matthew and more precipitously in Aldred’s colophon in the Lindisfarne Gospels. However, Biggs argues that Ælfric’s sermon on Mark (as well as his letter to Sigeward, which is not found in Corpus 198) provides a more “nuanced understanding of the relationship between Peter and Mark, and Paul and Luke, that underlies the illustration in Corpus 198” (186). He explains: “While there are sources for most if not all the individual claims Ælfric makes in elaborating this point, his focus on it, at least from the written record that survives, appears to be distinctly his own” (188). For Biggs, the image expresses the transmission of authority from Peter to Mark and from Paul to Luke through such things as tonsures (Peter and Mark), attributes associated with the figures (keys, orbed scepter), and gesture (Peter faces Matthew while placing his hand on Mark’s back). Even the “less dynamic” (183) visual relationship of Luke and Paul may be explained in reference to Ælfric’s sermon, which tells the reader that Paul was only one of Luke’s (several) sources for his Gospel. In an interesting aside, Biggs notes that Ælfric does specifically emphasize Luke’s life of purity, a theme which Biggs associates with the clean-shaven appearance of three of the apostles in the illustration: in his words, “a monk’s shaving must be seen as an outward sight of an

inward decision to renounce pleasures of the flesh.... In Corpus 198, Paul is depicted in the same way as John and Luke, and appropriately so as the advocate of chastity” (185). Though the precise origin of the illustration cannot be recovered, it in effect describes themes that were important to Ælfric: the apostolic authority of Peter, the importance of chaste living, and the continuity and disjunction of the Old and New Testaments.

Catherine E. Karkov focuses on the well-known depiction of Edgar offering a golden charter to Christ now found on folio 2v of BL Cotton Vespasian A.viii in “The Frontispiece to the New Minster Charter and the King’s Two Bodies,” *Edgar, King of the English 959-975*, 224-41. Whereas previous studies have emphasized how the image functions politically as a statement of monastic ideals and kingship, Karkov here proposes that the frontispiece “may have been as important for its liturgical references as it was for its political ones” (225). She advances two arguments. First, she suggests “that the image functions not as a record, but as a visual evocation of a dedication ceremony” which “furthers the message of purification and renewal conveyed in the charter itself” (225). By this she means the illustration does not so much document an actual dedication as much as envision an ideal one. To this end, she offers a description of the frontispiece that emphasizes the pivotal role of the figure of the king (“simultaneously part of the horizontal group” with Mary and Peter and as part of the “inverted triangle formed by the bodies of the angels” (226). She reviews what we know of surviving rites of dedication of churches found in the Benedictional of Archbishop Robert (Rouen, Bib. Mun. Y.7), in the Edgar Pontifical (Paris, BN lat. 10575) and in the Benedictional of Aethelwold (BL Add. 49598). She finds in these sources a consistent treatment of the church fabric as a living being and the identification of church and congregation and the attention to purification and she connects these themes to the iconography and decoration of the frontispiece. Building on these observations she offers a second conclusion, suggesting “that the figure of the king serves a dual function within the miniature, standing both for Edgar and his royal authority and for the corporate body of the New Minster comprised ... of its community and congregation” (225). She supports this with observations of the role of the king’s body in the frontispiece to the Regularis Concordia (BL Cotton Tiberius V.iii, fol. 2v), which she has previously compared to the image of Otto III in majesty found in the Ottonian manuscript, the Liuthar Gospels. Whereas she had previously argued that the Tiberius image highlighted the “two natures of Edgar’s kingship: the human and the sacral,” she now suggests that

the “two bodies” of the king are “individual and corporate” (240). Returning the Charter frontispiece, she concludes, “Like the Tiberius A.iii drawing, it is not just about Edgar’s exalted position, but about his relationship with living bodies that make up the community for whom the charter was written and decorated, and the living bodies of the congregation for whom the church was built, and who, on special occasions, would likely have seen the charter displayed on the altar” (240).

The public image of another Anglo-Saxon king informs another entry in this year’s bibliography, Robert L. Schichler’s “Ending on A Giant Theme: The Utrecht and Harley Psalters, and the Pointed-Helmet Coinage of Cnut,” *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach*, eds. Blanton and Scheck, 241-54. Schichler observes that the illustration of Psalm 143 (fol. 73v) in the Harley Psalter (BL Harley 603) includes two depictions of Goliath dressed in a pointed helmet. Because pointed helmets are not found in other images in Harley nor in its model the Utrecht Psalter, Schichler argues that the pointed helmet that Goliath wears is another example of the depiction of contemporary artifacts by the artists responsible for the Harley illustrations. As others have noted, the pointed or conical helmet is a regular feature of the armor of Scandinavian warriors in earlier and near-contemporary artifacts and Schichler calls attention to the silver pennies minted under King Cnut’s authority in 1023/24 to 1029/30 as prime examples. On this coinage, the pointed helmet can be seen as a way of reminding the viewer that Cnut’s status derives from his prowess as a warrior and from his descent from Svein. Schichler argues that the figure of Goliath is a response to the words of Psalm 143 in which the Psalmist asks for deliverance from the hand of foreigners (246). If so, as Schichler explains, “After 1023, a glimpse of Goliath at the end of the Harley Psalter would likely have produced an apt reaction in just about anyone in the kingdom: a simple tap to the purse, possibly, or even a thought of Cnut” (253). The associations aroused by the Harley pointed helmet is less positive than in other surviving example, as it is adopted for the archetypal enemy of God’s people, Goliath. Though many at Christ Church (one possible origin of the Harley Psalter) owed positions and patronage to Cnut and Emma, Schichler concludes that “such acceptance of Cnut was not universal ... in the minds of some, the king was still a conqueror: a powerful figure who stood firmly before them as Goliath before David” (254). If Schichler’s argument is accepted, then the use of the pointed helmet in Harley can be seen as a way of more precisely dating

this portion of its work (recent attributions suggested an earlier range of dates from “c. 1010-1025”).

Two further entries also require our brief attention. One article listed in this year’s bibliography, Laura Cochrane’s “‘The Wine in the Vines and the Foliage in the Roots’: Representations of David in the Durham Cassiodorus,” *Studies in Iconography* 28 (2007), 23-50, was reviewed in *YWOES* for 2007. One final entry, George T. Beech’s “An ‘Old’ Conquest of England Tapestry (possibly the Bayeux) owned by the Rulers of France, England and Burgundy (1396-1430),” *Revue Belge de philologie et d’histoire* 83 (2005), 1017-27, does not deal with manuscript illuminations at all, and therefore I will be brief in dealing with its arguments. It analyzes new evidence from the inventories of the possessions of Charles VI of France drawn up upon the orders of the English King Henry V (supervised by Henry’s regent, John Duke of Bedford in 1422 and 1432) and the records of the royal *Compte de L’Argenterie* (1396). The first two describe tapestries depicting “Duke William who conquered England” that were in Charles’ possession (1422 inventory) and record their removal (prior to 1432) while the latter describes the repair of a “large tapestry, Of the Conquest of England.” Beech decides that it is unlikely that the French king owned more than one tapestry of the Conquest and concludes that the three entries record the same artifact and that it is likely that this work is one now in Bayeux. Based on this conclusion, Beech is able to revisit his earlier study (published in 2005) in which he had argued that the Bayeux Tapestry had been in the possession of the Duke of Burgundy in the 1430s (rather than in the possession of the cathedral at Bayeux since the eleventh century, as many scholars believe). The new evidence allows Beech to speculate that the tapestry passed from the possession of Charles IV to Burgundy through the agency of the English regent, the Duke of Bedford, as part of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance.

BW

Works not seen:

- Karkov, Catherine E. “Evangelist Portraits and Book Production in Late Anglo-Saxon England.” *The Cambridge Illuminations: The Conference Papers*. Ed. Stella Panayotova. London: Harvey Miller, 2007. pp. 55-63 + plate iv.
- Lewis, Beryl. *Boundary Landscape: A Walk at Staunton on Arrow in Herefordshire to Look for the Boundary of an Anglo-Saxon Estate*. Kington: Kington Historical Society, 2008.

7. History and Culture

a. General Sources and Reference Works

Introduction to Early Medieval Western Europe, 300-900: The Sword, the Plough and the Book (London: Routledge), by Matthew Innes, is an undergraduate textbook that aims to help students understand why the Roman Empire broke down in western Europe and how it came to be replaced with quite different political systems. Britain and Ireland are thus considered together in a section made up of a brief summary, a chronology, and discussions of the end of the Roman province, post-Roman consolidation, the Anglo-Saxon settlement, Celtic kingships and Celtic churches, Anglo-Saxon kingships and conversion, and the Viking raids. These subsections are interspersed with separate short essays on Dunadd and Dalriada, Sutton Hoo, culture and identity in the age of Bede, and Repton. The section ends with a bibliographic essay. This is a vast amount of material to cover in seventy-nine pages, and what is actually addressed is not the historical sequence of events but rather interpretations of sources and subjects of debate. Large themes are emphasized, but where possible they are balanced by discussions of regional difference, and situations are often helpfully clarified by reference to the rest of the post-Roman world. Events are explained in new ways. For example, the Romans did not make a conscious decision to withdraw troops from Britain and redeploy them elsewhere; rather, military leaders stationed in Britain took their soldiers to the Continent in bids to become emperor, and those men never returned. In the case of the *adventus Saxonum*, ecological pressure on coastal Germanic communities already dislocated by the collapse of Roman power combined with a power vacuum in lowland Britain to send diverse and heterogenous groups of people to Britain, where they coalesced into new communities. There was no large-scale break in the exploitation of the land; the change was that agrarian strategies were adjusting to the new economic realities of a world without markets. Other insightful discussions cover the origins and functions of the local units of the early Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, the stratification of Anglo-Saxon society, the christianization of the population, the use of the vernacular for law-codes, and the interaction of ecclesiastical and royal power. The treatment of the Vikings is less reliable. For example, it is not widely accepted that *Lochlann* refers to western Scotland nor that the Irish labels “black foreigners” and “white foreigners” refer respectively to new Scandinavian incomers and those who had become settled

in Ireland. I would not use Innes's work as the sole textbook for a course in early medieval history, but it is a very impressive achievement and would definitely be on the list of recommended reading.

The main objective of Walter Goffart's *Barbarian Tides: The Migration Age and the Later Roman Empire* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania UP), as stated in his introduction, is to combat the scholarly view that there was a grand narrative of barbarian history. In doing so, Goffart seeks to “reform thinking and writing about the barbarians in late antiquity by driving out the anachronistic terms ‘German’ and ‘Germanic’ and the baggage that goes with them and by giving full weight, instead, to the multiplicity of foreigners faced by the Roman Empire and to the advantage this gave Rome in maintaining its ascendancy” (6). Goffart's book is divided between four chapters dealing with historiographical subjects and then three chapters that focus on important events in the history of relations between barbarians and Romans in late antiquity. In chapter one, Goffart criticizes the notion that there was an ancient “Germanic world” and that the barbarian peoples were migratory by nature. Instead he places emphasis on the many different barbarians who moved at the instigation of particular leaders. Building on this suggestion, chapter two challenges the view that the Roman Empire was overthrown by the collective effort of “Germanic” peoples. Goffart here makes use of previous work by the scholar Demandt. In a point-by-point format, Goffart tries to deconstruct Demandt's argument, suggesting instead that the downfall of the Roman Empire came about not only because of the pressures it faced from a variety of separate barbarian forces on its borders but also because of Rome's internal weaknesses. In chapter three, Goffart attempts to dispel the idea that there was a “German civilization” at the root of medieval Germany. After showing how Tacitus's “Germania” and the origin stories common before the Carolingian age have done much to shape this idea, Goffart stresses that, instead, impulses in Justinian's Constantinople and much later in sixteenth-century Germany caused the propagation of an “Ancient Germany.” In chapter four, the last dealing with issues of modern historiography, Goffart examines the veracity of origin tales and questions the view that the Goths and other “Germans” migrated from Scandinavia. Goffart suggests that this story was devised by Jordanes, in his “Getica” written in Constantinople after March 551, at a moment when Gothic intrusion in Italy was

being eradicated and Italy itself was becoming a dependency of Constantinople. Whereas the first four chapters by Goffart deal with modern views of barbarians and their “Germanic heritage,” the remaining chapters demonstrate the complex nature of the surviving source material for late antiquity by examining some important events involving barbarians. Thus, Chapter five tackles the famous breakthrough across the River Rhine by the Alans, Vandals, and Sueves in the early 400s in an attempt to show the movement of peoples involved in this period. Alternatively, chapter six offers an insight into barbarian peoples at rest and the various ways in which they developed a *modus vivendi* with other people in Roman territory (examining in particular the Burgundians and Goths in Roman Gaul and Italy). Here Goffart offers a defense, and sometimes also an adjustment, of arguments he made previously in his book *Barbarians and Romans: The Techniques of Accommodation* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980). In the penultimate Chapter seven, Goffart argues that ethnicity was not what mattered in dealings between Romans and barbarians in late antiquity but rather the strength of character of certain individuals and their dynasties. Here Goffart gives interesting examples of how barbarians were able to infiltrate the highest political positions in the late Roman Empire; he also provides accounts of seven of the less well-known barbarian tribes—the Gepids, the Sciri, the Herules, the Sueves, the Frisians, the Thuringians, and the Bavarians—deliberately avoiding any attempt to trace their origins or their routes of advance.

Peter Wells’s volume *Barbarians to Angels: The Dark Ages Reconsidered* (New York: Norton) aims to package early medieval archeology for a popular audience. In doing so, he hopes (as the title suggests) to replace the popular perception of the early medieval period as barbaric to one illuminated, in the words of Gerald of Wales, by the “works of angels.” Only one chapter in the book directly touches on Anglo-Saxon England, but it is one worth reading. In “Roman Londinium to Saxon Lundenwic: Continuity and Change (AD 43-800),” 88-120, Wells summarizes the evidence for continuity of habitation in London from the late Roman through the middle Saxon periods. He argues that archeological evidence shows London to have been a thriving community even when other evidence suggests that the site was virtually abandoned. The arguments in this chapter are neither new nor ground-breaking, nor are they meant to be, but he provides a useful account of the current state of knowledge which might be useful in a classroom or simply interesting to the non-specialist reader.

The target audience of *How the Barbarian Invasions Shaped the Modern World: The Vikings, Vandals, Huns, Mongols, Goths, and Tartars who Razed the Old World and Formed the New* (Beverly, MA: Fair Winds), by Thomas J. Craughwell, seems to be junior high school students. Visually, the book is very easy to read, with double-spaced text, ample margins, and catchy factoids in side-bars. The paragraphs are short, and the language is simple, with detailed retelling of gory anecdotes. Every chapter has a timeline of important events, and there are almost as many illustrations as text. Craughwell’s accounts of the *adventus Saxonum*, the Viking raids, Alfred’s defeat of Guthrum, and Harold’s defeat of Harald harðráði are reasonably accurate, but the work cannot be recommended for high school students or above because there is no identification of the primary sources that Craughwell is retelling or of the artwork, ranging from the medieval to the modern, that is deployed to depict the events. Without some guidance on these matters, non-specialist readers are apt to be misled.

Adam Ardrey has achieved his success in *Finding Merlin: The Truth Behind the Legend of the Great Arthurian Mage* (Woodstock, NY: Overlook Press) due to a careful selection of sources. Using Jocelyn’s *Life of Kentigern*, Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Life of Merlin*, Caradoc of Llancarfan’s *Life of Gildas*, and the anonymous late-medieval “Dialogue between Myrddin and His Sister,” Ardrey is able to construct a fairly coherent history that places Arthur (that is, Arthur Mac Aedan) and Merlin in late sixth-century Scotland. Merlin is a druid and the lifelong enemy of Kentigern, Merlin’s twin sister Languoreth is the wife of Rhydderch of Strathclyde, and their father is Morken (the Madoc Morvryn of the Welsh Triads). The figures in these texts who are accepted as historical establish the framework into which Ardrey fits his discoveries. A number of re-identifications are also proposed: “Pen Dragon” is a title, not a proper name, and Emrys is the first to bear it; and “Uther Pen Dragon” is really “the other Pen Dragon,” that is, Emrys’s successor Gwenddolau. Gildas’s birth is re-dated to 544 and placed in Scotland, allowing him to grow up in fear of the Angles and fit into Caradoc’s tale of his personal grievance against Arthur. The disparate pieces of the puzzle click neatly into place, with Gildas’s sister marrying Mordred and the Scottish scene of action yielding up a number of identifiable locations, such as Merlin’s last home, now Ardery Street in Partick, Glasgow. The reader’s willing suspension of disbelief, in the end, is strained not so much by the use of dubious sources as by Ardrey’s recreation of the political, religious, and social conflicts

between pagans and Christians in sixth-century Scotland, which depends far more on current stereotypes than on current scholarship.

A more rigorous argument for Arthur as the sixth-century Artúr mac Áidan is offered by the late Dr. Laurance J. Maney in "I Wonder What the King is Doing Tonight: Looking for Arthur in all the Wrong Places" in *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium* 25: (2009 for 2004): 54-72. He dismisses the need for Gildas to mention Arthur at the Battle of Badon and instead reviews the historical routes by which northern lore plausibly could have travelled to southern Britain. Maney thinks it likely that traditions concerning the Artúr noted in the *Vita Columbae* (§1.9) and the *Gododdin* (B₂₃₈), who are most likely the same person, came to Gwynedd, where they were linked to Gildas's battle of Badon Hill. To reach Wales, they passed along the same route as the "northern history" in Nennius's *Historia Brittonum*: from Strathclyde, where Feradach ua Artúr's kin were well known, to Ireland in the latter half of the eighth century, and thence to southern Wales and Merfyn's court. The conduit was almost certainly the Ui Mail of northeast Leinster, to whom the Dal Riata and Strathclyde Britons were allied in the late seventh century. Maney argues that Merfyn was probably allied to the Ui Mail as well because Merfyn's son Rhodri Mawr seems to have taken refuge with them when he fled from the Vikings the year before his death. As further evidence of Ui Mail knowledge of Artúr, Maney points out that the name Artúr is only found in Irish genealogies in early eighth-century pedigrees of the Clann Óengussa of Ui Mail and in ninth-century pedigrees of the lineages of Ui Muiredaig, who were allied by marriage to the Ui Mail.

Kenneth G. Henshall, professor of Japanese at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand, has produced a book for students as well as general readers on the topic of *Folly and Fortune in Early British History: From Caesar to the Normans* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan). It is a serious attempt to underscore the human factor in history through an investigation of bad choices and good luck as historical determinants. Emerging from this is also an exploration of why Britain's repeated conquest was possible. Henshall hopes that his readers will think about these issues for themselves, and perhaps because his target audience is not academic, he writes in a very casual style and is forthright about his conclusions. For example, he defends Vortigern's decision to continue the long-established practice of employing one group of barbarians against another, and he argues that Æthelred II was weak rather than foolish, but in any case dogged by ill fortune. He

pillories Harold Godwinson for numerous acts of folly, whereas he calls William lucky in a number of respects, only one of which was that Harold made so many mistakes. At the highest level, Henshall argues, British history was characterized by invasions of newcomers who did what they did "because they wanted to and they could" (247), largely because of a lack of unity in the targeted areas. Henshall is not a specialist in Anglo-Saxon history and relies considerably on secondary literature, not all of it up-to-date (as when he quotes Eric Oxenstierna's 1966 views on the Vikings), but he is a lively lecturer and gives his readers plenty to think about.

Dirk Meier's *Seafarers, Merchants and Pirates in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006) was originally published in German as *Seefahrer, Händler und Piraten im Mittelalter* (Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke, 2006). It is not a complete survey of maritime history but rather an examination of various points in the development of maritime culture in medieval northern Europe. Although this work is not academic in format, Meier is an expert and currently the Head of Coastal Archaeology at the Christian Albrechts University in Kiel. *Seafarers, Merchants and Pirates* is valuable for its descriptions and illustrations of all the northern boat types, not just the clinker-built Scandinavian vessels but also the cog, which goes back to the ninth century, the carrack, known from the end of the eighth century and the most important type of ship carrying cargo between England and the Continent, and the late-medieval caravel. Of the other topics, Chapter four, "Dorestad, London, Ribe: The North Sea and its early trading ports" (54-73), would be of interest to Anglo-Saxonists, as it gives a useful overview of the North Sea trade network from Roman times to the early Middle Ages. The two chapters on the Vikings are very brief surveys, and better versions of the same material can be found in *The Oxford Illustrated History of the Vikings*, ed. Peter Sawyer (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997).

b. Religion and the Church

In "The Midsummer Solstice As It Was, Or Was Not, Observed in Pagan Germany, Scandinavia and Anglo-Saxon England," *Folklore* 119: 41-57, Sandra Billington explores what seems like a curious omission on the part of pagan Germanic peoples, namely, their failure to celebrate midsummer. There is ample evidence for celebration at midwinter and at the beginning of summer, but there is no record of celebration on the summer solstice in Germany until the seventh century and none from Scandinavia until the end of the first millennium,

when St. John's Eve became one of the Christian feast days on which King Olaf Trygvason of Norway allowed drinking festivals. The reason why midsummer was not celebrated was because the period between June 21 and 24 illustrates the sun's weakness rather than strength, so it was very unlikely that any early sun-worshippers, who depended on the sun's strength for survival, would have chosen this solstice to venerate their god. Midsummer was a time for the Roman celebration of *Fors Fortuna*, with ceremonies that emphasized change and mutability, and it was this custom that was adapted by Christianity. There were medieval midsummer celebrations, but they were not holdovers from the pagan period.

James Campbell, in "Some Considerations on Religion in Early England" in *Collectanea antiqua: Essays in Memory of Sonia Chadwick Hawkes*, ed. Martin Henig (Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 2007), 67-73, complains that "conscientious disregard of arguably relevant evidence, however much earlier or later it may be, limits harmfully the range of possible understandings of Anglo-Saxon paganism (or paganisms)" (67). Campbell then goes on to review the evidence for Anglo-Saxon paganism, with special reference to the Kentish laws, Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*, and the limited archeological evidence. In doing so, he argues for the existence of a powerful, centrally organized pagan priesthood and against the notion that silence in the sources should be taken as evidence of historical absence.

Stephen J. Yeates takes on a barely attested pagan cult in *The Tribe of Witches: The Religion of the Dobunni and Hwicce* (Oxford: Oxbow). He identifies the Hwicce, a Severn Valley tribe conquered by the men of Wessex and integrated into Mercia in 628, as the Dobunni, an Iron Age people in the same area named in inscriptions and other sources from the second to the seventh centuries. His chief argument is that the Dobunni and the Hwicce practiced the same religion, whose central deity was a mother goddess symbolized by a sacred vessel. On the basis of inscriptions, fragments of sculpture, place-names, hill-forts, and the remains of large sacred groves called *nemetons*, Yeates hypothesizes that the sacred trees of the Dobunni were replaced by posts in enclosures, which in turn were replaced by stone columns, which in turn were replaced by high crosses. Horses and Nodens (the mining god of the Forest of Dean) also seem to have been foci of reverence. Christianization of the Hwicce began in the sixth century, and a permanent church was established over a temple site in Hereford in 540. Pagan temple sites were apparently still important around 700, if the story of

the foundation of the church at Evesham is properly interpreted.

In "The Power of the Imagination: the *Christianitas* and the Pagan North during Conversion to Christianity," *Medieval History Journal* 5 (2002): 309-332, David Fraesdorff shows just how fluid early medieval notions of "the north" might have been. So entrenched were associations of the northern latitudes with paganism (due largely to knowledge of then-pagan Scandinavia as well as Charlemagne's wars with the Saxons dwelling north of the Elbe) that even the similarly pagan Slavs of central and eastern Europe might have been characterized as dwelling within territories designated as *aquilo*, one of the terms in Medieval Latin for the north wind (312). Biblical associations were significant: the prophet Jeremiah (1.14) had declaimed that "The evil from the north will break out over all inhabitants of the country" (*ab aquilone pandetur malum super omnes habitatores terrae*). This passage, according to Fraesdorff, was one of many examples in which "the North is presented in the holy scriptures as the pagan and sinister *aquilo*" (309-310). With the Norsemen's assault on Lindisfarne Abby in 793, Jeremiah's prophecy seemed especially pertinent to English and Frankish monks (311). But crucial in establishing this *topos* was the role of ecclesiastical jurisdiction as well: "Only with the perception of this expansive area in northern and eastern Europe as a collective legation area, was the idea of the 'North born'" (310). Fraesdorff notes that more than religion separated these regions, something that allowed the myth of the *aquilo* to outlive the conversion of its peoples: "In the *aquilo*, feudal systems or even monarchical kingdoms which we know from ancient Europe, were completely missing," and oral cultures predominated (314). The perceived foreignness of these regions led ultimately to their description in the chronicles as the habitations of monsters (326).

James T. McIlwain's "The 'Celtic' Tonsure Revisited," *Pecia* 12: 63-76, consists of an examination of the differing descriptions of the Celtic tonsure's form in an attempt to reach some form of definitive description. McIlwain concludes that "considered in its entirety, the evidence supports the view that the Celtic tonsure, castigated by the Romani for its alleged association with Simon Magus, was indeed inherited from the druids and, as proposed by Venclová, retained hair at the front of an otherwise shaven head" (75).

An eighteenth-century altar in Fulda Cathedral provokes Franz Staab's inquiry in "Bonifatius, die *regula sancti patris Benedicti* und die Gründung des Klosters Fulda," *Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte* 57 (2005): 55-69. Since the nineteenth century,

commentators have been baffled by its dual images of Saints Boniface and Benedict—images that lead Staab to wonder whether the pairing might preserve some sort of authentic tradition. Some of the difficulties posed by this image, Staab argues, are in fact illusory, the products of present-day misunderstandings of what it meant to adhere to the Rule of St. Benedict during the lifetime of Boniface. According to Staab, we need not doubt (as some recent scholars do) whether the term “Benedictine” may be justifiably applied to regular clergy living before the reform activities of Louis the Pious and Benedict of Aniane. That the religious in this era were not in the habit of referring to themselves as “Benedictine” does not mean that they did not follow his rule; the term itself owes something to the atmosphere of post-Reform thought (56). Thus Staab is comfortable asserting that the fame of Benedict and the norms of his Rule accompanied Boniface throughout his life (54), a position conflicting with that of some recent scholarship and supported in Staab’s study with a wealth of references from hagiography, some explicit and others rather subtle, showing the basic alignment of Boniface’s observances with Benedictine norms, from restraint in the consumption of wine (60) to a belief in the importance of manual labor. The monastery of Fulda was itself organized along lines Staab is content to regard as part of the great tradition established at Monte Cassino in the middle of the sixth century: “Das Ergebnis war zweifellos ein Benediktinerkloster” (69).

Ian Wood investigates “Monasteries and the Geography of Power in the Age of Bede,” *Northern History* 45: 11–25, particularly in the Vale of Pickering and the Lower Tyne. Regarding the former, he begins with monasteries of uncertain identification. St. Gregory’s Minster, Kirkdale, is likely to have been *Cornu Vallis*, and King Æthelwald of Deira may have been buried there. Gilling East, with its fragment of early Anglian sculpture, is more likely than Gilling West to have been the Gilling where another Deiran king, Oswine, was murdered. Early Anglian sculpture found at Hovingham and Kirby Misperton indicates that they too may have been monastic centers. Taking into account the better-attested monasteries nearby, a group of five unquestionable monastic houses and three probable or possible ones emerges within a very tight area, all with royal connections. Æthelwald was associated with Lastingham and possibly with Kirkdale, Gilling was founded by Oswiu in memory of Oswine, and Crayke was a foundation of Ecgrith. The founder of Stonegrave and Coxwold is unknown, but King Eadbert had his eye on their property, and a later king, Æthelwold

Moll, held both of them. Wood proposes that some of these houses may have been among the twelve monasteries, six *in provincia Derorum*, founded by Oswiu as thank-offerings for the birth of Ælflæd. He sees a similar cluster of royal monasteries on the Lower Tyne. Jarrow and *Donamutha* are associated with Ecgrith, Tynemouth is the burial place of Osred, and royal connections are possible for Gateshead, Bywell, Hexham, and Corbridge. It would appear that by the late seventh century, the central monasteries of the Lower Tyne played a dominant role in commemoration in what had been the territory of the Bernicii, and the monasteries of the Vale of Pickering did the same in the region of the Deirans, yet neither of these centers championed exclusively Deiran or Bernician families.

In “Fact and/or Folklore? The Case for St Pega of Peakirk,” *Northamptonshire Past and Present* 61: 7–16, Avril Lumley Prior re-examines the evidence linking St. Pega to Peakirk. This saint was the virgin sister of St. Guthlac and, like him, an anchorite. All known references to Pega concur that she lived within a day’s journey from Crowland, probably at Peakirk, as Orderic recounted and etymology suggests (Peakirk derives from *Pege cyrcan*, Pega’s church). The most logical location for Pega’s cell is on the site of what is now called “Hermitage Chapel,” a former island that may have been perceived as a wilderness and was located on the frontier of Peterborough Abbey’s late seventh-century territory. It is unlikely that a monastery existed here before 870, but during the mid-tenth-century period of monastic renaissance a center of worship appears to have been established on the gravel margins west of the “Hermitage” site. It is possible that around 1016 Edmund Ironside aspired to endow a minster church staffed by a college of secular canons to offer pastoral care to the population of Pegecyrcan, upgrading the status of a pre-existing church that had close associations with the local saint. The endowment was not completed, due to Edmund’s death that year, and the church at Pegecyrcan remained with Peterborough. Pegecyrcan is absent from the Domesday survey, perhaps because it was included in the Glinton assessment.

James Kemble investigates the history of “The East and Middle Saxon Estates of Westminster Abbey,” *Essex Archaeology and History* 39: 152–61. Westminster was founded by Sabert, an early seventh-century king of the East Saxons, but it increasingly came under Mercian influence during the eighth century, and it was probably this influence that resulted in its ownership of estates in Essex and Middlesex as well as further afield. Kemble provides tables of the charter dates of Westminster’s estate holdings and the charter dates of those

estates that Westminster lost before 1086. The earliest extant charter may be from the end of the eighth century, but most are from the middle of the tenth century and later. Edgar (r. 957-975) was a significant donor who helped re-found the monastery after the Viking attacks. Other donations in the second half of the tenth century were made by noblemen. The next strong support of Westminster came from Edward the Confessor, who re-founded the monastery a second time, equipped it with a new church, and granted it estates throughout his reign. He did not live to see the consecration of the new church, but he was interred there as planned. By the time of the *Domesday* survey in 1086, Westminster held fifteen manors in Essex, ten in Middlesex, and nine in Hertfordshire. Of the Essex possessions, four had come to the monastery in or after 1066. But Westminster had suffered badly from losses during the twenty years after the Conquest and lost more than half of its Essex estates. Many had been let out to tenants instead of managed by bailiffs, and many had been seized by Normans, including Odo (William's half-brother) and Judith (William's niece). Little respect was paid to Edward's charters, and even grants made in William's reign were not always completed. Kemble concludes with an examination of Westminster's attempt to rationalize its holdings over the years by accumulating properties that could be reached by water or former Roman roads. It is unclear to what degree the sale of products of Westminster's estates contributed to its economic success in the Anglo-Saxon period; it was only later in the Middle Ages that its wealth greatly exceeded that of its rival, St. Paul's.

The purpose of *Contesting Christendom: Readings in Medieval Religion and Culture*, ed. James L. Halverson (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield), is to introduce students to the field of medieval Christianity. It comprises reprints of essays and book chapters that highlight particular issues under the broader rubrics of the extent of Christianization in the early Middle Ages, the development of Christendom, and the apostolic life. The first of these contains items of interest to Anglo-Saxonists, beginning with Rob Meens's contribution, which originally appeared in *Anglo-Saxon England* 23 (1994): 5-17. In "Background to Augustine's Mission to Anglo-Saxon England" (19-26), Meens re-evaluates Bede's simplistic portrayal of England as wholly devoid of Christianity before the arrival of the missionary Augustine in 597. Not only does Meens point out that there were significant Frankish and Irish influences on the early Anglo-Saxon church, but he also suggests that the pre-existing British church had a role in the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons. Meens draws in

particular on the so-called *Libellus responsionum*, a letter from Pope Gregory the Great to Augustine, which was copied by Bede into his *History*. Meens shows that some passages from this letter demonstrate that Augustine was encountering in England Christian practices of which he had no previous experience, practices that perhaps had been adopted by the Angli on the basis of teachings from British Christians. The second contribution is Ian Wood's "Historical Re-identification and the Christianization of Kent" (27-34), which originally appeared in *Christianizing Peoples and Converting Individuals*, ed. G. Armstrong and I. Wood (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000). Here Wood argues that the straightforward model of pagan versus Christian in early Anglo-Saxon England is too simplistic. Instead he proposes a more complex interaction where paganism could even be modeled in part on early Christianity. Wood, building on but not entirely agreeing with an argument by Rob Meens, also draws attention to evidence that suggests that the British Christians may have had a role in converting the Anglo-Saxon invaders but that the Anglo-Saxons looked "to the Franks and ultimately to Rome for the last stage in their conversion" (34). The contribution by Richard Fletcher, "The Barbarian Conversion from Paganism to Christianity" (35-44), is reprinted from Fletcher's *Barbarian Conversion from Paganism to Christianity* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1997). Here Fletcher examines the various reasons the barbarian aristocracy came to accept Christianity. Fletcher describes how the collapse of Roman authority led simultaneously to the decline of Christianity, and he looks in particular at the situation in northeastern Gaul and the effect of the Frankish invasions there. But the sixth century saw the beginnings of re-Christianization as Frankish kings became more "assertively Christian" (40). One consequence of royal support was that the Frankish church became a wealthy institution, which in turn made it appealing to the barbarian aristocracy. But this, of course, was not the only reason that Christianity became more widely diffused. Fletcher describes a range of influences that could have led to conversion, but he stresses that the outside stimulus provided by missionaries may have been essential. For Fletcher, Columbanus, the Irish missionary, was the pivotal figure under whom the Frankish church was transformed. Fletcher suggests that Columbanus was successful in spreading the Christian faith for three principal reasons: previous churches had been attached to cities, but under Columbanus, with his Irish background, rural establishments were allowed, which suited a rural aristocracy; Columbanian monasteries were permitted to maintain family interests;

and finally, Columbanus shifted penance from a public affair to a private affair, which meant that, since sin could be atoned for through private penance, aristocrats were encouraged to found and endow monasteries in order to purchase God's favor. Finally, Fletcher suggests that the adoption of Christianity by the Frankish aristocracy happened at just the same time as the aristocracy were acquiring a new status in society. The last three contributions are Jane Tibbets Schulenberg's "Forgetful of Their Sex: Female Sanctity and Society, ca. 500-1100" (45-56), excerpted from her book of the same name (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998); Karen Louise Jolly's "Popular Religion in Late Saxon England: Elf Changes in Context" (57-66), excerpted from her book of the same name (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1996); and Peter Brown's "The Rise of Western Christendom" (67-81), excerpted from his book of the same name (London: Blackwell, 2003).

Susan Wood's magisterial study of *The Proprietary Church in the Medieval West* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006) is more than a thousand pages long and forty years in the making, but it is not as comprehensive as many would like: little is said about Ireland, Scotland, and Scandinavia; and Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary are omitted completely. Nonetheless, in addition to her general discussions, there is much of interest to the Anglo-Saxonist. Chapter five, "Early Monasteries: Their Founders and Abbots" (109-39), includes arguments for monasteries as property of their successive abbots, cites Theodore's Penitential, the Council of Clofesho, and Alfred's laws in support, and discusses Lastingham, Ripon, Oundle, Wearmouth-Jarrow, and Crowland as examples. The circumstances of the founding of a number of English monasteries are also brought into the general discussion of the relationship between founder and proprietor. England merits a section of its own in chapter six, "Some Non-Frankish Patterns of Family Interest in Monasteries" (152-60). Here Wood investigates the "false monasteries" excoriated by Bede and finds that lay or religious men or women founding *monasteria* did it with grants of bookland, which was almost certainly not ordinary landlord property since holders of bookland had royal rights such as food renders over the inhabitants. The attraction of founding a family minster endowed with bookland was not merely the trick of giving land to the Church while contriving to keep it but rather obtaining property of a kind—alienable and bequeathable—that the founder and his heirs could not otherwise have had. Ordinary inherited land had to be divided among the heirs, and ordinary land-grants from a king were only for life. Founders of monasteries might sincerely wish to secure a holy place

for their heirs, as seems to have been the case at Farnham, Deerhurst, and an unknown church described in the early ninth-century poem *De abbatibus*. The same family orientation might apply to monasteries and their daughter houses, as happened at Wenlock, Bradfield, and Withington. The freedom of disposition of bookland raised the risk that later owners would not follow the wishes of the founder. An abbot might give the property to a successor from outside the proprietary family or could even leave it in lay hands or partition it. Wood argues that the under-kings whose foundations have been seen as dynastic proprietary churches cannot have controlled them for very long, as they began to be buried in regional cathedrals. There is also a section on England in the discussion of the emergence of lay rulers' lordship over churches (239-44). Woods notes that royal authority was crucial to the organizing of diocese and endowment of minsters, but English kings before the tenth century seem not to have had any policy of establishing formal royal defense and lordship of great churches, although those churches were subject to the public burdens, expected to provide hospitality to the current king, and could be important as burial places. Seventh-century kings could not appoint successor abbots or abbesses, but that later changed, so that Anglo-Saxon kings' and queens' major property right in monasteries consisted of being or displacing the head of the community, where they could live for a while on accumulated food-renders and estate produce. Cookham is considered in detail as an example of lordship built on escalating practical claims on monastic resources. A section on tenth- and eleventh-century England appears in the discussion of noble founders and their heirs (408-12). As a result of the Benedictine reform, a handful of important new monasteries were founded or partly founded by great laymen: Ramsey by the ealdorman Æthelwine; Tavistock by King Edgar's brother-in-law Ordulf; Cerne and Eynsham by ealdorman Æthelweard's son Æthelmær; and Burton-on-Trent by the thane Wulfric Spot. Finally, Anglo-Saxon England is mentioned in the discussion of arrangements in which a church's priest is its tenant (551-55).

Janet L. Nelson returns to the question of "The First Use of the Second Anglo-Saxon *Ordo*" in *Myth, Rulership, Church and Charters: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks* [see sect. 2], 117-26. The date of this use has been debated: was it in 900, at the coronation of Edward the Elder, or was it in 925, at the coronation of Æthelstan? Proceeding from Brooks's suggestion that the second *ordo* was developed by an archbishop, Nelson begins by reviewing what is known about the first *ordo*, which is in the Leofric Missal, a sacramentary produced for

Archbishop Plegmund of Canterbury. She argues that the second *ordo* was not in existence when this missal was created, and therefore, if Plegmund was the patron of the first *ordo*, it is unlikely that he would have seen any need for a new one, so that it would have been the first *ordo* that was used at the coronation of Edward. Additionally, the political circumstances of Edward's ascension to the throne and the ecclesiastical crisis of legitimacy that affected Plegmund because he had received the *pallium* from Pope Formosus suggest that tradition rather than innovation was the prudent course. Nelson then revisits and expands on Wormald's argument that the second *ordo* was first used at the coronation of Æthelstan: the phrase about "establishing and governing the apex of paternal glory unitedly" pertains to the intra-dynastic conflict of Mercia and Wessex, which was the major political issue of his succession; the symbols of crown, ring, sword, and rod similarly emphasize the consensual and conciliatory aspects of kingship; and its West Frankish elements would be explained by his father Edward's continental contacts. If the occasion was indeed the coronation of Æthelstan in 925, it follows that Archbishop Athelm of Canterbury is the most likely author of the *ordo*.

Ann Williams assembles three incidents—the speaking cross, the persecuted princess, and the murdered earl—from the patchy early history of the abbey of St. Mary and St. Æthelfleda at Romsey ("The Speaking Cross, the Persecuted Princess, and the Murdered Earl: The Early History of Romsey Abbey" *Anglo-Saxon* 1 (2007): 221-38). The speaking cross arose from a mistranslation of a passage in the abbey's foundation-charter (ca. 967), which now exists only in a copy. The original document contained Old English passages in addition to the Latin grant, and the spelling and script of the Old English was unfamiliar to the copyist, who produced a garbled rendering that Benjamin Thorpe thought began, "The golden crucifix which speaks in Latin" (*Diplomatarium Anglicum Ævi Saxonici*, 1865, 251). In fact it actually begins, "the golden dish of which the Latin [text] speaks," referring to an object that formed part of the payment for a grant of woodland. The persecuted princess was Christina, the sister of Edgar the Atheling, who entered the convent at Romsey in 1086. Although she held three manors, she was evidently left with few options when her brother fell out of favor with William the Conqueror and left England. She may have become the abbess of Romsey; according to twelfth-century sources, she certainly was at least partially responsible for the upbringing of her niece Matilda, who would go on to marry Henry I. The murdered earl was Waltheof, the last English earl, who

was executed in 1076. Williams argues that he was buried briefly at Romsey, where his empty tomb became the object of unauthorized veneration.

c. Ecclesiastical Culture

G. T. Dempsey paints a poignant portrait of "Aldhelm of Malmesbury and High Ecclesiasticism in a Barbarian Kingdom" in *Traditio* 63: 47-88. On one hand, Dempsey contrasts Aldhelm with Bede. Whereas Bede was convinced of the imminent end of the world, Aldhelm focused on the transience of individual lives, and his moral instruction was adapted for a society still making the transition from paganism to Christianity and from *Germanitas* to *Romanitas*. On the other hand, Aldhelm happened to receive an education that instilled in him the values of the late antique world: the shared delight expressed in puns, rhymes, and riddles; the belief that the sheer difficulty of a piece of writing made it more valuable; the certainty of the centrality of grammar in the explication of hidden meanings; the trained advocate's need for controversy and the disputatious thriving on self-justification; and even an appreciation for the literary qualities of Pelagius. The poignancy comes from the mismatch between Aldhelm's intellectual tastes and the "barbarian kingdom" in which he lived. The measured and leisured cultivation of scholarship was scarcely available to him, as Dempsey makes very clear through an analysis of the charters, bulls, and letters associated with Aldhelm, as he interweaves a discussion of Aldhelm's hard work to secure ecclesiastical independence for his monasteries with a discussion of the Aldhelmian language and features of the documents. In Dempsey's view, Aldhelm employs the rhetoric and style that he does in order to help bring an Anglo-Saxon society not far removed from its pagan Germanic past closer to its Christian Roman ideal.

Dempsey sheds further light on Aldhelm in "'Tempore pubertatis nostrae: The West Saxon Aldhelm of Malmesbury," *Proc. of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society* 129: 17-24. Here he reviews the possibility that both Exeter Book Riddles 35 and 40 and *Beowulf* were written by Aldhelm, who was renowned as a composer of Old English songs, and he raises a possibility of his own, namely that Aldhelm, like Guthlac, Benedict Biscop, and Eosterwine, turned to the religious life after spending his youth as a warrior. Dempsey sees Aldhelm manifesting his Germanic inheritance in his choice of the dragon rather than the devil for the enemy of mankind and in his depiction of aristocratic monks and nuns living arduous heroic lives like thegns serving their lord.

In "Paganism in Conversion-Age Anglo-Saxon England: The Evidence of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* Reconsidered," *History* 93: 162-80, S.D. Church argues that the current understanding of English paganism relies too heavily on the *Ecclesiastical History* of Bede and the letters of Pope Gregory I. Church contends that the purpose of Bede's and Gregory's discussions of English paganism was to support the process by which the English would be saved from eternal damnation in the face of the coming Day of Judgment. These fathers of the Church were active participants in the eradication of error amongst the English and had no interest or incentive to describe that error empirically. As far as Gregory was concerned, paganism meant the worship of idols, since that was the lesson he must have constantly drawn from his knowledge of the ancient world and the Bible, and this theme repeatedly emerges in his letters. Furthermore, he knew that those idols had been worshipped in temples, and many of those temples had been transformed into churches, of which the most famous example was the conversion of the Roman Pantheon into the church of Santa Maria Rotonda. The model for reusing pagan temples as Christian churches was one that came from Gregory's very own doorstep. When he advises that the idols in England be destroyed and the temples be converted into churches, he probably assumed that there were idols in the temples; we should not assume that he had specific knowledge of them. Bede, in turn, was not only familiar with the same works as Gregory but was writing a history that itself had didactic purpose. Church argues that Bede's famous account of the conversion of Edwin was modeled on Gregory of Tours's account of the conversion of Clovis and that the relationship between Edwin and the pagan priest Coifi was modeled on the relationship between a Christian king and his bishop. Church concludes that there is no reason to consider that this episode accurately describes any element of Anglo-Saxon paganism.

In "The Calculation of Columba's Arrival in Britain in Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* and the Pictish King-Lists," *Scottish Historical Review* 87.2: 183-205, Nicholas Evans argues that an expanded Pictish regnal list rather than an expanded Pictish Easter table was the source for Bede's assertion that St. Columba arrived in Britain in 565. Sources associated with Iona date this to 563, and the two-year difference in the *Ecclesiastical History* has been explained as the result of Bede calculating from some erroneous starting point, such as Iona's celebration of Easter using non-Dionysiac reckoning for 150 years, Columba's supposed stay in Britain for around thirty-two years, Columba's supposed arrival

in Britain in the first year of the reign of Justin II, or Columba's supposed arrival in Britain in the ninth year of the reign of Bridei son of Maelchon. Evans proposes that it was the latter and that Bede's claim that Iona was given to Columba by the Picts should be seen as evidence that Pictish overkings were beginning to attempt to dominate Dál Riata in the decades before 730. Evans seeks to corroborate this by referring to the fact that Iona changed its Easter calculation soon after the Picts did, and he further suggests that Nechtan's expulsion of the Iona *familia* in 717 could be punishment for their unwillingness to recognize his control. Evans concludes with some speculations regarding Ecgberht's role in Iona's decision to change Easter tables.

Joel T. Rosenthal's "Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*: Numbers, Hard Data, and Longevity," *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach* [see sect. 2], 91-102, as its title suggests, analyzes Bede's use of dates and facts in his most famous work, the *Historia ecclesiastica*. Rosenthal stresses the presence in almost every chapter of Bede's work of what he calls quantitative information; that is, details such as how long a secular or ecclesiastical leader lived and for how long he ruled. Occasionally these details have symbolic value: it turns out, for example, that a long life was often one that had had divine endorsement. Rosenthal states that Bede's inclusion of precise factual data is indicative of Bede's own conception both of how history should be written and also of how quantitative information would enrich his narrative. Of course it is abundantly clear that Bede was concerned with providing dates and a chronological framework for his *Historia* and that he was the first English author to write in such a manner. In doing so, Bede would have had to draw on a wide range of material (charters, regnal lists, and Easter tables, to name only a few), material that would have arrived from different areas of the country and would have been susceptible to different methods of calculation. Perhaps this essay would have been more engaging if there had been at least some discussion of the severe problems Bede would have faced in dealing with, and consolidating, this material and how it shaped the way he wrote his *Historia ecclesiastica*.

In "Bede and Change," *Aedificia nova: Studies in Honor of Rosemary Cramp* [see sect. 2], 33-42, George H. Brown characterizes the Northumbrian monk as following the model of St. Augustine in his strong affirmation of activism and in his zeal for change. Brown shows that Bede had been engaged with time and change in all his works of exegesis, history, and chronology. For example, Bede's re-dating of the age of the world ran

counter to the common belief that each of the six ages of the world was a thousand years, but in his Letter to Plegwin and *De temporum ratione*, Bede argues that not all of the world-ages were of equal length and that the duration of the sixth age was humanly unknowable. As Brown puts it, “[b]oth diversity and change are the historical reality, not neatly fixed limits and humanly predictable segments” (39). The chronicle Bede includes in *De temporum ratione* is thus left open-ended, and likewise the *Historia ecclesiastica* ends with an observation of change: many Northumbrians have laid aside their weapons and taken the tonsure. The Letter to Bishop Egbert, written towards the end of his life, moves from observation to activism: Bede calls for a reform of the Northumbrian ecclesiastical system in which the many lay-owned churches would be replaced with twelve episcopal sees based on existing monastic sites and led by humble missionary-bishops.

Lisa Weston does an able job of “Reading the Textual Shadows of Anglo-Saxon Monastic Women’s Friendships,” *Magistra* 14: 68-78. An analysis of the letters sent between the members of the “Boniface circle” (i.e., Boniface and his spiritual sisters Leoba, Eadburga, Heaburg, and Eangyth) demonstrates the solace to be found in friendship and spiritual kinship, and the fact that Boniface’s friends and “sisters” were always separated from him meant that expressions of their desire to be with him could never be misinterpreted. Monastic visions celebrating soul friends indicate that these relationships were known and accepted within the community. Letters of friendship or spiritual kinship exchanged between Anglo-Saxon women are rare, but they are supplemented by narratives of women’s communities such as those of Bede. All in all, they suggest the importance of elective kinships to create and maintain shared identities across great distances, especially in the earliest, formative years of Anglo-Saxon Christianity.

Irmeli Valtonen’s brief “The North in the *Old English Orosius*: A Geographical Narrative in Context,” *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 109: 380-84, is essentially an advertisement for her doctoral dissertation of the same title (published as volume 73 in the series *Mémoires de la Société Néophilologue de Helsinki* [Helsinki]). Here Valtonen sketches the background of the *Old English Orosius*, mentions some of its more interesting anecdotes, and summarizes her conclusion, which is that the description of the North reflects both contemporary concerns and traditional geographical perceptions and interests. The author of the *Old English Orosius* valued empirical knowledge, sponsored ideas about peace and religion, and desired the riches that came from northern lands.

Mary Frances Giandrea bases her “Review article: Recent approaches to late Anglo-Saxon episcopal culture,” *Early Medieval Europe* 16: 89-106, on three books: *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference*, ed. Matthew Townend (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004); *St Wulfstan and His World*, ed. Julia S. Barrow and N. P. Brooks (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005); and *St Wulfsgige and Sherborne: Essays to Celebrate the Millenium of the Benedictine Abbey 998-1998*, ed. Katherine Barker, David A. Hinton, and Alan Hunt (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2005). Giandrea begins by noting the lack of evidence pertaining to the bishops of eleventh-century England, and she finds that the multidisciplinary attempts of the volumes under review to make use of non-narrative sources is generally unsuccessful, as the book on Archbishop Wulfstan was the only one of the three to provide truly fresh insights into old problems and suggest new avenues of research. Patrick Wormald’s introduction to Archbishop Wulfstan and Simon Keynes’s review of Bishop Wulfsgige’s life are called out for special praise, as is Christopher Dyer’s overview of the ways in which lords, secular as well as ecclesiastical, were constrained by the types of estates they had at their disposal and the need to organize them for consumption rather than production. Another important contribution is Katherine Barker’s essay on the endowment of Sherborne, in which she suggests that the bishop of Sherborne shared with the crown and the abbot of Glastonbury responsibility for coastal beacon service and construction there; this sheds light on the secular responsibilities that all bishops shouldered, especially in the realm of defense, as well as showing how the bishop might have met that obligation in logistical terms. Also very useful are Richard Dance’s philological overview of Wulfstan’s writings, Andy Orchard’s call for the re-editing of Wulfstan’s sermons, Tom Hall’s addition of *Admonitio episcoporum utilis* to Wulfstan’s corpus, and Rosalind Love’s new edition and translation of Goscelin’s *Life of St Wulfsgige*. Taking advantage of her role as reviewer, Giandrea facilitates a kind of dialogue between Patrick Wormald and Joyce Hill on the question of Wulfstan’s relationship to the tenth-century reform, in which Hill might come to agree that Wulfstan participated in the reform movement to a greater degree than she first thought. Yet another benefit of Giandrea’s expertise is the list of areas for further or future research that emerges in the course of her review, namely, the continental context of the Anglo-Saxon episcopate, the relationship between bishops and their endowments, the tensions inherent in various episcopal responsibilities, the libraries of York and Sherborne, and the cults and *vitae* of the saint-bishops.

Susan Rankin's *The Winchester Troper: Facsimile Edition and Introduction* (Early English Church Music Series, London: Stainer and Bell, 2007), commissioned by the British Academy, is a triumph of art and scholarship. The Winchester Troper—Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 473—is one of the few surviving manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon musical notation. This volume contains a full-size, color facsimile of the manuscript as well as a detailed introduction describing the manuscript and elucidating the theoretical principles underlying the manuscript's use of neumes in annotating each chant. The introduction opens with a description of the manuscript and a discussion of its history, tracing it from its creation in Winchester in the 1020s or 1030s to its acquisition by Archbishop Matthew Parker, whence it passed into the collections of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Rankin then turns to a detailed discussion of scribal hands present in the manuscript, discussing both the main annotator and the notations in later hands. Finally, and most important for the student of early medieval musicology, Rankin provides an in-depth analysis of the manuscript's use of tropes, sequences and pauses, and *organa*. The remainder of the volume is taken up with the facsimile, and Stainer and Bell deserve special recognition for the high quality of the images. Scholarship on Anglo-Saxon music history is almost as rare as the evidence itself; however, this volume must be taken as a signal contribution to this too-little understood subject.

d. Society and the Family

In nine central chapters, Sally Crawford covers the major aspects of *Daily Life in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: Greenwood): society, taxes, and administration; housing and households; population density and life expectancy; food and drink; clothing and appearance; trade and travel; death and religion; health, sickness, and survival; and slaves, criminals, and outcasts. A final chapter considers the extent to which historical events such as the Viking attacks and the Norman Conquest affected or failed to affect daily life. The scope is comprehensive yet nuanced: for example, Crawford does not gloss over the health statistics, showing a photograph of the skeleton of a woman who died in childbirth and was buried with her fetus, along with a photograph of a mammiform pot associated with infant burial. The approach is intellectually rigorous, with little in the way of illustrations of reconstructed costumes and villages. Instead, only the hard evidence of manuscript illuminations, coins, archeological finds, and archeological sites is presented as a visual supplement

to the text. Given the level of technical knowledge assumed (e.g., "spolia" and "pouch complex" appear without definitions), it is odd that the volume lacks footnotes and provides only a selected bibliography. This is not a work for non-specialists, but it will be very useful for those with some archeological background.

Keith Bailey analyzes the Domesday Book evidence regarding "Slavery in the London Area in 1086," *Trans. of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society* 57 (2006), 69–82. In Anglo-Saxon England, individuals became slaves through warfare, crime, deliberate submission to obtain food or shelter, or birth to already-enslaved parents. The perpetual state of internecine warfare that characterized the post-Roman period must have ensured a steady supply of prisoners who could be enslaved or sold to foreign slave traders such as those based in Bristol, which supported a slave trade as late as 1100. Those slaves who stayed in England were men, women, and children attached to the demesne holdings of estates and engaged in a variety of agricultural activities for their owners. These owners ranged from kings to minor lay lords and even religious establishments. Although the Church was opposed to the concept of slavery and encouraged manumission, the managers of ecclesiastical-owned estates were at a remove from doctrinal discussion and continued to keep slaves as long as it was profitable to do so. Bailey argues that the primary use of slaves was most likely the backbreaking task of ploughing, and as each plough needed two men to work it, he expects the Domesday figures to indicate two slaves per demesne plough. A number above this ratio requires explanation, which can be found in the need to work at other demesne assets such as mills. If a demesne was a smaller settlement, the "extra" slaves might have worked at the parent estate. Factors as yet unknown must have played a part as well, for there are more than a dozen demesnes with unaccountably high numbers of slaves. Also unaccountable is the relative scarcity of slaves in the London area compared to the other regions surveyed in Domesday. Slavery *per se* came to an end in England shortly after 1086 as landowners realized that the labor of bordars and cottars cost less than the labor of slaves.

Eric Gerald Stanley, "The *Familia* in Anglo-Saxon Society: 'Household' rather than 'Family, Home Life' as Now Understood," *Anglia* 126: 37–64, closely considers the Old English vocabulary of domestic life, arguing that generations of scholars have misapplied modern notions to a society that can have known little of "the family" and its current associations. Stanley appears to date the arrival of such ideas to a period not too much earlier than the thirteenth century, for it is at this time

that the phrase “kith and kin” makes its first appearance in English prose—though here, in the *Ancrenne Wisse*, it is disdained among the “worldly vanities” a female religious was obliged to abandon, illustrating to Stanley that sentimentalizing the pleasures of home was still a long way off: “Where worldliness is a sin, the comforting warmth of a generous kith and kin is a false comfort” (38). That Anglo-Saxon literature lacks the ancestor of “kith and kin” or any phrase corresponding to it is a likely “consequence of the monastic dominance in the transmitted literature of Anglo-Saxon England” (39). Readers will find in this study a divergent perspective on Melantia’s courtship of Eugenia in the latter’s *Life* by Ælfric. According to Stanley, the former is not alluding to any sort of intimacy (or the absence thereof) when she says of her deceased husband *unc næs gemæne*, but rather she asserts with this word that while he lived “they had nothing in common, no communion of goods” (40): thus have commentators since Skeat misunderstood this line, according to Stanley. The remainder of the essay is concerned with OE *hiw* and *hired* as well as compounds derived from these elements, words that have similarly attracted what Stanley considers anachronistic glosses. Here as well Stanley asserts of the Anglo-Saxons that “a sense of ‘family’ as that word is now understood was not part of their understanding” (43). Stanley concludes by imagining the incredulity of the pre-Conquest English at our present-day notion of “family” (64) were they to be informed of it.

In “Foundlings, Ealdormen, and Holy Women: Reflections on Some Aristocratic Families in Ninth- and Early Tenth-Century Wiltshire,” *Medieval Prosopography* 24 (2003): 103-44, Shashi Jayakumar assembles the evidence for the families of Wihtbrord and Wulfgar. The former was one of Edward the Elder’s foremost thanes, and the latter was an ealdorman under Æthelstan, whose estates were in the border area of Wiltshire, Hampshire, and Berkshire. One of their descendants was the famous Wulfthryth, who bore King Edgar (d. 975) a daughter, the future St. Edith. Jayakumar concludes with the suggestion that another relative was a certain Wynflaed, a lay religious who controlled two estates quite close to estates controlled by Wihtbrord’s kin. In any case, it seems likely that the descendants of Wihtbrord were influential enough to place their female relatives in positions of power and authority throughout Wessex, while at the same time maintaining a proprietary interest in nearby religious establishments.

To learn about the public lives of *Widows in Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Britain* (Bern and Oxford: Peter

Lang), Marie-Françoise Alamichel examines legal documents, but to learn about their inner lives and how they were viewed by society, she turns to literature, history, hagiography, and art. She considers the role played by the Church in the doctrine of marriage and the male discourse about widows, the special legal status of widows and its many implications, and the options and independence that widowhood offered. For upper-class Anglo-Saxon women, widowhood meant much more than losing a husband; it meant calling into question the relationships between two lineages, the subtle network of dependencies and guardianship, and even the balance of economic power. Alamichel begins by reviewing the teaching of the Church Fathers, for their model of chastity and piety was presented to women as the ideal. She then proceeds to the writings of clerics such as Aldhelm, Bede, and Ælfric, who quote the Church Fathers when addressing real widows. A discussion of the law codes follows, which shows that widows were considered particularly vulnerable and in need of special protection. Finally, wills, charters, and letters provide the views of widows themselves and the context for the debate over whether Anglo-Saxon widows enjoyed near-complete autonomy or conversely had limited choices and simply confirmed the dispositions of their husbands or fathers. Alamichel concludes that there is almost no evidence that Anglo-Saxon kings or lords could dictate whom widows should marry, but despite their increased legal rights, widows were, and felt, vulnerable. The percentage of lands that they could bequeath freely was small, and in a society that regarded dependence as normal, widowhood meant instability, precariousness, hardship, and isolation. Even men of privilege feared that their wives would be dispossessed and impoverished as widows. Alamichel’s work—learned, clearly presented, and bolstered with many excerpts from primary sources (given in English translation)—is a substantial contribution to our knowledge of Anglo-Saxon women and Anglo-Saxon society.

Stefan Brink’s Dorothea Coke Memorial Lecture (*Lord and Lady—Bryti and Deigja. Some Historical and Etymological Aspects of Family, Patronage and Slavery in Early Scandinavia and Anglo-Saxon England* [London: Viking Society for Northern Research]) takes up a matter that many specialists in Old English may find themselves thinking about: what is to be made of the fact that the Old English ancestors of “lord” and “lady”—*hlafweard* and *hlafdige*—are both compounds whose first element is “loaf”? That this must reveal something of the importance of bread to early economic and social life is intuitive, and Brink pursues this

line of inquiry beyond these two celebrated words into the somewhat less frequently discussed cases of Old Norse *bryti* (long understood to refer to a person, presumably servile himself, who delivered food to slaves) and *deigja* (glossed in previous studies variously as “milkmaid,” “housekeeper,” and “concubine” [6]). Brink concludes that the accepted meanings of these words, being derived from later sources, are misleading as to their earlier significance. He reminds us that *bryti* “is a *nomen agentis* derived from the verb ON *brytja* ‘to break in pieces,’” while “the etymology [of *deigja*] confirms that she must have been a bread baker” (6-7). The vicissitudes of these words in later sources, where they typically designate persons of low or servile status, are ultimately less revealing than their etymologies if we wish to understand their apparent relations to *hlafweard* and *hlafdige*. When paired with the fascinating assemblage of early runic, archaeological, and historical evidence that occupies the rest of the paper, both words allow us to see, in Brink’s opinion, the outlines of early “bread-collectives” (23) that must have been diffused throughout early northwest Europe given the traces they left on the Finnish language—groups for whom bread was of such importance that it seems, given archaeological discoveries in Sweden, even to have played some role in “cultic rituals” (25). Such collectivities and their attitudes are evident in Old English and Old Norse because both are derived from early networks of “household units” whose lives “centred around the communal meal and the sharing of bread ... the glue that bound the members together” (28).

In “The Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England: Facts and Factoids,” *Prosopography Approaches and Applications: A Handbook*, ed. K.S.B. Keats-Rohan (Oxford: Prosopographica et Genealogica, 2007), 197-209, Francesca Tinti sets out the various phases in the development of the database ‘The Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England’ (known by its acronym, PASE), an online resource designed to record all of the people known to have lived in, or to have had contact with, Anglo-Saxon England in the period 597 to 1042. In recounting the evolution of this large, collaborative project, Tinti sets out the numerous problems involved in the compilation of this complex database, not least because the team of researchers had to deal with a wide range of different types of primary evidence. Tinti also usefully outlines the methodology involved in presenting the database in the form it is today.

Despite the narrow focus implied by the title, David A.E. Pelteret’s “Should One Include Unnamed Persons in a Prosopographical Study?” (*Prosopography:*

Approaches and Applications: A Handbook), 183-96, may serve as a useful overview, delivered with the ease and wit characteristic of the author, to the field of prosopography and the work undertaken by the Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England Project (PASE). Pelteret begins with a survey of earlier representative works of scholarship on prosopography revealing something of the scholarly habits that came to surround this field over the course of the twentieth century. Pelteret suggests that the focus of these works on named rather than unnamed persons was not merely due to the convenience of such evidence: the choice and its effects turn out to be “very much grounded in [the] social and political milieux” of each study (195). In Pelteret’s judgment, to dwell on the named rather than unnamed is to focus on the elites within a given society—a practice that may have seemed beyond question when politics was an explicitly aristocratic affair, as it was in Europe for much of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but which is plainly untenable now. The problems are not merely political in nature. Once our focus is trained on groups rather than individuals, the many different kinds of collectivities likely to have populated and governed pre-Conquest England do not seem as easy to categorize as they may have to earlier generations of scholars. We do not even always know what a *here* is likely to have consisted of: the standard dictionaries gloss the term as “army,” but this term “carr[ies] with it notions of organization, hierarchy, and discipline for which there is simply little or no information from the Anglo-Saxon period” (191). We should even, Pelteret suggests, be willing to consider the possibility that these groups, whatever they were, did not consist only of men and adjust the practice of PASE accordingly (194). The titles given to elites are no less deceptive than the standard meanings of terms such as *here*: an *eorl*, for example, seems to have been little more than a high-status warrior (as is the case in most verse) until he came over the course of the ninth century to be understood as something more like a Scandinavian *jarl*: “Thus an eleventh-century *eorl* such as Godwine played a far more influential role, politically and economically, within Anglo-Saxon England than an *ealdorman* ever did in the late ninth-century realm of Alfred, king of the West Saxons” (191). Pelteret’s study shows how the image of English political life in early heroic verse offers a world of pitfalls for the unwary historian and encourages us not to be content with pre-Conquest history as it has been handed down to us by earlier scholars—as a story of imposing personalities rather than the dozens, possibly hundreds, of unnamed persons on whom they depended for their impact (189).

e. Gender and Identity

Lisa M. Bitel's *Women in Early Medieval Europe, 400–1100* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002) claims to be not just a history of women but a history of the early European Middle Ages through the eyes of women. If so, it is a social history as much as a political one, for it is organized more topically than chronologically, covering gender and landscapes; invasions, migrations and barbarian queens; theory and practice of religion; survival by kinship, marriage, and motherhood; and mobility and economic opportunity. Throughout, the large themes are bolstered by references to specific people and sources from across Europe, some from England. The resulting impression is that the plight of women varied little from place to place or century to century. As Bitel states baldly at the beginning, “[M]en were officially in charge of everything, both deeds and written records of them” (3). Because there are few English women whose lives we know in any detail, this book is mostly useful to Anglo-Saxonists insofar as the insights about early medieval women in general apply to women in England. However, Bitel does mention Anglo-Saxon women in a number of places. For example, she reports that not many women accompanied the Anglo-Saxon invaders: “far more important to the creation of England was the contribution of women already in Britain” (62). This leads to brief comments on the role of women as cultural negotiators; the status of women in Anglo-Saxon England; Anglo-Saxons queens as rulers and christianizers; the involvement of Anglo-Saxon royal women in ecclesiastical communities; and the depiction of the limited capabilities of even the acknowledged holy women. St. Leoba is mentioned, as are the bequests of Anglo-Saxon women to nunneries. Moving from women religious to men, Theodore's Penitential is mined for attitudes toward sexual behavior, and Eddius Stephanus's story about St. Wilfrid of York, whose blessing revives a dead baby, is used to illuminate a discussion of motherhood, which then expands to include Grendel's mother. Slightly more detailed but still very brief is the presentation of English legal guidelines for negotiating a betrothal, after which the topic shifts from law-abiding women to criminals, with some allusion to the English sources that mention women finding lovers (*Maxims*) or being witches and whores (*Wulfstan*). Coming to the cutoff date of 1100, the examination of women's mobility extends both to English female pilgrims and dynastic alliances from the Heptarchy to Cnut's marriage to Emma. Finally, with regard to the categories of evidence, Emma reappears as a patroness of pictures and poetry, featuring visually

in the *Liber Vitae* of New Minster Abbey and verbally in the *Encomium Emmae*. Although the treatment of Anglo-Saxon women is superficial, the good bibliography will aid those in search of in-depth studies, and overall Bitel's survey is interesting and plausible in its conclusions, particularly the one attributed to Suzanne Wemple, who pointed out that the origins of our gender system lie in the earliest Middle Ages, when a dominant Christian religion, Germanic custom, and Roman ideologies combined to denigrate and disenfranchise women (295).

Helene Scheck, in her wide-ranging yet closely argued study, *Reform and Resistance: Formations of Female Subjectivity in Early Medieval Ecclesiastical Culture* (Albany: State University of New York Press), seeks to “examine subject possibilities as they evolved through the dynamics of ecclesiastical reform and then resistance to reform measures within an extremely complex intermingling of two distinct cultures—Germanic and Mediterranean” (10). Tracing the development of female subjectivity from the early Church through the Carolingian and Anglo-Saxon periods and into tenth-century Saxony, she argues that there existed “three states of being for women in early Germania: subject, supplementary or adjunct subject, and abject other” (22). Three chapters in Scheck's book deal explicitly with topics directly related to Anglo-Saxon studies. In “Soul Searching: Alcuin of York and his Circle of Female Scholars” (53–72), Scheck considers how Alcuin moved beyond prevalent attitudes about women at Charlemagne's court. Focusing especially on Alcuin's correspondence with female monastics and members of the Carolingian court, she argues that, “Alcuin's emphasis on intellect allowed him to transcend traditional views of gender and to promote instead an egalitarian basis for understanding what it is to be human ... His reassessment of gender and being is certainly one of his most important contributions, allowing a space within which women could imagine themselves as fully autonomous subjects before God” (71). Turning to the Old English period, “Redressing the Female Subject: Women, Transvestite Saints, and the Anglo-Saxon Benedictine Reform” (73–96) examines how texts concerning cross-dressing saints such as Ælfric's *Life of Eugenia* tested the boundaries of female subjectivity. She points out that such narratives, “while not so harshly antifeminist as the earlier legends, do not dwell on the notion of ‘becoming male.’ Instead, these texts, most likely translated for lay nobility of both genders, literally and figuratively redress the male imposers and reaffirm a patriarchal hierarchy of gender in Church and ‘State’” (86). She suggests that Old English

transvestite saints' lives "neither liberate nor empower women. Rather, recognizing the rich potential for subversion inherent in the device of cross-dressing, the Old English versions expose the male imposter in more explicit ways than the earlier accounts do and literally and metaphorically redress these and all women who would be male, raising the possibility of transcending gender limitations or collapsing gender difference only effectively to dismiss it" (96). In "Resounding Silences: Mary and Eve in Anglo-Saxon Reform Literature" (97-119), Scheck moves from discussing the depiction of non-normative female subjects to an analysis of those women who most fully express Old English models of female identity. In pursuing this analysis, Scheck focuses especially on the characterization of Mary in the works of Ælfric and the depiction of Eve in *Genesis B*. About these two characters she writes, "Although they seem to stand at opposite ends of the spectrum of possibilities for female subject formation, as constructed in Anglo-Saxon reform texts, they are really two sides of the same coin. That is, they reinforce the same restrictive attitudes towards women and justify thereby the subjection of women to men" (97). Comparing the Eve and Mary of these texts to the more outspoken women depicted in the earlier *Christ* poems, she concludes that, "in their subjection to masculinist order, these two powerful icons provide a medium for interpellation, effectively silencing the female subject in mainstream Anglo-Saxon culture of the pre-conquest period" (119). Scheck's volume provides a useful and innovative cross-cultural analysis of the development of female subjectivity in early medieval culture. Her arguments are not only significant in themselves, but her approach will provide a helpful model for anyone seeking to pursue this sort of analysis in the future.

In "Ethnicity and the Writing of Medieval Scottish History," *Scottish Historical Review* 85 (2006): 1-27, Matthew H. Hammond reviews the ethnicist historiography of medieval Scotland. Nineteenth-century scholars universally agreed that the point at which the "Celtic" phase of Scottish history yielded to the "Teutonic" phase was the marriage of Malcolm III to the Anglo-Saxon heiress Margaret around 1070. This marked a watershed in the civilization and progress of the Scots. Husband and wife respectively served to separate two distinct historical periods in the political arena and the religious sphere. The acceptance of these ethnic views lasted until the beginning of the twentieth century and was only disputed by a younger generation of scholars after the 1950s. But despite the dismantling of the overarching concept of "Celticity," it has proved almost impossible for contemporary historians

to avoid the labels "Celtic" and "Anglo-Norman." The nineteenth-century periodization has also been impossible to revise, but Hammond argues strenuously for its re-examination and warns historians against falling into the trap of ethnic dualism, particularly in the areas of law, kingship, lordship, and religion. The most important date for Christianity in medieval Scotland, he asserts, was the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, not the coming of St. Margaret around 1070.

Other studies that pertain to gender are Lisa Weston's "Reading the Textual Shadows of Anglo-Saxon Monastic Women's Friendships," reviewed above in Subsection C, Marie-Françoise Alamichel's *Widows in Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Britain*, reviewed above in Subsection D, and Pauline Stafford's "'The Annals of Æthelflæd: Annals, History and Politics in Early Tenth Century England,'" reviewed below in Subsection H.

f. The Economy, Settlement, and Landscape

Andrew Breeze suggests that Arclid, a nondescript parish on the Cheshire plain, may have "unexpected glory" (347) in "Where was Gildas Born?" *Northern History* 45: 347-50. Breeze provides a detailed philological analysis of the name "Arclid" in order to suggest that it ought to be identified as the "Arceluta" traditionally thought to be the site of Gildas's birth. If this is so, Breeze asks, "Perhaps one day a monument will be put up at what we can take as his birthplace, with an inscription in Latin and Welsh?" (350)

The title of Brian K. Roberts' essay, "The Land of Werhale—Landscapes of Bede," *Archaeologia Aeli-ana* 37: 127-59, refers to the old name for the peninsula of land between the Tyne and the Wear. Roberts uses the qualities of the land, fiscal tenements, medieval rents and renders, and the settlements of Werhale to piece together a picture of this strategically located area in the time of Bede. There is a strong presumption that this was a lightly settled zone in the eighth century where royal and episcopal generosity could be demonstrated with grants of relatively low-value land to monastic foundations. It may even be that the plantation of monasteries should be seen as, in part, colonizing ventures in less than desirable areas. In the mid-seventh century, Werhale's settlement may have comprised limited areas of arable and meadow set amid a "wasteland" of wood pasture and open pasture. Three extant manuscripts from that time took the skins of some 1,550 calves, indicating that there were grazing reserves and great herds of cattle. Conversely, the figure of 600 brethren present before Ceofrith departed on his last journey to Rome seems vastly exaggerated,

considering that Rievaulx did not achieve a community of 300 until 1142. Although most of the sources for Werhale are from the twelfth century and later, Roberts suggests that the areas of best tillage took a long time to develop, as they had to have the stones taken out, the soil improved, and the weeds controlled; it might be that this process began in the seventh century. But although the agricultural potential of the area was poor, the border location of Werhale allowed it to achieve pre-eminence in the development of intellectual culture, for it was between land and sea, land and river, fell and forest, and Bernicia and Catraeth/Deira. River, sea, and Roman roads all afforded lines of communication along which people, goods, and ideas could flow. In an intriguing postscript, Roberts speculates about the source of Benedict Biscop's wealth, since it clearly didn't come from the monasteries, and raises the possibility that he was trading slaves.

Alex Burghart and Andrew Wareham ask, "Was there an Agricultural Revolution in Anglo-Saxon England?" in *Myth, Rulership, Church and Charters: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks* [see sect. 2], 89-100. Not inapposite, in their view, is the analogy of much later periods, for "it may be that prodigious rises in agricultural output between the late sixteenth and nineteenth centuries were linked to a literate familiarity with texts concerned with the technologies of farm management" (92). Thus their inquiry into agricultural change acquires a focus not on improvements in farm implements but on the ways in which the dissemination of knowledge about agriculture may have changed over the course of the Anglo-Saxon period. In the twelfth century, it was known to at least one abbot that "leases which allowed regular feedback between holder and owner had the potential to create rises in agricultural output" (95). Burghart and Wareham conclude that such practices may be pushed back further than most historians might allow: "hypothetically" as far as the ninth century, "when both book-keeping and short-term leasing may have been taking place in at least some parts of England" (96), and perhaps even some years beyond. More concrete evidence is to be found in texts such as *Rectitudines Singularum Personarum* and *Gerefa*. As the only manuals of estate management to survive from the era before the Conquest, both are quite late texts, but they may point to the existence of older practices, and their use of the vernacular may indicate that "[l]iteracy, whenever it came to the fore as a powerful economic force, was presumably used, first and foremost, to manage the estates of the great magnates of Anglo-Saxon England" (98). The authors lament the focus of most scholarship on twelfth-century evidence,

and certainly this myopia has disposed generations of scholars to ignore pre-Conquest England when searching for the origins of ideas and practices that appear to have come to fruition in the High Middle Ages.

Susan Oosthuizen considers "The Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Mercia and the Origins and Distribution of Common Fields," *The Agricultural History Review* 55 (2007): 153-180, which is a subject, as is noted in her comprehensive overview of prior scholarship, of considerable scholarly interest for well over a century, and which has only in the past two decades been surrounded by some certainty that open and common fields appeared in the period before the Conquest, most likely in the tenth century, even though they are most in evidence in the thirteenth (154). Why this consensus was so slow to emerge is owing to a dispute between two giants of English historiography to which this subfield may trace its origins: While Frederic Seebohm was satisfied that common fields were present "in the middle Anglo-Saxon period," relying heavily for his argument on a clause in Ine's laws and his own belief in the continuity in early England of agricultural practices established by the Romans, Frederic William Maitland dismissed such conjectures in rather heated terms while not ruling out entirely the possibility of pre-Conquest origins (161). As Oosthuizen notes, more recent research has favored Seebohm's hypothesis and shed light on the vague beginnings he postulated, pushing the possible origins of these practices to "the 'long' eighth century, between about 670 and 840, in areas dominated by the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Mercia" (154). Most attempts to explain the origins of common fields have had to explain their "distinctive restriction ... to the Central Province," an area narrowed down further by Oosthuizen to include "eastern Warwickshire, southern Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, Huntingdonshire and west Cambridgeshire" (158). This is an area that certainly would have found itself within the boundaries of the broad Mercian empire of the pre-Alfredian era, and Oosthuizen finds much in the profile of the Mercian kingdoms to recommend them as the sites from which innovative agricultural practices may have originated. The period itself was one of "rapid economic innovation and growth" (171), much of it spurred on by the example of parallel revolutions in agricultural specialization playing themselves out in West Francia, whose institutions are known to have captured the imaginations of Mercian kings and churchmen. Oosthuizen ends her critical survey of recent scholarship with a cautious endorsement of the early Mercian kingdoms as the originators of practices "which eventually led to the development of common fields" and suggests ways

in which this view might be established with greater precision (179).

Richard Jones and Mark Page's *Medieval Villages in an English Landscape: Beginnings and Ends* (Oxford: Windgather Press, 2006) continues to investigate why some areas of England gave rise to nucleated villages while other areas gave rise to dispersed settlements. The area chosen for study is Whittlewood, consisting of a dozen parishes on either side of the Buckinghamshire-Northamptonshire boundary in which nucleated villages and dispersed settlements are often no more than a few miles apart. The authors find that the formation and development of settlements in the centuries after 800 AD was a complex and diverse process. The decisions of lords and communities were influenced by environment, culture, and idiosyncratic human behavior, with the result that in some places differences in topography and decision-making were so slight that settlements resembled one another, but in areas such as Whittlewood, the variations were enough to produce a diverse mix of dispersed and nucleated plans.

In "Transport and Canal-Building on the Upper Thames, 1000-1300," in *Waterways and Canal-Building in Medieval England*, ed. John Blair (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007), 254-94, Ann Cole presents a considerable amount of circumstantial evidence that the Thames was used for transport even upstream of Oxford. She begins with the account of the Thames being canalized at Abingdon Abbey in the time of Abbot Orderic (1052-1066) and then turns to the onomastic evidence of the Thames crossings Cricklade and Lechlade: she sees the "-lade" element of these names (from *lād*, "lading, loading, lode, canal") as indicating possible transfer points from road freight to water freight on the uppermost reaches of the river. The element "Eaton" (from *ēa-tūn*, "river settlement") seems to be associated with special duties to keep watercourses clear of obstruction, and there are four such names on the upper Thames. References to an *eald ea* ("old river") are only meaningful if there is also a "new river," and Cole suggests that the former refers to the old riverbed, possibly with a weir blocking traffic, and a new bypass channel. Such references are found in charter-bounds as early as 1005. Charter-bounds also provide evidence for the nature of the *lād*. The 1005 charter-bounds of Shifford show that a *lād* could be a "lode" or canal, in this case the Great Brook, which meets the Thames immediately south of the manorial center at Shifford and which is the end of a canal beginning at Black Bourton. Another *lād* is mentioned in the charter-bounds of Whitehill, and in 1004 this *lād* was described as old. Early maps are yet another source of information, as they can show relict

canals that have now completely disappeared. These first lodges and canals seem to be products of the last century of the Anglo-Saxon period, and elsewhere in this essay, Cole demonstrates that they were maintained and extended into at least the twelfth century.

Any investigation into the various uses of rivers and streams in Anglo-Saxon England is immediately hampered by the scarcity of direct documentary or literary evidence. In her "Uses of Waterways in Anglo-Saxon England," *Waterways and Canal-Building in Medieval England*, 37-54, Della Hooke brings together the complicated evidence afforded by charters, place-names, and archaeology to provide an overview of the functions of rivers in early England. Hooke begins by discussing how rivers could be used as significant lines of transport. She demonstrates, for example, that the fact that many minsters were sited next to river-crossings perhaps suggests that stone for the construction of these churches had been ferried by boat; she explores place-name evidence that suggests that various rivers were used specifically as a kind of transport link connecting different places, and also the evidence, archaeological and toponymic, for landing-places on rivers. Hooke then moves on to an exploration of how rivers were exploited not just for navigational purposes but also for the creation of fisheries, mills, and weirs. According to Hooke, for example, in the tenth century mills become more popular and were connected at this time in particular with royal estates. But the construction of such buildings or weirs also meant that it was increasingly difficult to use rivers for navigation, and Hooke demonstrates that in various instances there is evidence that new channels were cut to avoid these structures.

Alban Gautier's "Manger et boire à la mode étrangère: adoption, adaptation et rejet des pratiques festives continentales dans la Grande-Bretagne du VIIIe siècle," *Médiévales* 51 (2006): 37-52, seeks through the evidence of drinking vessels and other material remains to assess the relations between the early Celtic and English kingdoms of the British Isles and Merovingian Francia. Gautier explains the value of this sort of evidence by comparing it to the kingdoms of the Philippines prior to their first encounters with the Spanish. In the quantities of fine Chinese porcelain imported by the chieftains residing within this area, archaeologists have seen evidence of competitive festivities—and of great insecurity. This classic case of so called "core-periphery interaction," familiar, according to Gautier, to all students of imperial polities, is clearly relevant to the situation of early Britain, whose kings were always obliged to dwell in the shadow of Gaul, leaving the British Isles

in this period a loose collection of rival chiefdoms that nonetheless preserved better than most in western Europe something of the culture of Rome (6-7). Gautier finds substantially different patterns pertaining to the English and Celtic realms of southern Britain. While Cornwall appears to have drifted away from late Roman types of pottery—evidence, Gautier holds, of “la fin de la domination des modèles festifs romains dans la Bretagne occidentale” (12)—the “claw beakers” found in Kent, inspired largely by late Roman examples but manufactured perhaps in Faversham, suggest the hegemonic position of Kent as “la porte d’entrée principale de l’influence franque en Angleterre,” perhaps by virtue of its skillful cultivation of political and (under Æthelberht) marital ties with Frankish monarchs (21). On the other hand, the Sutton Hoo hoard, perhaps belonging to the East Anglian king Rædwald, shows no evidence of objects favored in Kent and thus suggests the political and economic independence of these territories from Kent. This and other evidence suggests to Gautier that the development of *emporia* independent of Kentish dominance was already under way, a development that laid the groundwork for the eighth-century contest between Kent, East Anglia, Wessex, and Mercia, each dependent on their respective *emporia* for the flow of goods and wealth (26). It is thus in the early East Anglian kingdoms that the drift toward some relative independence from the Continent began.

Another study that pertains to landscape is Emma Griffin’s *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain since 1066*, which is reviewed below in Subsection J.

g. Magic, Medicine, and Science

Richard Raiswell and Peter Dendle illustrate the culturally constructed nature of “Demon Possession in Anglo-Saxon England and Early Modern England” (subtitled “Continuity and Evolution in Social Context”), *Journal of British Studies* 47: 738-67. Overall, they show that not only did the core of diagnostic symptoms differ radically during these two historical moments but so too did the explanatory power of the concept of “possession.” As an ontological category for a body of symptoms and behaviors, “possession” proved malleable and polysemous. With respect to their Anglo-Saxon example of a boy cured of demonic possession by the virtue of St. Cuthbert (*Vita Cuthberti* 4.15), Raiswell and Dendle note that for Anglo-Saxons “possession” was deployed to explain a broad category of afflictions. They considered a great variety of physical and environmental misfortunes, beyond physical possession of a person by a sentient spirit, to constitute the work

of demons in an abstract sense. Consequently, Anglo-Saxon medical books do not distinguish clearly between demonic possession of a person and disease agents; at some level, all can be construed as external assaults and forms of the “devil’s tribulations,” and as external assaults, they can be expelled through some form of adjuration. Curiously, there are only nine references to cases of demon possession for the entire Anglo-Saxon period that provide any details of sex, age, social status, or symptoms, and all date from the seventh or the early eighth century and come from Northumbria and Anglia. They also adhere closely to a fairly specific profile, mimicking neurological and muscle-control disorders such as epilepsy, and they offer a fairly safe idea of the construction of demon possession as an ontological category in the minds of contemporary authors. The cases are relatively devoid of more cultural symptoms, and demoniacs in Anglo-Saxon sources are generally treated with the same empathy and pity accorded to unfortunate sufferers of other illnesses. Significantly, the demoniacs are not cured by exorcism, as might be expected from the medical texts; instead, it is the relics of a saint that are efficacious. Raiswell and Dendle attribute this anomaly to the low degree of Christianization in Northumbria and Anglia in the seventh and early eighth centuries; priests were scarce, but local saints could satisfy the need for spiritual guidance through example and miraculous healings, without fully asking the populace to submit unquestioningly to a church whose very language was incomprehensible.

See also reviews of medical works in Section 1, above.

h. Law, Politics, and Warfare

P. J. C. Field proposes to take up the question of Arthur’s existence in “Arthur’s Battles,” *Arthuriana* 18: 3-32. Of particular importance to Field’s essay are accounts of the Battle of Badon in which Arthur is reputed to have been a participant. Though Gildas is untrustworthy on most matters having to do with Britain in the Roman period, Field suggests that he may be believed about things his audience is likely to have remembered, and so his account of the battle may have more plausibility than other claims made in *De excidio Britanniae* (4). Somewhat more believable are accounts of Arthurian activities in *Y Gododdin* and *Marwnad Cynddylan*, since “references to persons in early Welsh verse are exclusively to historical figures” (5), something which indicates to Field that the authors of these poems believed themselves to be writing about a real person when they turned their attention to Arthur. Further evidence comes from more controversial sources. Field

finds that accounts of Arthurian exploits in Nennius's *Historia Brittonum* should not be dismissed as other commentators have done given the likelihood that it preserves some element of "historical truth" (11), if in an admittedly garbled form and filtered through layers of written and oral sources. A similar defense of material in the *Annales Cambriae* follows. Fields concludes that Arthurian passages in "the *Historia*, the *Annales Cambriae*, Nennius's battle-listing poem, and even the lost source Q look like serious and largely successful efforts to preserve information about the past" (21). Skeptical readers may still find useful Field's intricate considerations of place-names occurring in these texts.

Barbara Yorke examines "Anglo-Saxon Origin Legends" in *Myth, Rulership, Church and Charters: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks* [see sect. 2], 15-29, as a distinctive type of early medieval record. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* includes legends for Kent (Hengist and Horse), the South Saxons (Ælle and his three sons), the *Wihthara* of the Isle of Wight (Stuf and Wihthgar), the Jutish people in southern Hampshire (Port and his two sons), and the West Saxons (Cerdic and Cynric), and Yorke suggests that the inclusion of these legends is a manifestation of the hegemony that the West Saxons had established over the people of the south coast. If so, it is analogous to the Anglian collection of genealogies and regnal lists of provinces that were subject to the overlordship of Northumbria and Mercia. The *Chronicle* origin legends are diverse and may have originated before the ninth century, but they probably underwent considerable adaptation in order to be fitted into the *Chronicle's* annalistic format. The appearance of Hengist and Horsa in Gildas's *De Excidio Britanniae* suggests that origin legends were being developed among the Germanicized communities of eastern England by the first half of the sixth century, and Yorke sees this as paralleling other aspects of early Anglo-Saxon society, such as the Germanic elements of female dress and the adherence to the burial practices (i.e., cremation or male weapon-burials) of their ancestral homeland. British elements such as the name Cerdic and Romano-British designs in brooches indicate a layering of different traditions created at different times for different purposes, such as the development of kingdoms in the early seventh century. More speculatively, Yorke sees parallels between the origin legend of Kent and that of the Goths, which could have come from direct knowledge. Gregory of Tours mentions a "Saxon" army that had been in Italy, and Æthelbert's father Irminric shares a name with the Goths' most famous king. Gothic legends might also have come to Kent via the North Sea trade-network. Gothic and Scandinavia influence

appears in other parts of early Anglo-Saxon England as well, as seen at Sutton Hoo, a Northumbrian prince named Theodric, and the widespread claim of descent from Woden. Claims to a common Germanic past seem to have been important in England from a much earlier date than is often supposed.

Two Lópezes produce two works on the Cynewulf and Cyneheard episode of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in the same issue of *SELIM*. In "The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 755: An Annotated Bibliography of the Cynewulf and Cyneheard Episode from Plummer to Bremmer," *SELIM* 13 (2007): 99-117, Francisco Javier Álvarez López offers a review of the scholarship on this important narrative that will be particularly useful to students. Álvarez López states in the article abstract that "the aim of this annotated bibliography is to offer, in chronological order of publication, a comprehensive analysis of the several studies and editions publi[s]hed from the nineteenth century (Plummer 1892-99) to the very first years of the twenty-fi[r]st century (2005)" (99). This episode from the chronicle has enough scholarly and teaching interest and a bibliography just deep enough to support such an exercise, and Álvarez López does a good job of gathering together the extant scholarship. Despite his claim in the abstract, he does not attempt to produce a comprehensive bibliography. Rather, he excludes translations and, as he states in his introduction, "I have also refrained from including in the main body of the bibliography the numerous works of mainly historical nature which cite the annal for 755 or at best retell its plot" (100.4). The focus of the bibliography thereby becomes primarily literary, but the annotations will still be beneficial to students of Anglo-Saxon history. Álvarez López divides his bibliography into three sections: editions, commentary, and works not specifically focused on Cynewulf and Cyneheard but that nonetheless contribute significantly to scholarship on the entry. He does not omit any important works on this episode, and although his summaries are sometimes unfortunately brief, they typically highlight any significant discoveries or debates so that one can trace lines of argument through the scholarship. It is unfortunate that the title of the bibliography reproduces the erroneous manuscript date of 755 for these events rather than the correct date of 757 found in modern editions. Álvarez López seems to have some awareness of the problematic manuscript dates when he writes in his introduction that the annal describes events "that took place between the years 755 and 784 (757 and 786, to be exact)" (99-100), but no further explanation is offered and the introduction continues to refer to "the annal for 755." Nevertheless, the bibliography provides

a very helpful introduction to the scholarship on this episode for anyone embarking on a first-time study of it. Later in the same volume, Ignacio Murillo López reviews the scholarship on the style of the annal and the possibility that it might have its roots in oral transmission in “Cynewulf and Cyneheard: A Different Style for a Different Story” (87–98). He adopts Cecily Clark’s division of the pre-Conquest Chronicle entries into five groups of annals that represent different phases in the compilation of the ASC—“The Initial Alfredian Compilation,” “The Later Alfredian Annals,” “The Annals for the Reign of Æthelred II,” “The Annals for the Confessor’s Reign,” and “The Conquest”—and notes that each of these groups is characterized by a distinctive style (88). The prevailing style of the first-phase annals is described as simple, paratactic, and semi-formulaic, with the style and syntax of entries belonging to later phases becoming gradually more complex. As others have noted previously, the Cynewulf and Cyneheard episode is an exception to this rule, belonging technically to the Initial Alfredian Compilation but exemplifying an altogether more complex prose style. Murillo López notes that scholars including Bruce Mitchell and Fred Robinson, Stephen D. White, and Francis P. Magoun have compared the style of the episode with that of the Icelandic sagas, and he therefore asks whether a Germanic oral tradition similar to that which forms the background of the sagas underlies the Cynewulf and Cyneheard episode and helps to explain its stylistic distinctiveness. He reviews the scholarship on this point but does not seem to arrive at any particularly new conclusion. He also goes on to discuss Janet Bately’s suggestion that the distinctive narrative portion of the annal did not form part of the initial compilation but was added to a more paratactic entry at a later date. Murillo López concludes that the Cynewulf and Cyneheard narrative could have been added to the Chronicle during King Alfred’s reign because the narrative stresses the importance of kinship ties with reference to members of the house of Wessex. The implication seems to be that the advancement of this agenda required a new prose style, but this conclusion is not made explicit in Murillo López’s essay.

Pauline Stafford’s “‘The Annals of Æthelflæd’: Annals, History and Politics in Early Tenth-century England,” *Myth, Rulership, Church and Charters: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks* [see sect. 2], 101–116, is the latest in a series of important studies that will significantly revise the way in which we understand the composition of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* generally and in particular the role of gender in it. She examines the entries between 902 and 924 chronicling the life and career of Alfred’s

daughter, Æthelflæd, “Lady of the Mercians.” Her essay argues that “these annals should be seen as a continuation of the Alfredian Chronicle, produced at or near the Mercian court in the early tenth century and paralleling those produced in contemporary Wessex” (101). At stake, according to Stafford, is “a claim on Alfred’s past and inheritance” (115). These annals function as an implicit argument for Mercian political precedence and for the claim of the line of Æthelflæd to the over-kingship left vacant on Alfred’s death and eventually assumed by Edward the Elder.

Scholarly consensus points to King Alfred’s court as a place where notions of a united Anglo-Saxon England were fostered and promulgated and where Alfred came to be styled *rex Angulsaxonum*, ‘king of the Anglo-Saxons.’ In “Cultural Difference and the Meaning of Latinity in Asser’s Life of King Alfred,” *Cultural Diversity in the British Middle Ages: Archipelago, Island, England*, ed. J. J. Cohen (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan), 57–73, David Townsend offers his own reading of Asser’s ‘Life of Alfred.’ Townsend suggests that Asser’s choice to write in Latin instead of Old English, at a moment when English was being used for a wide variety of texts produced at Alfred’s court, demonstrates “the residual misgivings of a Welsh churchman over the erasure of difference in that same West Saxon project to which he contributed so centrally. In other words, we should entertain the possibility that Asser’s text includes elements subversive of West Saxon linguistic supersessionism and the proliferation of West Saxon cultural and symbolic capital” (65). Townsend finds similarly subversive elements in some of the content of Asser’s work, drawing attention to Asser’s apparently mistaken, but in Townsend’s view pointed, rendering of the royal West Saxon genealogy at the beginning of the *Life* (67–8).

In “Taking Sides: Some Theoretical Remarks on the (Ab)Use of Historiography,” *Medieval Chronicle* 5: 99–111, Wojtek Jerzieski argues that medieval historiography stands closer to the modern phenomenon of heritage than it does to modern historical research. By “heritage” he means the kind of historical knowledge delivered by schoolbooks, theme-parks, memorial parades, and national monuments. “Heritage” is and is supposed to be selective, trumpeting the victories and successes of “our” ancestors and keeping silent about their shames and defeats. “Bias is the very essence of heritage” (100): it pertains to nationalism rather than scholarship; it provides material for the construction of identity; it aims to create a politically usable past. In the case of the *Chronicon* of the tenth-century ealdorman Æthelweard of Wessex, written for his distant relative Abbess Mathilda of Essen, it provides a careful

selection of facts and establishes a community that is sometimes the family that Æthelweard has in common with Mathilda and sometimes their people, the Saxons and the Anglo-Saxons. For example, although Æthelweard begins with Bede's account of the arrivals of the Saxons in eastern Britain, the rest of Kentish history is immediately elided, creating the impression that the *adventus Saxonum* is part of Wessex's history. Similarly, although he borrows substantially from a redaction of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, he omits notices about bishops, abbots, and churches other than those from Wessex. Jezierski proposes two reasons for this: on one hand, the rule of Wessex is meant to be seen as independent from the sanction of the Church; on the other hand, Matilda's interests may have been focused on dynastical and genealogical records more than on ecclesiastical ones, as her religious duties and loyalties were subordinated to family relations.

Richard Abels takes on the historiography of medieval warfare in "Cultural Representation and the Practice of War in the Middle Ages," *Jnl of Medieval Military History* 6: 1–31. He begins by suggesting that there exist two competing models for understanding the history of warfare: a "scientific" model that takes as its central principle that wars are carried out in a militarily sensible way that makes the best use of resources, geography, technology, etc. to achieve the aims of a state, and a "cultural" model that maintains that wars are motivated and shaped by a culture's values and institutions and are understood and written about through that lens. Abels himself advocates a balanced approach but emphasizes in this article that the cultural is particularly important in medieval warfare and that historians should not discount sources as unreliable simply because they describe battles in a way that is not scientifically plausible. Such sources may still provide us with a picture of what motivated the combatants and what cultural discourses legitimated and ennobled acts that would be condemned as atrocities in our present-day society. Abels concentrates on later medieval warfare here; he discusses at length the *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, Caesarius of Heisterbach's *Dialogus Miraculorum*, and the *Chronique d'Ernouf*. Nevertheless, his main point—that the historian of warfare should not discount as irrelevant sources which are more concerned with cultural norms than with military technology and strategy—presumably would be equally applicable to historians studying the battle at Stamford Bridge or the Viking attacks on Canterbury in 1011–12.

Lisi Oliver's article, "Sick-Maintenance in Anglo-Saxon Law," *JEGP* 107.3, 303–26, traces the history of legislation concerning individuals' responsibility to

care for persons they have injured as a way to better understand the processes of legal codification in Anglo-Saxon England. She identifies three principal ways in which sick-maintenance clauses enter Old English law: inheritance from West Germanic, borrowing from Irish tradition, and innovation. Oliver's argument is (not surprisingly) quite learned and entirely convincing. She concludes that "while inheritance and borrowing play significant roles in the various instantiations of the ruling of sick-maintenance in Anglo-Saxon England, it is Alfred's innovation that lays the basis for the future of common law" (326).

Andrew Reynolds' inaugural A. J. Robertson Lecture, *The Emergence of Anglo-Saxon Judicial Practice: the Message of the Gallows* (Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen) picks up on many of the themes explored in his recent book *Anglo-Saxon Deviant Burial Customs* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009). Addressing the long-disputed role of capital punishment in Anglo-Saxon law, Reynolds writes, "my approach here is to return squarely to a topic framed by written evidence and to address it from an archaeological perspective" (5). He focuses especially on two questions: "Did formal execution take place prior to the late ninth century and the proposed emergence of the late Anglo-Saxon state? Is the appearance of capital offences in the lawcodes of late seventh-century Kent and Wessex supported by independent dating of execution-cemeteries?" (16) To answer these questions, Reynolds presents case-studies of execution-cemeteries in Cambridge, Staines, Walkington Wold, and Sutton Hoo. Ultimately, he concludes that "conversion to Christianity might have supplied the impetus for the exclusion of social 'others' from communal cemeteries during the seventh century, that expansionist policy of emerging regional overkingdoms provided a context for the emergence of capital punishment, and that the landscape-archaeology of execution constitutes a blending of top-down imposition and regional practice" (47). As is the case with his broader discussion in *Anglo-Saxon Deviant Burial Customs*, Reynolds raises a number of provocative points that are sure to be controversial; nonetheless, his work must be counted among the most significant recent contributions to the study of early English legal practice.

Particularly welcome this year is Donald Scragg's edited collection, *Edgar, King of the English 959–975* (Woodbridge: Boydell), which provides a much-needed reassessment of one of the most important yet enigmatic Anglo-Saxon kings. The volume opens with Simon Keynes' magisterial summation, "Edgar, *rex admirabilis*" (3–59). Keynes examines the different, contradictory images of Edgar—as dedicated reformer or

opportunistic womanizer, as *rex Anglorum pacificus* or brutal dictator, as among the greatest of the pre-Conquest kings or a merely competent ruler whose reign foreshadowed the greater failures of his son, Æthelred *Unræd*—in order to better assess both his reign itself and the surviving sources for it. Not surprisingly, Keynes focuses on the diplomatic evidence of Edgar's governing style, and in doing so, presents a valuable new account of the relationship between royal and ecclesiastical authority during the height of the Monastic Reform. In the end, Keynes agrees with Stenton's judgment that Edgar's reign was "singularly devoid of recorded incident," although, as he points out, it was this very feature of Edgar's reign that enabled subsequent historians to paint such widely different portraits of the king. Yet if Edgar's reign does not necessarily conform to the narratives found in later accounts, his very skill in managing both his office and his realm leads Keynes to conclude that Edgar was indeed "a powerful, determined, and effective ruler" (58). Keynes follows his essay with a very useful "Conspectus of the Charters of King Edgar, 957-975" (60-82). Keynes here lists all of Edgar's surviving royal charters, ordered chronologically and organized according to those produced during his reign as king of the Mercians (957-9) and his reign as king over all the English (959-75). Keynes also lists charters of dubious authenticity as well as charters known to have existed but now lost. Though some might disagree with some of Keynes's judgments (particularly regarding the "problematic" charters), this conspectus will provide a necessary starting point for any future study of late-tenth-century diplomacy. Keynes's contributions are followed by Shashi Jayakumar's "Eadwig and Edgar: Politics, Propaganda, Faction" (83-103). Jayakumar begins with a problem similar to that raised by Keynes: "the difficulty with Edgar's regime is not just that so little is known about it, but that the monastic memory of him sought to plug a gaping hole by imposing its own image" (83). A similar problem, Jayakumar notes, affects accounts of Edgar's predecessor Eadwig, who frequently comes to be treated as a villain against whom Edgar might be compared. Jayakumar identifies the presence of competing "Edgar" and "Eadwig" factions at the early Edgarian court and traces the decline in Eadwig's historical reputation in part to the suppression of his faction, particularly following the rise in political prominence of Edgar's queen, Ælfthryth. In the end, Jayakumar, like Keynes, returns to Stenton's description of Edgar's reign as "singularly devoid of recorded incident," yet draws from this the conclusion that the seeming placidity of his reign concealed "a type of rulership that might be called vindictive or

even (occasionally) despotic" (103). C. P. Lewis's contribution to the volume, "Edgar, Chester, and the Kingdom of the Mercians, 957-9" (104-23) examines how Edgar's charter of 958 for the minster church of St. Werburgh in Chester (S 667) sheds light on his brief reign as king of Mercia while Eadwig ruled as overking in Wessex. Lewis notes that "although the division of the kingdom in 957 has been a recurrent focus of interest, far less has been written on Edgar's government in Mercia or on how this period fits within the longer history of the reign" (104). Lewis argues that Edgar's policies during his reign as king of Mercia—particularly those concerning his involvement with Chester—foreshadow those that he would adopt during his longer and more celebrated reign as king of England. Lewis concludes that Edgar's reign during this period was carried out with a self-conscious awareness of its Mercian character; however, "it was a Mercian identity articulated in the full knowledge that Edgar's half-kingdom was a temporary expedient in the affairs of the English" (123). The early part of Edgar's career is also the focus of Frederick M. Biggs's essay, "Edgar's Path to the Throne" (124-39). Biggs writes that "one of the more puzzling questions associated with Edgar's reign" concerns his progression to the throne between 955 and 959: "how are we to interpret this stepped ascent to rule especially in light of the laconic and often contradictory contemporary written sources as well as the even more bewildering evidence of charters and coins?" (124) Biggs argues that the division of the kingdom between Edgar and Eadwig should be understood as following the tradition of joint kingship more common in earlier Anglo-Saxon England, yet which had fallen into disfavor with the Church by the tenth century. Biggs points out that "recognizing joint kingship at the core of the events that led to Edgar's sole rule over the Anglo-Saxons allows us to understand the competing claims of the written record and may provide new opportunities for assessing the related charters and coins" (139).

Barbara Yorke, in her essay, "The Women in Edgar's Life" (143-57), observes that we know far more about the women with whom Edgar associated than we do about many other aspects of his reign. Accordingly, she describes her "main aim" as an attempt to "return to the issue of what we can learn about Edgar himself, and his shifting reputation, through the women associated with him" (143). In particular, Yorke focuses on accounts concerning Edgar's relationship with his third wife, Ælfthryth, and his daughter, St. Edith of Wilton, in both Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman sources. She points out that Edgar's relationships with and treatment of the women around him aroused considerable

bitterness; however, “Edgar was able to keep resentments in check while he was alive, but the tensions surfaced after his early death to the detriment of his widow Ælfthryth and, ultimately, to the image of him as a model Christian king that had been carefully nurtured during his reign” (157). In “Edgar, Albion and Insular Dominion” (158–70), Julia Crick examines both how Edgar came to style himself as the king of “Albion” in his charters and how the adoption of this title illuminates tenth-century understandings of royal sovereignty and English dominion. Responding to claims by Eric John and Patrick Wormald, Crick situates Edgar’s charters within the development of Anglo-Saxon England’s sense of itself, not merely as a unified polity, but as a nation with imperial aspirations. The references to Albion, she argues, indicate “a sense of dominion unbounded by ethnic history,” which lends “a geographical aspect to the language of early English empire” (170). Julia Barrow revisits “The Chronology of the Benedictine ‘Reform’” (211–23) in an effort to better understand the influences and key stakeholders in this important development in the history of the English Church. Dating events in the reform process depends on establishing a date for the promulgation of the *Regularis Concordia*, so Barrow begins with a discussion of how the traditional dating window of c. 970 x 973 ought to be opened further. After considering the evidence for dating significant developments within the reform movement presented in the *ASC*, the *Vita Æthelwoldi*, the *Vita Sancti Oswaldi*, and the relevant charters, she proposes a revised chronology in which she suggests 966 as a date for *Regularis Concordia*, linking it with Oswald’s foundation of a new monastery at Worcester and with the New Minster refoundation charter. Such a date would seem to suggest that the *Regularis Concordia* might have played a more important role than previously recognized in the reform activities that took place in the middle of King Edgar’s reign. Barrow also suggests that her revised chronology highlights the activities of Ælfthryth during the reform period, as well as emphasizes the importance of bishops in tenth-century England and the opportunities to reform monasteries created by the deaths of individual bishops. Alexander R. Rumble, in his essay, “The Laity and the Monastic Reform in the Reign of Edgar” (242–51), cautions that although lay people are mentioned only selectively in the sources for Edgar’s reign, “we should not think from this that the rest of the lay population were unaware of, or impervious to, the events and consequences of the reform and there are clear indications that some individuals, families, and groups were greatly affected in one way or another” (242). He then

goes on to survey the records of the Monastic Reform, with special reference to the New Minster Refoundation Charter, in order to determine how the laity influenced and interacted with ecclesiastics during this period. He concludes that, “it was a lasting paradox that, although the New Minster Refoundation Charter and other documents urged the monks and nuns to shun lay people and their behavior, they could not in fact follow the exclusive monastic life to which they aspired without the patronage, protection, and sympathy of both those in authority and the general population living around their monasteries” (251). Finally, Mercedes Salvador-Bello discusses “The Edgar Panegyrics in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*” (252–72). Here, she analyzes the language and style of the *Coronation of Edgar* and the *Death of Edgar* with the aim of demonstrating “that the two pieces are probably literary products created to propagandize reformist ideas” (252–3) and suggesting that they are part of a tradition of praise poetry that developed alongside the Benedictine reform movement. The idea that the Edgar poems in the *ASC* drew on a tradition of praise poetry based on either Latin or Norse sources (or possibly both) is not a new one, and Salvador-Bello acknowledges this and speculates that there may be a continuing tradition of poetry in praise of King Edgar composed by supporters of the reform, although such poems do not survive. Her suggestion that the *Chronicle* poems were specifically composed as pro-reform propaganda is more interesting, as it might add significantly to our understanding of the development of the reform movement. However, not all of the points of evidence she presents to support this suggestion are equally persuasive. Her suggestion that the *Coronation of Edgar* “stands out from the other *Chronicle* panegyrics in its conspicuous use of ambivalent terms applying to Christ and Edgar” (254), for example, is interesting, and the phrases she cites in support of this assertion do give the impression that they are both ambivalent in their context and unusual in poetry. More discussion and a comparative analysis of the language of other poems, or at least other *Chronicle* poems, would help to strengthen the point. Some of her other evidence of pro-reform propaganda at work—the comparison of Edgar to Christ the Good Shepherd, for example, or the association of Edgar’s death with apocalyptic imagery—strike one as the sort of thing one finds everywhere and at every time in Old English literature rather than evidence of a poet consciously composing in support of the reform movement. Although the argument is unevenly supported, the article does remind us of the importance of these poems as a source for the history of the monastic reform.

John P. Sexton, in “Saint’s Law: Anglo-Saxon Sanctuary Protection in the *Translatio et miracula s. Swithuni*,” *Florilegium* 23.2: 61–80, argues that the wheat-thief episode in the *Translatio et Miracula S. Swithuni*, which Patrick Wormald lists as an example of a “rescue from prison or penalty” case in his “Hand-list to Anglo-Saxon Lawsuits,” should instead be understood as a dispute involving the right to sanctuary. Pointing out that the wheat-thief’s story echoes in significant ways Old English sanctuary legislation, he argues that the issue in the narrative is not guilt or innocence, but rather the way in which the legal authorities respect (or fail to respect) the right of the church to extend sanctuary to petitioners. He argues that Lantfred, the narrative’s author, “juxtaposes Swithun’s compassionate beneficence to the excesses of royal officers and even the king’s law itself ... Lantfred’s audience would also recognize in Swithun’s merciful protection of the downtrodden a rebuke of those engaged in overzealous enforcement of written law and the rejection of customary settlement” (78).

Compared to Richard Abels (see above), Simon Keynes describes a very different approach to writing history in “Re-Reading King Æthelred the Unready,” *Writing Medieval Biography 750–1200: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow*, eds. David Bates, Julia Crick, and Sarah Hamilton (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2006): 77–97. In the process of doing so, he provides an excellent example of the way in which historians should go about re-assessing the reign of an Anglo-Saxon king when that reign has been treated many times in the past. Keynes describes the process in five stages: a deconstruction of received ideas about the monarch, a skeptical re-assessment of the literary sources, a consideration of documentary and other sources, a departure from what Keynes terms the “biographical mould,” which focuses the history of a reign narrowly on the person of the king, and integrating all of the sources into a coherent narrative. In the course of illustrating this methodology, he provides a re-assessment of Æthelred’s reign, which synthesizes some arguments that he has made elsewhere, but also presents some significant new evidence. In particular, he makes a persuasive case for the authenticity of the Abingdon Abbey charter of 993 (S no. 876), which Susan Kelly elsewhere suggests was a fabrication based on an earlier charter of King Edgar. There is much at stake in the matter, as Keynes’s reading of the charter shows; if it is authentic, it provides a glimpse of the reaction within Æthelred’s court to the Viking invasions in the early 990s and demonstrates that, even at this early date, the Viking raids were thought to be connected to the violation of church privileges and understood as a form of divine

punishment. It is in this article that Keynes also first broaches the subject of Ælfric of Eynsham’s contemporary commentary upon the Viking raids in his *Lives of Saints*, which he elsewhere treats at greater length (see “An Abbot, an Archbishop and the Viking Raids of 1006–7 and 1009–12,” *ASE* 36 [2007]: 151–220). Other sources considered or re-considered include the narrative provided by the ASC, hoards of English coinage found in Scandinavia, and the Eynsham charter of 1005 (S no. 911). The fact that so many sources are brought together here to form a coherent picture of the response of Æthelred and his councilors to the Viking invasions makes this an important essay and required reading for anyone wishing to understand Æthelred’s reign.

In *The Earls of Mercia: Lordship and Power in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007), Stephen Baxter analyzes the fortunes of the house of Leofwine, ealdormen and earls of Mercia in the eleventh century, in order to ascertain how the upper aristocracy of the later Anglo-Saxon period could be simultaneously wealthy, powerful, and distinctly insecure. In doing so, he examines both how the Leofwinesons held on to power longer than any of their peers and what circumstances ultimately contributed to their fall. Baxter begins with a survey of the lives and careers of the Leofwinesons, beginning with Leofwine’s elevation to ealdorman in 994 and ending with the fall of his great-grandsons, Eadwine and Morcar, in 1071. In doing so, he argues that the “defining characteristic of the house of Leofwine was its capacity to survive” (58). This capacity stemmed, he suggests, in part from good fortune—especially the good fortune of being the *second* rather than the *first* most powerful clan in the kingdom—and political acumen; however, he also argues that deeper, structural considerations were also at play: “the house of Leofwine held on to power through four generations by making effective use of the powers vested in them as agents of royal government, by amassing and exploiting immense tenurial resources, by forging connections with several Mercian monasteries, and by cultivating a substantial network of retainers and commended men” (59–60). In “The Extent, Nature, and Limits of the Leofwinesons’ Power” (61–124), perhaps the most significant and certainly most wide-ranging chapter in the volume, Baxter focuses on the first of these factors, the Leofwinesons’ exercise of legal power within the context of the later Anglo-Saxon state. Baxter advances two arguments here: “The first demonstrates that late Anglo-Saxon kings exercised a remarkable degree of control over the structure of English earldoms. The second argues that, although earls discharged a wide range of important political, military, and judicial functions,

there were distinct limits to their powers" (61). These arguments are, as Baxter emphasizes, designed in part to support the so-called "maximalist" account of the later Anglo-Saxon state, though he notes that they are not necessarily inconsistent arguments examining potential structural weaknesses in this state. He provides the most detailed account yet of the rights, privileges, and duties of the later Anglo-Saxon nobility, as well as their limitations. As such, Baxter's analysis here is a major contribution to our understanding of the legal functioning of the later Anglo-Saxon state. In the next chapter, "The Leofwinesons' Land" (125-51), Baxter surveys the Leofwinesons' tenurial resources. As Baxter himself concedes, this chapter is considerably more speculative than others in the book, which somewhat weakens his argument. Nonetheless, the conclusion he draws from the limited evidence is convincing: the Leofwinesons' wealth, however extensive, rested on a precarious foundation. Land may have been the basis of their wealth, but their resources were still less than those of the Godwinesons and the overwhelming majority of their lands were "comital manors," that is, properties "assigned to them by the king on an 'ex officio basis,' for as long as they held office" (150). As the title suggests, "The Earls and the Monasteries of Mercia" (152-203) examines the known connections between the Leofwinesons and Mercian religious establishments. The evidence here is more extensive than in the previous chapter and the argument is correspondingly stronger. After a survey of Mercian monasteries, Baxter concludes, "The political calculations of the Leofwinesons were partly influenced and partly determined by their relationships with the monasteries within their earldoms" (201). Monasteries functioned as agents (and recipients) of propaganda as well as sites of mediation in times of crisis. Perhaps most importantly, monasteries served as a means of connecting the Leofwinesons' national interests with regional and local circuits of power. In "Lordship and the House of Leofwine" (204-69), Baxter offers a secular analysis to correspond with the ecclesiastical analysis of the previous chapter. To do so, Baxter attempts to identify all of those known to have been dependent upon or commended to members of the house of Leofwine. He finds that the Leofwinesons' lordship connections may even have been "comparable in scale to the greatest late medieval affinities" (268). In compiling these data, he concludes, "The relationships between the earls of Mercia and their men were conditioned by deeply rooted social conventions and powerful emotional bonds, but also by self-interest. The essence of lordship was interdependence, not dependence" (269). Baxter concludes

his study with an analysis of the fate of the Leofwinesons between 1066 and 1071. If the success of the house of Leofwine derived from its ability to exploit the structural resources of power at its disposal, then its downfall resulted from its inability to access those resources following the Norman Conquest. Baxter argues that the power of the Leofwinesons was so dependent upon the structural integrity of the late Anglo-Saxon state that the collapse of that structure made the survival of the family impossible. *The Earls of Mercia* is an innovative, compelling piece of scholarship that will be useful to researchers in a wide range of disciplines. It is a most impressive accomplishment.

In "The Shiring of East Anglia: An Alternative Hypothesis," *Historical Research* 81: 1-27, Lucy Marten re-examines the evidence for the shiring of East Anglia and challenges the assumption that the creation and imposition of this West Saxon administrative structure was an immediate consequence of Edward the Elder's campaigns of 917. She argues instead that 917 marked only the beginning of what turned out to be a century-long process, as the former kingdom was gradually integrated into the political and administrative apparatus that characterized West Saxon/English regional governance. As evidence that East Anglia was still a functioning political unit during the reign of Æthelred II, she quotes the list of places that the 'C' version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* states were affected by Danish raids in 1011, namely, Essex, Middlesex, Oxfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Bedfordshire, half of Huntingdonshire, Northamptonshire, Kent, Sussex, Hastings, Surrey, Berkshire, Hampshire, Wiltshire, and East Anglia. The quite convincing alternative hypothesis of her title is that the process of "shiring" actually took place as part of a package of religious and administrative reforms during the reign of Cnut (1016-35). Dividing the borough of Thetford between the new shires of Norfolk and Suffolk supplanted Ulfcytel's regional capital with new county towns of Norwich and Ipswich, as seems to be evinced by the expansion of the Norwich mint, which overtakes the Thetford mint in production during Cnut's reign. As he had elsewhere, Cnut used his position and patronage to create new urban centers of political loyalty, thus undermining what had been a bastion of resistance against the Danish invasion.

i. Vikings

Andrew Pearson's "Late Roman Britain: A Perspective from the Viking Age," *Britannia* 37: 337-353, seeks to compare the period of Viking attacks on Anglo-Saxon

England with those raids by barbarian pirates on late Roman Britain. He begins by examining the character, scale, and nature of Viking raids (with details of places targeted by Vikings, the amount of plunder taken, and the level of destruction caused) and then moves on to the question of piracy in Roman Britain. By analogy with the Viking situation, Pearson “attempts...to place the question of piracy within a wider context” (345), and he concludes that barbarian piracy occurred on a much smaller scale, in which attacks “were sporadic ... and probably disruptive rather than destructive” (349).

In his essay, “Paying the Danegeld: Anglo-Saxon peacemaking with Vikings,” *War and Peace in Ancient and Medieval History*, ed. P. de Souza and J. France (Cambridge: Cambridge UP): 173-92, Richard Abels examines the various methods employed by successive Anglo-Saxon kings in their attempts to reach peaceful settlements with Vikings. In doing so, Abels shows that an Anglo-Saxon king, ruling over a people within a certain territory, had a very different concept of peace than did his Viking counterpart, who had command of a band of warriors and who was mainly intent on extorting tribute. If a peace treaty was made under such circumstances, it often held different meanings for the different parties involved; while the English king might see it as a lasting resolution, for a Viking it was often only a temporary truce. In certain instances (most famously the treaty concluded between Alfred and Guthrum), the peace brokered between English and Viking rulers was more permanent. Abels suggests that such a settlement occurred when a particular Viking leader had ambitions which stretched beyond the mere acquisition of wealth and towards the possibility of being a ruler with a defined territory and defined subjects.

Kari Ellen Gade in “Norse Attacks on England and Arnórr Jarlaskald’s *Þórfinnssdrápa*,” *Skandinavistik* 33 (2003): 1-14, finds doubtful the claim of *Orkneyinga saga* (one of two sources for the life of Jarl Þorfinnr Siguðarson along with *Þórfinnssdrápa*) that this formidable raider “gave up his warlike exploits in 1046 after the death of his nephew Rognvaldr Brúsason” and “spent the rest of his life peacefully building churches and upholding the law” after a pilgrimage to Rome in 1049 or 1050 (1). Suspicious as well is *Orkneyinga saga*’s account of “two attacks on England by Þorfinnr and Rognvaldr during the years 1036-44” (4). *Orkneyinga saga* is alone among extant sources in describing these attacks, and Gade notes that battles of the scope it describes “would not have gone unnoticed in English and Irish chronicles” (6). A raid did take place, but it cannot, according to Gade, be ascribed to the reign of Hǫrðá-Knútr (Harthacnut), as the saga maintains. A

sensible solution is to assume these raids to be the ones that the Irish, Welsh, and English did take note of in the year 1058, even if Þorfinnr is supposed to have spent these years placidly building churches and making amends for the crimes of his youth. The leader of these raids is unlikely to have been Magnús, the ten-year-old son of Haraldr harðráði (Harold Hard-Rule); more plausible is the assumption that Þorfinnr “continued to play an active part in Scottish-Irish affairs throughout his life” (1). The battles described in the Skaldic stanzas upon which this portion of *Orkneyinga saga* relies most likely represent a joint effort undertaken with the Welsh king Gruffud ap Llewelyn (14).

The “biographical mould” from which Keynes (see above) advocates a departure is well illustrated in Ian Howard’s *Harthacnut: The Last Danish King of England* (Stroud: History Press). Here, Howard is clearly producing a biographical study of a monarch, although arguably that monarch is Queen Emma rather than King Harthacnut. Emma’s picture features prominently on the book’s cover and her name appears in the titles of three separate chapters of the book, as well as on most of the volume’s pages. The focus on Emma is not total—she disappears for several of the book’s central chapters that deal with Harthacnut in Denmark—and not particularly off-putting, since the surviving sources for Harthacnut’s brief reign in England are not truly sufficient support for a full biographical treatment of the king alone. More troubling is the fact that there is nothing new in Howard’s treatment of the material surrounding the reign. His approach is strictly chronological, beginning with the historical background to Harthacnut’s birth and covering his time in Denmark, the succession crisis in England upon Cnut’s death, his alliances with King Magnus of Norway and Emperor Conrad, his return to England, and his death and Edward’s succession. Howard draws primarily upon the standard narrative sources for the period, including the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the *Encomium Emmae Reginae*, and the *Heimskringla* and *Knytlinga Saga*. He does not treat these sources in any particularly new way and does not question or challenge any of the stereotypical views of any of the major players. Emma is portrayed as “manipulative and mendacious” (79), Edward the Confessor is well educated and diplomatic, and Harthacnut himself is reluctant to engage in warfare (although Howard suggests he was “in advance of his time” in this respect (61). It is difficult to find much that is original in this volume, aside from the illustrations provided by the author’s wife, Mary. The book may be of interest to a popular audience, but it will be of little use to serious historians.

j. The Norman Conquest and Settlement

Harriet Harvey Wood offers a popular account of *The Battle of Hastings* (subtitled *The Fall of Anglo-Saxon England* [London: Atlantic]), arranged thematically by “the background,” “the contenders,” “the prize,” and “the armies,” and then chronologically by the “prologue,” “the battles,” and “the aftermath,” concluding with a review of the primary sources. Harvey Wood admits that she is partial to the English, and it seems that she wrote this book to tell the story in a way that would emphasize the greatness of the Anglo-Saxons and highlight the loss resulting from their defeat. But once she embarked upon the research, the unwieldy mass of complicated but unavoidable material seems to have swamped the original project. Despite the systematic arrangement of the topics, the narrative is often difficult to follow, as it is dense with reference to Vikings, Englishmen, and Normans, not all of whom are introduced when they first appear. The scholarship on which Harvey Wood relies is in places outdated (as when she cites Stenton’s 1969 *Anglo-Saxon England* to sum up of Cnut’s achievements), and the narrative has a tendency to drift into byways (such as Eustace of Boulogne’s visit to England in 1051) that are distractingly irrelevant to a general audience. The key chapter on the Battle of Hastings itself is happily much clearer, as Harvey Wood examines the various theories about why Harold conducted the battle the way he did and whether the Normans actually feigned a retreat to draw the English away from their safe defensive position. Nonetheless, it must be said that Anglo-Saxonists will be able to follow the narrative but do not need to, and non-specialist readers will be better served by works such as David Howarth’s 1066: *The Year of the Conquest* (Penguin, 1981) or Stephen Morillo’s *The Battle of Hastings: Sources and Interpretations* (Boydell, 1999).

In *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain since 1066* (New Haven and London: Yale UP), Emma Griffin asks why the “prehistoric” (2) custom of chasing and killing wild animals survives modernity and flourishes today. In the opening pages, she summarizes what is known about hunting in Anglo-Saxon England and after the Norman Conquest. The great Anglo-Saxon landowners had fine hunting grounds and employed the method of the “drive hunt,” in which a team of beaters drove herds of animals towards a waiting ambush, thus enabling hunters to kill dozens and even hundreds of animals in a single day. Ælfric’s *Dialogues* has a royal huntsman explain how this was done. The Normans introduced the *par force* hunt, in which a small band of hunters was pitted against a solitary wild animal, usually a deer

or a boar. Dogs, horses, and men set off in search of a suitable prey, and in contrast to the drive hunt, no one could know where the hunt would end. It was not a practical or energy-efficient way of finding food; it was a means of displaying wealth, status, and skill, as indeed was true for the Anglo-Saxons who hunted in the old way. Eadmer of Canterbury noted that keeping horses and hunting with hounds were the marks of an earl, and kings such as Alfred, Edward the Confessor, and Harold were devoted to the sport. In eleventh-century England, local people were required to contribute to the hunt by building hunting lodges, providing spears, digging ditches, erecting fences and hedges, and acting as beaters. The frequent references to deer-hedges in eleventh-century charters suggest that the deer were driven or corralled into an enclosure, where archers would shoot at them. But as wild animals were declared property with no owner, anyone could hunt so long as he had a right to be on that land. William the Conqueror changed this, decreeing that the red deer, the fallow deer, and the roe deer belonged to him, so that anyone caught killing any deer anywhere was guilty of theft of the king’s property. William also designated large tracts of land, including commons, arable, heath, and moor, as royal forests, and these lands and their inhabitants were placed under “forest law,” ruled by the king personally. To protect the deer, all hunting was forbidden, and to that end, bows and arrows were forbidden within royal forests as well. All large dogs had to have their toes amputated, and deer grazing on crops could not be disturbed. The new laws caused hardship to the people who had depended hunting and trapping, and the barons and bishops resented the second-rate hunting land that was left to them. In this way, hunting was transformed into a contentious and politicized issue at all levels of English society.

Stephen Matthews examines the topic of “William the Conqueror and Chester—The Making of a Myth: William the Conqueror’s Assault on Cheshire in 1070,” *Journal of the Chester Archaeological Society* 80 (2008 for 2005): 175–91. It is often unquestioned that William the Conqueror ravaged Cheshire, destroyed the fortresses of Macclesfield and Stockport, and severely damaged Chester itself. Nonetheless, a review of the contemporary and near-contemporary evidence shows that this is very unlikely to have happened. The D text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* does not refer to it, and Orderic Vitalis’s twelfth-century description of William’s expedition against the Welsh and the men of Chester says simply that he brought his army safely to Chester and suppressed all risings throughout Mercia with royal power. It is only the Evesham chronicler who includes

Cheshire in his list of counties to which William laid waste, thus giving rise to a terrible famine. Symeon of Durham also mentions the Norman plundering and the resulting famine but gives no details. The Cheshire *Domesday* contains many entries about properties classified as *wasta* (literally “waste”), and these have formed the basis for the belief in William’s savage treatment of the county, but the thirteenth-century chronicles of Chester (the *Polychronicon* of Ranulf of Higden and the *Annales Cestriae*) say nothing about Cheshire’s destruction. Edward Freeman, in his *History of the Norman Conquest of England* (1867-1879), is the first to claim that William applied to Cheshire “the same stern remedy” that he had applied north of the Humber: “A fearful harrying fell on city and shire and on the lands round about” (182). In 1943, Stenton followed and developed Freeman’s account. His claim of systematic wasting on the part of William was widely accepted, and Matthew suggests that historical geographers and historians, influenced by Stenton, used *Domesday* to prove what they thought to be true rather than checking their assumptions. Matthews points out that *wasta* areas are recorded throughout Cheshire in 1066 as well as in 1086, so the term cannot mean “laid waste” in every case. Indeed, the author of the *Domesday* chapter of in the Staffordshire Victoria County History specifically discounted any devastation in that county, alluding merely to its general poverty. Matthews finds it difficult to believe that William’s ravaging army in Cheshire suddenly ceased its destruction once it crossed to the next county, and he concludes that there is no evidence that ravaging took place there. The myth that it did is a modern one, adopted and expanded according to the writers’ views of William and the Conquest.

H. Blurton’s “Reliquia: Writing Relics in Anglo-Norman Durham,” *Cultural Diversity in the British Middle Ages: Archipelago, Island, England*, 39-56, is a discussion of the form, meaning, and purpose of the poem “Durham,” a work perhaps composed ca. 1104 for the translation of St. Cuthbert’s relics into Durham Cathedral. The poem itself is only twenty-one lines long, and it describes the topographical position of Durham and the relics stored there; it has been of interest to scholars because it stands at the juncture between Old and Middle English. In a discussion of the poem’s form, Blurton suggests that “Durham” is really a riddle (rather than an *encomium urbis*), and here she proposes that the use of the Latin word *reliquia* (“relics”) points to the solution of the riddle: a reliquary. In the late eleventh and early twelfth century, Durham became the center for an explosion of historiographical material. The variety of texts produced went somewhat towards shaping

a history of the community’s past in the face of deeply uncertain political events. Blurton situates “Durham” within this large historiographical output and demonstrates the interest of the poem as part of a program whereby the monks sought to legitimate their position in the new Cathedral and guard Cuthbert’s relics.

Judith Green’s “Kingship, Lordship, and Community in Eleventh-Century England,” *Anglo-Norman Studies* 31: 1-16, was originally delivered as the annual Allen Brown Lecture. As the title suggests, Green examines how power was conceived and how it operated in eleventh-century England. She offers an overview that demonstrates that, despite concepts of an English state, power remained “multifaceted, locally varied, exercised through differing channels, and through the medium of different discourses. Identities and communities were constructed and shifting. Relationships between the centre and the localities changed over time” (16). Holders of local power might meet at public assemblies such as shire courts, ecclesiastical ceremonies, and wedding feasts, and the number of these members of the lesser aristocracy increased as the larger units of lordship broke up and smaller units were created. Towns (not just London) became centers of power, and above all, there continued to be major differences between the North and South.

W. Raymond Powell provides a top-down review of land ownership in Essex after the Norman Conquest in the somewhat misleadingly titled “The Norman Government of Essex 1066-1154,” *Essex Archaeology and History* 36 (2005): 110-17. Although William only seems to have visited Essex in 1067, he took significant measures to ensure control over this large county, whose long coastline made it vulnerable to invasion. By 1086, the Saxon lords there had been replaced by Normans, including William himself, who took over thirty manors that had been held by King Harold. William’s half-brother Bishop Odo held forty-five manors, and Count Eustace of Boulogne held some eighty manors. Other Norman barons with grants in Essex include Count Alan of Brittany and Eudes *dapifer* (steward). Powell then turns to the Norman sheriffs of Essex (Robert Fitz Wimarc, Robert’s son Suen, Ralph Baynard, and Peter de Valognes), a few tenants-in-chief who were not great barons, a few under-tenants, and ecclesiastical landowners (bishops and monasteries already holding lands in 1066 were usually allowed to keep them). According to *Domesday*, Essex’s Norman aristocracy controlled a population of some 14,000 rural families, plus 600 burgesses in Colchester and Maldon. Powell touches on some Essex events during the reign of William I, such as the unlawful seizure of land (by three

sheriffs, among others) and treason (by Count Eustace and Bishop Odo). Powell further argues that Essex was subject to the devastation of coastal areas ordered by William to prevent their resources falling into the hands of the Danes, who were threatening invasion in 1085. This may have been the cause of the population decrease that *Domesday* records for the eastern and southern areas of the county.

Simon Meecham-Jones's "Where was Wales? The Erasure of Wales in Medieval English Culture," *Authority and Subjugation in Writing of Medieval Wales*, ed. Ruth Kennedy and Simon Meecham-Jones (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), 27-55, explores the significant silence that medieval English authors generally maintained with regard to Welsh topics. The focus is therefore on the post-Conquest period, but a few references are made to the Anglo-Saxon era. For example, later kings of England were conscious that the *de facto* control over areas of Wales exercised perhaps during the reign of Alfred and certainly during the reign of Æthelstan did not give them *de jure* authority. Elsewhere in the essay, the possibility is raised that OE *wealh* did not designate foreigners in general but rather people who had been Romanized. Finally, the speed of the Norman Conquest of England is contrasted with the centuries it took the Normans to subjugate Wales, and William is contrasted with his Angevin successors; whereas William could claim to embrace the law of Edward the Confessor, thereby implying that foreign conquest should not be resisted because it had not changed English custom, the twelfth- and thirteenth-century kings were unable to assert any kind of continuity. Instead, they had to claim that the defeats of the Welsh necessarily made Wales a feudal possession of England. Meecham-Jones suggests that the words "rebels" and "disloyal" should always be placed in quotation marks in discussions of medieval Wales to signal that the "rebels" did not believe themselves to be such or to owe any allegiance to a foreign crown. Anglo-Saxonists could also consider the degree to which the language of their scholarship is complicit in the perpetuation of a colonialist discourse.

[SA] reviewed Brink, Burghart and Wareham, Field, Fraesdorff, Gade, Gautier, Oosthuizen, Pelteret, Staab, Stanley; KP reviewed Abels "Cultural Representation," Álvarez López, Barrow, Howard, Keynes "Re-Reading," Murillo López, Salvador-Bello; AR reviewed Baxter, Biggs, Breeze, Campbell, Crick, Jayakumar "Eadwig," Keynes "Edgar," Keynes "A Conspectus," Lewis, Oliver, Rankin, Reynolds, Rumble, Scheck, Sexton, Stafford, Wells, Yorke, "The Women"; EAR reviewed Alamichel,

Ardrey, Bailey, Billington, Bitel, Blair, Brown, Church, Craughwell, Crawford, Dempsey "Tempore," Dempsey "Aldhelm," Evans, Giandrea, Griffin, Hammond, Harvey Wood, Henshall, Hillaby, Innes, James, Jayakumar "Foundlings," Jezierski, Jones and Page, Kemble, Lumley Prior, Maney, Marten, Mathews, Meecham-Jones, Meier, Nelson, Powell, Raiswell and Dendle, Roberts, Valtonen, Weston, Williams, Wood "Monasteries," Wood *Proprietary*, Yorke "Anglo-Saxon"; DW reviewed Abels "Paying," Blurton, Fletcher, Goffart, Green, Hooke, McIlwain, Meens, Pearson, Rosenthal, Tinti, Townsend, Wood "Some Historical".]

Not Seen

- Brown, George Hardin. "Bede's Commentary on I Samuel." *Biblical Studies in the Early Middle Ages: Proceedings of the Conference on Biblical Studies in the Early Middle Ages, Università degli Studi di Milano Società Internazionale per lo Studio del Medioevo Latino, Gargnano on Lake Garda, 24-27 June 2001*. Eds. Claudio Leonardi and Giovanni Orlandi. *Millennio Medievale* 52. Florence: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2005. pp. 77-90.
- Crawford, B. E. *The Churches Dedicated to St. Clement in Medieval England: A Hagio-Geography of the Seafarer's Saint in 11th Century North Europe*. St. Petersburg: Axioma, 2008. xii, 237 pp. ill. + maps.
- da Graca, Laura. "Reflexiones metodológicas sobre el estudio comparativo de Chris Wickham." *Edad Media* 9 (2008), 265-97.
- Dargie, Richard. *Invaders and Settlers: 450-1066. A History of Britain*. London: Franklin Watts, 2008. 32 pp. ill.
- Dendle, Peter and Alain Touwaide, eds. *Health and Healing from the Medieval Garden*. Woodbridge and Rochester, NY: Boydell, 2008. xiii, 256 pp. ill.
- Dunning, R. W., ed. *The Victoria History of the Counties of England: A History of Somerset, Volume IX, Glastonbury and Street*. London: Boydell and Brewer for the Institute of Historical Research, 2006.
- Grimmer, Martin. "Invasion, Settlement or Political Conquest: Changing Representations of the Arrival of the Anglo-Saxons in Britain." *Jnl of the Australian Early Medieval Association* 3 (2007), 169-86.
- Hamilton, Janice. *The Norman Conquest of England. Pivotal Moments in History*. Minneapolis: Twenty-First Century Books, 2008. 160 pp. ill. + maps.
- Higgins, David H. *The Bristol Region in the Sub-Roman and Early Anglo-Saxon Periods*. Local History Pamphlets 118. Bristol: Bristol Branch of the Historical Association, 2006. 52 pp. ill + maps.

- Higham, N. J. *A Frontier Landscape: The North West in the Middle Ages*. Macclesfield: Windgather P, 2004. xii, 273 pp. ill. + maps.
- Higham, Robert. *Making Anglo-Saxon Devon: Emergence of Shire*. Exeter: Mint P, 2008. xxvi, 306 pp. ill.
- Keene, Katie. "Margaret of Scotland and Monastic Traditions in the Eleventh Century." *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU* 14 (2008), 65-80.
- Kleist, Aaron J. *Striving with Grace: Views of Free Will in Anglo-Saxon England*. Toronto Old English Series 20. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 2008.
- Kölzer, Theo. "Bonifatius und Fulda: rechtliche, diplomatische und kulturelle Aspekte." *Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte* 57 (2005), 25-53.
- Krüger, Kristina, Rolf Toman with a contribution from Rainer Warland and photographs by Achim Bednorz. *Monasteries and Monastic Orders: 2000 Years of Christian Art and Culture*. Königswinter: H. F. Ullmann, 2008. 431 pp. ill.
- Lapidge, Michael, ed. *Storia della Inglese = Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*. Scrittori greci e latini. Rome: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 2008. clxxxvi, 400 pp.
- McCarthy, Conor. *Marriage in Medieval England: Law, Literature and Practice*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004. [vii], 185 pp.: Neil Cartlidge, *MÆ* 77 (2008), 361-62.
- McLeod, Shane. "Client Kings and New Boundaries: The Establishment of the Ninth-century Viking Kingdoms in England." *Jnl of the Australian Early Medieval Association* 3 (2007), 187-205.
- Pauli, Reinhold and Benjamin Thorpe, eds. *The Life of Alfred the Great*. Kessinger Publishing Rare Reprints. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger, 2008. ix, 582 pp. [reprint]
- Plassmann, Alheydis. *Origo Gentis: Identitäts- und Legitimitätsstiftung in früh- und hochmittelalterlichen Herkunftserzählungen*. *Orbis mediaevalis* 7. Berlin: Akademie, 2006. 458 pp.
- Rex, Peter. *Hereward, the Last Englishman*. Stroud: Tempus, 2005. 223 pp. ill.
- Rivinius, Karl Josef. "Rückblickende auf das Bonifatius-Jahr: Arnold Janssen und die 'Wiedervereinigung der getrennten Christen.'" *Verbum SVD* 46 (2005), 303-16.
- Roebuck, Derek. *Early English Arbitration*. Oxford: Holo Books and Arbitration P, 2008. xiii, 312 pp. ill. + maps.*
- Sansterre, Jean-Marie. "Les moines d'Occident et le monachisme d'Orient du Vie au Xie siècle: entre textes anciens et réalités contemporaines." *Settimane di studio della fondazione Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* 51 (2004), 289-335.
- Sayers, William. "King Alfred's Timbers." *SELIM* 15 (2008), 117-25.
- Schwarz, Jörg. *Das europäische Mittelalter II: Herrschaftsbildungen und Reiche 900-1500*. Grundkurs Geschichte. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2006. 236 pp. ill.
- Walsh, Christine and Mícheál Ó hAodha. *Postcolonial Borderlands: Orality and Irish Traveller Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, 2008.

Dissertations

- Clay "Landscapes of Conversion"; Gates "The Rhetorical Construction of Kingship".

8. Names

Several books in this year's bibliography will be of interest to name scholars. Andrew D. Mills's *A Dictionary of British Place-Names* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003) is a revised and expanded version of his earlier *Dictionary of English Place-Names*, but it also includes new entries compiled by Adrian Room from Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, as well as entries from the islands. His Select Bibliography at the end of the dictionary identifies the major recent name studies consulted in his revising process.

Anglo-Saxon Mint Names I: Axbridge-Hythe (Nottingham: English Place-Name Society, 2007) by Jayne Carroll and David M. Parsons is the first of three volumes of a gazetteer of the minting towns of pre-Conquest England. It begins with a clear history of Anglo-Saxon minting

from around 600 to the Norman Conquest. This volume presents the names of minting towns arranged alphabetically, a history of each town, minting activities and a listing of mint-signed issues, a survey of the forms of the place-names from both coins and other records, and an analysis of these name-forms. The analyses reflect a thorough knowledge of sound changes in the various Old English dialects as they explain spelling changes and alternate spellings on the coins.

The Place-Names of Fife Volume 1: West Fife between Leven and Forth (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2006) by Simon Taylor with Gilbert Márkus is the first of a four-volume work on the place-names of the Scottish county of Fife modeled partly on the EPNS county volumes and partly on the Place-Names of Northern Ireland

series. The place-names are primarily of Pictish, Gaelic, and Scots origins, but some are also from French, Norse, or Scottish Standard English. The names are arranged alphabetically within each parish, and the parishes are arranged alphabetically within the volume. Each place-name entry lists the current place-name and provides spatial information, lists the earlier forms of the place-name along with the source and date, analyzes the elements of source languages, and suggests the meanings of the place-names. The first volume has forty-seven maps showing the distribution of place-names within the parishes.

Language Contact in the Place-Names of Britain and Ireland, ed. Paul Cavill and George Broderick (Nottingham: English Place-Name Society), contains nine papers given at the International Conference on Language Contact in the Place-Names of Britain and Ireland held in Douglas, Isle of Man, 17–18 September 2004, five of which are reviewed below. The editors note “the place-names of Britain and Ireland serve as a prime example of the influence external factors can have in the course of time on indigenous languages.”

Other books in this year's bibliography are not as clearly targeted at a name-scholar audience. In *Beavers in Britain's Past* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2006), Bryony Coles, a wetland archaeologist, traces the presence and activities of beavers in England from 13,500 B.C. to their extinction in the wild in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century of this era. The entire book is reviewed in section 9. Of some interest to name scholars, however, is Chapter ten: “Beaver Place-Names.” Here, she identifies beaver place-names from OE *beofer* and ON *bjorr* as well as some possible Welsh beaver-names from *afanc* ‘beaver, water monster’ rather than from the Welsh *befyr* or lost *hyndan* ‘broad tail’ as might have been expected.

In *Understanding Leicestershire and Rutland Place-Names* (Loughborough: Heart of Albion, 2003), Jill Bourne popularizes the results of scholars such as Margaret Gelling, Kenneth Cameron and Barrie Cox, whom she acknowledges, but she adds nothing to their scholarship. Moreover, she does not make the results of place-name studies accessible to the lay person, though the section on “Deserted Medieval Villages of Leicestershire and Rutland” is rather poignant.

James Kemble's *Essex Place-Names: Places, Streets and People* (London: Historical Publications, 2007) is targeted toward a general, rather than a scholarly audience. It is, however, a fun read and is illustrated by 115 photographs, paintings, and maps that reflect Kemble's background in archaeology and history as well as his interest in Essex place-names.

Anthony Poulton-Smith's *Derbyshire Place-Names* (Stroud: Sutton, 2005) is also aimed at a general audience and has many illustrative photographs, but it provides more onomastic information than Kemble's book. Poulton-Smith organizes all of the place-names that he discusses alphabetically without sub-categorizing them but provides up-to-date analyses of the names.

In his “Names” chapter from *A History of the English Language*, ed. Richard Hogg and David Denison (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006), 312–51, Richard Coates provides an excellent framework for the theory behind name studies as well as for understanding personal names, surnames, and place-names from Anglo-Saxon England to the present. It is very thorough and makes the text much better than more traditional history of the language texts that spend little time on names. Coates's conclusion identifies further sources of current information on name-studies and even includes the “annual report on English onomastics in *The Year's Work in English Studies*.”

In “Microdialectological Investigations in the English South-East,” *Locus Focus: Forum of the Sussex Place-Names Net 7* (2003-2007): 62–80, Richard Coates shows that onomastic evidence provides reliable data for dialectologists to draw precise isoglosses for narrowly defined time periods by bypassing the normalizing tendency that shows up in sources, such as literary, official, and liturgical documents, and the problem of precision in early texts which were usually written in scriptoria and followed a learned tradition in which texts were to be copied as previously written without regard to dialectal differences that might occur in the area where the scriptoria were located. Among several examples discussed by Coates to illustrate his point is the appearance of the Old English weak genitive singular */an/* as */i/* in the place-names of an area about seven miles by eight miles centered around Bodiam, such as *Bodiam*, *Udimore*, and *Udiam*, which date from the Old English period.

In “Reflections on Some Major Lincolnshire Place-Names Part 1: Algarkirk to Melton Ross,” *JEPNS* 40: 35–96, Richard Coates provides commentaries on the place-names in Cameron's six-volume *The Place-Names of Lincolnshire*, his *A Dictionary of Lincolnshire Place-Names* and his 1996 *Nomina* article as well as on a few other Lincolnshire major names. Coates presents the names discussed in alphabetical order and includes some names for coastal and maritime features such as *Buncom*, a shoal off Cleethorpes, which he derives from OE *burg-cyme* ‘arrival at the town’ or OE *burg-cuma* ‘arrives at the town’ because it is “the last shoal on the larboard side of a ship entering the port of Grimsby.”

In “Correction to *The Place-Names of Gloucestershire*, Vol. 3 (EPNS Survey Vol. 40)” *JEPNS* 40: 129–130, Coates notes that Shirehampton, Gloucestershire was always a detached tithing of Westbury-on-Trym parish in Hembury hundred, but it is considered part of Hembury parish in the third volume of *The Place-Names of Gloucestershire*. He then lists all of the names including field-names with page numbers that should be discussed under Westbury-on-Trym instead of under Hembury parish.

Several articles this year deal with more than one specific place-name. In “Some Scottish Names, Including *Vacomagi*, *Boresti*, *Iudanbyrig*, *Aberlessic*, and *Dubuice*,” *Scottish Language* 26 (2007): 79–95, Andrew Breeze proposes an emendation of Ptolemy’s *Ouakomagoi* or *Vacomagi* to *Vocomiugi* ‘those strongly bounded together’ or ‘firm comrades, loyal allies’ referring to a Celtic people in the Scottish highlands who fought valiantly against the Romans. He also emends Tacitus’s *Boresti* to *Roresti* ‘hastening ones, eager ones, impetuous ones, those running forward (in battle)’ a Celtic people who lived around the lower Spey and Findhorn. Breeze also identifies the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (D text) reference to *Iudanbyrig* where Wulfstan was imprisoned by King Eadred as Bede’s *urbs Giudi* which would translate into Irish **Duniudan* and says that such a Gaelic name could then be translated into *Iudanbyrig*, now probably Stirling. He agrees with Jackson’s identification of *Aberlessic* in the twelfth-century fragment of the *Life of St. Kentigern* as the mouth of the North Tyne but suggests that the name means ‘rotten river-mouth’. Breeze identifies the names *Luchaire* and *Debuice* in a twelfth-century grant recorded in the ninth-century book of Deer as river names meaning ‘foal’ (perhaps a small and lively river) and “Black Ugie” with “Ugie” meaning ‘sighing, groaning one, river making a mournful sound’ respectively. He is not sure which stream near Deer was *Luchaire*, but he is inclined to think that South Ugie Water is the “Black Ugie” from the twelfth century.

In “*Egardesie* and *Millincke*,” *Locus Focus: Forum of the Sussex Place-Names Net* 7 (2003-2007): 54–56, Pamela Combes deduces that two lost place-names in Barcombe and Ringmere, *Egardesie*, the name of a mill associated with an island, and *Millincke*, a mill associated with a lynchet, are in the area of modern Barcombe Mills. The final element of *Egardesie* comes from OE *ēg* ‘an island or well-watered land’ with the first element from the genitive of a personal name from OE *Ēad-*, *Ecg-*, *Hyge-*, *Eard-*, *Earn-*, or *Ēan-*. Its location was described in a grant as “in the place which is across the mill of Millinke.” *Millincke* is associated

with a place on the opposite bank of the Iron River in Barcombe.

In “Upton, Thurgarton Wapentake, Nottinghamshire,” *JEPNS* 40:23–33, Jean Cameron, Paul Cavill, and Richard Jones identify the place-names, including field-names, in the village of Upton in Nottinghamshire that is two and a half miles east of Southwell and was part of a large Anglo-Saxon estate whose center was Southwell in the late Old English period. Since *The Place-Names of Nottinghamshire* does not include field-names, these field-names may be of interest to scholars, included several with the place-name element *wong* from ON *vangr* ‘a field, a garden’ like *Farinely Wong* or *Trinity Wong* as well as those with the more common Old English place-name elements.

In “Seven Wells,” *JEPNS* 39 (2007): 7–44, Keith Briggs identifies sixty-six English place-names referring to “seven wells,” as well as references to four names in Old English charters: *Seofenwyllas* in a charter of Æthelbald, (*on*) *syfan wyllas* in a charter of Athelstan, *seuen willes þry* in a charter of Eadred, and *seofan wyl-lan broc* in a charter of Æthelred. Briggs shows that the “seven wells”-names tend to be concentrated in the limestone country from Somerset to the midlands. He also shows that such names occur in French, German, and Italian and were connected to springs associated with pagan superstitions. While the Church tried initially to suppress these superstitions, it later adopted the names with Christian interpretations, and several monastic orders, including the Cistercians, started using “seven wells” in the names of their monasteries.

In “Notes and Corrigenda,” *JEPNS* 40:119–120, Keith Briggs gives connections and additions to his article reviewed directly above. The most significant include accepting Brian Rirh’s suggestion that a more likely site for the Derbyshire *Seuwelledale* is not Parwich but a site about five hundred meters north of Aldwark and adding a fifth example of “seven wells” in an Old English charter bounds of King Edgar in 961 for land in Somerset.

In “Latin *Rumen* ‘Gullet’ and the Name of Romney,” *Archaeologia Cantiana* 128: 368–70, Andrew Breeze derives the name Romney in New Romney and Old Romney in Kent from Latin *rumen* ‘gullet’ and OE *ēa* ‘river’ and suggests that the name was used by sailors from the time of Roman Britain to refer to a safe harbor in the shape of a broad harbor which opened from a narrows which resembled the stomach in the gullet of a cow or other ruminant animal.

In “The Name of Shirehampton,” *Shire on the Web* (online at [http://www.shire.org.uk/index.php?page=name of shirehampton](http://www.shire.org.uk/index.php?page=name%20of%20shirehampton)), Richard Coates suggests

that the first element in Shirehampton derives from OE *scearn* 'dung' or OE *scearnig* 'dungy' but was changed to *shire* 'county' in the sixteenth century to avoid negative connotations. However, the word *dungy* may have implied 'rich and fertile' in addition to 'manure'.

In "Freemantle," *JEPNS* 40: 97–111, Keith Briggs rejects Ekwall's etymology for the several places in Hampshire, as well as one in Leicester and one in Cornwall, with the name *Freemantle* as 'cold cloak' and purposes a derivation from the French *fromental* 'wheat-field' from Latin *frumentum* 'wheat'. He suggests that the borrowed term was not understood at all in England and was re-interpreted as 'cold cloak' by folk etymology from about 1100.

In "In Search of Caldeburgh," *Locus Focus: Forum of the Sussex Place-Names Net* 7 (2003-2007): 43–46, Christopher Whittick, Mark Gardiner, and Richard Coates suggest that Caldeburgh cited in a survey of the estates of Battle Abbey in 1433 "lies largely in the area of the Diplocks Farm estate and may well be covered with the houses of suburban Hailsham."

Paul Cullen, in "There Have Always Been Starkaðrs at Cold Comfort": A Note on *Sindles Farm* and other Sussex Names," *Locus Focus*: 59–61, identifies the possible underlying surname Sandolf from the personal name ON *Sandúlfr* as the source for *Sindles* in *Sindles Farm* in Sussex and posits another Old Norse surname **Starkúlfr* from a Gmc **starku-* 'strong, rigid' as the possible source of a fifteenth century field-name *Starkwulf* in Alciston.

In "The Domesday Book Castle *LVVRE*," *JEPNS* 40: 113–18, Keith Briggs rejects the etymology of the Domesday Book name for a castle in Maesbury (currently Oswestry in Shropshire) identified as *LVVRE* as being from *l'oeuvre* 'the work'. The name is one of the few French names recorded in the Domesday Book. Briggs, however, inconclusively suggests three different alternative French sources.

In "Coming Back to Dingsmere," *Language Contact in the Place-Names of Britain and Ireland*, eds. Paul Cavill and George Broderick (Nottingham: EPNS), 27–41, Paul Cavill argues that the *ding* of *dingsmere* in *Brunanburh* refers to the *þing* of Kingwall and *dingsmere* derives from a "hybrid Norse-OE *þings-mere* 'wetland by the thing'."

In "Stour in Ismere," *Myth, Rulership, Church and Charters: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks* [see sec. 2], 83–87, Margaret Gelling tentatively identifies the *Stour* in the phrase *æt Sture in Ismerum* from a charter from around 736 granted by King Æthelbald of Mercia to Cyneberht for the construction of a monastery in what later became Worcestershire as Kidderminster

and suggests the place was probably known as Stour and was an important land-unit along the River Stour.

In the same volume, Barbara E. Crawford, in "The Saint Clement Dedications at Clementhorpe and Pontefract Castle: Anglo-Scandinavian or Norman?" 189–210, explores the dedication of the two northernmost churches dedicated to St. Clement shortly before or shortly after the Norman Conquest in southern Northumbria. She concludes that *Clementhorpe* is Anglo-Scandinavian and was so named because St. Clement, who was martyred by drowning, was often adopted as a patron saint by Danes (as well as Anglo-Saxons) whose lives were in danger from the sea because they were sailors, fisherman, or merchants. On the other hand, she concludes that the castle chapel at *Pontefract* was dedicated to St. Clement during the early Norman period although it may be on the site of an earlier Anglo-Saxon church. She speculates that the dedication to St. Clement might have been chosen by William the Conqueror or by the person he left in charge in recognition of the safe passage across the River Aire in 1069 after three weeks of delay of William's forces as they traveled north to put down the rebellion in York, which was aided by a Danish fleet sent by King Svein Estrithsson.

Six essays in *A Commodity of Good Names: Essays in Honour of Margaret Gelling*, ed. O.J. Padel and David N. Parsons (Donington: Shaun Tyas) also deal with individual place-names. In "Dimmingsdale," 350–351, Barrie Cox suggests that the topographical name *Dimmingsdale* in Leicestershire and other north-east midland counties derives its first element from ME *dimming* 'the action of growing dim' which refers to "the valley which darkens quickly, the valley which rapidly fills with shadow," referring to narrow valleys with high ridges on the western sides which cause the valleys to grow dark quickly when the sun sets. In "Freeford (Staffordshire)," 377–381, Carole Hough shows that a reasonable interpretation of OE *frēo* is 'free from service' in the place-name *Freeford* rather than 'free from tolls' since tolls were not usually charged at fords, but crossing-places like bridges were "subject to service" i.e., their upkeep was the responsibility of owners or communities. She concludes that *Freeford* may refer to a ford without such an obligation imposed upon an owner. In "Vagniacis and Winfield," 95–100, Paul Cullen argues that Springhead is indeed the *Vagniacis* mentioned in the Antonine Itinerary and that the first element in *Winfield Bank* just east of Springhead derives from British **wāgniako* 'marshy place', the source of *Vagniacis*. In "Sitting Above the Salt: The Origins of the Borough of Droitwich," 3–27, Steven

Bassett points out *Droitwich*'s atypicality as a borough in that, unlike other boroughs in 1086, it did not have defenses, one major church at its center, and a planned layout. These details provide further evidence of its age as a major industrial and commercial center of salt production from before and during the Roman occupation. He says it shows additional evidence of OE *wīc* developing the narrowed meaning of "settlement with a specialized production and commercial purpose." In "Freystrop: A Sacral Scandinavian Place-Name in Wales?" 133–146, Peder Gammeltoft argues that *Freystrop* in Pembrokeshire contains the pre-Christian deity name ON *Freyr*/ODan *Fró* to suggest that onomasts consider the possibility that *thorp*-names in Scandinavia may contain the pre-Christian deity names ON *Freyr*/ODan *Fró*, ON *Týr*/ODan *Tī*, or ON *Þórr*/ODan *Thör*. He presents a list of seventeen such names in Denmark and concludes that at least three of them (*Tastrup*, *Torstrup*, and *Tostrup*) can reasonably be assumed to contain *Thor* and others may as well. He is less certain about either of the cases of *Fróstrup* deriving from *Fró*. The instances of *Tirstrup*, *Tistrup*, and *Testrup*, however, are better explained as reflecting ODan *Tī* than an alleged and unattested **Tistēn* personal name. In "The Name of Magonasæte," 101–116, John Freeman revisits the Herefordshire names discussed earlier by Margaret Gelling: *Maund*, the generic of several settlements north-east of Hereford, *Magnis*, a Romano-British town north-west of Hereford, and the folk-name *Magonasæte*, a pre-Conquest group of people in Anglo-Saxon Herefordshire in which *sæte* 'settlers, dwellers' is a commonly used second element so that the name means 'dwellers in the region of **Magon* (Maund)'. It is with the first element, however, that Freeman is concerned. He hypothesizes that British **magos* 'plain' and the Indo-European suffix *-on* are the source of both *Maund* and the first element of *Magonasæte*. He even speculates that *Magnis* might be a scribal error or the Latinization of a Romano-British form like **Magonis* meaning '(at) the plains.'

Several articles this year focus on specific place-name elements. Judie English, in "Worths in a Landscape Context," *Landscape History* 24: 44–51, suggests that Old English place-name element *worth* initially may have indicated early enclosures held in severalty because the majority of the names in Berkshire, Hampshire, Surrey, and Sussex counties with *worth* are complex and associated with personal names. In addition, there is a positive correlation between proximity to rivers and *worth*-names in three of the counties: Berkshire, Surrey, and Sussex. In "The Significance of Old English *Burh* in Anglo-Saxon

England," *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 15: 240–253, Simon Draper uses archaeological and topographical evidence to argue that OE *burh* was not used just to identify fortified sites such as fortresses, monasteries, or towns but also to identify any sites that were "ditched, fenced, hedged, or even walled" including royal and aristocratic residences. In "Das altenglische Toponym *ce(a)stel*, *cistel* 'Steinhaufe, Erdwall, Ruine,'" *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 43: 1–12, Klaus Dietz shows that the Old English place name element *ce(a)stel*, *cistel* 'heap of stones, earthwork, ruin' as in *stancestil* or *stan cistele* comes from Latin *castellum* and is not related to OE *cist* 'troop' or ON *kǫstr* 'pile'. In "Old English *wīc* and *walh*: Britons and Saxons in Post-roman Wiltshire," *Landscape History* 24: 29–43, Simon Draper concludes that the number of *wīc* and *walh* place-names in Wiltshire (listed and discussed in appendices at the end of the article) that are connected to Romano-British archaeological sites argues for the continuing strength of British communities in the fifth and sixth centuries after the collapse of Roman rule there; the Anglo-Saxons gradually moved into the area and did not conquer western Wiltshire until the seventh century. In "Fornengelska *meresteal* och forsvenska **marstall*: En nordvästgermansk sammansättning?" *Ortnamnssällskapet i Uppsala Årsskift*: 37–42, Staffan Fridell posits the existence of a Northwest Germanic compound **maristallaz* meaning 'a place where a pool is liable to form in wet seasons' as the source for OE *meresteall* and a large, low-lying meadow called *Marstallen* in the province of Uppland in Sweden. Heather Warne, in "Tar," *Locus Focus* 7: 81–83, first suggests that *Tar* in the field name *Tarr Brooke* in West Sussex might come from the same source as *carr*, which often refers to the edges of a marsh where tree cover such as alder and willow may grow. She observes that alder carr in Cambridgeshire grows in "what looks like thick black soup" and wonders if the color of the ground was thought to resemble tar. Later, she adds that the place-name element may come from Latin *terra* or Anglo-Norman *terre* 'land' and refer to firm land in flood-prone river valleys. In "Four possible *nemeton* Place-Names in the British and Bath Area," *Landscape History* 27: 17–30, Richard Dunn tentatively proposes that the Celtic place-name element *nemet* or *nemeton* 'sacred place' rather than OE *emnet* 'flat ground' is the etymon for *Nempnett* in Nempnett Thrubwell parish south-west of Bristol, seven fields named *Nimblett* or with *Nimblett* in their names by Burledge Hill Fort, a field named *Nemlet* in the parish of Weston near Bath, and *Nimlet Down* in the parish of Cold Ashton north of

Bath. All of the sites "occupy spurs of plateau land with steeply sloping sides on three sides and far-reaching views." This hypothesis is predicated on the assumption that natural places might have been considered sacred because of their topography.

Eight essays in *A Commodity of Good Names: Essays in Honour of Margaret Gelling* [see sec. 2] also focus on specific place-name elements. In "Early Medieval Woodland and the Place-Name Term *lēah*," 365–76, Della Hooke argues that the term *lēah* was used in place-names initially to refer to areas of open woodland that were more of a wood-pasture than a clearing and were accessible to livestock, usually on a seasonal basis. In "Weg: A Waggoner's Warning," 345–49, Ann Cole uses a suggestion by Gelling concerning the name Farway, Devon, which had been derived from OE **fær-weg* 'passage road', that another term OE *fær* 'fear' might be appropriate. Cole examines the gradients of roads incorporating the elements *weg*, *stræt*, and *pæð* to conclude that most of the *weg*-names were much steeper than the *stræt*-names and usually steeper than the *pæð*-names. She concludes that *weg*-names like *Farway* often indicated that the routes were dangerous for wagons and carts because of the steepness of these roads. Therefore, *fær* 'fear' might well be the source of the first element in *Farway*, the village, from the name of the road which was actually a warning. In "Old English *fæsten*," 333–44, John Baker argues that the traditional place-name element OE *fæsten*, which is generally taken to mean 'place to resist attack or intrusion' or 'place which can be shut fast, enclosure' as in *Brinfast* in Sussex and *Buckfast* in Devon, actually refers to naturally inaccessible or obscured places that might be suitable for a stronghold or a place where domestic animals could be corralled. Baker says that *fæsten* is not synonymous with OE *burh*, which designates genuinely fortified sites. In "Watching for Magpies in English Place-Names," 286–99, Diana Whaley writes, "Place-name references to magpies cannot at present be demonstrated before the Conquest ... but *pie* becomes quite common thereafter." She cites OE *higera* as possibly meaning 'magpie' and appearing in *Higrefeld* in 1086, but the *pie*-names do not appear until Middle English with *magpie* itself not appearing in place-names until the sixteenth century. In "Three New Elements in the Minor Toponymy of Western Lindsey, Lincolnshire," 259–269, Richard Coates identifies a series of names in Ace or Hase or Hayes which he suggests derives from a "hitherto-unrecognized place-name element Scand. **(h)ás* ... which is of significance in either geological or land-use terms." Examples in Western Lindsey include *Ace*

Field and *Hayes Wood*; such names are associated with soils derived from Kellaways sands, which are fertile when drained properly. He also mentions *Dinter Hill*, whose first element he derives from **dint* "of unknown origin and meaning but perhaps of geological significance." The third element discussed occurs in the field-name *Kerves* which may reflect *kerf* in the sense of a 'piece cut off' or a 'nitch'. In "Names and Landscapes in Medieval Nottinghamshire, with Particular Attention to Lindrick and Lime Woods," 395–409, Peter McClure examines the geomorphology in Nottinghamshire to show that most of eastern Nottinghamshire lies over Keuper Marl, whose heavy clay soils were suitable for ash trees and maples trees as shown by *Askhan* and *Maplebeck* respectively, but north Sherwood on the Magnesian Limestone west of the Bunts is where *Lindrick* and other place-name from OE *lind* 'lime tree', which grows well on soils derived from limestone, are found. McClure provides further examples to support Gelling's suggestion that OE *Lindric* meant 'a straight strip of raised ground growing with lime trees' by citing other place-names that support the idea of OE **ric* referring to a strip of ground that was raised and straight. In "The Distribution of *whin*, *gorse* and *furze* in English Place-Names," 253–58, Jean Cameron shows, with a clear map as well as a clear text, the frequent occurrence of *whin*-names from ON *hvin* in the north of England, of *gorse*-names from OE *gorst*, *gors* in the west midlands, and of *furze*-names from OE *fyrz* in the east midlands and the south. She suggests that exceptions to this pattern are late anomalies and that the pattern is reflective of existing dialect differences at the time of the Domesday Book. In "Fog on the Barrow-Downs?" 382–394, Peter Kitson suggests that Gelling and Cole are often wrong by identifying a place-name element narrowly. He thinks the more likely scenario is that the elements had broader meanings initially and the meaning narrowed over the course of time. For example, Kitson says OE *beorg* originally meant 'mountain' but narrowed to mean 'barrow, burial mound' or a hill with a certain shape in later place-names but should not be so narrowly construed for older place-names with that element.

Many essays this year concentrate on the influence of other languages on the place-names of the Old English era. Thomas Green, in "The British Kingdom of Lindsey," *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 56: 1–43, uses "linguistic, historical, literary, and archaeological evidence" to show that the seventh-century Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Lindsey derives its name from a post-Roman British territory centered around Lincoln in the fifth century, occupied by a people identified by

Late British **Lindēs*. Green cites the word *lynwyssaws* in *Y Gododdin* (which recounts the Battle of Cathaeth, ca. 570) which is usually translated as ‘blood-stained bodies’ as really meaning ‘Lindsey-men’, thus showing the presence of men from the British kingdom of Lindsey in the sixth century. Furthermore, the presence of the name *Cæbæd* in the genealogy of the Anglo-Saxon King Aldfrith of Lindsey suggests that the high-status Britons came into contact and likely intermarried with the leading Anglo-Saxon families, thus connecting the British and Anglo-Saxon kingdoms of Lindsey in the sixth century.

In “A Cumbric Diaspora?” *A Commodity of Good Names: Essays in Honour of Margaret Gelling* [see sec. 2], 187–203, Alan James uses place-name evidence to further Kenneth Jackson’s suggestion that the number of Brittonic place-names in Cumberland from **cair* ‘stockade village’ might reflect a migration of settlers from Strathclyde because of political conditions in the late ninth to mid-tenth centuries to suggest an even wider area of Cumbric resettlement. The place-name elements include: *Cumbre* and the personal name *Cumbra*, which is likely the source of Comberton near Cambridge; *Brettas* which may be the source of the Brettons in the West Riding of Yorkshire and in Derbyshire; **cair*-names in the Solway and Clyde basens; **trev*-names in the same area including those with the *ī(r)* definite article like Treales from **trev-īr-liss* ‘court-house farm’; and other elements. James envisions from the place-name evidence a “Cumbric diaspora: people traumatized by violence and fear, their traditional order shattered, seeking first safety, but as time went on, prosperity and new opportunity.”

In “Field-Names and Roman Sites in Sussex,” *Locus Focus* 7: 37–42, Paul Cullen cites field-names with Old English elements near the sites of Roman villas such as: *Old Bury* or *Pavement Field* from OE *eald* and *byrig*, the dative singular of OE *burg* ‘stronghold’ near the villa at Bignor; *Great Camp* and *Little Camp* from OE *camp*, borrowed from Latin *campus* ‘open land, field’, north of a bath-suite and other buildings at Pitlands Farm; *Dunstall* from OE **tūn-steall* ‘site of an enclosure or farm’ near a villa in Barcombe; *The Horse Wicks* from OE *wīc* ‘specialized farm’ from Latin *vicus*, which is northeast of the villa near Worthing Crematorium and Muntham Court in Findon; and *Work-Gate*, whose first element is probably OE (*ge-*)*weorc* ‘a work, fortification’, near the farmstead at Elsted, which is also near Bury Field.

In “Why Are There Not More Scandinavian Place-Names in Bedfordshire?” *Bedfordshire Family History Society Jnl* 16.4: 8–15, Gillian Fellows-Jensen explains

why place-names in eastern Bedfordshire that had been Danish territory show little Danish influence by citing charters from the time of King Æthelstan, indicating that the English kings were buying land from the Danes at the edge of the Danelaw in order to regain control over that land, perhaps for security reasons. Fellows-Jensen discusses the two Scandinavian names in Bedfordshire, *Tofte Manor* and *Holme*, as well as three hybrid names with Scandinavian specifics and English generics, and three other names that may have some connection to the Danes.

Duncan Probert, in “Towards a Reassessment of ‘Kingston’ Place-Names,” *JEPNS* 40: 7–22, notes that the etymology of *Kingston*-names may derive the first element from either OE *cyning(es)*- ‘king’, OE *cyne-royal*, or ON *konungr* and identifies sixty-one *Kingston*-type place-names, predominately south of the Humber. He argues that most of them were formed between the seventh and tenth centuries and that the term *cyninges-tūn* had some technical but not clearly understood legal function within the landscape organization, although not necessarily a central one. This conclusion is supported by the use of the phrase in the law-code of King Æthelberht of Kent from the late sixth or early seventh centuries and the law-code of King Alfred of Wessex in the late ninth century.

In “Grimston Revisited,” *A Commodity of Good Names: Essays in Honour of Margaret Gelling* [see sec. 2], 125–53, Gillian Fellows-Jensen, after reviewing all of the research on Grimston-hybrid names for nearly forty years, concludes that most of the Scandinavian names reflect analogical formations based on Grimston-hybrids that were of common occurrence in the Central Lowlands of Scotland, as well as in the areas of secondary Scandinavianization in the Danelaw, and the areas to the north and west of the Danelaw.

In “Scandinavians at Home and Abroad during the Viking Age and the Middle Ages: The Evidence of Place-Names,” *Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Onomastic Sciences: Uppsala 19–24 August 2004*, ed. Eva Brylla, Mats Wahlbert (Uppsala: Språk- och folkminnesinstitutet, 2005), 50–61, Svante Strandberg summarizes the place-name evidence of Scandinavian settlement from 800 to 1520 in the west including the British Isles and the east. While the paper provides a thorough overview, it does not add any new information.

An entire book, *Language Contact in the Place-Names of Britain and Ireland*, ed. Paul Cavill and George Broderick (Nottingham: EPNS) also focuses on the influence of other languages on place-names in the British Isles. In “Invisible Britons: The View

from Toponomastics," 43–55, Richard Coates argues from toponomastic evidence for the traditional view that the Britons were expelled, killed, or enslaved by the ancestors of the English in the fifth and sixth centuries, particularly in the south and east of England, although there were Brittonic-language enclaves in the area south of Sheffield, such as *Carburton* from a possible **Cair Britton* 'village of the Britons' and in Wiltshire such as *Chitterne* from the same source as modern Welsh *Coetre* 'wood-village/farm'. Coates reviews several of his and Andrew Breeze's essays suggesting Brittonic origin of place-names in England, but he also points out that Anglo-Saxons borrowed almost no Brittonic vocabulary in the first centuries of settlement, suggesting the relatively small number of Britons in the areas occupied by Anglo-Saxons.

In his chapter from the same volume, "Goedelic-Scandinavian Language Contact in the Place-Names of the Isle of Man," 1–26, George Broderick identifies twenty-three Scandinavian place-name elements that appear in the place-names on the Isle of Man and gives examples containing elements from each source, such as *Ballanayre* 'farm of/by the gravel bank' with *ayre* from Scandinavian *eyrr* 'an extent of gravel beach, bank'; and *Sandwick* 'sand creek' with *wick* from Scandinavian *vík* 'cove, bay, creek', not to be confused with *wick* from the Latin *vicus*. The Scandinavian period began in the ninth century and lasted until 1266 when Man was sold to the King of Scotland, although Old Norse continued to be spoken there for some time after that.

Gillian Fellows-Jensen's article from the same volume "Some Thoughts on English Influence on Names in Man," 97–110, summarizes the English influence on names on the Isle of Man, beginning with the English personal name *Blæcgmon* in runes on headstones at Maughold, which she suggests might be connected to the seventh-century control of Man by the English, beginning with Edwin of Northumbria, but more likely is from the eighth or early ninth century. Fellows-Jensen also cites the name *Hepin* in runes on another stone at Maughold from around 1000 as possibly coming from Viking-Age England and the large number of *bý*-names on Man resulting from migrating Danes from the Danelaw.

In another chapter from the same volume, "Describing Language Contact in Place-Names," 123–35, Berit Sandnes focuses on the types of hybrid names that occur in the place-names of Orkney reflecting the Old Norse and Scots contacts and the changing relationship between the two languages. Sandnes suggests that many hybrid names result from borrowed appellatives

such as *Peat Geo* < ON *gjá* 'ravine' or secondary names like *Loch of Skail* where the specifying element is a farm name of Old Norse origin. Sandnes then illustrates phonetic adaptations and morphological adaptations of various types.

In her contribution to the same volume, "From the 'banks-gæt' to the 'hill-grind': Norn and Scots in the Place-Names of Shetland," 165–83, Doreen Waugh points out that there are still traces of Norn in the "Insular Scots" dialect of Shetland, but that they are used with decreasing frequency except as they survive in place-names, such as Old Norse words for farms like *Breibister* from ON *bólstaðr* and *Hoversta* from ON *staþir*. She also points out that ON *grind* 'a gate' survives in *Grindabister* and Norn *gæt* from ON *gata* 'a thoroughfare, way, path or road' survives in several *banks-gæts*, which are "paths beside the edge of the sea in Shetland."

Two articles this year re-approach the issue of names ending in *-ingas*. In "*-ingas* and the mid-Seventh Century Diocese," *Nomina* 31: 67–87, Gavin Smith argues convincingly that "*-ingas* in English place-names refers not to a 'tribe' or 'kingly line', but to either 'congregation (of a minster Hundred)', or alternately 'royal (monastic) household'. He observes that there is only one *-ingas*-name per Hundred and suggests that the people who gave the places their names were ecclesiastics who founded minsters at the central royal holding in each of the Hundreds under their jurisdictions as bishops between the 620s and the 680s.

Thorsten Andersson, in "De germanska *-ingi-namen*," *Namn och Bygd* 94: 5–13, reconciles the traditional view of Old Norse scholars such as Carl Ivar Ståhles that place-names in *-inge* and *-unge* derive from Proto-Gmc **-ingōz*/**-ungōz* used to indicate families or groups of people in a certain area with Bent Jørgensen's suggestion that place-names in *-inge* and *-unge* were formed by adding *-ia* suffixes to existing place-names from nature and field names in *-ing* and *-ung* to form settlement names for such groups.

In "An Early Boundary of the Dioceses of Canterbury and Rochester," *A Commodity of Good Names: Essays in Honour of Margaret Gelling* [see sec. 2], 28–43, Nicholas Brooks suggests that the Old English boundary clause entered between 1035 and 1060 into the MacDurnan Gospels of the late ninth or early tenth century, and describing part of the boundary between the dioceses of Canterbury and Rochester, may assign part of the estate of Maidstone on the east bank of the Medway to the Diocese of Rochester. Or it may simply note that it was always the boundary but imply that some future archbishop might choose to cede this western

projection of the diocese of Canterbury to the diocese of Rochester. He bases his conclusion on these interpretations of three of the landmarks in the charter as follows: *sandhlinca* as the settlement of Sandling in Boxley, *ēa* as the Medway, and *wīc* as the northern “borgh” of Maidstone.

In her contribution to the same volume, “The Litigious Afterlife of an Anglo-Saxon Charter: Wyke Regis, Dorset,” 55–78, Joy Jenkyns discusses the legal wrangling that began in the thirteenth century and continued for centuries concerning the land covered in the Anglo-Saxon charter of *Wyke Regis*, supposedly from the tenth century, whereby King Æthelred granted to Atsere the land in question. The two extant versions of the grant are similar but not identical. Jenkyns says, however, that “The charter is spurious.” The names in the witness lists are incompatible and onomastic features in the charter suggest “post-twelfth century linguistic input.” More importantly, the name *Atsere* (Scandinavian *Aszor*) for the receiver of the grant would seem more appropriate for a grant during the reign of King Cnut rather than the reign of King Æthelred. Jenkyns proposes that the more likely time of the charter is around 1019. Nevertheless, the charter was used in the legal disputes into the seventeenth century.

S. E. Kelly’s chapter from the same volume, “An Early Minster at Eynsham, Oxfordshire,” 79–85, cites archaeological evidence, as well as evidence in charters, for the existence of a minster at Eynsham in the eighth century or later, which was the predecessor of the reformed Benedictine house of Ealdorman Æthelmær. Its existence is suggested by two seventh-century diplomas in the Bath cartulary, one of a grant to Abbess Beorngyth from around 671 and the other to a woman named Folchurh from 680. Kelly thinks that the 864 diploma of King Burgred disposes of land that was probably part of the earlier endowment of Eynsham minster.

In his article from the same volume, “Butter Place-Names and Transhumance,” 352–364, Harold Fox concludes that there were two periods of transhumance or “summering” of livestock on Dartmoor in Devonshire by citing place-names with Old English elements: *smearu*, *buture*, and *wīc*. These names come from the earlier stage when the owners of the livestock lived in Dartmoor with their animals and made butter on the spot at places like *Smearon Down*, *Butterberry*, and *Cowich*. Fox accepts the emendation of the OED definition of OE *smearu* to include ‘butter’ as has been suggested at various times by Smith, Ekwall, and Gelling, as well as Coates’s suggested meaning of OE *wīc* to

include ‘farm specializing in some products’ to arrive at these conclusions. The later phase of transhumance he calls the “guardianship phase,” in that there were paid guardians who supervised the animals instead of their owners doing it, and the animals did not include cows that could be milked but only “immature cattle and sheep and horses.”

Christopher Dyer’s chapter from the same volume “Place-names and Pottery,” 44–54, explains why there are thirty scattered place-names of villages and hamlets in England dating from the eleventh through the fourteenth centuries referring to the manufacture of pottery in contrast to the much smaller number of place-names reflecting other crafts or industries. The place-names incorporating *potter* or *crocker* were beginning to shift to rural areas by the time of the Domesday Book, and because potters gathered in groups in settlements that were often distant from each other, they attracted attention so that a name reflecting the presence of potters would be a generally recognized identifying characteristic in contrast to smiths, tailors, carpenters, or other craftsmen who were spread more thinly in villages and rural areas.

In “Essex Beacons and Look-Outs: A Multi-Period Place-Names Study,” *Essex Journal* 42: 11–15, James Kemble, by using place-names and other evidence, adds seventeen beacon sites in Essex to the twenty-six sites identified by F. Kitchen earlier, including *Great Gotham* mentioned in a tenth-century will and Domesday references to what are now *Ashingdon* and *Hockley*, but *Bacheneia* and *Plumberga* respectively in Domesday Book.

Carole Hough, in “Deer in Sussex Place-Names,” *Antiquaries Journal* 88: 43–47, cites a study by Sykes *et al.* showing the presence of fallow deer in the first century around a Roman palace at Fishbourne, Sussex and suggesting the presence of an animal park or *vivarium* there. Hough provides onomastic evidence to show that the species was present in England at the end of the Roman period with examples such as *East* and *West Broyle* from Latin *brolium* and the lost place-name *Polegrove*, possibly from OE **pocca* ‘fallow deer’ also in Sussex.

In “The Place-Name Evidence for Water Transport in Early Medieval England,” *Waterways and Canal-Building in Medieval England*, ed. John Blair (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007), 55–84, Ann Cole identifies the place-names related to water transportation in England after the Anglo-Saxon invasion that contain the place-name elements *port* from the Latin *portus*; OE *hȳ*, OE *stæf*, and ON *stǫ*, which all refer to sheltered anchorages or landing places; the Old English element *lād* ‘an

artificial waterway or canal', which she distinguishes from OE *gelād*; and the compound term OE *ēa-tūn* 'river settlement'. She provides many excellent maps showing the specific place-names with each element as well as the distribution of the elements themselves.

Four essays in this year's bibliography have their primary focus on personal names. Two of them appear in *A Commodity of Good Names: Essays in Honour of Margaret Gelling* [see sec. 2]. In "Scandinavian Women's Names in English Place-Names," 154–62, Judith Jesch adds to Carole Hough's list of place-names incorporating Scandinavian women's names from her essay "Women in English place-names." She calls for studies of their significance, such as whether they indicate the number of Scandinavian-speaking females in the Danelaw at different stages of the Danish invasion.

John Insley's article from the same volume "Onomastic Notes on Cnut's Slavonic Connections," 147–153, documents the connections of the Danish kings of the tenth and eleventh centuries to West Slavonic peoples through the personal names of Slavonic origins that occur in documents referring to Swein Forkbeard and Cnut. Insley says that Swein's second wife, identified in *Heimskringla* as *Sigríþr en storraþa*, is probably the daughter of Mieszko I of Poland and that *Sigríþr* derives from an unrecorded Old Polish personal name **Czirada* or Old Czech name **Sderada*. The name of the sister of their son Cnut is recorded in *Liber Vitae* at Winchester as *Santslaue* and comes from Old Polish *Sedzislawa*. Furthermore, one of the witnesses to a charter of 1026 recording a grant by Cnut is a *Wrytsleof*, which Insley suggests comes from a Polabo-Pomeranian or Sorbish personal name *Virchoslav*.

In "Women in the Landscape: Place-Evidence for Women in North-West England," *Nomina* 31: 45–66, Carole Hough focuses on place-names in Cumberland, Westmorland, and Lancashire that reflect not only the feminine personal names found in English place-names (as she has done in earlier work) but also names reflecting an appellative referring to a woman's "age, appearance, occupation, religion, marital status or social class." She presents a preliminary corpus and discussion of such names in the article, as well as an

appendix at the end of the essay of all of such names mentioned in published sources, usually minor names and field names. In the appendix, Hough has organized the names into categories of personal names, dedications, and "others." Although the personal-name category's largest component consists of names she classifies as "medieval or post-medieval," she also has lists of Old English, Old Norse, and Gaelic place-names containing references to women's personal names.

In "Evolution of Names in English Literature," *Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Onomastic Sciences*, 563–70, Alexander Zhivoglyadov begins his essay by pointing out that personal names in the *Elder Edda* were descriptive and reflected or determined the fate of their bearers as poetenyms. He proposes a framework for classifying the semantic areas of such names. Later Germanic texts like *Beowulf* and *Widsith* continued the use of such poetic names, such as *Farway* in *Widsith*, but added historical names as well like *Alexandreas* (Alexander the Great). Most of the essay, however, deals with the naming practices of later writers from Chaucer to Robert Penn Warren.

Works Not Seen

- Bolcskei, Andrea. "A differenciált angol településnevek korrelációs rendszeréről." *Névtana Ertesítő* 29: 65–77.
- Fellows-Jensen, Gillian. "Another Look at the Danes in Lancashire." *Aspects of Lancashire History: Essays in Memory of Mary Higham* (Preston: Lancashire, Local History Federation, 2007–2008), 18–27.
- Gelling, Margaret. "Place-Names and Landscapes in the North West." *Aspects of Lancashire History: Essays in Memory of Mary Higham* (Preston: Lancashire, Local History Federation, 2007–2008), 28–36.
- Kemble, James. "Middle English **Wrestman*." *Locus Focus: Forum of the Sussex Place-Names Net* 54 (2007): 22–23.
- Leech, Geoffrey. "The Unique Heritage of Place-Names in North West England." *Text, Language and Interpretation: Essays in Honour of Keiko Ikegami*, ed. Yoshiyuki Nakao. (Tokyo: Eihosha, 2007), 42–61.

9. Archaeology, Sculpture, Inscriptions, Numismatics

a. Excavations

In *An Early Saxon Cemetery at Rayleigh, Essex: Excavations at the Former Park School* (Chelmsford: Historic Environment, Essex County Council), Trevor Ennis describes the 2004 excavation of an early Saxon cremation cemetery some six miles north of the Thames Estuary. Most of the urns had been truncated during site levelling prior to the construction of the school: of the 145 cremation urns, only thirteen were more than 75% complete, and, in many cases, only their lower third survived. In spite of these limitations, the excavator has produced this report on the cemetery with commendable speed. In addition to the cremations, one inhumation was found; however, others may exist in the area not excavated. Finds were limited: copper alloy dress fittings were absent, six knives were found, at least twenty-four of the urns contained burnt glass beads, and a necklace of glass and amber beads were found in the grave. In spite of the limitations imposed by the material, Natasha Powers produced a useful report on the burnt human and animal bones. The age at death of sixty of the cremations could be estimated, but in only seven cases was it possible to suggest the individual's sex. This report has done credit to a damaged site. The illustrations, some in color, are good and the plans useful. I would have liked to see individual columns for major types of finds rather than a single "Finds" column. Despite the recent discovery of the "Prittlewell Prince," only five miles away from Rayleigh, few early Saxon cemeteries are known from the area, and this excavation makes a valuable contribution to our knowledge of it.

In *Archaeological Excavations on the Route of A27 Westhampnett Bypass West Sussex, 1992: Volume 1, Late Upper Palaeolithic-Anglo-Saxon* (Salisbury: Trust for Wessex Archaeology), A.P. Fitzpatrick, A.B. Powell, and M.J. Allen describe archaeological sites found along the 2.8-km line of a new highway at Westhampnett, near Chichester. These include deposits ranging in date from the late glacial through the high Medieval periods. The Anglo-Saxon material occupies only a small part of this publication—nine pages out of 284. The finds from the cemetery were described in Volume 2, which was not available for review. The cemetery contained ten graves, possibly nucleated on a Bronze Age barrow. Three of them lay within a rectangular enclosure. The grave goods consisted of knives and a spearhead. Two *Grübenhauser* [*sic*], one probable and one possible,

were also located, one of which was dated to the fifth or sixth century by pottery found within it. This would be very early for West Sussex. A wider date range—fifth to seventh century—was suggested for both the other feature and the cemetery. These discoveries are important in that they come from West Sussex, which, unlike East Sussex, has produced little evidence for early Anglo-Saxon activity. It is to be hoped that these finds will herald further discoveries.

Nicholas J. Cooper's *The Archaeology of Rutland Water: Excavations at Empingham in the Gwash Valley, Rutland, 1967–73 and 1990* (Leicester: Leicester UP, 2000) presents the findings of excavations at Empingham. With one exception, all of the seven excavations described here were carried out in advance of the construction of Rutland Water, a massive reservoir some twenty miles east of Leicester that produced, in addition to the Anglo-Saxon burials and settlement, evidence for Prehistoric and Roman activity. Much of this work was a salvage excavation. Its publication was delayed by the tragic death of Malcolm Dean, who excavated the Empingham I cemetery, and by a lack of time and resources, which prevented Sam Gorin from writing up his excavations. The efforts of the team that published these important sites, together with specialist reports on the pottery, human skeletons, and remains, are to be welcomed.

The report contains some oversights. The find numbers quoted in the text sometimes fail to match those on the figures, and some of the illustrations, particularly of the finds from the Empingham I cemetery, are, at 50%, too small—is the equal-armed brooch associated with grave 4 really 180 mm wide, or is that figure actually at 100%? There are no dimensions in the catalogue to help us. The ten projectiles found in grave 12 are now being cited as Anglo-Saxon "arrow heads," but, with lengths ranging between 99 mm and 156 mm, they are probably javelin heads. The collection of close-packed iron pins in grave 10 could represent the remains of wool comb, as was found at Lechlade. Looking at the photograph of the skeleton in grave 1, which formed part of a small group of "Middle Saxon" burials, it is impossible to see it as "supine;" this body is surely prone, lying face down. This would be in keeping with its Middle Saxon (actually seventh-century, Final Phase) dating. Nonetheless, the evidence presented here helps provide a context for Jane Timby's report on the large Empingham II cemetery and will be of lasting importance.

In *Anglo-Saxon Settlement on the Siltland of Eastern England* (Sleaford: Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire, 2005), Andy Crowson, Tom Lane, et al., draw together and contextualize the accounts of ten excavations carried out on the coastal siltlands in the south of Lincolnshire and the northern part of Norfolk. They were undertaken as part of a research program to look at the archaeology of England's former wetlands before their final destruction by drainage and desiccation. In an area subject to both marine ingressions and freshwater flooding, environmental considerations are of great importance. During the Roman Period, the area became drier, allowing extensive settlement. This was followed by a tidal flooding during the fifth and sixth centuries leaving the Roman sites covered by up to two meters of silt. It had previously been assumed that the siltlands were uninhabited until the Middle Saxon period (taken here as ca. 725 to 850), when dispersed settlement appears on top of "roddens," the silt beds of former rivers left raised by the reduction of the surrounding landscape. However, this report presents evidence, although limited, for Early Anglo-Saxon settlement on the siltlands. It was only with the consolidation of the "Sea Bank" into a unitary system during the eleventh century that large-scale land reclamation occurred, expanding down onto the marshlands. This is a thorough, well-structured report, the cartography is informative, and the illustrations of the finds (few though they were) are good. The ten small excavations have been integrated into a useful account of an interesting part of England.

KL

Andrew A.S. Newton reports on an excavation in Heybridge, Essex during October and November 2006 in "A Late Bronze Age to Early Iron Age enclosure and an early Anglo-Saxon cremation cemetery at the Chalet Site, Hall Road, Heybridge," *Essex Archaeology and History* 39: 57-123. The report explains that four distinct phases of archaeological activity were uncovered. The earliest phase dated to the late Neolithic period, the second to the late Bronze Age/early Iron Age, the third to the Anglo-Saxon period, and the fourth to the post-Medieval period. Although more specific dates could not be determined with regards to the earlier two phases, during the excavations the researchers discovered evidence of burials that were reused as a cremation pit by the Anglo-Saxons hundreds of years later. Figures illustrating the site location plan and the plan for each phase, as well as illustrations of some of the late Bronze Age/iron Age and Saxon pottery, are also provided. This thorough report also includes statistics and

graphs outlining the size, shape, and other features of each item unearthed in the cremation pit. The number of items discovered is quite staggering and adds to the ever-growing list of Anglo-Saxon findings. However, the excavation also reveals the way in which the presence of the earlier enclosures influenced the siting of the Anglo-Saxon features. Essentially, in a wider historical context, the excavation's various phases demonstrate "the reuse of earlier sites [as] a constant theme of Anglo-Saxon burial," while also showing a "consistent tradition of Anglo-Saxon secondary activity occurring at Bronze Age burial mounds and Neolithic long barrows" (119). Interestingly, Newton suggests that because "Anglo-Saxon poetry [like *Beowulf*] makes reference to barrows or prehistoric earthworks being associated with the supernatural" (119), it seems to indicate that there was an awareness among the Anglo-Saxons' of the site's previous function. Newton claims that "it appears likely that the site was evident to the Saxon population because visible earthworks remained or through some kind of folk memory" (119). At any rate, the practice of reusing ancient sites for burial was not uncommon among Anglo-Saxons, and this excavation provides further evidence of this fact while also demonstrating "a kind of Anglo-Saxon obsession with the historical landscape and its supernatural qualities" (120). This report provides a fascinating look at the history of the landscape and the use and reuse of land over time. Archaeologists, literary historians, and anthropologists alike will benefit from this paper.

"Roman to Saxon in East Anglia," *Aedificia nova: Studies in Honor of Rosemary Cramp*, ed. Catherine E. Karkov and Helen Damico [see sect. 2], 268-82, by Catherine Hills explores the archaeological evidence for the transition from Roman to Saxon in East Anglia. Although Hills does not provide a new synthesis of the area, she examines the findings from two case studies, Spong Hill and Icklingham, in which she was directly involved. Her examination of the previous archaeological excavation findings at the two aforementioned sites indicates that grave goods from cremations reveal patterns of trade and exchange. While expounding on the trade routes throughout Anglo-Saxon England, Hills further argues for the importance of recognizing Ipswich as a trading center and describes artifacts found in Spong Hill and Kent that indicate that much more trading occurred during the Anglo-Saxon period than some might think. One particular find is a bag of rings of elephant ivory, which "probably came from Ethiopia, where it was one of the luxuries traded by the kingdom of Aksum" (273) until the seventh century. Hills notes that ivory was found in 205 cremations at Spong Hill

alone. After discussing the various other finds at Spong Hill that indicate that the community must not have “emerged from nothing” (272) and that its land was definitely in use by the Romans before the Saxons arrived and settled, Hills turns her attention to the Anglo-Saxon cemetery uncovered in Icklingham. The site was first excavated in the nineteenth century and more recently by a small team in 1997–2000. During the latter dig, the remains of a female were unearthed, although her feet were missing because they were cut away by a later pit that contained the skeleton of a horse. These finds were layers above a ditch that contained Roman and later-period pottery. Radiocarbon dating indicates that the woman was from the Roman period; although most burials in the period were properly laid out in cemeteries, “there are a number of instances of burials disposed of in apparently less careful ways, including ditches” (282). Hills concludes that in the absence of radiocarbon dating, archaeologists might have thought that the woman was murdered by invading Anglo-Saxons, although the evidence suggests nothing of the sort. Ultimately, Hills cautions readers of the “dangers of constructing stories on the basis of what are sometimes shifting sands,” and allows the evidence and technological testing conducted on finds that she discusses in her essay to speak for themselves as proof of Roman communities transforming into Anglo-Saxon ones.

Tom Phillips’s “Iron Age Ditches and an Anglo-Saxon Building near the Mile Ditches, Bassingbourn, TL 3294 4335,” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 97: 77–81, reports on an excavation in 2007 at Bassingbourn Village College in south Cambridgeshire. The results of this excavation were evidently very fruitful, as Phillips explains that findings included evidence for the first Iron Age settlement. The dig revealed a “series of parallel Iron Age ditches, perhaps representing a wide track or drove way, set within a landscape of known prehistoric and Roman routes, boundaries and monuments” (77). Two large illustrations provide a view of the site location, the topography, the site plan, and the results of the geophysical survey. Apart from the ditches that were discovered, material findings recovered at the site included Early to Middle Saxon pottery, all of which was found undecorated (apart from a single shard from the rim and shoulders of a jar). Although the report is quite brief, it does demonstrate the importance of small-scale excavations, as findings can still offer a great deal in terms of the landscape, its history, and the ritual behavior that may have been linked with the location.

Ben Roberts et al. provide a report on the “Excavations at the former Dovercourt Motors site, Spital Road,

Maldon, 2002” in *Essex Archaeology and History* 38 (2007): 109–19. Previous knowledge of the site indicated that there was an early Iron Age occupation at Maldon, so with this information—coupled with records from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle outlining that Edward the Elder’s army was stationed in Maldon in 912 AD—the location seemed prime for excavation. Three phases were discovered: the Roman, the Saxo-Norman to Early Medieval (ninth to thirteenth century), and the Late Medieval (thirteenth to sixteenth century). Pottery, stone, and iron objects were unearthed, and brief specialist reports are provided with regards to specific findings. Overall, the excavation “revealed part of a large Roman domestic refuse pit, in addition to early and later medieval activity in the form of gravel quarry pits and further domestic refuse disposal” (117). However, there was a “complete absence of any archaeological evidence for Saxon burh fortifications mentioned in documentary sources” (117). This is not to suggest that the burh was never there, as Roberts explains that “the defenses may have been leveled in the medieval period” (118), but that for the most part, the site and surrounding area were a “medieval waste dumping ground.” Thus, this excavation’s revelation provides hints of what was once a prime location for military use evolving into a medieval wasteland and offers greater understanding of the historical landscape at Maldon.

James Wright’s “An Anglo-Saxon Settlement at Cherry Orton Road, Orton Waterville, Peterborough,” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 95 (2006): 115–20, summarizes the excavation results of the area in Peterborough during 2004. The succinct report outlines evidence of Anglo-Saxon activity in the area and suggests that the excavation revealed a “mid to late Saxon rural settlement probably spanning the seventh/eighth—tenth/eleventh century with hints of both earlier and later activity” (119). Although the article is short, Wright offers a compelling argument for the necessity of taking advantage of opportunities to investigate vacant plots of land within villages before they are infilled with modern development.

The origins of the area of Fowlmere are becoming clearer thanks to some recent discoveries outlined by Paul Spoerry, Mark Hinman et al. in “Early Saxon and Medieval Remains adjacent to the Round Moat, Fowlmere,” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 96 (2007): 135–42. Previous small-scale excavations had been carried out in the area (dating from 1975–1999), which had produced findings of medieval pottery from the eleventh to fourteenth centuries as well as some residual Roman buff and grey-ware bases. During the most recent excavation, a sunken-featured building

was found, and a complete, articulated skeleton of a small pony was also unearthened. Although the skeletal remains are undated, "the burial's position in relation to the building suggests that the two might have been contemporary" (137). Further evidence of a second structure surrounding the sunken-featured building was discovered, although there does not seem to be any association between the two structures. Essentially, "the most recent work at Fowlmere has produced the first direct evidence for Early Saxon origins of the village" (139). Although the excavation was small and limited in scope, the findings have raised exciting, new questions, and the key to a clearer understanding of the area and the history of the Saxon settlement there can only come from further excavations of the area.

Andrew A.S. Newton et al. provide a report on the excavation carried out from September to November 2005 at Barnwell Road, Cambridge, in "Mid-Saxon burials at Barnwell Road, Cambridge," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 96 (2007): 127-34. In this report, Newton describes two identified graves, three burials contained within them, a pit, and a linear feature. Although there seems to be a lack of grave-goods, a copper-alloy buckle was found. The item was considered typical of the period when English people were converting to Christianity, thus the finding indicates that this was a time when the "prevalence of Christianity was increasing in Anglo-Saxon England" (132). Examination of the skeletal remains determined that all but one were probably young adults (or at least older than fourteen). One child aged around six to seven years was also buried. The gender of the skeletal remains was not determined. Overall, the succinct report offers further evidence for Saxon activity in the Cambridge area "and adds to the number of Saxon burial sites that have been recorded within the city in recent years" (133).

"Prehistoric, Roman and Saxon Activity on the Fen hinterland at Parnwell, Peterborough," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 96 (2007): 79-114, by Leo Webley et al. offers a record of the excavation that took place in Peterborough during the winter of 2004 to 2005. The investigation covered a 12.2-hectare site and included extensive examination of the clay hinterland adjacent to the gravel terraces surrounding Flag Fen. Neolithic pits were discovered, and evidence of Early Bronze Age activity was apparent. Evidence of an Iron Age settlement was also unearthened, as "features associated with the Romano-British settlement included a corn-drier, which had been used for roasting malt" (79). Radiocarbon dating of burnt fills from some fifty-seven pits scattered across the site identify

an Anglo-Saxon presence between the seventh to ninth centuries. This report provides abundant statistics, graphs, and illustrations of the findings as well as brief summaries of findings within each period or phase. Overall, as the report suggests, the excavation provides a "significant contribution to our understanding of the long-term development of the landscape around the Flag fen basin" (112). As more excavations continue in the area, our understanding of the development of the landscape will certainly increase.

Paul Spoerry, Rob Atkins, Stephen Macaulay, and Elizabeth Shepherd Popescu collaborate and report on "Ramsey Abbey, Cambridgeshire: Excavations at the Site of a Fenland Monastery," *Medieval Archaeology* 52.1: 171-210. The report is the first of three publications outlining the different aspects of Ramsey Abbey and the excavations that occurred between 1998 and 2002. In the first of the trilogy of reports, this work provides the historical background, geology, and topography of the area and summarizes the archaeological background and previously recovered items from the area, which include an array of pottery. Specific attention is given to the monastic buildings, and an interpretative map showing possible elements of the Ramsey Abbey precinct enclosure is provided. What follows is an extensive analysis of the archaeological evidence uncovered in the five phases of the excavation. The earliest remains found possibly "represent the first evidence for the pre-Conquest phases of Ramsey Abbey" (197), and other discoveries made in the various phases point to a vivid image of the monastic landscape as well as to a rich description of the abbey that once flourished there. Ultimately, the excavations provide an opportunity to understand the workings of the Abbey during the high and late Middle Ages and offer a "wider and more accurate synthesis of the landscape and economy of the monastery" (205). The results of the excavation are indeed abundant as Spoerry et al. contextualize the recovered remains and conclude that the findings reflect "the focus on water/waterways, drains and drainage in the works of the great religious houses and the special significance of cleansing and life-giving water under the monastic codes" (205). Thus, the appearance and reappearance of hithes (wharves) and waterways surrounding the monastic and lay settlements in fenland reveal "a place wholly circumscribed, blessed and cursed through its wateriness" (205).

Andy Letch's "A Bronze Age, Roman and Saxon site at Bishops Park College, Jaywich Lane, Clacton-on-Sea: Excavation 2003," *Essex Archaeology and History* 36 (2005): 55-70, is a report on the excavation that revealed rural activity dating from the prehistoric to

post-Medieval periods. Letch outlines the different phases of the excavation, and findings within each phase are discussed in detail. Illustrations of each phase and the artifacts recovered from each are useful because they allow readers to identify what discoveries were made within each excavation phase. The wealth of evidence analyzed during this excavation and details in the report that outline the history of the landscape and its use over hundreds of years will no doubt be of great interest to archaeologists, historians, and anthropologists alike.

MR-O

Language and boundaries, ever-changing, are discussed in a succinct article by Ernest Pollard and Neil Aldridge. In “An Early Boundary, Probably Anglo-Saxon, Associated with Roman Sites in Benenden,” *Archaeologia Cantiana* 128: 301-308, Pollard and Aldridge provide an overview of the Roman sites uncovered in Benenden. The suggested boundary between the early lathes discovered was conserved in one hundred boundaries that are preserved on nineteenth-century maps. Pollard and Aldridge further explain that the “suggested lathe boundary is likely to be pre-Domesday, on the basis that the dens which it divides are Saxon creations and that the Benenden Manor ... was in existence at Domesday” (301). While the discussion of this discovery is significant in understanding the history of the landscape in Benenden, and while it is noted that Roman activity left traces in the landscape that were markers for years and even centuries later, evidence for an Anglo-Saxon connection to the site is sparse.

The article “Late Saxon and Medieval Derby: Excavations at King Street Derby, 2004” by Kate Bain, with contributions from James Greig and Stephanie Rátkai, in the *Derbyshire Archaeological Journal* 126 (2006): 46-81, is a long, detailed report of the excavations completed in Derby on the site during the demolition of an abandoned car showroom. The site is adjacent to the historical St. Alkmund minster church, which was established by 800 (and demolished in 1967-1968 for the purpose of modern road building). The excavations reveal four phases of activity at the location, the earliest of which shows evidence of a Saxon or Saxon-Norman craft site, possibly related to cloth-making. These conclusions were drawn after researchers examined the pits and post holes at the site, noting that these pits were clay-lined to make them water-tight and contained relatively few pottery shards, indicating that the pits were backfilled after their usefulness rather than used as midden heaps for domestic waste. The water-tight nature of these pits lead Bain et al. to speculate

that they might have been used for cloth-making: flax requires retting (soaking) to loosen the plant fibers for use, and woolen cloth requires fulling, or tamping in fuller’s earth, to bind and mesh the woolen fibers for greater textile stability and wear. Bain notes that while cloth-making seems likely, this of course cannot be proven. Significantly, though, this phase’s probable time period (ninth to tenth century) coincides with the development of the treadle-operated loom, which “could produce cloth at a faster speed,” and spurred the movement of cloth-making from an exclusively domestic context to the “professional weaver’s workshop” (77). The site’s abandonment as an industrial locale in the early twelfth century coincides with a shift of clergy to the newly built cathedral in Lincoln, and the subsequent demotion of Derby from a minster location. St. Alkmund became a less-well-known pilgrimage site, and the church gradually declined in prestige. Bain suggests that the cloth-making facility may have been related to the pilgrimage trade; once the pilgrims were not a factor, there was little to no need for the cloth-making facility.

Sometimes an archaeological excavation uncovers an Anglo-Saxon royal grave or a Bronze Age artifact. Other times, one discovers the town dump. The excavation report by Catherine Edwards entitled “Saxon Archaeology and Medieval Archaeology at Forbury House, Reading” is an example of the latter. Compiled with contributions from Lucy Whittingham, Ian Betts, Lynne Keys, Alys Vaughan-Williams, Jackie Keily, Sylvia Warman, and Beta Analytic, Inc. and published in the seventy-seventh volume of the *Berkshire Archaeological Journal* (2004-7): 39-44, the report focuses on the findings from the Anglo-Saxon period that were entirely surprising to the archaeologists, who had assumed that the Saxon settlement at Reading was contained only along Broad Steet. Instead, this excavation uncovered the first “*in situ* Saxon archaeological features with overlying medieval deposits and features” (43) to be discovered near Reading, a site with evidence of continual habitation from prehistoric times. Based on the stratification of the pits, postholes, and environmental evidence, the Saxon site shows evidence of use for domestic waste, which was possibly contained by a fence or other barrier requiring postholes.

Three short notices in the *Kent Archaeological Review* indicate the ongoing and often emergency nature of local archaeology. In “Saxon Deptford,” 163 (2006): 53-7, Brian Philp describes the excavation of two graves dated to the seventh century near Deptford. The two graves, which are located very near and aligned to

each other, are nevertheless somewhat different. One is a coffin burial, with no grave goods. The other inhumation of a female body is without a coffin but does include a significant amount of grave goods, including a decorated pendant and eleven glass beads. Philp notes that this is an important discovery "for the early history of Deptford," as it indicates a continual settlement from pre-Roman times. While the location of the Anglo-Saxon settlement in the area is still unknown, these two graves provide more evidence that such a settlement must have existed nearby.

While this excavation was completed in a scholarly fashion, a subsequent issue of the *Kent Archaeological Review* contains another article by Philp that bemoans the activities of a certain Vince Burrows, a "tomb raider" infamous among local archaeologists for site interventions with metal detectors. In "The Saxon Cemetery at Alkham, Near Dover" 170 (2007): 213-14, Philp reports that Burrows's most recent activity was at a cemetery in Alkam, near Dover, where he thought he was unearthing a Bronze Age barrow. Instead, he found three Saxon skeletons and claimed a new find. Philp contests this, stating that local archaeologists knew of the site, but that "its position had been kept secret due to its exposed location" (213). Philp goes on to relate this most recent affront to scholarly archaeology with a 2002 appearance on eBay of the "grave goods of a Saxon warrior" offered for £825. He finds it quite likely that these artifacts came from Alkam.

Finally, in 2008, the *Kent Archaeological Review* published a short notice from Edna Mynott announcing an early Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Northfleet, Kent. In "Possible Royal Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Northfleet" 173: 73, Mynott speculates that the Northfleet graves, especially a series of eighteen female inhumations laid out in a row, may indicate a parallel royal cemetery, mirroring the royal cemetery in Folkestone. Mynott notes that this would fit with a split in the Kentish royal family during this time (620-700).

New insights into the Anglo-Saxon iron-smelting industry are provided by an excavation report, "Three Late Saxon Iron-Smelting Furnaces at Burlescombe, Devon," by S.J. Reed, G. Guleff, and O.J. Bayer in the *Proceedings of the Devon Archaeological Society*, 64 (2006): 71-122. This excavation, undertaken before a proposed quarry extension near Town Farm, Burlescombe, uncovered three iron-smelting furnaces that the authors date to sometime between the late eighth and tenth centuries (71). These furnaces are significant both because they provide more information about Anglo-Saxon ironworking processes and because they seem to be dual-use furnaces of a type not attested to

before this excavation. Reed et al. describe the structures as non-slag tapping pit furnaces with no evidence of any superstructure. Simply put, these are pits dug into the earth, with a blow-hole for a bellows, and the raw iron ore is heated to a high temperature (over 1100° c.) so that the non-iron mineral components of the ore heats to a liquid state and runs off as slag, and the iron "blooms" at the hottest part of the furnace in a porous solid state. This bloom is then collected, reheated on an open hearth, and worked by hammer on an anvil to remove further impurities. The waste material from this stage is called "hammerscale." The furnaces excavated at Burlescombe are "non-slag tapping," in that the slag simply collects in the pit as it cools, rather than running off into another collection site. This style of furnace has usually been described as more primitive and perhaps a step backwards from more advanced Roman slag-tapping furnaces known to have been in use. However, more recent research cited by the authors calls this assumption into question, noting that the two types perhaps coexisted more than previously thought, and there might have been very good reasons that a non-slag tapping furnace would have been preferable. This article suggests a scenario in which this might be the case. The Burlescombe furnace slag heaps indicate that these furnaces might have been dual-use; in other words, the slag heaps show evidence of both primary smelting to produce the iron bloom, and secondary re-heating for the more work-intensive hammering of the raw iron. If this is the case, then this would be a new style of furnace not attested in the archaeological record previously. When the lack of superstructure at the site, which would allow for access to the furnace's heat for the secondary process, is also considered, this scenario gains in probability. The authors also note that this site seems to have been in use for a relatively short period of time, and the amount of hammerscale found at the site perhaps indicates the smithing of artifacts there as well. When all these indicators are combined, the site seems to have been used as a short-term smelting facility where raw iron ore could have undergone all the processes necessary for turning ore into a finished artifact.

Much work can be done in one day; for the village of Great Easton, in Welland Valley, Leicestershire, June 22, 2003, was the day of the "Big Dig." On this day, forty-one test pits were dug in an effort to do a quick archaeological survey to determine the basic history of the village. This dig was described by Nicholas J. Cooper and Vicki Score in "Investigating the Origins of Great Easton, Leicestershire: Community Archaeology Meets the 'Big Dig,'" *Transactions of the Leicestershire*

Archaeological and Historical Society 80 (2006): 209-14. The finds from this excavation, combined with existing information and a few later developer-funded excavations, established the village's Roman (or even later Iron Age) settlement. During the 2003 dig, more Roman pottery shards were found, some mingled with early Anglo-Saxon shards, which is "suggestive of continuity of the Roman period settlement into the Early Anglo-Saxon period (ca. AD 450-650)" (212). However, there was no evidence found that could date from the Middle Saxon period (650 to 850); this leads the authors to state that "[t]he subsequent development of the Early Anglo-Saxon settlement and its exact relationship with the eleventh century settlement documented in Domesday is difficult to trace" (212). Thus they conclude that "[t]he survey throws up more questions than it answers" (214), and more excavation work is advisable.

RSA

Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History 15 yields six articles of interest to the field. The first is by Martin Welch, "Report on Excavations of the Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Updown, Eastry, Kent." It covers the first 146 pages of the volume, not quite half of which is actual text. The remainder is maps, artist's renderings of the multiple finds and the layout of the various excavated graves, and, perhaps most useful (to the non-archaeologist at least), tables relating the demography of the cemetery, catalog of finds, and so on. The cemetery occupies a place known now as Sangrado's Wood. The site was discovered in the early 1970s via aerial photographs, and part of the cemetery was excavated by Sonia Chadwick Hawkes in the middle of the decade. It has been dated to the seventh century, a period for which we know too little from documentary sources, making this site another important one. Some of the graves are early seventh century; others are middle to late seventh century. Burials with weapons were common in the graves exhumed, though difficult to date with certainty. Interestingly, in at least two cases, weapons were buried with adolescent males, whereas other adolescent graves did not have weapons with them. Many of the finds, such as inlaid iron belts, indicate international contacts for the occupants of the grave site, chiefly contact with the Franks. There are, however, amethyst beads and a Byzantine belt buckle that suggest the possibility of wider contacts. No documentary evidence appears until approximately the early ninth century, when a charter mentions a land-gift. Place-name evidence suggests to the author that four districts existed in Kent, of which Eastry (*Easorege* and similar

early forms) was one. The other three were the Eastern center, corresponding to the Stour region center in Sturry, and north and south Kent, which together comprised the Limen region center in Lyminge. In western Kent, Welch points to Wester, although he notes that it was short-lived. The Mildrith Legend, if historical, indicates that Eastry was a royal center of some kind by the end of the seventh century, which makes it contemporary with the cemetery. Hawkes's earlier work in and around Eastry, as well as on this site, indicates that Eastry may have been a royal site in the sixth century. To date, no Anglo-Saxon buildings or evidence for buildings have been found in the area. However, there are several early Anglo-Saxon cemetery sites in the area, which further indicate that Eastry was placed centrally in early Anglo-Saxon settlement in the region. The article is rich in detail; descriptions of the finds, of the grave orientations, and of the possible gender and ages of the occupants, all contribute to the image of this site's importance in the seventh century.

Next in this issue is Laurence Hayes and Timothy Malim's "The Date and Nature of Wat's Dyke: A Reassessment in Light of Recent Investigations at Gobowen, Shropshire," *ASSAH* 15: 147-79, which reopens discussion on the vexed and as yet unsolved issues mentioned in the title. In 2006, carrying out an excavation of the dyke in Gobowen before a housing subdivision invaded the area Shropshire utilized three trial trenches and three different methods of dating. Optically Stimulated Luminescence (OSL) examined the sediments, radiocarbon dating methods examined carbonized materials, and a new method, which was developed by Matt Conti of the English Heritage Foundation, examined earthworm casts. The article gives an overview, complete with maps and diagrams, of previous arguments regarding the dating and purpose of the dyke. Then the authors give a detailed description of their own work on the site, discussing, again with maps and diagrams to illustrate, the location and topography of Gobowen, their intended accomplishments, and their methodology and related concerns. The results are laid out in detail with photographs and diagrams and include a description of the analysis of pottery and soil and the results of the various dating methods. One of the interesting elements of the article is its attempt to specifically integrate its findings with previous work done in other locations of the dyke. The earthworm casting method failed to produce useable dating material, leaving a single dated radiocarbon element and seven OSL dates. The dates overlap for a period from 792 to 852, corresponding to the dating on the pottery by radiocarbon. This dating suggests that the dyke is from

the ninth century and not the eighth century or earlier, as has been argued previously. The authors suggest then that the dyke dates to the reign of Cenwulf (reigned 796-821) or to the subsequent period of Mercian infighting (821-830), when Wiglaf consolidated his power. The purpose of the dyke was as a defensive wall against the resurgent kingdoms Gwynedd and Powys. This is confirmed by the facts that, unlike Offa's Dyke to the West, Wat's Dyke connects several Mercian forts and that Cenwulf died in battle at the north end of the Dyke, Basingwerk. Earlier work on the dyke has shown a uniformity in construction throughout, suggesting that the entire dyke was designed and built altogether rather than piecemeal and imitated Roman defensive techniques. These facts are taken to help support the authors' interpretation. As is often the case with studies like these, the authors are not conclusive but rather hope to foster further investigations into the date and purpose of the dyke and invite further discussion on these questions.

One of the advantages of archaeology, in contrast to other fields, is its ability to say "we do not know" or "the evidence does not support a conclusion." In "The Middle and Late Anglo-Saxon Defences of Western Mercian Towns," *ASSAH* 15: 180-239, Steven Bassett says this about some of the conclusions drawn in previous work. That is not to say that he does not reach conclusions. Bassett examines the evidence for defensive walls at Mercian centers: Hereford, Tamworth, Winchcombe, and Worcester. The author begins at two points before turning to detailed examination of the digs. First, underneath the known defensive walls assumed by most to be late ninth or early tenth century, earlier defensive circuits were found but did not receive sufficient attention. Second, Bassett objects to the insufficient basis for the widespread conclusions that the defenses at these sites were of the aforementioned period. Bassett sets out to address the second by examining the first. Each city has had multiple sites at least partially excavated, some more than others, that illuminate the current issues. Bassett examines each city, then each site within the city, and discusses their implications. In the end, Bassett establishes that the earlier, first-stage defenses were quite substantial and built on a very similar design and size, suggesting that they were established at the same time in a similar project of defense. Further, Hereford now also seems to be part of that defensive system. Thus, by addressing his first concern, Bassett has addressed his second: the study of the earlier defensive walls as foundation for later walls gives better grounding for the assumption that the later defenses date to the tenth century. As a result, Bassett

has established good grounds to think that the "second-stage" defenses are those undertaken by Æthelred or Æthelflæd. While admitting that no single piece of either literary or archaeological evidence places this conclusion beyond doubt, the evidence fits best in that context. Particularly, those at Tamworth seem to be those built in 913 by the Lady of the Mercians.

LS

b. Numismatics

In "The Coinage of William I in Kent," *Archaeologia Cantiana* 128 (2007): 59-74, Peter Bagwell Purefoy presents evidence of the Conqueror's coinage in Kent, including all known Kent mints and non-Kent coins found up until the article's publication in April 2007. The painstaking efforts of Bagwell Purefoy are apparent in his accompanying, exhaustive catalogue of all known coins published on the KAS website (<http://kentarchaeology.ac>). Before presenting the tables of findings, Bagwell Purefoy discusses the historical context and setting of the coins by indicating where mints opened in the tenth century and where traffic for foreign coin might have been exchanged and processed. After offering a brief historical synopsis, an overview of the coinage of William I of Kent is provided. Bagwell Purefoy goes on to explain that "of the over 400 surviving coins of William I minted in Kent, 120 have been recovered in hoards" (62), which makes a strong case for the importance of combining archaeological excavations and the study of numismatics. Bagwell Purefoy offers detailed accounts of the three most significant hoards discovered that contain William I coins. Summaries of The Denge Marsh Hoard, discovered in 1739, The Scaldwell Hoard, recovered in 1914, and The Beauworth Hoard, unearthed in 1833, are all provided. Useful tables indicating Kentish finds elsewhere, moneys at the Kent mints and their coins, and findspots of the coins are included, while additional commentary of the historical relevance of Canterbury, Rochester, Sandwich, Dover, Hythe, Romney, and subsequent coin discoveries at these locations is supplied. The catalogue of coins is impressive, not just in number but also in the work that went into compiling the list. Bagwell Purefoy's conclusion highlights a major problem for numismatists, the "lack of coordination in the older records of existing coins" (73), although he acknowledges that modern databases are relieving the difficulty. He concludes by suggesting that new evidence of dates would support studies of other aspects of social history, thus subtly reminding readers of the necessity and importance of numismatists in the greater context of historical studies.

This thorough study of William the Conqueror's coins in Kent demonstrates the importance of interdisciplinary research and how a lack of cooperation among various historical fields of study can hinder our understanding of the past. This article will benefit numismatists, archaeologists, and historians alike.

MR-O

Hugh Pagan contributes to *Edgar, King of the English, 959-975: New Interpretations* [see sect. 7] in an article focusing on the coinage of the realm prior to the monetary reform undertaken by the king in or around 973, just before his untimely death in 975. The article, "The Pre-Reform Coinage of Edgar" (192-205), focuses on the variety of coins that may be ascribed to this period just before the reform in which "all the coins struck throughout Edgar's kingdom were of a uniform design carrying the king's name and bust on the obverse, and a small cross in the center of the reverse surrounded by an inscription which provided the name of every coin's moneyer and mint" (192). Prior to this, there were a variety of coins minted in Edgar's reign; Pagan's project in this paper is to "set out the same numismatic evidence [as collected by Blunt, Stewart and Lyon in 1989's *Coinage in Tenth-Century England from Edward the Elder to Edgar's Reform*] on a region-by-region basis" (193). Therefore, while this article presents very little new or revolutionary information, it is a useful aid for numismatists desiring a regional, rather than longitudinal, study of the development of coinage during the late tenth century. The article highlights information discovered post-1989 as well as information contained within the discussions of moneyers and mints found in various regions of England, including a long section on the south-east Midlands and the north-west/north-central Midlands; Pagan also provides charts of moneyers working in Chester (976 to 979) and Derby, Stafford, and Tamworth (960s to 979).

RSA

c. Sculpture, Monuments, and Textiles

Elizabeth Coatsworth's *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture: Vol. 8, Western Yorkshire* (Oxford: Oxford UP) is a worthy addition to an already distinguished series which provides a full account of the known stone sculpture of Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Scandinavian England. A publication of this sort stands or falls on the quality of illustrations, which are, in this case, half tones of uniformly good quality, clear and carefully lit. Unless stated, the illustrations are at standard scale of one-eighth full size, removing the need for ugly scale

bars. The catalogue is lucid and includes, in addition to a description of the sculpture, the lithology of the stone used along with its likely origin and details of the piece's location and discovery. The volume contains a review of the historical context of the sculpture, discussing earlier work on the topic and relating the sculpture to major ecclesiastic estates such as Ripon and Otley. The catalogue is in alphabetical order, by site, but the sculpture is also reviewed by monument type and style, with motifs also discussed. Additionally, forms and motifs are presented as a table, and the eleven inscriptions are considered in detail. This is a fine and important book that will be of lasting value to a wide range of scholars.

KL

The appraisal in the title "The Lichfield Angel: A Spectacular Anglo-Saxon Painted Sculpture" is not an overstatement by authors Warwick Rodwell, Jane Hawkes, Emily Howe, and Rosemary Cramp in *Antiquaries Journal* 88: 48-108. The article is a comprehensive overview of this significant discovery in 2003 during an excavation of the nave of Lichfield Cathedral. The panel is a "remarkable survival" from the late eighth or early ninth century, depicting a winged angel in relief, with traces of polychrome decoration (80). The article opens with a lengthy historical overview of the Cathedral's history, including its early association with St. Chad and the Cathedral's relationship with the smaller St. Chad's church located in nearby Stowe. The authors speculate that the panel is from the end of a shrine box designed to encase a previously existing object, possibly the tomb of St. Chad himself. The panel was found near the site where the saint's shrine in the Anglo-Saxon church would have stood and was buried (probably deliberately and ritually) prior to the Norman Conquest in the tenth century (56, 60). The sculpture was made from oolitic limestone and formed part of the left end of a rectangular, open-floored box that was placed so that one long side was formed by a wall. The right side of this panel is missing; tool marks indicate that this portion of the panel was removed deliberately. The breakage lines of the panel into three subsequent parts prior to its burial are more random (59), and it is impossible to tell if they are deliberate or not. The angel itself is depicted in a "complex posture" (62) that most resembles an early ninth-century relief sculpture of an angel in Breedon-on-the-Hill, Leicestershire (73). The authors speculate that the angel's posture and depiction indicate that this panel illustrated an Annunciation scene and that the Virgin was depicted on the now-missing right half of the panel. Jane Hawkes specifically notes that the

style of its iconography “point[s] to dependence on a good-quality model that was based on an (ultimately) early Christian, sixth-century iconographic type of late antique early Mediterranean origins” (80). She additionally suggests that this piece of sculpture was crafted at or around the brief period of time when Lichfield was elevated to archiepiscopal status over Canterbury in 787 under Offa’s Merican ascendancy. Offa, who admired and emulated his continental contemporary Charlemagne, perhaps commissioned this shrine case to enhance the veneration of the local St. Chad. Hawkes argues that through this commission, “Offa ... can be seen as expressing political aspirations through the propaganda of royal dedications and enshrinements” (74) and possibly importing talented craftsmen displaced by the iconoclast controversy to Lichfield in order to create this and other sculptural works. In addition to the notability of this find for the obvious reasons, the Lichfield Angel also provides archaeologists and art historians with a plethora of information about polychrome sculpture decoration. Like the evidence recently discovered in Deerhurst (see below), the Lichfield Angel was decorated in red, yellow, and black pigments; however, in contrast to the Deerhurst paintings, the angel’s pigments were applied to the limestone over a white base-coat. There is evidence that the halo may also have been gilded. All of this elevates this find from merely notable to “spectacular,” and it hopefully will be soon displayed in Lichfield Cathedral, along with the Lichfield Gospels, at the west end of the Lady Chapel. While the conservation work by Emily Howe is not yet complete, the article concludes by summarizing nicely the processes by which the conservator is preserving this unique survival of Anglo-Saxon art.

“The Ninth-Century Polychrome Decoration at St. Mary’s Church, Deerhurst,” by Richard Gem and Emily Howe (with contributions by Richard Bryant, FSA), printed in *The Antiquaries Journal* 88: 109-64, is a fascinating analysis of the remaining fragments of paint in this Anglo-Saxon church. This is a significant article; Gem and Howe are the first to describe, in detail, a program of polychrome decoration within an Anglo-Saxon architectural context. Gem notes that the carving in St. Mary’s has been recognized as exceptional and studied; however, “barely a mention has been made in the literature of the surviving traces of colour on these sculptures” (110). This article corrects that scholarly disregard and succeeds in presenting to the reader a detailed overview of the decorative program, including the animal-head carvings that terminate the hood molding on the east end chancel arch, the chancel arch itself, and a figurative panel of the Virgin that is mounted above an

arch in the west porch. All the decoration dates from the fourth period of construction of St. Mary’s, which corresponds to a period of expansion undertaken in the years 790-1000; the authors comfortably date the work to the ninth century. One of the most interesting aspects of this research lies in the relationship the authors note between the degree of stone carving done and the use of paint. They note that the animal heads and the chancel arch ends are quite detailed, while the Virgin panel in the west porch has much less carved detail. They conclude that “[i]n some cases the polychromatic treatment was executed so as to enhance the carved detail of the sculptures, whereas in others it was applied to sculptures that were only blocked out, thus serving as a substitute for finely carved detail” (154). In St. Mary’s, the authors note that the finely-carved animal heads show a decorative program that started with a yellow wash of the whole carving and then used red as the “detail” color for the “ears, mouth and nostrils, and scrollwork on the cheeks,” with black used to “punctuate the eyes” (115). An analysis of the paint remnants on the chancel arch shows a plant scroll motif on the arch, done in the same yellow and red seen on the animal heads. The Virgin panel was the most difficult to analyze, as the paint remnants were largely microscopic; these are enough to “demonstrate the fact (but not much of the detail) of the original polychromatic treatment” (140): Gem and Howe note that a four-pigment color scheme (red, yellow, black, and white) was applied directly to an unprimed limestone substrate (in contrast to other Anglo-Saxon wall painting examples at Monkwearmouth and Jarrow, for example) and sealed with an egg-based medium. This application procedure also contrasts with the recently discovered Lichfield Angel (see above), which had a white calcium carbonate base layer (144). Like the Deerhurst examples at St. Mary’s, however, these are the only two examples that use a sealant for the paint. The authors end the paper by discussing the figural Virgin panel and conclude that it was probably “dependent on an intermediary painted wooden panel, probably brought from Rome” (154). This analysis, combined with the connection of the plant scroll design on the chancel arch to manuscript decorative work, is a major contribution toward our understanding of the interrelated nature of Anglo-Saxon art and culture and the ways in which one art form used and echoed elements of another.

RSA

The Crosses of St. Martin and St. Oran on the Isle of Iona and Kildalton on Islay are the focus of Jane Hawkes’s “Constructing Salvation: The Figural Iconography of

the Iona Crosses,” *Aedificio nova: Studies in Honor of Rosemary Cramp* [see sect. 2], 198-225. Although the nonfigural motifs of the crosses have been subjected to academic inquiry, their figural decorations have been largely ignored. Thus, Hawkes examines the crosses in relation to their figural imagery and provides interpretations of the icons contained on each cross. The Cross of St. Martin’s representations of David and Goliath, David the Psalmist, the sacrifice of Isaac, Daniel in the lion’s den, and the Virgin and Child all provide a “complex commentary on the salvation inherent in Christ [which is] available through participation in the mysteries of the Church of the New Covenant of Christ” (214). Similarly, Hawkes contends that the figural decoration on both the St. Oran’s and Kildalton Crosses constructs a narrative in which the onlooker is guided toward the theme of Christ and salvation through images from the Old and New Testaments. Eight photos of the examined crosses are also included, as well as one illustration. Overall, Hawkes offers a reading of the crosses that sheds new light on the monuments because the essay highlights how the figural decoration, itself, played an intricate role in relaying the message of salvation. This essay will be of interest to literary historians, art historians, theologians, and the like.

Reports of the analyses of the ninth-century Dupplin Cross are provided in “The Dupplin Cross: recent investigations,” *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 137 (2007): 319-35, by Gordon Ewart, Dennis Gallagher, and Anna Richie. Weathering concerns prompted the Dupplin Cross’s relocation from the parklands of Dupplin Castle to the shelter of St. Serf’s church, Dunning. As a result, an archaeological investigation of the immediate environment of the cross was carried out. The paper describes the findings of that investigation and sheds light on various aspects of the cross’s history and the landscape surrounding the cross’s present location. Ritchie provides an archaeological and art-historical synopsis of the cross, detailing its relatively low scholarly appeal because it was considered a Scottish monument and fell “outside the upsurge of interest in Pictish studies that began in the 1970s” (320). However, in 1990 identification of a Latin inscription on the cross generated more interest in it. Along with providing a summary of the cross’s artistic features and carvings (with additional illustrations) on all its sides, Ritchie contextualizes the imagery by exploring its primary function. She interprets the cross’s imagery as revealing the “political value of supporting the Church,” while she also asserts the notion that its function was “also bound up with its topographical location in relation to the power-centre

at Forteviot” (324). She concludes by stating that the cross’s close proximity to the parish boundary (at Forteviot) makes it possible that it was previously associated “with the early estate of Cairny, in Forteviot parish, rather than Dupplin” (329). Gallagher provides information on the recent history and conservation of the cross. Ewart reports on the small-scale excavation that occurred on the area immediately adjacent to the Dupplin Cross during and after its relocation. In discussion of the two phases, Ewart attempts to determine whether Dupplin Cross was, in fact, in its original position or whether it was imported elsewhere and at what point this repositioning would have occurred. His findings are inconclusive, although “the presence of paving and the kneeling platform on the cross base itself, give some indication of how the cross was actually used” (334). Despite efforts to have the cross give up its story, there is still much more for it to reveal, and further analyses of the Dupplin Cross will undoubtedly offer new insight into the cross itself, its first audiences, and its location.

The Franks Casket has been the focus of an abundance of analyses, including textual, art-historical, anthropological, and palaeographical. Carol Neuman de Vegvar contributes to scholarly analysis of the casket in “Reading the Franks Casket: Contexts and Audiences,” *Inter-texts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach*, ed. Virginia Blanton and Helene Scheck [see sec. 2], 141-60. Neuman de Vegvar’s paper offers an alternative and multi-layered reading of the casket’s imagery by suggesting that the images are indicative of an “idealized vision of rulership” (141) closely paralleling some Old English wisdom literature. For readers unfamiliar with the imagery carved on the casket, Neuman de Vegvar provides detailed descriptions of the narrative carvings, and the essay includes a number of photos of the Franks Casket in which readers can identify the scenes and inscriptions discussed for themselves (142-47). While agreeing with more recent interpretations of the casket’s use, Neuman de Vegvar disagrees on one point suggested by previous scholars, namely that the casket’s alleged destination was an English aristocratic household (royal or otherwise). Neuman de Vegvar argues that such a place “was most probably not a haven of scholarship, and would have had little if any library” (147). She further contends that because the casket functioned as a transmitter of information meant to stimulate the mind even after its contents were gone (or used), “it would have had to be at least partially accessible to an audience of high-status individuals with unpredictable and possibly widely differing levels of literacy, let alone intellectual training”

(148). She argues for a didactic function of the casket similar to Old English wisdom texts such as *Maxims I*, *Maxims II*, *Deor*, *Vainglory*, *The Order of the World*, *Widsith*, and *The Gifts of Men and the Fortunes of Men*. Although a brief comparative analysis of each particular poem in relation to the Franks Casket is provided, no specific lines or references from the texts are provided early in the essay. It may have been more useful to offer more detailed examples of how each relates to the Franks Casket. Instead, the author only suggests that each had a didactic function and would have appealed to Christian audiences, despite their invocation of the secular tradition of wisdom literature. This is, of course, not to suggest that details are lacking; after all, this is not primarily a literary study, and Neuman de Vegvar's approach is more historical as she contextualizes the social content of the wisdom literature. The main crux of the argument comes in suggesting that the various images of royalty on the casket "concern not only rightful rule but also the role of the secular ruler in a Christian society where the church and the crown are allies" (153). At this stage in the essay various line references to the *Maxims* and *Vainglory* are provided, which certainly adds strength to Neuman de Vegvar's argument. What is at the heart of this reading is that all the narrative images are similarly reflected in many Old English wisdom texts. Like many wisdom poems, the casket reveals that "exile is suffering, and reconciliation to society and participation in all its aspects of reciprocity, loyalty, and faith are the only hope for the individual in this world or the next" (158). Overall, the parallels in structure and context between the Franks Casket and several Old English wisdom texts are plentiful, and the essay offers a fresh reading of the casket in relation to its putative destination. Neuman de Vegvar quite rightly points out that the literary texts and the casket do not share a similar date of composition; however, she offers a provocative approach to reading the casket and also reveals how the designers of such caskets demonstrated "intellectual range and insight" (159).

Elizabeth Coatsworth provides a fascinating analysis of the interrelationship between Anglo-Saxon decorated textiles and the sculptures of both Scandinavia and Anglo-Saxon England in "Design in the Past: Metalwork and Textile Influences on Pre-Conquest Sculpture in England," *Aedificia nova: Studies in Honor of Rosemary Cramp* [see sect. 2], 139-61. Coatsworth explores the links between textiles and art within pre-Conquest England by examining the edges, borders, and trimmings of textiles alongside contemporary metalwork and sculpture. She uses examples from Viking art and textiles and compares the outer decorations to

the borders and edges of Viking Age crosses that contain chain patterns. She further examines Anglo-Saxon fine woolen fabric with decorated seams, comparing them to sculptures that might have been inspired by textile forms. She concludes that the evidence might suggest that "edges and trimmings may be diagnostic of stylistic trends and betray the primacy in time and in taste for certain arts over others" (161). In other words, it seems the designs on the edges and sides of Anglo-Saxon sculpture did not develop in isolation (since the designs are found throughout Scandinavia), nor were the designs uninfluenced by other textiles. Coatsworth concludes by noting that even with the arrival of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England, the previous art trends remained, and there was never a complete displacement of the "taste for the native arts, in either style or medium" (161). This article will be of special interest not only to archaeologists but also to art historians.

Art and architectural historians will find interest in Catherine E. Karkov's "Pictured in the Heart: The Ediths at Wilton," *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach*, ed. Virginia Blanton and Helene Scheck [see sect. 2], 273-85, as she argues that Goscelin of Saint-Bertin's description of the wooden chapel built and decorated by Saint Edith of Wilton (961-984) may not be as reliable as previously argued. Karkov argues that because the cycle of wall paintings relating to Saint Edith were developed to glorify the saint, and hagiography, in turn, was affiliated with aggrandizement and fiction, Goscelin's account cannot be understood as a completely accurate narrative. She further states that the description of the chapel and its dedication is the narrative's zenith, and as such "its very narrativity can be interpreted as calling into question its historical accuracy" (273). Karkov further points out that other surviving descriptions of the church at Wilton are either vague or even contrary to the descriptions provided by Goscelin. Although there is nothing intrinsically unbelievable about the building of a wooden church, rather than a stone one, Karkov investigates why Queen Edith would have destroyed the church after it was erected and decorated by the abbey's patron saint. Three possibilities include: 1) there was a stone church that preserved portions of the wooden one; 2) Goscelin embellished the entire account; or, 3) the church did exist at some point, and Goscelin had his own aims for aggrandizement (278-79). Karkov dismisses the first scenario and argues that although the second scenario is possible, it is unlikely since Goscelin's audience would have known the truth. Turning to the third suggestion, Karkov argues that it is the most likely, and she goes on to provide descriptions

of several specific images of Edith's life and death in light of historical evidence and documents relating to the saint. Ultimately, Karkov contends "that promotion of Saint Edith's cult seems to have been largely the product of Goscelin's pen rather than the desire of the community itself, and that his claims about the church are a part of that" (184). What seems to be at the heart of Goscelin's embellishment is the desire to distract his audience from the economic troubles following the Conquest and the problems associated with Queen Edith. Goscelin's aim seems to be well-intended, not just to distract his audience from political and economic problems, but also because he desired his audience to "look back to what in retrospect could be portrayed as an idyllic period of growth for the monastery, [and thus] he could not only promote ... Edith's cult, he could also create a space in which the nuns of Wilton could picture her and her church in their own hearts" (285). Given the current economic and political state of affairs around the globe, such crises beg the question: if Goscelin were still around, what narratives might he embellish now to help distract us from modern quandaries? The essay is an interesting read and offers yet another reminder to remain analytical and not take factual accuracy for granted in literary texts.

The Bayeux Tapestry's multi-layered story continues to unravel in Gale R. Owen-Crocker's "Embroidered Wood: Animal-Headed Posts in the Bayeux Tapestry" in *Aedificio nova: Studies in Honor of Rosemary Cramp* [see sect. 2], 106-38. Owen-Crocker discusses the recurrent feature of the zoomorphic or grotesque human heads on wooden posts found within the first half of the Tapestry (eighteen of which are parts of ships, sixteen connected to furniture, and four associated with architectural detail). She argues that the beast heads can sometimes be read as a reflection of the situation or emotion of a human protagonist and that the heads function as accessories to interpreting the Tapestry's narrative. Along with highlighting that the zoomorphic heads on wood are not merely fillers and decorative, rather serving a specific function with regards to the Tapestry's narrative, Owen-Crocker also reveals that close analysis of the ealdorman Harold's journey sheds light on differing hands at work embroidering his story. Owen-Crocker supports her argument with very specific instances within the Tapestry in which the zoomorphic heads on the ships, furniture, and architecture are pointers to the larger narrative, adding to the complexity and intricacy of the Tapestry as a readable text. For example, Owen-Crocker identifies Guy of Pontieu as "a little man who wants to be big"; thus the Tapestry captures Guy in a chair that has small, mute,

canine heads. The chair has no canopy or cushion, and though he is accompanied by border lions and preening birds, this image reflects "Guy's pretensions to grandeur, [while] the animal heads suggest he has no voice and little power" (115). Similar examples are provided throughout the paper as Owen-Crocker provides a fascinating dimension to reading and interpreting the Tapestry with the aid of these indicators and signals. To aid readers, the paper includes twenty four specific images contained within the Tapestry. Overall, Owen-Crocker demonstrates that there is so much more to be discovered within the Tapestry and that even the smallest of details can function as guides to interpretation and cannot be brushed off as mere decoration. This essay will be of interest to art historians, archaeologists, Anglo-Saxonists interested in textiles, and those specializing in Anglo-Saxon literature.

Susan Youngs's "Missing Material: Early Anglo-Saxon Enameling," *Aedificio nova: Studies in Honor of Rosemary Cramp* [see sect. 2], 162-75, investigates enameling in Anglo-Saxon England in light of recent discoveries as well as improved understanding of older ones. After offering a select overview of previously discovered Anglo-Saxon items containing enamel—such as a sixth-century bronze sword pommel, a five-spiral saucer brooch, the Ipswich bowl, hanging bowls, ornaments, and an enameled disc from Great Barton in Suffolk—Youngs analyzes the more recent finds to reveal that for the most part "early Anglo-Saxon enameling [did] not necessarily depend on or relate to the survival of a culturally distinct element in the population" (165). Youngs provides a fascinating look at the differing techniques and styles of enameling in Anglo-Saxon England and challenges traditional views of enameling during in the sixth and seventh centuries: most of the items she discusses possess a hybrid of techniques and styles from across Anglo-Saxon England. She contends that the evidence that has survived "does not support or prove the existence of British craftsmen continuing to work within the Anglo-Saxon kingdom ... into the seventh century in their own techniques and styles, with independent cultural development expressed in fine metalwork" (165). Ultimately, she argues that "enamel had to wait for another three centuries before it made a significant contribution to Anglo-Saxon art and ornament" (175), as enamel in England before the first millennium "achieved no great status" (165) in relation to the arts, and the techniques and styles were borrowed from the continent. Additionally, exceptional illustrations of items discussed in the paper provide readers with a clear picture of the Anglo-Saxon discoveries containing enamel. Because this paper covers many

areas of Anglo-Saxon study, it will certainly appeal to readers with interest and expertise in archaeology, art history, metallurgy, and Anglo-Saxon history.

The ever-present idea in late Anglo-Saxon England that the world's end was near is the topic of discussion in Leslie Webster's cleverly titled essay "Apocalypse Then: Anglo-Saxon Ivory Carving in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries" in *Aedificio nova: Studies in Honor of Rosemary Cramp* [see sect. 2], 226-53. Webster examines ivory carvings containing apocalyptic images in late Anglo-Saxon England while also providing an excellent overview of the history of apocalyptic beliefs in a broader cultural perspective. She also outlines historians' evolving understanding of past views concerning the end of the world. At the heart of the essay is an analysis of the iconographic implications of ivory carvings in light of Doomsday in late Anglo-Saxon England, as Webster concentrates the study on many surviving carvings from the later tenth to early eleventh century. Fourteen vivid photos of specific ivory pieces discussed in the essay are included, which allows readers to see the high quality and intricate detail of the ivory carvings. The items discussed in detail in the essay include plaques of the Crucifixion, Judgment Day, Christ in Majesty, Angus Dei, a portable altar, several crosses, and two *tau* crosses. Late Anglo-Saxon ideas about Doomsday were expressed in a variety of ways and offered visual or mental images for contemplation, instruction, and study. Thus Webster's analysis of a selection of ivory carvings offers insight into the artistic traditions of Anglo-Saxon England that both captivated and modified ideas for Anglo-Saxon audiences. Webster connects the ivory carvings to a number of Anglo-Saxon texts to demonstrate the strong links between the literary and artistic traditions and ultimately concludes that "the references to Doomsday encapsulated in [the] artifacts, great and small, had a powerful message that both commented on and transcended the troubles of the years around 1000" (253). This perceptive essay will be of interest to experts in a variety of fields, including historians of art and of religion, archaeologists, anthropologists, and literary critics.

MR-O

Lucia Sinisi frames her charming article "The Wandering Wimple," *Medieval Clothing and Textiles* 4: 39-54, with a simple question: why is the veil of St. Agatha, located in a reliquary in Catania Cathedral in Sicily, called a *glimpa* (or *grimpa*) among the people of Catania today? The word, as Sinisi notes, is "unknown in standard Italian," though documented as an "obsolete

term, in the dialects of southern Italy, especially in Sicily" (41-2). Sinisi connects this word to the English word *wimple* and uses this connection as a forum in which to discuss the short-lived Norman occupation of Sicily, arguing that this one instance of lexical borrowing is a result of this cultural interaction. In her article, Sinisi outlines the Germanic history of the word *wimple*, which originally referred to, in Old English, a garment worn "primarily by women...made of fine material...that covers head, shoulders and breast" (45). She notes that this garment probably came into fashion after the eighth century and was predominantly associated with England. Sinisi notes several appearances of the word in Old Low German but asserts that its first use was most likely Alcuinian (and thus English in origin) and that later it was used as an alternate word for a garment, indicating a lack of a "linear evolution of the term" (46). Later, she notes, the *Ancrene Wisse* (early thirteenth century) distinguished the wimple from the simpler, more preferable veil; Sinisi concludes that this meant that the wimple had become a garment of ostentation and luxury (47). Returning to the question of St. Agatha's garment, Sinisi places this bit of fashion history into the context of the 1061 Norman conquest of southern Italy and Sicily. She notes that the Norman occupation of Sicily placed the English in greater contact with Sicily in the twelfth century; she draws special attention to the English archbishop Walter of the Mill. Finally, she connects these historical events to the rise of interest in the cult of St. Agatha in the twelfth century. In 1126, two soldiers brought the relics of St. Agatha back to Catania from Constantinople. Sinisi links the Norman-fueled revival of interest in St. Agatha, as well as the Normans' use of the Church and its saints to legitimize their colonial processes of rule, to the usage of the loan-word *wimple* (italicized to *glimpa* or *grimpa*) to describe the miraculous veil of St. Agatha—a usage that has persisted to this day.

RSA

In their article "From Head to Hand to Arm: The Lexicological History of 'Cuff'" *Medieval Clothing and Textiles* 4: 55-67, Mark Chambers and Gale R. Owen-Crocker trace the interesting history of *cuff* from its first appearance in a tenth-century Anglo-Saxon will to its present-day usage as both a noun and a verb. The history includes two major lexical shifts: a *cuff* originally described a cap or other head-covering, then a glove or a mitten, before finally settling into its primary contemporary meaning of a sleeve-end. Citing the lone Old English use of the word in the will of an Anglo-Saxon woman, Wynflæd, the authors make a case for

the word referring to a piece of clothing that served as a head-covering, rather than one associated with the arm or hand. Chambers and Owen-Crocker take issue with the *Oxford English Dictionary's* dismissal of an early English cognate relationship between the Old English *cuffia* and the French *coif* and cite the former as a Middle English loanword from the French/Late Latin. They assert that "it is clear that there exists a cognate relationship between Wynflæd's *cuffia* ... an item most likely worn on the head, and Old French *coife/coiffe*, a cap or headcovering" (61). Their reasoning is highly persuasive, as is their assertion that this relationship is further obscured by the subsequent lexical history of the word *cuff* in the English language. In Middle English, the word underwent a substantial shift, when "it ceases quite abruptly to refer to an item worn on the head and quite clearly begins to refer to one worn on the hand" (61). The ME term referred to an item of clothing that resembled gloves or mittens and protected the hands as boots protect the feet. Later, in the early modern period, the word was specialized yet again to refer to a garment that, like the early modern collar, was removable and encircled the wrist but did not necessarily cover the hand. Finally, the authors address the modern usage of the term, noting that its verbal usage (*to cuff*, meaning 'to hit with a blow of the hand or fist'), most likely from its association with the hand, was first attested in the early modern period.

d. The Anglo-Saxon Church

Churches and their histories are most commonly studied by means of their architectural features, historical documents, and archaeological excavation. However, John F. Potter highlights the benefits of geological study in "A Geological Review of some Early Essex Church Quoins," *Essex Archaeology and History* 36 (2005): 99-109. Potter provides an examination of nine Anglo-Saxon churches in Essex and illustrates the new knowledge that can be gained by assessing their stone composition. Among Potter's findings is that "Anglo-Saxon church builders when using stone were obliged ... to incorporate unusual local rock types into their walls" (108) because Essex possessed little or no stone of true ashlar quality. Potter also identifies important rock types used by the Anglo-Saxons for structural purposes and draws attention to the study of stone types in other church structure analyses. With his investigation of the history of churches through analysis of the stones and the surrounding area, Potter offers another approach to assessing and understanding the history of a church structure and its geographic context. This worthwhile

read will be of benefit to historians, geologists, geographers, archaeologists and others.

e. Funerary Archaeology and Practices

Thomas Woolhouse et al. provide a report on "Anglo-Saxon and medieval boundaries and burials at the form Oblic Engineering site, Church Street, Litlington," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 96 (2007): 115-26. As a result of this excavation, boundary ditches dating from the sixth to tenth centuries and eleventh to thirteenth centuries were uncovered. There were also three inhumation burials discovered, which have been tentatively assigned broad dates contemporary with the dates of the ditches. Three human skeletons and a fragment of a human tibia were recovered, but all were less than 50% complete. Each skeleton was examined to determine age, sex, height, and pathology. One skeleton was determined to be an individual aged 14 to 24, another to be an individual in middle adulthood (40 to 49), and the third to be an individual aged 35 to 45 years old. The tibia discovered was determined to be adult-sized, but age could not be determined. The gender of the individuals was also not stated. Cattle, horse, sheep, goat, and dog bones were all identified in the assemblages. Whether the animals were used for food can only be speculative since further investigations are needed. Eighty-one pottery shards and the remains of a lead-alloy plate were uncovered, as well as metal and glass objects, but those have been dated to the post-Medieval period. Overall, the site yielded much in the way of findings, and since the burial ground on the site could date from as early as the sixth century, there is the possibility that the location was an early post-Roman settlement. There is a growing body of evidence from Cambridgeshire that Anglo-Saxon settlements and burial grounds were either adjacent to or reusing Roman remains, and this report adds to that evidence.

MR-O

Information on the daily lives and rituals of common Anglo-Saxon people is often difficult to find. Tania M. Dickinson's article, "An Early Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Quarrington, near Sleaford, Lincolnshire: Report on Excavations, 2000-2001," *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 39 (2004): 24-45, provides insight into the life of a disabled young woman and her role and status in her small early Anglo-Saxon community just south of Lincoln. The excavation report provides a significant amount of detail concerning the items removed from fourteen graves containing fifteen inhumations at the

Quarrington site. Dickinson relates this site, which she names Quarrington II, to a nearby site (Quarrington I, 1.1 km to the east), which has been determined to be an Anglo-Saxon cemetery dating from the sixth to eighth centuries. Also found at the site are shards of early Bronze Age pottery, indicating that the cemetery plot may have been chosen due to a visible prehistoric grave mound or barrow. The fifteen individuals found buried at this site were buried in a way consistent with inhumations found in other Anglian regions of England during the sixth- to seventh-century period (42). One burial site stands out, however. It contains the remains of a young woman in her late teens whose skeleton shows that she suffered from advanced tuberculosis for much of her life. Her lower limbs were wasted or atrophied, and her life must have been preserved until early adulthood only by "devoted" caring and tending (42). Furthermore, this burial had the most grave goods associated with it, including a brooch and beads. Later, this grave was reopened and another body (also young and female) was added on top of this occupant's remains; this is quite idiosyncratic, and the author cannot fully interpret what this means. No other graves at the site are stacked burials of any sort. Future research is needed, Dickinson asserts, to determine the location of the associated settlement at Quarrington and, more generally, "how early Anglo-Saxon household, family, and community were represented in [the] place of burial is still a major problem for future research" (43).

The politics of excavation and the sensitive nature of archaeology are on display in Brian Philp's "Saxon Cemetery Protest Stops Dig at Bridge," *Kent Archaeological Review* 165 (2006): 99-100. This short article describes a series of events that led to the uncovering of several Saxon graves at Bridge, near Canterbury. These graves were first excavated by a group of trainees working on some hexagonal earthworks identified by Paul Wilkinson as late Iron Age (although Philp disagrees, stating that they are more likely to be from 1750-1830 and be features related to Bourne Park). Wilkinson publicized the find, including mention of the fact that the graves had yielded gold pendants and "rare Saxon coins" (99). Local residents, bothered by the excavation in 2005 and a subsequent trainee dig in 2006, complained and successfully relocated the training dig by extending the Scheduled Ancient Monument protection to the area containing the new graves. By this action, the local residents hope to shield the graves from premature excavation by non- or under-trained professionals or looting by treasure-hunting metal detectorists.

RSA

Burial practices in early Medieval Ireland and Britain are the focus of Elizabeth O'Brien's "Literary Insights into the Basis of Some Burial Practices in Ireland and Anglo-Saxon England in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries," *Aedificio nova: Studies in Honor of Rosemary Cramp* [see sect. 2], 283-99. O'Brien explores three aspects of burials during the ninth and tenth centuries in Britain and Ireland along with literary references and material records to reveal how the records illuminated each other. Because Christians of the early Medieval period tended to reuse ancestral cemeteries, O'Brien discusses the reuse and location of Christian burials in relation to specific ecclesiastical texts and passages that dealt with funeral rites. She notes that while some eighth-century Christians were encouraged to abandon ancestral or familial cemeteries (as evidenced in the *Collectio Canonum Hibernensis*), monks and ecclesiastical tenants were encouraged to seek burial at establishments with which they were affiliated. O'Brien contends that the practice of reusing ancestral cemeteries was a widespread phenomenon in all eras and that "it can readily be identified in the archaeological record up to as late as the seventh or eighth century in both Ireland and Anglo-Saxon England" (289). As an example, she highlights Guthlac's burial place, which was a prehistoric burial chamber. In addition to discussing burial locations, O'Brien investigates the treatment of the body and the practices associated with burials, such as burial rites, grain burning, funeral feasts, and burial enclosures. Also interesting is O'Brien's discussion of grave robbing as documented in texts such as the *Life of Guthlac* and *Beowulf*. She concludes that Christians were not afraid to retrieve grave goods deposited for the benefit of earlier pagans or in graves of pagan relatives because "it was in God's power to remove curses" (298). O'Brien concludes that archaeologists face challenges similar to literary historians because both attempt to discover meaning from materials and/or texts discovered. However, interdisciplinary approaches combining history, literature, and archaeology can advance our understanding of past behaviors and beliefs within Anglo-Saxon England. With ample archaeological findings and materials discussed along with a generous amount of literary texts cited and analyzed, the essay offers much in the way of understanding certain burial customs and practices within late Anglo-Saxon England. The benefits of this interdisciplinary research are strongly apparent in this essay, and no doubt literary historians, archaeologists, anthropologists, and theologians alike will find this text informative and helpful.

Sarah Semple's "Politics and the Princes AD 400-800: New Perspectives on the Funerary Landscape of

the South Saxon Kingdom,” *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 27.4: 407-29, examines the Anglo-Saxons’ uses of ancient remains and natural topography through an assessment of burial evidence from fifth- to eighth-century Anglo-Saxon England. Specifically, Semple investigates burial evidence from West Sussex. Her essay includes tables detailing Anglo-Saxon burials and associated grave goods recovered in the area as well as outlining the burials’ topographic associations. While Semple acknowledges that “past approaches to the South Saxon funerary record have taken a broad and historically informed overview, providing a grand narrative of invasion ... with settlement” (409), her paper aims “to capture the material essence of the nascent political structures and identities forming within the post-Roman landscape of Sussex” (409). Semple’s observations reveal that the funerary choices of Saxon communities in the fifth to the eighth century did not “reflect the emergence or existence of a single political authority or identity.” (422). As a result, the pattern of settlement and burial in the west seemed to suggest that Anglo-Saxon England had a fragmented political geography. Semple argues that analysis of burials reveals distinct topographical traits within cemetery and burial placement and that communities in the region defined themselves by funerary methods. Thus, she contends that there is evidence of a micro-kingdom structure within Anglo-Saxon England from at least the fifth century and possibly beyond the seventh.

MR-O

The reader might well ask, “Why another book on Sutton Hoo?” After some seventy years, the site and its importance have not yet been exhausted, as Tom Williamson shows in *Sutton Hoo and its Landscape: The Context of the Monuments* (Oxford and Oakville, CT: Windgather Press). Williamson’s purpose is to explore why the burial site is located where it is and to recover, as far as is possible, the landscape as it appeared to the seventh-century Anglo-Saxons. Two questions form the basis of this study. First, why were the burials placed where they were within this locality? Next, why this locality rather than another? Williamson advocates a “phenomenological approach” to this question, an approach that attempts to reconstruct the meanings with which the inhabitants at the time imbued both the natural and the man-made features of the landscape. The first chapter reviews the archaeology of the site and the various approaches to it, explaining the terms and Williamson’s own approaches. The next two chapters turn to the reconstruction of the landscape as it appeared circa 600, through archaeological surveys,

place name studies, historic maps, and the Domesday Book. The fourth chapter develops a model for the landscape based on a “river and wold” sectionalization—that is, sections that include a part of the river and then continue up the shore and the hill and into the territory beyond. The greatest problem with this reconstruction is that no mention is made of the opposite side of the river. Nonetheless, in the fifth chapter, Williamson argues that the cemetery is situated to overlook not just the river but to serve as a doorway to a “North Sea Province” from which the Wuffings were able to take advantage of the river, connections to the continent, connections with Scandinavia, and other rivers and roadways into the interior. The author goes so far as to suggest that the “wuff-” element of the name derives not from Old English *wulf* but from *hweorfan*, meaning to turn or bend—an appropriate name for a “river-people.” The book is interesting on several levels. The author questions accepted conclusions about the site, posits arguments regarding archaeological approaches, advocates a mixture of traditional and “post-processual” approaches to the question, challenges the conclusion that Sutton Hoo is simply an “East Saxon” burial, and argues for a wider understanding of the purpose of the site. The slim volume’s conclusions are supported by a great deal of information, including photographs, maps, and charts, and interesting argumentation. A great deal is accomplished in a small book.

LS

Christina Lee’s “Forever Young: Child Burial in Anglo-Saxon England” is a loosely structured and repetitive article in *Northern World: Youth and Age in the Medieval North*, edited by Shannon Lewis-Simpson (Leiden: Brill), 17-35. Its main thesis is that Anglo-Saxon cemeteries showed a distinct inclination to group the graves of the pre-adult with the infirm or impaired, which is a category that may have also included the elderly. Lee draws her examples from a wide variety of sources, including Cnut’s laws and various burial sites throughout England. She opens her study by noting that in “the study of non-literary evidence ... analysis is largely dependent on interpretation” (17)—I would assert that literary evidence is also in need of interpretation!—and proceeds to discuss the relationship between child and infirm burials by taking an openly inquisitive stance. Lee’s article runs into problems less because of this stance but more because of her willingness to move toward conjectural conclusions that, while often presented as such, make the article seem less like an argued thesis than a loosely organized set of musings on the burial of children in the Anglo-Saxon period.

For example, she discusses the disparity of grave goods in child burials by noting that the "more highly furnished burials may mark an end of a chain of generations" while a less-endowed grave indicated a child who had siblings to inherit the wealth of the family. This thesis, while intriguing, is not adequately discussed or supported with detailed analysis. More interesting is her discussion of the occurrence of graves containing skeletons with markers of disease, like the leprosy victims discussed on page twenty-nine, which were overlain by the graves of small children. Only later does she introduce a religious factor, namely, that the practice of grave-sharing was largely abandoned as a result of Christian conversion (31). In the end, it is unclear whether her thesis of the proximity of the graves of children and the infirm rests on a pre- or post-conversion model of inhumation or if her discussion of the topic is asserting a linkage that exists independent of the religious aspect of burial practice in Anglo-Saxon England.

The enigmatic practice of charcoal burial in Early Medieval northern Europe is the subject of James Holloway's "Charcoal Burial: A Minority Burial Rite in Early Medieval Europe," which is included in Eileen M. Murphy's collection of essays, *Deviant Burial in the Archaeological Record* (Oxford: Oxbow), 131-47. Holloway opens the essay by noting the predominantly negative connotation of the word "deviant," stressing that the term "embod[ies] concepts of difference and marginalisation" (132) when placed in contrast with "normal" burials. However, as Holloway continues, "there are a wide variety of other variant or minority burial rites ... which remain enigmatic" (132). Holloway specifically examines the practice of charcoal burial, or the presence of transported (not burned within the grave cut) charcoal below, and sometimes over, the grave's occupant. He looks at five sites (Waterford, Ireland; Gloucester, England; Lund, Sweden; Barhobble, Scotland; and Mazerny, France) that all have charcoal burials. He finds that the comparative frequency of charcoal burials in England and Sweden, when compared to the infrequency of the practice in Ireland and Scotland (indeed, the two burials in Waterford constitute the entirety of charcoal burials in that country), indicate a ritualistic connection between the two cultures. However, Holloway notes that "the distribution of rites ... is completely different." He concludes that "communities with different identities employed similar rites differently, interpreting them in the context of an existing vocabulary of burial rites and constructing new interpretations and oppositions for them" (144). While this conclusion is a bit weak, the value of this essay lies in its approach to whether the presence of charcoal in an

early medieval grave is indicative of a "deviant" burial. While the essay ultimately cannot provide any definitive answers, the value of the question remains, as does Holloway's urge that scholars avoid the easy opposition of "normal" and "deviant" and instead consider "a vocabulary of symbolic elements from which a range of rites are produced and reproduced" (144).

RSA

D.M. Hadley explores an overlooked niche in "Warriors, Heroes and Companions: Negotiating Masculinity in Viking-Age England," *ASSAH* 15: 270-84. How burial remains inform us of constructed gender identities has been something of a hot topic in archaeology in recent times. The exception, according to Hadley, is the study of Norse remains in England during the ninth and tenth centuries. Hadley argues that there is an emphasis on masculine display in funerary practice, which is mirrored in sculpture from the same period. This emphasis was not simply a matter of survival but was a purposeful practice revealing "the negotiation of lordship in the context of conquest and settlement." One of the interesting points, which Hadley discusses at length, is the marginality of women in this "symbolic language" of burial and sculpture. In terms of sculptural representations, two women are displayed, each grasped by the hair by a warrior brandishing a sword. Other female figures are rare or debatable, such as the very contentious possible images of Hildr. There is also an absence of female figures in the burial record, though Hadley argues that this absence in both funerary and sculptural records is not explained by a paucity of women in the area. Hadley concludes that the Norse were in a phase of transformation while acculturating to Anglo-Saxon society, while the indigenous Anglo-Saxons were flexible in their responses; however, this conclusion has been made before and such acculturation is easily demonstrated from a number of factors. Hadley is on better ground discussing the construction of gender identity based on the grave goods. Here Hadley notes that weapon burials were, as a general rule, reserved for high status individuals who conquered land or ruled or both. But Hadley successfully argues that these sites should no longer be seen as wholly Scandinavian in strategy. The practices discussed in the article demonstrate that these burials were designed to display new masculine symbolisms that would appeal and communicate to both Scandinavians and Anglo-Saxons in an effort to nullify social and cultural disruptions and consolidate claims to property and power.

LS

f. Regional Studies and Economic Studies

In “The East Fields of Cambridge,” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 96 (2007): 143-60, Mary Heese utilizes archive terriers in order to complete a mapping of the fourteenth-century East Field of Cambridge. The Cambridge borough consists of three large medieval fields (West and East Fields and Chesterton Field), although only the West Field has ever been comprehensively mapped. In her reconstruction of the East Field, Heese concludes that two fields (Clayangles and Bradmore) were easy to reconstruct because the nineteenth-century street pattern maintained many of the boundaries going back to the fourteenth century. Due to modern housing developments, various industrial activities, and post-enclosure arable fields, medieval patterns in other areas are not so easily discernible. Thus, reconstruction was made more difficult in the largest fields (Sturbridge, Middle, and Ford). Although little new evidence is offered with regards to the establishment of the Cambridge open fields, Heese argues that the reconstruction does nothing to contradict previous conclusions that the open fields were pre-Conquest in origin. Heese does offer a new argument as she examines “plough-lands” in the *Domesday Book* in light of the East Field, and she contends that “arable cultivation in the East Field might have extended to a periphery at about a mile from the town before 1086, and subsequently to the parish boundaries as these existed in the fourteenth century” (158).

Although urban archaeology is usually small-scale in nature, Cecily A. Spall, Nicola J. Toop, et al. attempt to place it in its wider research context in “Before Eoforwic: New Light on York in the 6th-7th Centuries,” *Medieval Archaeology* 52.1: 1-25. The article discusses excavations, carried out in 2000 and 2001 outside the walls of York, that reveal new evidence for the transition between the Roman and Viking city. It also includes discussion of the site where Eoforwic, which is presently Heslington Hill in the campus of the University of York, contained Anglo-Saxon settlements dating from 550 to 650. A new settlement emerged two kilometers west in the seventh century. Spall and Toop therefore argue that the ceramic assemblage recovered suggests that the two communities, which were in close proximity, were connected. The article outlines the location and its background, pointing out that the place-name of the village, Heslington, “is Old English in derivation, interpreted as ‘farmstead near the hazel woods.’” This place-name, Spall and Toop contend, is suggestive of an early medieval settlement in the area, which previous archaeological findings confirm through

evidence of inhumation burials possibly dating back to the Roman period, although seventh- to eighth-century dates are more generally accepted. Discussion of the findings in Heslington are outlined in detail by contributors Ailsa Mainman, Alan Vince, Diana Briscoe, Stephen Rowland, and Allan Hall. These findings include pottery, glass beads, animal bone, and carbonized grain, although no human remains were recovered. What these discoveries indicate is that the remains were refuse deposits, “but the distance of around 100 m between them implies settlement of substantial size or duration” (12). There was also evidence of trade, since the glass beads are not distinct to England and the decoration of them suggests that they “may have been traded from the Netherlands, although perhaps not directly” (12). The findings suggest, overall, that there was a rural population “practicing a largely subsistence economy” (13). Along with a summary of findings and their analysis at Heslington, the area on the eastern bank of the River Ouse at Fishergate is also examined. A large quantity of artifacts were recovered, some of which include dress pins, garment hooks, bone combs, buckle plates, spindle whorls, and loomweights. Spall and Toop argue that “instead of being a brand new, royally controlled centre, the establishment of a settlement at Fishergate is the result of longer-lived, more integrated social and economic processes at work in the wider landscape, with a predecessor represented at Heslington” (20). Overall, “the discoveries at Heslington reveal an adjacent Anglo-Saxon agricultural settlement contemporary with early Anglo-Saxon burial sites” (20-21). Although the site was abandoned by the seventh century, a new settlement was established at Fishergate. This settlement shift, according to Spall and Toop, was not a new community but rather “the heir of a longer development in the nearby hinterland” (21). It is further argued that because industries, ecclesiastical links, political ties, and long-distance contacts had already been established, perhaps these together “and changing attitudes towards ‘Romanitas’ attracted the rural population back to the old city” (21). Archaeologists, anthropologists, and historians alike will benefit from this detailed and informative article.

Roger White’s “The Lingering Death of Roman Britain,” *Current Archaeology* 211 (2007): 11-18, tackles the question of why the Anglo-Saxons were unsuccessful in infiltrating western Britain despite the absence of a physical barrier that would have prevented penetration into the area. The article is not a précis of White’s book *Britannia Prima: Britain’s Last Roman Province*, but it offers an overview of a persistent Roman presence in early Anglo-Saxon England while signaling that

White's book provides explanations in further detail. In the article, White explores the Anglo-Saxons' lack of headway into western Britain, arguing that the Province of Britannia Prima survived for quite some time and was able to mount successful resistance to invasion. After defining the Province of Britannia Prima as the territory of Dobunni (encompassing Gloucester, Cirencester, and Kenchester) with core tribes from Gloucester and Cirencester, White investigates what happened in the region. Basing his argument on Germanic metalwork finds as well as Irish place-names and tombstones, White contends that the finds as a whole suggest "that British and Irish warriors defended 'Roman' West Britain against 'Germanic' East Britain in the 5th century AD." He discusses further archaeological evidence to support his case. What follows is a brief historical study of fifth-century West Britain. The author argues that some vestiges of Roman town-life and urban existence were evident into the early seventh century (17), but that tribal chieftains on the western fringes had gained power by the fifth century and that Britannia Prima's coherent identity ceased to exist. Still, its existence at all during the fifth century and the military presence there "allowed time for the emergence of the Brittonic kingdoms of the coastal fringes of the west, kingdoms that formed the genesis of the Cornish and Welsh peoples" (18). Pictures, including those of Caernarfon Castle and the 1984 excavation at Wroxeter, with illustrations of the different phases, several maps of finds, illustrations of various finds, and a map of mercenary travel and migration to Britain from the continent accompany the article.

MR-O

"Where Most Inclosures Be": East Anglian Fields: History Morphology and Management by Edward Martin and Max Satchell (Ipswich: Suffolk County Council) is a detailed report summarizing the findings from the extensive Historic Field Systems of East Anglia Project, conducted from 2000 to 2005. The book is divided into three sections. The first part describes the current archaeological evidence for land usage in East Anglia, concentrating primarily on medieval land use but also including a short separate chapter (chapter two) describing the prehistoric and Roman evidence for land usage. The rest of the first section (chapters one and three) provide an introductory context and a summary of prior research into the topic. Of most interest to the researchers in terms of land use was the allocation of land for common fields and "their antithesis, ancient 'block holdings' or holdings in severalty (i.e. farmsteads surrounded by their own group of fields)"

(xiii). The distribution of the frequency of these two land uses followed an "unexpected" line roughly corresponding to the River Gipping; namely, north of this line, where the land was not as friendly to pre-modern farming, there was a larger percentage of the land held "in common," while south of the river, where the land was richer, there was a much higher percentage of land held "in enclosure," for which, the authors note, the East Anglian landscape became known. The core of the book, part two, is a detailed overview of twelve case studies conducted by the authors in various locations in the East Anglian region, namely, three sites in Norfolk, four in Suffolk, three in Essex, and one each in Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire. Each site was intensively studied and walked and quantified by land type. There were eight basic land types noted; these types were further broken down into eighteen subtypes. Chapter four provides a detailed characterization of each of these land types; chapter five provides the reader with each locational case study, fully supported by full-color photographs and maps. Part three extrapolates from the raw data presented in part two. In chapter six, Martin discusses the regionalities evident in the East Anglian field system, as evidenced by the differences in land use highlighted by the collected data. Specifically, he notes that the "Gipping divide" is not only a divide in terms of land use but also a significant cultural divide that can be seen in such other areas as architectural design, linguistic terminology, and inheritance customs. These differences, he notes, extend beyond the East Anglian region and thus indicate that "this was a boundary of regional importance that has greater cultural significance than the existing county boundaries" (xiii, 201-206). In chapter seven, Martin discusses the possible origins of the land-use distribution in the area, noting especially the emergence of the common fields in the Saxon period (216-17) and the Viking impact in conjunction with the seemingly Scandinavian impact on the common field land-use pattern (217-221). He reminds the reader, however, that the "lack of evidence for common fields in the Viking homelands makes it unlikely that they introduced them to England" (221). However, he does note that the idea of the "free peasant" tends to be frequent in Scandinavian thought and thus might be useful to take into consideration when considering land use in this area (223-4). Finally, in chapter eight, "Managing the Historic Field Systems of East Anglia for the Future," Martin provides recommendations for conserving the landscape's historical evidence and managing such conservation in the future.

RSA

g. Artifacts and Iconography

Because strap-ends were the most common class of dress accessory from late Anglo-Saxon England, a myriad of materials were deployed to create strap-ends and other accessories. In the article “Re-evaluating Base-Metal Artefacts: An Inscribed Lead Strap-End from Crewkerne, Somerset,” *ASE* 37: 173-81, Gabor Thomas, Naomi Payne, and Elisabeth Okasha undertake collaborative efforts to analyze a newly discovered strap-end found at Crewkerne, which bears distinctive features because it is inscribed with a personal name. Since the area of Crewkerne in south Somerset was a royal manor of the kings of Wessex, several strap-ends, a fragment of a Ringerike-style harness cheek-piece, and an oval Urnes-style mount have previously been discovered in the area with the aid of metal-detecting. This article outlines a comparative study of other strap-ends with similar dates that have been found and determines that “the distribution of these recent discoveries seems likely to reflect the locations where metal detecting has taken place rather than to represent a historically significant pattern” (175). After discussing the location of the find and offering a detailed description, the authors emphasize an analysis of the inscription. Although two letters in particular cannot be determined with total certainty, the text appears to say “w[u]lfstan m[e]c ah a, that is, ‘Wulfstan owns me,’ apparently with an extraneous letter A at the end” (175). It is determined that the final letter A in the inscription is a space-filler rather than a part of the text. Further linguistic analysis is offered with regards to the script, as well as a thorough codicological examination. Ultimately, it is established that “the Crewkerne find belongs to a series of Anglo-Saxon tongue-shaped strap-ends, derived from a continental Carolingian prototype, popularized across southern and eastern England during the tenth and eleventh centuries” (178). Ultimately, this exceptional find demonstrates the possibility that metal was used as a means to advertise status, and it also offers evidence of a dress accessory with male ownership (since most finds do not give clues to gender or are evidently female accessories, such as hair pins). Included at the end of the article are two strikingly clear images of the strap-end and inscription, followed by two further illustrations of the inscription. The article offers a multi-faceted examination of the Anglo-Saxon strap-end and demonstrates the benefits of interdisciplinary research. The article will be of use to literary and art historians, metallurgists, archaeologists, anthropologists, and linguists.

Michael J. Cuddeford’s “An Early Medieval Hanging Bowl Mount from Good Easter,” *Essex Archaeology and*

History 38 (2007): 197-98, provides a succinct description of a piece of a medieval hanging bowl that was found with the aid of a metal detector in 2004. The artifact was discovered in a field within the parish of Good Easter in which no excavations have ever been carried out. Most striking about this piece is that it is decorated in the “native ‘Celtic’ style prevalent in Ireland and northern Britain during the early medieval period, rather than reflecting the artistic traditions of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms” (197). Reflecting on Rupert Bruce-Mitford’s 2005 publication, which contains images of previously discovered medieval hanging bowls, Cuddeford piques interest by suggesting that this find raises interesting questions about the function and use of these non-Saxon-style bowls. Measurements and a small image of the hanging bowl are provided.

A description of a silver strap-end is provided in “Anglo-Saxon Silver Strap-End from High Easter,” *Essex Archaeology and History* 38 (2007): 195-97, by Michael J. Cuddeford. The object was found in the early 1990s before the passing of the Treasure Act and therefore has not previously been formally published. Cuddeford offers a detailed description of the item and includes an image in the article. The silver strap-end contains stippled gold inserts, and, since there is only one other strap-end comparable to the High Easter find (known as the Strickland Brooch), Cuddeford provides a comparative analysis of the two items. He concludes that the two pieces bear much in common and are possibly of the same school and date range (ninth century).

Kate Ravilious’s article “Spectacular Viking Hoard,” *Archaeology* 60.6 (2007): 9, provides an account of how the father and son metal-detecting team, David and Andrew Whelans, discovered in 2007 the largest Viking treasure hoard for 150 years. Ravilious provides a brief summary of the findings and revisits the Whelans’s personal account in the days, weeks, and months after their discovery. The succinct article is more feature-like in its style and offers general readers a summation of the Whelans’s find in Harrogate, England.

MR-O

In a new feature in *Norfolk Archaeology*, Andrew Rogerson and Steven Ashby summarize “A Selection of Finds from Norfolk Recorded Between 2006 and 2008” (45.3: 428-41). This is a selected overview, for, as the authors note, there are over 20,000 objects recorded each year. They concentrate for the most part on Anglo-Saxon objects, though two brief sections describe outstanding prehistoric and Romano-British objects (429). The authors accompany their descriptive entries with illustrations, most of which were prepared by Jason Gibbons.

The objects are not all of English origin; for example, there were finds of eighth- to ninth-century Celtic insular metalwork from Ireland (434) and a "Scandinavian late Vendel period cast-in-one oval brooch" that "dates from the 8th century, many decades before Viking settlement got underway in East Anglia and, indeed, to before the onset of the Viking Age" (439). These finds, and others, perhaps indicate a stronger trade network than usually is assumed for the time and place.

In "The Discovery and Analysis of a Urinary Calculus from an Anglo-Saxon Burial in Sedgeford, Norfolk," *Norfolk Archaeology* 45: 397-409, Sophie Beckett, Martin Hatton, and Keith Rogers provide a fascinating look into Anglo-Saxon disease through their detailed examination of a bladder stone recovered from a grave of a juvenile (S3010) in the Boneyard field, an Anglo-Saxon cemetery in Sedgeford, Norfolk. Comparatively few gall, bladder, or kidney stones have been found in archaeological excavations; however, the authors note in their enlightening overview of the history of the disease that urinary calculi were quite common in Norfolk, especially in children. The authors surmise that researchers often overlook the calculi because of their appearance and take them for gravel of geological origin rather than stones of biological origin. Nevertheless, the stone in grave S3010 was recovered and subjected to a detailed analysis that enabled the authors to conclude that the occupant of S3010 was a young person who had a history of "stress" in his or her life, probably as the result of frequent disease or malnutrition, or both. They speculate that the urinary calculus, which was about 3.5 cm long, was formed as a result of a urinary tract infection (UTI), and probably contributed to the juvenile's evidenced ill-health: an untreated bladder stone was often the site of further infection as a result of accumulating bacteria on the stone. Thus, the authors propose that the inhabitant of grave S3010 could have been female (females are disproportionately prone to UTIs, as a result of their shorter and wider urethra), despite the much higher prevalence of urinary calculi in male juveniles and adult men.

A brief article in *Antiquaries Journal* 88: 37-42, entitled "Making Gold-Mercury Amalgam: The Evidence for Gilding From Southampton" by Justine Bayley and Andy Russel describes two finds from the Southampton area that indicate gilding was practiced in the area during the Middle and Late Anglo-Saxon periods. As the authors note, the process of gold-mercury amalgam gilding is "well understood," and gilded artifacts are "not uncommon finds from the third century AD onwards" (37). However, until these finds, there has been no archaeological evidence for the process of mercury

gilding. This paper presents two such finds, both mortars. Trace gold and mercury in the mortars indicate that they were used as a part of the first step in the gilding process, which is to combine the two elements into an amalgam suitable for gilding objects made from silver, copper, or tin. The first find is a reused stone found within Hamwic, a Middle Saxon town, and probably dates from the seventh to ninth centuries. The other mortar is a reused Roman amphora shard, which was found in a pit excavation at the Roman city of Clausentum. While the pit mostly contained artifacts dating from no later than 150 AD, it also contained a few pieces of Mayen ware, a rare German import, which dates the detritus to 300-450 AD or later. The authors speculate that the gilder found the amphora shard in the rubbish pit and reused it as a mortar during the Early Saxon period or the fourth or fifth centuries. It is, of course, possible that the shard was used even later, contemporary to the Hamwich mortar; it possible, as the authors point out, that the gilder was using a six-hundred-year-old artifact on which to combine his gold and mercury. The article concludes by requesting readers to inform the authors of any other finds that may also be archaeological evidence for the gilding process in England. They also thank Rachel Cruse, the student who first noticed the gold flake on the amphora shard, and conservator Vanessa Fell, who, while analyzing the shard, also noted the gold flakes on the stone mortar, thus showing that significant finds happen at all stages of archaeological work.

A very brief notice in *Norfolk Archaeology* 45 (2007): 410-11, by Adrian Marsden (introduced and illustrated by Giles Emery) announces the discovery of an Anglo-Saxon brooch made from a Roman coin. The article, entitled "A Nummular Brooch from Bull Close Road, Norwich," summarizes the find, a 33 mm diameter brooch that shares many details with a Roman gold *solidi*, which were made from the reign of Constantius II (353-61) until the fifth century (411). These would have been available in Britain, the authors note, as a result of the Roman presence in England and because "[l]ate Roman gold coins may well have been in existence as bullion hundreds of years after the collapse of the western empire" (411). Marsden tentatively dates the brooch to the eighth or ninth century.

In "Investigations at Godwick and Beeston St. Andrew," Andrew Rogerson provides an introduction to two articles by the late Alan Davison, who had prepared them for publication prior to his death. Rogerson provides the reader with a contextual overview of Davison's work, as first a landscape archaeologist and later as one of the leading archaeologists of East Anglia

and editor of *Norfolk Archaeology*, in which these two articles are printed (45 [2007]: 141-54). Both are reports of fieldwalk surveys; the first, at Godwick, yielded evidence of habitation before the Late Saxon period, which was the purported goal of the research (145). While the evidence was slight, there were prehistoric finds (worked flint) and several shards from the Romano-British period (43-410) and the Anglo-Saxon period (450-1100). By far, however, the largest number of items of archaeological interest dated to the Medieval and post-Medieval period (1100 and onwards). Nevertheless, the presence of earlier artifacts indicates that the site has been continuously inhabited since prehistory. The second section of the article details a fieldwalk survey of Beeston St. Andrew; the findings of this survey were quite similar to the author's findings in Godwick, with even less evidence from the pre-medieval periods. This was "decidedly puzzling" to Davison, who notes that Beeston is mentioned in the Domesday Book (147, 149). This mention makes the decided dearth of pottery from the Late Saxon period a puzzling aspect of the survey; Davison suggests that the evidence may be beneath extant villages or that "the absence of significant pottery finds from the central area may indicate the presence of woodland" (152), which would have provided a raw material that would not survive as archaeological artifacts. Davison concludes that there "remain many unanswered questions," as a result of these two fieldwalk surveys, and both sites merit further archaeological excavation.

RSA

James Graham-Campbell's "Viking Age and Late Norse gold and silver from Scotland: an update," *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 138: 193-204, is a two-part report that, firstly, takes the form of addenda and corrigenda to Graham-Campbell's catalogue of Viking Age gold and silver recovered in Scotland and that, secondly, offers additions of relevant finds to the catalogue since its first publication in 2006. The author tackles the corrections to items found in hoards, gold rings and coins. Given the length of the original catalogue, the amount of corrections is rather diminutive, which is a testimony to the excellent standard of cataloguing previously undertaken by Graham-Campbell. The second part of the paper describes various artifacts that have been found since the first publication of the catalogue was made available; the author adds these items to the complete catalogue. Among the new items are three Viking Age arm-ring fragments, two gold strips, and two silver ingots. Stunningly vivid photos of the finds are included, showing the superb condition

in which the artifacts have survived and indicating the precise size of each find. Brief analyses of each new find are also included.

MR-O

h. Place-Names

Forget sticky situations; a salty one is the focal point of Steven Bassett's "Sitting above the salt: the origin of the borough of Droitwich," *A Commodity of Good Names* [see sect. 2], 3-27. Bassett investigates the history of Droitwich (Worcester) to determine how late into the Anglo-Saxon period this major salt-producing center was still in production. Reflecting on the center's history, Bassett discusses the salt industry's existence since at least the late first millennium BC. Previous archaeological evidence has already determined that the area had been exploited for salt by at least the third century BC. The more important aspects of this study are an examination of Droitwich's function during the Anglo-Saxon period, its origin, and a place-name study of its location. Although historical documents are not analyzed in detail, Bassett suggests that by piecing together a number of Anglo-Saxon charters, Domesday Book, and other early sources, a "royally controlled industry is revealed, which kept on expanding in the Anglo-Saxon period" (4-5). The author examines the earliest map of the borough (dated to 1456), which reveals that the area was divided between five parish churches. By examining the relationship of the five parishes (St. Augustine's, Witton St. Peter's, Witton St. Mary's, Droitwich St. Nicholas, and Salwarpe), Bassett describes the "intricate pattern of manorial fission" (12) and the continued desire for a stake in the use of the brine-pits in Droitwich. A map outlining the location and boundary of each parish in 1086 AD is a useful addition, providing a visual guide to understanding the complex relationship of the parishes within the borough and their proximity to the salt-pits (8). Additionally, a map detailing the former parochial affiliations in the vicinity of Droitwich (11) shows how "the complicated interlocking of the five parishes strongly indicates that they had all once belonged to a single territory, focused on the brine pits" (12) along with the settlement that established itself adjacent to the parishes. Because of what seemed to be an "unfailingly lucrative industry" (13), lay aristocrats and men affiliated with the Church remained eager for direct involvement with the brine-pits. Along with the discussion of the strong links between each of the five major parishes in the borough, Bassett argues that St. Augustine's parish and its location to the brine-pits resulted in the parish's financial

and spatial growth. Consequently, by the eleventh century, St. Augustine's became a "mother-church of an extensive territory spanning the majority of the catchment area of the Salwarpe" (17). Bassett deviates from the ongoing scholarly debate concerning in which century the mother-church parishes existed (contending anywhere from the seventh to the early eleventh, according to Bassett) but maintains that what is important to his argument is that the mother-church parish "provides a sound socio-economic and geographical framework within which to explore the origins of the borough of Droitwich" (17). Included in the essay is an in-depth discussion of the aforementioned borough and the activity and use of the brine-pits by the Anglo-Saxons in the late eleventh century. This is followed by a brief place-name study. The name *wich* (*wīc*) may have been borrowed from the Latin *vicus* or a Brittonic derivative (25), thus "in 1086 the significance of the area called Wich was still something of a historical anachronism, even if the territory to which the name was currently attached was of relatively recent creation" (27). Bassett's multi-faceted argument draws on numerous methods of investigating the history of a borough to produce a strong case. Ultimately, the author suggests that Droitwich's Anglo-Saxon church and aristocratic interests in the salt-pits, which began in ancient times, were exploited into the eleventh century because of their lucrative prospects. This interdisciplinary study will no doubt be of interest to historians, specialists in place-name studies, linguists, archaeologists, geographers, and topographers.

Also included in place-name studies this year is Nicholas Brooks's interesting article, "An early boundary of the dioceses of Canterbury and Rochester" in *A Commodity of Good Names*, ed. O.J. Padel and David N. Parsons [see sect. 2], 8-43. The essay features a linguistic and palaeographical study of a brief Old English boundary clause listed in a late ninth- or early tenth-century Irish pocket gospel-book (the MacDurnan Gospels, MS London, Lambeth Palace, 1370, 114r). The clause does not seem to describe explicitly an Anglo-Saxon estate, and Brooks investigates whether the clause might have defined a small (extra-diocesan) enclave. The author provides a succinct palaeographical analysis of the scribe's hand and compares the hand to other records in the gospel-book. Brooks concludes that the scribe, or someone with a similar style of script, wrote three writs in the gospel-book. What follows is a study aiming to understand the insertion and purpose of the clause. Brooks claims that an interpretation of the clause is dependent upon its awkward opening sentence, so he thus explores the words and phrases in

the sentence. The mysteriousness of particular words within the clause are unraveled as Brooks provides brief linguistic studies of the words and phrases: *hansfleot, to Hoingdene, to tumpyllan, to sandhlincan*, 'along the river (*ēa*) to the *wīc*, to *cortan*, and 'and so along to Sussex,' respectively (38-42). Through his analysis of the language Brooks identifies what are possibly three successive landmarks (*sandhlincan*, *ēa*, and *wīc*), thus demonstrating why the clause may have been entered into the MacDurnan Gospels. The author provides an alternative reading and suggests that *wīc* and the *corte* might mark the two ends of the parish of Maidstone. This new theory contends "that this was where the boundary of the two bishoprics had always run, [and] to envisage the possibility that some future archbishop might wish to cede this anomalous western foothold to Rochester" (42). Later evidence of parish boundaries and episcopal land-holdings revealed that "no subsequent archbishop followed up this hint" (42) from the clause found in the gospel-book. Although Brooks's linguistic study is quite convincing based on his analysis of the language of the text, his argument needs further support, especially in the area of topography (for which he makes an appeal [42]). Brooks both reveals the benefits of place-name study and is aware of its limits, acknowledging the value a topographer in the area might bring to this investigation. By analyzing place-names, the essay as a whole provides a fascinating look at the diocese boundaries of Canterbury and Rochester in ninth- or early tenth-century Anglo-Saxon England.

With his specialization in geography, Gavin Smith's "-*ingas* and the Mid-Seventh-Century Diocese," *Nomina* 31: 67-87, adds another dimension to the place-name discussion first presented by James Kemble and Carole Hough. Smith's article examines the regularities of place name suffixes, investigating, for example, the raft of *-ingas* places in Surrey, and further explores the identity of the namers and purposes of the names. Smith outlines the *-ingas* names of Surrey and then explores the parallels with the *-ingas* of Essex. After a brief description of the distribution of the names within both regions, Smith explores the possible royal or monastic associations with the place names. Might the places be named after their first minsters? Smith suggests that "all Surrey's *-ingas* places could once have been minsters, though some of very brief life" (74). Similarly, the possibility exists that all Surrey *-ingas* places were minsters' sites on focal royal holdings at an early period. While Smith offers an interesting theory about *-ingas*, he also confronts some of the problems associated with his theory, namely the dating of places and whether or not the minster and hundredal

organizations occurred simultaneously. Ultimately, Smith concludes that although *-ingas* in Surrey may very well be associated with minsters of mid-seventh-century dioceses, the idea cannot be proven definitively. Despite the lack of evidence to fully prove his point, Smith offers an interesting look at place-names in seventh-century Anglo-Saxon England from a geographer's point of view, and his conclusion suggests that more work in this area could help determine the origin of some *-ingas* names in Anglo-Saxon England.

MR-O

In an article using archaeology to illuminate place name studies, Simon Draper offers "The Significance of Old English *Burh* in Anglo-Saxon England," *ASSAH* 15: 240-53. Names with *burh* are widespread in geography and time and are easily one of the more important indicators of habitation, and seem to have been important from an early period. Draper notes that while the majority of place name scholars take *burh* as associated with pre-historic fortifications, but Draper notes that this association is probably less due to etymology and meaning of the name than to what is known about a large number of places that bear some form of the name. Draper's purpose is to ground *burh* names in the etymology and meaning of the word, and the verb from which the noun derives, *beorgan* 'to protect', and to offer supporting archaeological formations at places where the name occurs to redefine *burh* place names as 'enclosure'. But he does not want to see this as just any old enclosure: the literary evidence indicates an enclosure belonging to a nobleman or church official. Among the important observations in this article is that one need not differentiate monastic and secular functions of a *burh*. He notes that archaeologically there is little to differentiate the two types; both yield archaeological evidence of production and trade, document production, and most importantly had boundary enclosures "meriting the descriptive element *burh*." In connection with this discussion, Draper mentions Flixborough, commented on by this author in *YWOES* last year, since part of the discussion there is whether it was a monastic site in the ninth century or secular, based entirely on the discovery of writing implements dated to that period. Draper continues to examine other sorts of related names. *Burhgate* and *Burhstreet* (and related spellings) often indicate streets that lead to the enclosure of a town or other fortified center. Of greater interest to this feature is the occurrence of *-burh* centers near *wics*. Thus, not unexpectedly, *Londonburh* refers to the walled, Roman city and *Lundenwic* to the nearby trading center. Such a feature is also

found at Canterbury and the nearby *Fordwic*. Draper finds plenty of evidence for his conclusion from the Chronicle, Bede, Laws of Ine, and charters. Thus, he concludes that both etymology and archaeology confirm that at least in origin *burh* place-names referred to habitations enclosed, regardless of whether religious or secular, defensive or serving some other purpose, and that this continued into the Late Saxon period when the term took on more general meaning.

LS

John Cleary's brief "Urns Farm, Baston: The 8th Century *Spalda* and 21st Century *Spalding*," *Lincolnshire Past and Present* 62 (2005/06): 5-6, offers his first-hand amateur observations and researches undertaken at Urns farm, a fifth-century Anglo-Saxon cemetery. He suggests that the *Spaldas*, or descendants of *Spalda*, were keepers of ford-crossings along an old Roman road. Cleary proposes the name *Spaldham* for the early Anglo-Saxon settlement near the Kates Bridge a mile north from Baston, and suggests that modern-day Spalding was a daughter *vill* of that earliest settlement. A useful map of the region is reproduced.

AA

i. Inscriptions and Runes

Was the runic inscription on the Ruthwell cross a product of its time, or was it added to the cross 250 years later, giving it new life with its monumental tenth-century facelift? In "The Ruthwell Monument Runic Poem in a Tenth-Century Context," *RES* 59: 25-51, Patrick W. Conner offers a thought-provoking approach to dating the runic inscription on the Ruthwell monument and argues that a tenth-century context offers evidence that that runes were added to the monument centuries after its construction. Conner's approach is both bold and forthright as he intends "to disturb the status quo concerning the context for the reception of the runic poem on the Ruthwell monument" (26), and he does not shy away from arguing his case in light of the fact that his view has met opposition. Although a more common understanding of the inscriptions suggests that the runic poem was added to the monument at or near the time it was first carved and that the audience was most likely new Anglo-Saxon converts, Conner challenges these assumptions in light of the evidence he presents. At the heart of Conner's argument is that "the choice of English as the language of the Ruthwell inscription is a choice which fits best with the tenth/eleventh-century practices, not with eighth-century practices" (32). What follows is a convincing

account of linguistic, liturgical, and historical evidence along with a comparative study to runes on the Franks Casket to support Conner's main theme. Ultimately, Conner contends that a monastic setting under Benedictine reform may be connected to the inscriptions on the monument, and that "the English poem on the Ruthwell monument may well have been written in runes in an effort to distinguish it from the Latin texts already there, thus to preserve its integrity" (36). Conner does justice to his argument by addressing a number of subsidiary questions linked to his primary claim, which places the runic inscription of the monument in a tenth-century monastic context, while additionally supporting his claims with a plethora of historical documents and scholarly verification. The challenges faced in establishing a later date for the runic inscription are by no means small, and traditional or even romanticized ideas of how the Ruthwell monument was created can stand in the way of the cross's main message. However, Conner never fails to remind readers of the poem's message, and, more importantly, he emphasizes and reemphasizes that his claim is contextual rather than deductive. Essentially, he does not aim to prove the Ruthwell monument could not possibly have been carved before the tenth century based on historical certainties, rather he argues "that the poem fits a tenth-century context as well—and maybe better—than an eighth-century one" (42). Accompanying the essay is a chart outlining the precise location of all surviving manuscripts exhibiting runes in the English tradition from around the world (39-40). The chart serves to support the claim that there was somewhat of a revival of runes in the centuries following the Viking invasions, while also indicating that the high level of later manuscripts that contained English runes suggests the possibility that the Ruthwell inscription was written during the period following the Benedictine Reforms. Overall, Conner provides a stimulating, and for the most part, convincing argument for the possibility that the runic inscription was added to the Ruthwell cross some two centuries after it was erected. Certainly his discussion is not the final word concerning the dating of the runic inscription, but Conner's thorough analysis and meticulously arranged argument is successful in proposing a later date for the inscription. This essay should stimulate a lively discussion of the runic inscription contained on the Ruthwell monument for years to come.

MR-O

Insular Inscriptions by David Howlett (Dublin and Portland: Four Courts Press, 2005) takes the word

"inscription" at its most literal, Latinate meaning: a writing. While most of the inscriptions discussed in the book are on stone, many are in manuscripts and on other writing surfaces. Howlett discusses inscriptions from the late Roman period through the end of the fifteenth century. The subject matter is divided by language of the inscription, including chapters on Latin, Old English, Old Norse, Welsh, Irish, Anglo-Norman, and even Semitic language inscriptions. Howlett's aim seems to be two-fold. On the one hand, he seeks to study a tradition that is continuous from the early Roman period through the fifteenth century, that demonstrates learning, and that is every bit as interesting and literary as the literary texts that are more commonly studied. On the other hand, Howlett seeks to demonstrate that even in inscriptional texts the "biblical style" is present and again is a continuous practice from the ancient world through to the early modern in Ireland, Wales, Scotland, and England. Howlett underscores the similarity of learning and style that all writers shared during the ancient and medieval periods, connections often missed because the academy encourages geographic and linguistic pigeon-holing. Howlett brings these disparately located inscriptions written in different languages together in a useful and fascinating study. That alone makes the book worth dipping into. However, much of the discussion does deal with Howlett's theory regarding "biblical style," and much of the usefulness of the analysis will depend on the reader's position regarding that theory. Nonetheless, it is useful to have a discussion of Latin and vernacular inscriptions plus inscriptions in Greek, Arabic, and Hebrew.

LS

In "Noms de personnes, noms de lieux, noms de peuples dans la Tapisserie de Bayeux: une perspective française," *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 51: 201-11, George T. Beech argues that a close examination of the ways in which the Bayeux tapestry author or artist used inscriptions, particularly onomastic inscriptions, indicates that the tapestry shows a Norman French perspective, and while "Il ne s'agit pas d'une preuve absolue qu'il eût été en France" ("it cannot be definitely proven that it was made in France"), his conclusion is that it most likely was. He bases this conclusion on his detailed study of the frequency and style of naming seen in the tapestry inscriptions, noting, for example, that it "est deux fois plus importante pour la présentation des activités normandes que pour celle des Anglais" ("it is twice as important to present the Norman activities than those of the English") (204), and concluding that the inscriptions amount to a French point of view of the Battle of

Hastings, rather than an English one. He further elaborates on this thesis by noting that the author's choice of verbs (between *venire* and *ire*) also indicate a Franco-centric point of view, as does his propensity to be more specific when referring to or naming English locations or figures (such as Harold's brother's Gyrth and Leofwine) than Norman ones. Beech's research and conclusions challenge the belief that the Bayeux tapestry was produced in England, specifically at the St. Augustine Monastery in Canterbury; he suggests instead that a Loire Valley manufacturing location is more likely.

RSA

R.I. Page's "Anglo-Saxon Runes: Some Statistical Problems," *Runes and their Secrets: Studies in Runology*, ed. Marie Stocklund, Michael Lerche Nielsen, Bente Holmberg, and Gillian Fellows-Jensen (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 2006), 271-82, is part of a collection of articles on runes resulting from a conference in 2000. Articles range in subject matter from very early runic inscriptions and the origins of runes to early modern use of runes. The two articles discussed here are the only two that directly deal with Anglo-Saxon runes and runology. Page's article reviews the simple fact that the sample is simply too small to make any significant conclusions regarding their use and cultural contexts. For the five-hundred-year period from 500 to 1000 in Anglo-Saxon England there are a mere eighty-four inscriptions as of 2000, excluding the special difficulty of coins and what Page terms "travelers' graffiti." Page explains that "This means that statistically speaking there are 18 inscriptions per century ... hardly enough to keep a single rune carver busy" (272). Page then states that there are two general conclusions to be made from this paucity of evidence: on the one hand, no firm conclusion can be or should be made regarding runes and use of runes in Anglo-Saxon England. On the other hand, no theory or conclusion about the use of runes in the period can be disproven. Thus, every theory and conclusion may be met by even the most skeptical with a "maybe it is so." The runic inscriptions on coins have a similar problem. The names of the two most prolific minters, Efe and Wilred, are known. Some twenty-six dies have been identified for these two on ninety-six pennies. Of the twenty-six, twenty-five have runes or a mixture of runes and Roman letters on them. How large of a statistical sample this is is unknown: did these two moneymen have additional dies that do not survive, or did they only have these? Of course, this assumes that there were only two men minting money in the period. What of others that perhaps have yet to

be found? Page notes that some of his statistics have changed even as he was writing: there had been new finds just in the year in which he published his paper alone; certainly there have been additional finds, since the first decade of this century has been particularly fortunate in finding hoards. Nonetheless, these new finds do not significantly change the picture Page has delineated. He ends with two good pieces of advice from his early work in engineering: do the best with the materials at hand (that is, go ahead and come to conclusions regarding runes), and do not be surprised if it does not work. Considering the statistical problems, these are both excellent guidelines for the field.

In the second article, "The yew-rune and the Runes [hægl], [giefu], [gear], and [is] in the Old English Corpus (Epigraphical Material)," 385-414, Gaby Waxenberger takes on the controversial subject of the yew-rune, also called the star-rune, in Old English epigraphy, with some comparison to other written texts in Old English. The yew-rune occurs in surviving examples from the fifth through late ninth or early tenth centuries over a region covered by Northumbria, Mercia, and Kent. This study is synchronic in nature and discusses the phonological values of the signs in the Old English corpus with only minimal reference to non-runic material in Old English. Like Page, this author too must point to the paucity of evidence. The evidence is surveyed and divided into four categories, which correspond to the various phonological values given to the rune: high front vowel, consonant, uncertain value, and where the sign is part of futhorc. The preliminary conclusion is that the high front vowel, likely *i*, is the original value and that the other values existed side-by-side through accretion. By way of comparison, Waxenberger examines <3>, <h>, and <i> and then the Ruthwell Cross inscription. One of the author's stated goals is to demonstrate the complexity of the situation. While no certain conclusions are reached, Waxenberger succeeds in illuminating, however slightly, the use of these runes.

LS

j. Miscellaneous

In *Beavers in Britain's Past* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2006), Bryony Coles explores the long-held supposition that beavers were extant in Britain during the early medieval period. Indeed, their highly distinctive bright orange incisors have been found in graves, sometimes mounted in precious metal. Most notably, the Sutton Hoo lyre was buried in a beaver-skin bag. It was believed that the beaver had become extinct in England

before the Norman Conquest, but Professor Coles has taken the matter further. In a multi-disciplinary study, she has examined the evidence for the existence of the European beaver over the last 13,000 years. This study has drawn on what must be every possible source: historical records, archaeology, ecology, heraldry, place-names, art, and folk-lore are included, as well as the fieldwork carried out as part of the Beaver Works Project in Brittany and the Drôme area of south-eastern France. This study examined the results of modern beaver activity in order to ascertain what traces might be expected to survive in the archaeological record. A belief that the European beaver, *Castor fiber*, did not build dams or fell trees was quickly disproved: they were found to be just as active as their North American cousin, *Castor canadensis*. The historical sources produced some surprises: in 1789 the Churchwardens' Accounts for Bolton Percy, Yorkshire record a payment of a two-pence bounty for a beaver's head, suggesting a very late survival. Beavers impacted medieval communities in many ways: their skins and flesh were seen as the prerogative of the aristocracy, and *castoreum* from their scent glands, having analgesic and antiseptic properties, was important as a drug. Their impact on the landscape was also important: air-dried standing timber was valuable, as was the creation of "beaver meadow" alongside rivers.

In a work of this scope, the early medieval period can form only part of the discussion; it is concentrated, along with the Roman period, between pages 126 and 138 and in the chapter dealing with the earlier second millennium AD, between pages 160 and 176. The section on beaver place-names in England and Wales (139-59) is of great interest, although justifiably cautious. Errors are few; I was surprised to read that the monastery at Jarrow was founded by the Venerable Bede in the seventh century (164). Even so, this is a good piece of work, well-written, with excellent color illustrations and mapping. The book ends with a plea for the reintroduction of beavers into Britain, which sounds both practical and interesting.

KL

In "Insect invaders of reconstructed Anglo-Saxon houses at West Stow, Suffolk, England," *Environmental Archaeology* 13.1: 51-57, Harry Kenward and Jess Tipper examine the insect remains recovered from West Stow, the location where one of the first large-scale investigations of an early Anglo-Saxon settlement occurred years ago (between 1965 and 1972). With the aid of pitfall traps placed in four of the reconstructed buildings on the site, Kenward and Tipper collected beetles,

invertebrates, springtails, mites, spiders, woodlice, booklice, larvae, and clothes moths, but the primary focus of the investigation was the beetles. A complete summary of the insect remains recovered accompanies the article, and the research carried out demonstrates that "the salt traps employed were successful in preserving the bodies of insects" (56). Although the investigation was successful in recovering insect remains and offers an effective method in collecting insect fauna, the article neither indicates what the remains suggest in relation to the buildings in which they were recovered, nor makes a connection to the Anglo-Saxon settlement that once existed there.

MR-O

Experimental and experiential are two similar words that, when applied to archaeology, sometimes cause scholars to wince; thoughts of "Medieval Faires" and other such weekend activities often come to mind. Mary Ellen Crothers, in "Experimental Archaeology within the Heritage Industry: Publicity and the Public at West Stow Anglo-Saxon Village" (*Experiencing Archaeology by Experiment: Proceedings of the Experimental Archaeology Conference, Exeter 2007*, ed. Penny Cunningham, Julia Heeb, and Roeland Paardekooper, [Oxford: Oxbow], 37-46), challenges assumptions of this sort and argues for the benefits of incorporating the public into archaeological research. She specifically describes the "methods used to communicate experimental archaeology" at West Stow Village, an excavated Anglo-Saxon village (most work done from 1956 to 1972), which has been used since 1973 as the site for a reconstruction project based on the archaeological information excavated in the prior decades. The site, Crothers stresses, does not encourage visitors to passively engage with the site but to experience the debates in contemporary scholarship, such as how Anglo-Saxon houses with a pit and two post-holes were constructed. Did the inhabitants live in the pit and simply put up gables and a roof, or did they build a wooden platform over the pit and build a house with walls and a much higher roof? While the former may have been much easier to build, the experiment (and experience) of actually building and living in the two structures indicates that the latter was a much more likely possibility. Crothers then goes on to explicate other activities in West Stow, including projects and camps with young adults who engaged actively with archaeological information and grappled with daily life problems with an Anglo-Saxon mind- and skill-set. Crothers concludes that "[e]xperimental archaeology provides a set of valuable tools which could be used more widely within the heritage industry

in order to convey what life could have been like in the past" (45) and that this methodology would go a long way toward public understanding of the "dry subject" of archaeology (46).

RSA

Works Not Seen

- Abramson, Tony. *Studies in Early Medieval Coinage: Vol. 1, Two Decades of Discovery*. Woodbridge and Rochester, NY: Boydell & Brewer, 2008. 204 pp. ill.
- Allen, T. G., Chris Hayden *et al.* *From Bronze Age Enclosure to Anglo-Saxon Settlement: Archaeological Excavations at Taplow Hillfort, Buckinghamshire, 1999-2005*. Oxford: Oxford Archaeology, 2008. xxiv, 222 pp. ill.
- Allen, T. G., Zena Kamash and Chris Hayden. *Saved from the Grave: Neolithic to Saxon Discoveries at Spring Road Municipal Cemetery, Abingdon, Oxfordshire, 1990-2000*. Thames Valley Landscapes Monograph 28. Oxford: Oxford Univ. School of Archaeology for Oxford Archaeology, 2008. xi, 106 pp. ill. + maps.
- Anon. "East Saxon King Buried at Prittlewell?" *Essex Journal* 39 (2004), 19-20.
- _____. "A Viking Ship at Meols?" *Current Archaeology* 213 (2007), 4-5.
- _____. "A Thrill on Silbury Hill." *British Heritage* 29.1 (2008), 6.
- _____. "Ancient 'Thyng' Found in Sherwood Forest." *Current Archaeology* 220 (2008), 8.
- _____. "Anglo-Saxon Royal Burial Site Found on Teeside." *Current Archaeology* 215 (2008), 4.
- _____. "Mapping Domesday." *Current Archaeology* 224 (2008), 41-43.
- _____. "Saxon Grave Markers Found in Precinct Wall." *Current Archaeology* 218 (2008), 5.
- _____. "The Viking Roots of North-West England." *Current Archaeology* 217 (2008), 7.
- _____. "Viking House found at Hungate." *Current Archaeology* 225 (2008), 4-5.
- _____. "Vikings in York and Liverpool." *Current Archaeology* 215 (2008), 7.
- _____. "Winchester Celebrates the Achievements of Alfred the Great." *Current Archaeology* 217 (2008), 8.
- Barnett, Catherine, Rob Scaife and Nicholas Cooke. "Iron Age to Saxon Landscape and Landuse Change in the Taw Valley: Evidence from an Inilled River Channel at Little Pill Farm, Sticklepath Hill, near Barnstaple." *Devon Archaeological Society Proc* 65 (2007), 15-34.
- Barrett, James. "Cod Bones and Commerce: The Medieval Fishing Revolution." *Current Archaeology* 221 (2008), 20-25.
- Barrett, James *et al.* "Detecting the Medieval Cod Trade: A New Method and First Results." *Jnl of Archaeological Science* 35 (2008), 850-61.
- Baxter, David. "Roman Tumuli or Medieval Industry? Moulton Hills, Bourn, Reconsidered." *Proc of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 95 (2006), 49-56.
- Bayley, Justine and Andy Russel. "Making Gold-Mercury Amalgam: the Evidence for Gilding From Southampton." *AntJ* 88 (2008), 37-42.
- Beech, George. "The Alternation between Present and Past Time in the Telling of the Bayeux Tapestry Story." *Annales de Normandie* 58.1-2 (2008), 7-24.
- Blackburn, Mark. "Currency under the Vikings, Part 4: The Dublin Coinage c.995-1050." *British Numismatic Journal* 78 (2008), 111-37 ill.
- Blair, Ian. "Prittlewell Prince." *Current Archaeology* 207 (2007), 7-11.
- Bond, Julie M. and Fay L. Worley. "Companions in Death: The Roles of Animals in Anglo-Saxon and Viking Cremation Rituals in Britain." *Social Archaeology of Funerary Remains*. Eds. Rebecca Gowland and Christopher Knüsel. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2006. pp. 89-98.
- Bowman, Paul. "Villages and their Territories: Part I." *Leicestershire Landscapes*. Leicestershire Museums, Archaeological Fieldwork Group Monograph 1. Leicester: Leicestershire Museums Archaeological Fieldwork Group, 2004. pp. 105-119 ill.
- _____. "Villages and their Territories: Part II—The Southeast Leicestershire Survey." *Leicestershire Landscapes*. Leicestershire Museums, Archaeological Fieldwork Group Monograph 1. Leicester: Leicestershire Museums Archaeological Fieldwork Group, 2004. pp. 120-36 ill.
- Brady, Kate. "Horcott Quarry." *Current Archaeology* 224 (2008), 34-40.
- Brookes, Stuart. *Economics and Social Change in Anglo-Saxon Kent, AD 400-900: Landscapes, Communities and Exchange*. BAR British Series 431. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2007. viii, 243 pp., ill.: Della Hooke, *Landscape History* 29 (2007), 118-19; Christopher Scull, *MA* 52 (2008), 388-89.
- Buckberry, Jo. "Off with their Heads: The Anglo-Saxon Execution Cemetery at Walkington Wold, East Yorkshire." In *Deviant Burial in the Archaeological Record*. Ed. Eileen M. Murphy. Studies in Funerary Archaeology. Oxford: Oxbow Books. pp. 148-68.
- Buckley, Richard. "Leicester." *Current Archaeology* 207 (2007), 21-31.
- Carew, Tim. "An Early Bronze Age Timber Structure, a Saxon Kiln and Saxon and Medieval Occupation at Coppice Street, Shaftesbury, Dorset." *Proc of the*

- Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society* 129 (2008), 59-96.
- Carver, Martin. "Archaeology, Monasticism and Romanitas in Northern Britain." *Antiquity* 82 (2008), 220-22.
- Chatwin, Diana and Mark Gardiner. "Rethinking the Early Medieval Settlement of Woodlands: Evidence from the Western Sussex Weald." *Landscape History* 27 (2005), 31-49.
- Cherryson, Annia Kristina. "Normal, Deviant and Atypical: Burial Variation in Late Saxon Wessex, c. AD 700-1100." *Deviant Burial in the Archaeological Record*. Ed. Murphy. pp. 115-30.
- Cooper, Amy. "The Harrogate Hoard." *Current Archaeology* 212 (2007), 26-30.
- Cowie, Robert and Lyn Blackmore. *Early and Middle Saxon Rural Settlement in the London Region*. Museum of London Archaeology Service Monograph 41. London: Museum of London, 2008. xvii, 239 pp. ill + maps.
- Crawford, Sally and Helena Hamerow. *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 15. Oxford: Oxford Univ. School of Archaeology, 2008.
- Dawson, Mike. "A Slice of Clay-land." *Current Archaeology* 210 (2007), 38-42.
- Edwards, Ben and James Graham-Campbell. "An Eighteenth-century Record of a Lancashire Viking Burial." *Trans of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society* 104 (2009 for 2008), 151-58.
- Ennis, Trevor. "In Search of St Botolph: Archaeological and Geophysical Investigation in Fields to the East of St Botolph's Church, Hadstock, 2005." *Essex Journal* 42 (2007), 6-10.
- Everson, Paul and David Stocker. "Two Newly Discovered Fragments of Pre-Viking Sculpture: Evidence for a Hitherto Unsuspected Early Church Site at South Leverton, Nottinghamshire." *Trans of the Thorton Society* 111 (2007), 33-49 ill.
- Evison, Vera I., Sonja Marzinzik et al. *Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Glass in the British Museum*. London: British Museum, 2008. v, 142 pp. ill.
- Gardiner, Mark and Stephen Rippon, eds. *Medieval Landscapes*. *Landscape History After Hoskins* 2. Macclesfield: Windgather P, 2007. xiv, 272 pp. ill. + maps.
- Gent, Tim. "Bronze Age Burnt Mounds and Early Medieval Wells at Town Farm Quarry, Burlescombe." *Devon Archaeological Society Proc* 65 (2007), 35-46.
- Gilbert, David with contributions by Paul Blinkhorn. "Excavations West of St Mary's Church, Black Bourton, Oxfordshire: Early, Middle, and Late Anglo-Saxon Activity." *Oxoniensa* 73 (2008), 147-60 ill.
- Grünzweig, Friedrich E. *Runeninschriften auf Waffen: Inschriften vom 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr. bis ins Hochmittelalter*. Wiener Studien zur Skandinavistik 11. Vienna: Edition Praesens, 2004. 203 pp.: Jana Krüger, *Skandinavistik* 36 (2006), 75-76.
- Guilbert, Graeme. "Excavations at Holm Pierrepont Quarry, Nottinghamshire, in 2002-03: Preliminary Summary of a Multi-Period Palimpsest on the Trent Gravels." *Trans of the Thorton Society* 110 (2006), 15-48.
- Hall, R. A., Toby Kendall and Colin Briden. "St Helen's Church, Skipwith, North Yorkshire." *ArchJ* 165 (2008), 399-470.
- Harding, Steve, Mark Jobling and David Griffiths. "Looking for Vikings in North-West England." *British Archaeology* 103 (2008), 18-21.
- Harrington, Sue. *Aspects of Gender Identity and Craft Production in the European Migration Period: iron Weaving Beaters and Associated Textile Making Tools from England, Norway and Alamannia*. BAR International Series 1797. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2008. vi, 138 pp.
- Hill, Paul and Julie Wileman. *Landscapes of War: The Archaeology of Aggression and Defense*. Stroud: Tempus, 2002. 224 pp. ill. [discusses Offa's dyke at some length].
- Hines, John. "Angeln and the Angles." *Von Thorsberg nach Schleswig: Sprache und Schriftlichkeit eines Grenzgebietes im Wandel eines Jahrtausends*. Eds. Lars E. Wogull, Düwel, Klaus, Edith Marold and Christiane Yimmermann. *Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde* 25. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2001. pp. 37-51.
- Hinton, David A. "Debate: The Dating of Ferruginously-Cemented Gravel as Building Material." *Landscape History* 24 (2002), 121-22.
- _____. "Debate: South Hampshire, 'East Wessex' and the *Atlas of Rural Settlement in England*." *Landscape History* 27 (2005), 71-75.
- Hinton, David Alban. *The Alfred Jewel: And Other Late Anglo-Saxon Decorated Metalwork*. Ashmolean Handbooks. Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 2008. 96 pp. ill.
- Howell, Isca, Lyn Blackmore et al. "Excavations Adjacent to the River Crane on the Site of the Former Railway Marshalling Yards, Feltham." *Trans of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society* 58 (2007), 5-14.
- Howkins, Chris. *Over Early Saxon Fields: 5th and 6th Century Surrey and Beyond*. Addlestone: C. Howkins, 2008. 128 pp. ill.
- Hull, Bradley Douglas. "Social Differentiation and Diet in Early Anglo-Saxon England: Stable Isotope

- Analysis of Archaeological Human and Animal Remains." Ph.D. Diss., Oxford Univ, 2008. <http://uk.bl.ethos.491260>.
- Jones, Elaine. *The Oakham Parish Field Walking Survey: Archaeology on the Ploughland of Rutland*. Uppingham: Elaine Jones, 2007. 96 pp. ill.
- Jones, Graham. *Saints in the Landscape*. Stroud: Tempus, 2007. 256 pp. ill. + maps.
- Jones, Iestyn. "Môn's 'Black Gentiles': Anglesey and the Vikings." *Trans of the Anglesey Antiquarian Society and Field Club* (2004), 47-64 ill.
- Karlinger Escobedo, Libby. "Re-Use and Re-Interpretation of Pagan Sites in Anglo-Saxon England." (*Im*)permanence: *Cultures in/out of Time*. Eds. Judith Schachter and Stephen Brockmann. University Park, PA: Penn State UP, 2008. pp. 224-33.
- Kelly, Helena. "From Bronze Age *briquetage* to Saxon Spearheads." *Current Archaeology* 222 (2008), 40-44.
- Kenyon, David and Martin Watts. "An Anglo-Saxon Enclosure at Copsehill Road, Lower Slaughter: Excavations in 1999." *Trans. of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 124 (2007), 73-109.
- Knox, Richard. "Early Anglo-Saxon Leicestershire." *Leicestershire Landscapes*. Leicestershire Museums, Archaeological Fieldwork Group Monograph 1. Leicester: Leicestershire Museums Archaeological Fieldwork Group, 2004. pp. 95-104 ill.
- Lambrick, George. *Neolithic To Saxon Social And Environmental Change At Mount Farm, Berinsfield, Dorchester-on-Thames, Oxfordshire*. London: Harvey Miller, 2008. 220 pp. ill.
- Landon, Nick, Paul Ash *et al*. "Pilsbury: A Forgotten Castle." *Derbyshire Archaeological Jnl* 126 (2006), 82-102.
- Laycock, Stuart. "Britannia: A Failed State?" *Current Archaeology* 219 (2008), 18-25.
- Leahy, Kevin. "A Warning to the Curious: Digging an Anglo-Saxon Cemetery." *Current Archaeology* 210 (2007), 26-31.
- Malim, Tim. "A Romano-British Temple Complex and Anglo-Saxon Burials at Gallows Hill, Swaffham Prior." *Proc of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 95 (2006), 91-114.
- Margham, John. "Charters, Landscapes and Hides on the Isle of Wight." *Landscape History* 25 (2003), 17-43.
- Mason, Austin, Alecia Arceo and Robin Fleming. "Buckets, Monasteries, and Crannógs: Material Culture and the Rewriting of Early Medieval British History." *Haskins Society Journal* 20 (2008), 1-38.
- Mason, David. *Chester, AD 400-1066: From Roman Fortress to English Town*. Stroud: Tempus, 2007. 160 pp. ill. + plates and maps. anon., *Current Archaeology* 224 (2008), 224.
- Mays, Simon. "The Osteology of Monasticism in Medieval England." *Social Archaeology of Funerary Remains*. Eds. Rebecca Gowland and Christopher Knüsel. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2006. pp. 179-89.
- Minter, Peter, John F. Potter and Pat Ryan. "Roman and Early Medieval Bricks and Tiles: Can they be Distinguished?" *Essex Archaeology and History* 37 (2006), 95-102.
- Murphy, Eileen M., ed. *Deviant Burial in the Archaeological Record*. Studies in Funerary Archaeology. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2008.
- Naismith, Rory G. R. "Tribrach pennies of Eadberht 'Præn' of Kent and Eadwald of East Anglia." *British Numismatic Journal* 78 (2008), 216-22.
- Oosthuizen, Susan. "Medieval Greens and Moats in the Central Province: Evidence from the Bourn Valley, Cambridgeshire." *Landscape History* 24 (2002), 73-87.
- Pearce, Susan. *South-Western Britain in the Early Middle Ages*. London: Continuum, 2004. xv, 365 pp. ill.: Ken Dark, *Landscape History* 27 (2005), 113-14.
- Pearson, Andrew and John F. Potter. "Church Building Fabrics on Romney Marsh and the Marshland Fringe: A Geological Perspective." *Landscape History* 24 (2002), 89-110.
- Pitts, Mike. "Anglo-Saxon London may Date back to AD 500." *British Archaeology* 101 (2008), [online].
- _____. "Kent Anglo-Saxon Cemetery Could Be Royal." *British Archaeology* 100 (2008), [online].
- Pollard, Joshua and Andrew Reynolds. *Avebury: The Biography of a Landscape*. Stroud: Tempus, 2002. 288 pp. ill.
- Potter, John F. "Continuing the Debate on Ferruginously-Cemented Gravel Churches." *Landscape History* 25 (2003), 79-82.
- Poulton, Rob. "Excavations of a Saxon and Early Medieval Occupation site at Saxon County School, Sheperton in 1986." *Trans of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society* 56 (2005), 45-76.
- Reavill, J. B. "Lincolnshire in the Dark Ages." *Lincolnshire Past and Present* 53 (2003), 3-4.
- Redknap, Mark. "Llanbedrgoch: An Early Medieval Settlement and its Significance." *Trans of the Anglesey Antiquarian Society and Field Club* (2007), 53-72.
- Reynolds, Andrew and Alex Langlands. "Social Identities on the Macro Scale: A Maximum View of Wansdyke." *People and Space in the Middle Ages, 300-1300*. Ed. Wendy Davies, Guy Halsall, Andrew Reynolds and Alex Langlands. Turnhout: Brepols, 2006. pp. 13-44.
- Rippon, Stephen. "Emerging Regional Variation in Historic Landscape Character: The Possible Significance

- of the 'Long Eighth Century.'" *Medieval Landscapes*. Ed. Gardiner and Rippon. pp. 105-21.
- Roberts, Brian K. *Landscapes, Documents and Maps: Villages in Northern England and Beyond AD 900-1250*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2008. xvi, 336 pp. ill.
- Shapland, Michael. "St Mary's Church, Broughton, Lincolnshire: A Thegnly Tower-Nave in the Late Anglo-Saxon Landscape." *ArchJ* 165 (2008), 471-519.
- Spear, David. "Recent Publications on the Bayeux Tapestry." *Annales de Normandie* 57.1-2 (2007), 172-78.
- Sronach, Simon and M. Hastie; with contributions by J. Franklin, D. Henderson, P. Wagner, and J. Carrott. "The Anglian Monastery and Medieval Priory of Coldingham: *Urbs Coludi* Revisited." *Proc of the Scottish Antiquaries Society* 135 (2005), 395-422 ill.
- Steane, Kate. *The Archaeology of the Upper City and Adjacent Suburbs*. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 3. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2006. viii, 361 pp. ill.
- Suzuki, Seiichi. *Anglo-Saxon Button Brooches*. Anglo-Saxon Studies 10. Woodbridge: Boydell P, 2008. xxxi, 418 pp. ill.
- Swain, Hedley. "London's Last Roman?" *Current Archaeology* 213, 35-39.
- Taylor, C. C. "Nucleated Settlement: A View from the Frontier." *Landscape History* 24 (2002), 53-71.
- Taylor, Christopher. "England's Landscape: A Review Article." *Landscape History* 29 (2007), 93-99. [review of the 8-volume *England's Landscape*]
- Taylor, Gary. "Hall Farm, Baston, Lincolnshire: Investigation of a Late Saxon Village and Medieval Manorial Complex." *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 38 (2003), 5-33.
- Telfer, Alison and Lyn Blackmore. "A Farewell to Arms: A Saxon Shield Burial and Later Occupation at Covent Garden." *Trans of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society* 59 (2008), 153-69.
- Thomas, Gabor. "The Symbolic Lives of Late Anglo-Saxon Settlements: A Cellared Structure and Iron Hoard from Bishopstone, East Sussex." *ArchJ* 165 (2008), 334-98.
- Tipper, Jess. "Secular and Ecclesiastic Dynamics at Anglo-Saxon Flixborough." *Antiquity* 82 (2008), 1124-27.
- Tyler, Susan and Hilary Major. *The Early Anglo-Saxon Cemetery and Later Saxon Settlement at Springfield Lyons, Essex*. East Anglian Archaeology 111. Chelmsford: Essex County Council Heritage Conservation Planning Division, 2005. xii, 212 pp. ill. + maps.
- Upex, Stephen. *The Romans in the East of England: Settlement and Landscape in the Lower Nene Valley*. Stroud: Tempus, 2008. 288 pp. ill. + maps, plates. [see esp. ch. 9, "The End of the Roman Occupation," pp. 240-57]
- Whyte, Nicola. "The After-Life of Barrows: Prehistoric Monuments in the Norfolk Landscape." *Landscape History* 25 (2003), 5-16.
- Williams, Gareth. "Burgred 'Lunette' Type E Reconsidered." *British Numismatic Journal* 78 (2008), 222-27.
- _____. *Early Anglo-Saxon Coins*. Shire Archaeology. Botley: Shire Publications, 2008. 64 pp. ill.
- _____. "The Coins from the Vale of York Viking Hoard: A Preliminary Report." *British Numismatic Journal* 78 (2008), 228-34.
- Williams, John Garnons. "Mapping *Domesday*." *Current Archaeology* 224 (2008), 41-43.
- Woolrich, Gill. "Some Archaeological Glimpses of the City's History." *Trans of the Hunter Archaeological Society* 22 (2003), 1-14.
- Yeates, Stephen James. *Religion, Community and Territory: Defining Religion in the Severn Valley and Adjacent Hills from the Iron Age to the Early Medieval Period*. BAR British Series 411 (i-iii), 2006. 1425 pp.

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 www.oenewsletter.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
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:

Robert Hasenfratz
Department of English
University of Connecticut
215 Glenbrook Rd.
Storrs, CT 06269
email: hasenfratz@uconn.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